Board of Regents

March 2016

March 31, 2016
8:45 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.

Boardroom, McNamara Alumni Center
1. Recognition of McKnight Land-Grant Professors  
   Docket Item Summary - Page 4

2. Approval of Minutes - Action  
   Minutes - Page 5

3. Report of the President  
   Docket Item Summary - Page 56

4. Report of the Chair  
   Docket Item Summary - Page 57

5. Receive & File Reports  
   Docket Item Summary - Page 58  
   Quarterly Report of Grant and Contract Activity - Page 59  
   ASA Committee Information Item: Update on Accreditation - Page 65

6. Consent Report - Review/Action  
   Docket Item Summary - Page 66  
   Gift Report - Page 68  
   Finance Committee Consent Report - Page 76

7. Report of the Student Representatives to the Board of Regents  
   Docket Item Summary - Page 79  
   Report - Page 80  
   Presentation - Page 113

8. Resolution on Enrollment Principles and Tuition / Aid Philosophy - Action  
   Docket Item Summary - Page 120  
   Resolution - Page 122  
   Enrollment Plan - Page 123

9. FY2017 Budget Framework  
   Docket Item Summary - Page 129  
   Presentation - Page 131

10. Resolution on Restructuring System-Wide Operations Leadership - Action  
    Docket Item Summary - Page 155  
    Resolution - Page 157  
    Organizational Chart - Page 159

11. System-wide Strategic Planning: UMM

Docket Item Summary - Page 251
Presentation - Page 252

13. Report of the Committees

Docket Item Summary - Page 270
AGENDA ITEM: Recognition of McKnight Land-Grant Professors

☐ Review ☐ Review + Action ☐ Action ☒ Discussion

This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: Regent Dean Johnson
President Eric W. Kaler
Karen Hanson, Senior Vice President and Provost

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

To recognize the 2016 McKnight Land-Grant Professors:

- Xiang Cheng, Chemical Engineering and Materials Science, UMTC
- Meggan Craft, Veterinary Population Medicine, UMTC
- Jed T. Elison, Institute of Child Development, UMTC
- Emma Goldberg, Ecology, Evolution, and Behavior, UMTC
- Jiarong Hong, Mechanical Engineering, UMTC
- Neha Jain, Law School, UMTC
- Barry Kudrowitz, Design, Housing, and Apparel, UMTC
- William Pomerantz, Chemistry, UMTC

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The McKnight-Land Grant Professors are junior scholars chosen for their potential for important contribution to their field; the degree to which their past achievements and current ideas demonstrate originality, imagination, and innovation; the significance of their research; and the potential for attracting outstanding students. Recipients are honored with the title McKnight Land-Grant Professor, a special award that they will hold for two years. The award consists of a research grant in each of two years, summer support, and a research leave in the second year.
A retreat of the Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota was held on Wednesday, February 10, 2016 at 8:00 a.m. at the Minnesota Humanities Center, 987 Ivy Avenue East, St. Paul.

Regents present: Dean Johnson, presiding; Thomas Anderson, Richard Beeson, Laura Brod, Linda Cohen, Thomas Devine, Michael Hsu, Peggy Lucas, David McMillian, Abdul Omari, Darrin Rosha, and Patricia Simmons.

Staff present: President Eric Kaler; Vice President Kathy Brown; General Counsel William Donohue; Executive Director Brian Steeves.

Others present: Sarah Dirksen

At 8:12 a.m. a motion was made and seconded and the Board voted unanimously to adopt the following resolution:

WHEREAS, based on advice of the General Counsel, the Board of Regents has balanced the purposes served by the Open Meeting Law and determined that there is a need for absolute confidentiality to discuss particular matters involving the University of Minnesota;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that in accordance with Minn. Stat. § 13D.03, a non-public meeting of the Board of Regents be held Wednesday, February 10, 2016 at 8:00 a.m. at the Minnesota Humanities Center, 987 Ivy Avenue East, St. Paul for the purpose of discussing matters related to labor negotiations strategy.

The meeting was reopened at 9:15 a.m. at which time President Kaler, Vice President Kathy Brown, and General Counsel William Donohue left the meeting.

At 9:18 a.m. a motion was made and seconded and the Board voted unanimously to adopt the following resolution:

WHEREAS, based on advice of the General Counsel, the Board of Regents has balanced the purposes served by the Open Meeting Law and determined that there is a need for absolute confidentiality to discuss particular matters involving the University of Minnesota;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that in accordance with Minn. Stat. § 13D.05 Subd. 3(a), a non-public meeting of the Board of Regents be held Wednesday, February 10, 2016 at the Minnesota Humanities Center, 987 Ivy Avenue East, St. Paul for the purpose of evaluating the performance of the Board’s direct reports.

The meeting was reopened at 12:45 p.m., at which time the Board recessed for lunch. The Board reconvened at 1:40 p.m. for a public meeting. President Kaler joined the Board to discuss the following topics:
1. M Health;
2. Administrative restructuring;
3. Senior leader searches;
4. Glensheen, the Historic Congdon Estate; and
5. The 2016 legislative session.

The meeting adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

BRIAN R. STEEVES
Executive Director
and Corporate Secretary
A meeting of the Finance Committee of the Board of Regents was held on Thursday, February 11, 2016 at 7:45 a.m. in the West Committee Room, 600 McNamara Alumni Center.

Regents present: Abdul Omari, presiding; Laura Brod, Thomas Devine, Michael Hsu, and David McMillan.

Staff present: President Eric Kaler; Chancellors Jacqueline Johnson and Fred Wood; Vice Presidents Kathryn Brown, Richard Pfutzenreuter, and Pamela Wheelock; Interim Vice President Bernard Gulachek; General Counsel William Donohue; Executive Director Brian Steeves; and Associate Vice Presidents Gail Klatt, Stuart Mason, Julie Tonneson, and Michael Volna.

Student Representatives present: Max Hall and Nikki Ripp.

TWIN CITIES ATHLETICS FINANCES

Regent Omari invited Vice President Pfutzenreuter, Interim Director of Athletics Beth Goetz, and Tom McGinnis, Senior Associate Director of Athletics and Chief Financial Officer, to present a financial overview of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics on the Twin Cities campus (Athletics), as detailed in the docket.

Goetz outlined the goals of Athletics and her focus on ensuring that the department is a good steward of its resources. The current budget for Athletics totals $107.3 million, or 2.9 percent of the University’s total budget. Goetz summarized key facts related to the department and provided context for how Athletics compares within the Big Ten Conference.

McGinnis summarized the FY 2016 budget. He outlined the major expenses and revenues that compose the budget. He noted that FY 2016 is unusual given revenue from the Minnesota Vikings games at TCF Bank Stadium, along with other non-athletic events held on campus. He added that some expense areas have increased due to new guidelines on cost of attendance and meals provided to student athletes.

Pfutzenreuter reviewed the history of the University’s central allocation to Athletics. He reminded the committee that in the past the Minnesota Legislature appropriated a special allocation for Title IX funding of women’s athletics. In 1998, that $3 million state special for Title IX was rolled into the University’s total O&M allocation. Those funds are still being transferred to Athletics for that purpose. Pfutzenreuter summarized how changes to the system-wide budget model in 2007 affected the amount transferred to and from Athletics from the central allocation, and noted the current transfer amounts.

Pfutzenreuter reported the debt payment schedule for all Athletics facilities. He explained that funds given to the University by the state under statutory appropriations do not flow through Athletics, but go directly to the Office of Debt Management. Pfutzenreuter explained that this helps simplify the transaction to pay bondholders, but is not shown as revenue to Athletics.
McGinnis described the expenses paid by Athletics to the University, which total $18.997 million. He also detailed the revenues provided to Athletics by the University and expenses paid by the University on behalf of Athletics. Pfutzenreuter highlighted how the University pays the out-of-state tuition waiver given to scholarship athletes directly.

Regent Hsu asked about the total amount spent on Athletics. Pfutzenreuter explained that the totals included in the presentation are the current, non-sponsored funds spent on operating expenses. He noted that they do not include any funding for booster clubs, which exists in separate accounts. He indicated that the numbers also do not include any capital expenditures. As a follow-up, Hsu wondered if $120 million was a fair amount for the total. McGinnis responded that Athletics reported a total of $111 million to Deloitte for purposes of their audit. Pfutzenreuter offered that the full total would be roughly $123 million given all funds.

Regent Devine noted that there are 324 full scholarships within Athletics and wondered how that compared to others in the Big Ten. Goetz explained that the NCAA sets a limit on the total number of scholarships available for each sport. She added that the University, and most other Big Ten schools, offers the maximum number of scholarships available for each sport. Devine asked if the funding per scholarship was the same for each institution. Goetz responded that while the total number of scholarships is the same, the amount per scholarship differs across institutions.

In response to a question from Devine, McGinnis noted that revenue from tickets is increasing. He indicated that Athletics is making progress in that area, but that TCF Bank Stadium is smaller compared to other Big Ten stadiums and generates less total revenue. Devine commented that special events at TCF Bank Stadium are of interest to the fan base and that he appreciated the additional revenue they generate.

In response to an additional question from Devine, Goetz stated that she welcomed the opportunity granted by the external review to examine and be more intentional with the resources provided to Athletics. She noted that the continued oversight by the Board was welcome.

In response to a question from Hsu, McGinnis explained that the scholarship seating fee goes directly to the University of Minnesota Foundation. Each year, Athletics taps those funds to help fund student athlete scholarships.

FACULTY RETIREMENT PLAN: GOVERNANCE REVIEW

Regent Omari invited Vice President Brown and Associate Vice President Mason to outline the recently completed governance review of the Faculty Retirement Plan (retirement plan), as detailed in the docket.

Brown explained that the Office of Human Resources (OHR) and the Office of Investments & Banking (OIB) engaged the local consulting firm of Jeffery Slocum & Associates to review the current retirement plan governance structure. The objective of the review was to determine whether modifications should be made to better align the plan’s governance framework with fiduciary best practices. Brown stated that the findings recommend changes to the governance structure only, with no plan changes recommended.

Mason outlined the key governance structure recommendations. Currently, the chief financial officer serves as the sole trustee of the retirement plan. To align with best practices, the consultant recommends establishing a five-person, cross-functional committee to professionalize the plan’s oversight. Mason defined the structure and membership of the proposed new Retirement Plan Committee (RPC). The RPC would continue to interact and consult with the Faculty Senate Retirement Subcommittee, and would include the chair of the
Faculty Senate Retirement Subcommittee as a member. Mason outlined the proposed matrix of roles and responsibilities given the change in governance structure.

In response to a question from Regent Hsu, Pfutzenreuter explained that he is the current trustee of the retirement plan. In his 24-year tenure, he noted he could not recall that this topic has ever come to the Board for discussion. He expressed his strong opinion that the governance of the retirement plan should be professionalized and that the formation of the RPC is the right first step to do so. Mason agreed, explaining that the RPC could review and recommend changes if the current plan offers too broad a range of investment options that could be detrimental to employees. Brown emphasized that the current plan is transparent and is providing good retirement options, but that optional retirement plans are under utilized. She offered that continued education and support for employees is essential.

Regent McMillan wondered how the RPC could build off of the experience of the Investment Advisory Committee and the Debt Management Advisory Committee. Brown responded that the presidential appointment could be used to appoint an industry expert to the RPC. She noted that faculty engagement is a key component of the committee structure and that she anticipates following the example of the Benefits Advisory Committee to ensure that engagement. Brown noted that the University also has expert consultants in the field on retainer and the RPC could turn to them for advice.

Regent Devine asked if further approval to appoint the RPC is needed. Brown responded that the new committee follows the president’s delegated authority and in her opinion, no further approval is needed by the Board. Devine additionally commented that offering education to employees is critical. Brown agreed and explained that the University is partnering with suppliers to provide additional employee education over the coming year.

Omari commented that shared governance is essential and that he appreciates that the proposed structure includes interaction with the faculty.

**FULLY ALLOCATED COST OF MISSION ACTIVITIES: UNIT ANALYSIS**

Regent Omari invited Associate Vice President Tonneson and Lincoln Kallsen, Director of Institutional Analysis, to give an update on the fully allocated cost of mission activities, unit analysis (study), as detailed in the docket.

Tonneson reminded the committee of the study’s purpose, its principles and audience, how the study has been organized, and the conceptual framework. Kallsen reviewed results by unit, describing what might cause instructional costs to vary among colleges and campuses.

The committee members discussed whether the study could be used to compare cost to student debt load, how the study accounts for student aid, if units acted on data from 2010, how the data are affected by enrollment levels, the impact of state appropriations, and whether surcharges should be more widely used across units.

**LONG-RANGE FINANCIAL PLANNING FOR THE LAW SCHOOL**

Regent Omari invited President Kaler and Law School Dean David Wippman to present the long-range financial plan for the Law School, as detailed in the docket.

Kaler noted that the steep national decline in law school enrollment has hit the University’s Law School hard. Applications to the Law School have declined by 50 percent over the past six years, which has resulted in a 32 percent decline in enrollment. Kaler indicated that the University has chosen to maintain the quality and reputation of the Law School, while seeking to address the budget shortfall created by declining enrollment.
Wippman explained the historic national trend in law school growth and the total number of licensed lawyers since the 1960s. He outlined the decline in national law school applications since 2004 and the resulting enrollment changes from 2010 to 2015. He reported the number of degrees awarded over that time period and the annual mean earnings of those with a law degree. Wippman commented that the Great Lakes region as a whole was hit hardest, but suggested that the market has bottomed out and that he anticipates applications and enrollment to increase.

Wippman reviewed the FY 2016 Law School budget. He outlined the responses that the Law School is using to solve its structural deficit. He indicated that the Law School is currently seeking to right-size itself by decreasing the size of the incoming class and reducing the number of professors and staff. Wippman outlined the reallocations and cost avoidance measures that have been used, highlighting the focus on fundraising, increasing international student enrollments in the Master of Laws program, and the fixed cost of tenured faculty. He noted that by following the plan and reaching the planning assumptions, the Law School would reduce and cease non-recurring transfers from the University by FY 2020.

Wippman stressed that it is essential to maintain the ranking of the Law School by only admitting highly qualified students. He argued that lowering standards to admit more students would yield short-term gains, but create a downward spiral over the long term. Wippman emphasized that the Law School has a long history of serving the state, with numerous examples of graduates serving as judges and elected leaders. He expressed his appreciation for the additional University support and stated that given the smaller O&M allocation and the importance of the Law School, he felt the non-recurring transfers were appropriate and needed.

Regent McMillan expressed his support for the long-range financial plan, and wondered how these trends have influenced recruitment of faculty. Wippman responded that faculty recruitment has been a struggle, but that is also true of peer institutions. The Law School is not hiring any new faculty members at this time, but is focusing on retention. Wippman stated that the goal is to shrink the size of the faculty and maintain the quality of the faculty members. He reported that the faculty overall are very engaged and happy.

Student Representative Hall expressed his support for the long-range plan and the focus on maintaining the Law School’s ranking. He wondered whether it was possible to leverage the downturn to increase the ranking. Wippman offered that the he has thought about how to do that, but does not have the funding it would require. If a donation or additional funds were found, the Law School could increase the admissions standards, reduce the incoming class size, and increase the ranking. Wippman added that rankings do impact the hiring of graduates.

In response to a question from Regent Hsu, Wippman explained that if the non-recurring funds from the University were treated as a loan, it would be very difficult for the Law School to pay off and maintain the current ranking. He suggested that units within the University sometimes find themselves under stress and the University should provide them with support. He stated that the Law School has a plan to return it to a balanced budget within a short amount of time.

**CONSENT REPORT**

Vice President Pfutzenreuter presented the Consent Report, as detailed in the docket:

**General Contingency:**

- There are no items requiring approval this period.
Purchase of Goods and Services $1,000,000 and Over:

- To Identity Works LLC for an estimated $2,163,150 for implementation of Oracle Identity Manager (OIM) for the Office of Information Technology (OIT) for the period February 15, 2016, through June 30, 2017. OIT will make this purchase with O&M funds. Vendor was selected through a competitive process.

- To LKO Enterprises, Inc. and Ulland Brothers Inc. for an estimated $5,000,000 of contract machine work labor, materials, and equipment services as needed for the Department of Facilities Management on the Duluth campus for the period of March 1, 2016, through February 28, 2017, and with contract extensions through February 28, 2021. This purchase of contract labor and equipment services by Facilities Management has been budgeted for FY 2017. It will be funded through individual R&R projects and O&M funds. Vendors were selected through a competitive process.

- To Siemens Medical Solutions USA, Inc. for $3,024,525 for purchase of a 3T Magnetom Prism MRI Scanner and for a five-year service contract on the scanner for the Center for Magnetic Resonance Research, Department of Radiology. A University Plant Fund will be set up to fund the 3T Scanner purchase, and the service contract will be paid annually for five years (renewable after initial period expires). The revenue generated by usage charges of the scanner will pay back the University Plant Fund; and pay for the service contract and other miscellaneous operating costs. This is included in the financial forecasts for this facility.

Approval of Purchasing Bid Thresholds:

- Board of Regents Policy: Purchasing requires that purchasing bid thresholds be established by the administration and reviewed and approved by the Board biennially. The policy is included in the docket for reference. The current bid threshold for the purchase of goods and standard services is set at $50,000; professional services is set at $50,000; construction services, excluding architects and engineers, is set at $250,000; and construction purchases for architects and engineers is set at $100,000. The administration recommends no changes in the current bid thresholds.

Approval for Underwriting/Investment Banking Services:

- To Barclays, RBC Capital Markets, LLC, Bank of America Merrill Lynch, Wells Fargo Securities, and Goldman Sachs to be considered prequalified for a “Senior Manager Pool” to serve as a book-running senior manager for the University’s future financing transactions to occur during FY 2016 through FY 2020. The vendors were chosen through a competitive bidding process.

- To Barclays as senior manager, and Piper Jaffray as co-manager, for underwriting and investment banking services for the issuance and sale of bonds during FY 2016 providing proceeds of approximately $148,000,000 to fund a number of capital projects. The vendors were chosen through a competitive bidding process.

Approval of Off-Cycle Tuition Rates:

- The President recommends approval of tuition rates for the following programs for Summer 2016, Fall 2016, and Spring 2017, as detailed in the docket:
  - Carlson School of Management - Master of Science in Business Analytics, Master of Science in Business Analytics Part-Time Program, Industry Master of Business Administration, and Master of Finance.
College of Science and Engineering - Master of Security Technology and Medical Device Innovation Masters.

A motion was made and seconded, and the committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the Consent Report.

INFORMATION ITEMS

Vice President Pfutzenreuter referred the committee to the Information Items contained in the docket:

- Central Reserves Update
- Central Reserves Legal Settlements Update
- Quarterly Purchasing Report
- Debt Management Advisory Committee Update
- Annual Capital Financing and Debt Management Report
- Annual Investment Performance: Peer Comparisons
- M Health Status Report
- Exception to Bid: Electric Steel Elevator Demolition Contract

The meeting adjourned at 10:04 a.m.

BRIAN R. STEEVES
Executive Director and Corporate Secretary
A meeting of the Academic & Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Regents was held on Thursday, February 11, 2016 at 8:00 a.m. in the East Committee Room, 600 McNamara Alumni Center.

Regents present: Linda Cohen, presiding; Thomas Anderson, Dean Johnson, Peggy Lucas, Patricia Simmons, and Darrin Rosha.

Staff present: Chancellors Jacqueline Johnson and Stephen Lehmkuhle; Senior Vice President and Provost Karen Hanson; Vice Presidents Katrice Albert, Kathryn Brown, and Brooks Jackson; and Executive Director Brian Steeves.

Student Representatives present: Callie Livengood and Cory Schroeder.

PROGRESS CARD METRICS FOR MINNESOTA STUDENTS

Provost Hanson introduced the discussion on options for a University progress card measure that reflects the University's success in serving Minnesota students, as detailed in the docket. Hanson invited Lincoln Kallsen, Director of Institutional Analysis, to provide an overview of three options under consideration.

Kallsen briefly described each of the three options and their strengths and limitations:

1. Option 1: The percent of Minnesota high school graduates enrolling at the University as freshman. Kallsen noted that it is sensitive to increases and decreases in the number of high school graduates over time, while ensuring accountability to serving Minnesotans through undergraduate education.

2. Option 2: The percent of Minnesota high school graduates who elect to attend college in Minnesota and enroll at the University as freshmen. Kallsen offered that this measure acknowledges that some high school graduates always will want to leave the state for post-secondary education, and more directly measures accessibility for those who wish to stay in Minnesota.

3. Option 3: The percent of currently enrolled University undergraduate students who are Minnesota high school graduates. Kallsen noted that this metric would include transfer students and monitors retention of Minnesota students, but is not responsive to changes in strategy or performance.

In response to a question from Regent Simmons, Kallsen noted that option 2 allows for better tracking of student data. Regent Simmons added that data collected from option 3 may be meaningful for positioning, but she wondered how useful it would be for managing enrollment.

Regent Rosha suggested a fourth option: The percent of freshman enrolling at the University who are Minnesota students. He stated that options 1, 3 and this fourth option best inform how the University is serving in-state students. In response, Kallsen offered additional information that captures data on new Minnesota students entering four-year colleges and universities statewide.
A discussion ensued about the benefits of each of the four options. Several Regents suggested limiting the number of new measures to those most useful and valuable for planning. Regent Johnson asked which option worked best for the administration; Kallsen responded option 2.

Regent Rosha offered that the University has very little direct influence on options 1 or 2, and made a motion to recommend options 3 and 4, noting their ability to provide a clear picture of how incoming freshman and transfer students are being served. Regent Simmons offered a friendly amendment to include option 2; the committee further discussed this suggestion.

A motion was made and seconded, and the committee unanimously recommended approval of the following progress card metrics:

- Option 2: The percent of Minnesota high school graduate who elect to attend college in Minnesota and enroll at the University as freshmen.
- Option 3: The percent of University undergraduate students who are Minnesota high school graduates.
- Option 4: The percent of freshmen enrolling who are Minnesota students.

**MEDICAL SCHOOL UPDATE**

Provost Hanson invited Brooks Jackson, Dean of the Medical School and Vice President for Health Sciences, to provide an update on the Medical School’s strategic plan goals, as detailed in the docket.

Jackson reported that significant progress has been made within each of six key areas of focus: scholarship, research, education, clinical care, financial sustainability, and diversity.

1. **Scholarship**: Jackson noted that the school has renewed its emphasis on a culture change intended to attract top students, retain and attract top faculty, achieve national awards, and secure funding. He highlighted three progress points associated with raising the bar on scholarship: use of clear metrics to measure departmental publications, 16 of 25 departments receiving new investments, and the addition of 12 faculty to the Wall of Scholarship.

2. **Research**: Jackson offered examples of research excellence that include publication in the journal *Science*, project renewals within medicine and pediatrics, $6 million in research funding linked to the University’s Regenerative Medicine Minnesota partnership with the Mayo Clinic, submission of a CTSI renewal application, and leadership in the development of an Academic Health Center “aging” grand challenge.

3. **Education**: Jackson underscored increased funding and mentoring for student research, expanded international experiences for students, additional longitudinal clerkships at the Veterans Administration, and a partnership with a clinic in Uganda. He recognized the positive impact of a recent tuition freeze, reduced fees and health insurance costs, and increased scholarship funds, while acknowledging an increase in student debt.

4. **Clinical Care**: Jackson discussed the opening of the new Clinics and Surgery Center and continued work toward full integration with Fairview. He also highlighted reduced mortality rates that exceeded 2015 goals, high patient satisfaction scores, Women’s Choice Awards for Excellence in multiple categories, and 2016 “Best Hospitals” recognition from the American Heart Association and *U.S. News & World Report*. 
5. Financial Sustainability: Jackson discussed revenues exceeding expenditures by over $20 million per year for five years, investments in Medical School faculty mentoring, reduced student costs, successful philanthropy, and the Governor’s bonding proposal support for the Health Sciences Education Facility.

6. Diversity: Jackson pointed to rapidly changing demographics in Minnesota and the University’s efforts to represent these changes among students and faculty. Progress made to enhance student diversity includes a 23 percent increase in 2014 and a 52 percent increase in 2015 of applications from students defined as “Underrepresented in Medicine” (UIM). The school also saw a 77 percent increase in enrolled UIM students in 2014. Jackson described faculty training on implicit bias, a Dean’s Committee on Women in Leadership, and a program in Health Disparities Research: Health Equity Leadership & Mentoring.

Regent Cohen thanked Jackson for a positive and optimistic report, remarking on the excellence of efforts to support healthy aging.

In response to a question from Regent Johnson, Jackson explained that the school’s successful grant acquisition is the result of grant writing workshops, well-written proposals addressing significant issues, and the strong track records of well-published investigators.

Regent Lucas asked about the emphasis on recruiting women faculty and researchers, given her assumption that an ample number of women were entering the field of medicine. Jackson explained that despite women comprising 59 percent of entering program participants, only 21 percent of full professors are women. He added that the school has created mentoring programs and leadership training to help address the many reasons for this gap.

Regent Simmons requested additional information about student debt, its composition, loan interest rates, and how these factors impact student selection of specialty areas. Jackson shared that 90 percent of students carry significant debt due to undergraduate debt carry-over, room and board costs, and a federal loan program shift prompting debt accumulation on the front end rather than at the close of deferment. He described research on specialty selection and the link to debt load. Regent Simmons thanked Jackson for his research on this issue.

K-12 ACHIEVEMENT GAP

Provost Hanson introduced Professor Michael Rodriguez and Director Julie Sweitzer, both from the College of Education and Human Development and co-directors of the Educational Equity Resource Center, and invited President Kaler to frame the discussion of the state’s K-12 achievement gap, as detailed in the docket.

President Kaler remarked that when he arrived at Minnesota, he was stunned by the size of the achievement gap between white students and students of color, as well as between wealthy and low-income students. He acknowledged the significance of this problem and its impact on the future of the University and the prosperity of Minnesota. Kaler expressed his gratitude to the two speakers and highlighted evidence of progress, such as the inclusion of “Fostering Just and Equitable Communities” as a Grand Challenge research and outreach priority area.

Rodriguez thanked Kaler and Hanson for their leadership and support for this work. He described replacing the term “achievement gap” with “educational equity” as a way to recognize a systems perspective for addressing the very different needs of youth within a one-size-fits-all educational delivery system. Rodriguez noted the extensive work being done on the Twin Cities campus, and introduced a new website that posts the work of 130 faculty and staff addressing a broad range of issues impacting educational equity. He described efforts to translate research to practice, and the recent launch of the Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement.
Sweitzer shared examples of partnerships and collaborations focused on educational equity, such as Generation Next, University of Minnesota Urban Research and Outreach – Engagement Center, the Minnesota P20 Education Partnership, Ramp-Up to Readiness, and the Northside Achievement Zone. She noted strong work system-wide at each campus, and highlighted efforts to break down silos within internal networks including a series of college readiness and achievement talks.

Sweitzer also described a first-time Educational Equity in Action Conference in June that will convene Minnesota’s education leaders, researchers, policy makers, and non-profit organizations committed to taking action to improve educational equity. She acknowledged the Grand Challenges efforts to address equity, and exploration of peer research institutions for approaches to K-12 initiatives.

In response to a question from Regent Simmons, Sweitzer articulated interventions that make a difference for first-generation college students, including summer bridge programs, effective counseling and support, academic advising, and pre-college steps to prepare students for the college experience.

Student Representative Schroeder shared that the Spring 2016 report of the student representatives will address challenges he faced as a first-generation student, and asked whether efforts are being made to reach out to suburban schools. Sweitzer affirmed outreach in Brooklyn Center, Richfield, and Bloomington, and in Greater Minnesota cities like Crookston.

In response to a question from Regent Lucas, Rodriguez described initiatives, such as a free weekly SAT/ACT preparatory program, that assist students who struggle with standardized tests. He underscored the need for alternatives to current standardized testing to better determine student capacity for academic success. Rodriguez also noted that a spectrum of scores exists for all racial groups. Regent Cohen noted efforts by admissions staff to address the overuse of test scores, while acknowledging the need for some tool to sort through 48,000 applications each year.

Regent Rosha expressed interest in further analysis of data to determine students’ family structure, city of origin, specification of rural or urban settings and other factors that could illuminate potential gaps in college preparation.

Regent Cohen pointed to the University’s Ramp-Up to Readiness program as an excellent model for preparing high school students for postsecondary success.

**ACADEMIC ADVISING TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS**

Provost Hanson invited Nikki Letawsky Shultz, Assistant Dean in the College of Biological Sciences, and LeeAnn Melin, Assistant Dean of the Office of Undergraduate Education, to share the final report and recommendations of the Task Force on Undergraduate Academic Advising for the Twin Cities Campus, as detailed in the docket.

Melin described the composition and work of the task force, which was charged with making recommendations to enhance and support the advising experience for undergraduate students on the Twin Cities campus. The task force examined current advising procedures, advising profession best practices, peer institutions, and results from a survey of students and advisors. An initial set of recommendations was revised following input from 33 campus-wide listening sessions, resulting in a final report and recommendations presented during an academic advising town hall meeting.

Melin provided a detailed overview of the task force’s three overarching recommendations:
1. Ensure undergraduate students have equitable and assessable advising across collegiate advising units.

2. Prioritize the ongoing support, development, and retention of a professional community of academic advisors who are satisfied in their roles and reflect the identities of the undergraduate student body.

3. Continue to support the development of the essential infrastructure of advising.

Schultz shared a set of principles for excellent advising, along with a description of an advising team structure focused on student needs and a set of advising service standards. She concluded by advocating for shared responsibility between administration leaders and collegiate units to work within their structures to implement the recommendations and make improvements to the current system.

In response to a question from Regent Johnson, Shultz explained that each college uses a different method to assign students to their advisors.

Regent Anderson commented that a ratio of one advisor to 250-300 students seems high, and asked if lower ratios and more financial support would be beneficial. Melin responded that a preliminary gap analysis shows a preferred ratio of one advisor for every 35 students, especially for students who receive special services to assist them with a range of challenges, including first-generation college students, individuals with disabilities, and low-income students. The cost of adding 30 advisors is about $1.8 million.

Student Representative Livengood affirmed the positive and important impact of a lower ratio, noting her positive experience as an honors student and as a committee member associated with this project.

In response to a question from Regent Cohen, Melin described how the A+ tool is used to access real-time student data on registration and other processes that allow for positive and proactive intervention.

Regent Rosha inquired about the average tenure for advisors. Shultz responded that 1-30 years is the current range, with a tenure goal of at least eight years. Rosha commented on the improvement in advising over the past few decades and the strong return on investment that could be achieved through investing $1.8 million. In response to Rosha’s question about the impact of various faculty advising models, Melin responded that the 4-year collegiate advisor model best enables the preferred mentoring role.

**CONSENT REPORT**

A motion was made and seconded, and the committee unanimously recommended approval of the following program changes, as described in the Consent Report:

- **Request for Approval of New Academic Programs**
  - College of Design (Twin Cities campus)—Create B.S. degree in Product Design
  - Carlson School of Management and the Law School (Twin Cities campus)—Create undergraduate minor as Business Law
  - Medical School (Twin Cities campus)—Create fellowship in Cardiovascular and Thoracic Transplant
  - College of Education and Human Service Professions (Duluth campus)—Create Education Administration Specialist degree and deliver online
  - College of Liberal Arts (Duluth campus)—Create B.A. degree in Journalism
• College of Liberal Arts (Duluth campus)—Create post-baccalaureate certificate in Geographical Information Science
• Swenson College of Science and Engineering (Duluth campus)—Create Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering degree

**Request for Approval of Discontinued Academic Programs**

• College of Veterinary Medicine (Twin Cities campus)—Discontinue graduate minor in Veterinary Medicine.

**INFORMATION ITEM**

Provost Hanson referred committee members to the following information item:

• USGA and University of Minnesota announce research partnership to tackle golf’s challenges and foster innovation.

The meeting adjourned at 10:01 a.m.

BRIAN R. STEEVES
Executive Director and Corporate Secretary
A work session of the Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota was held on Thursday, February 11, 2016 at 10:15 a.m. in the West Committee Room, 600 McNamara Alumni Center.

Regents present: Dean Johnson, presiding; Thomas Anderson, Richard Beeson, Linda Cohen, Thomas Devine, Michael Hsu, Peggy Lucas, David McMillian, Abdul Omari, Darrin Rosha, and Patricia Simmons.

Staff present: President Eric Kaler; Chancellors Lendley Black, Jacqueline Johnson, Stephen Lehmkuhle; Senior Vice President and Provost Karen Hanson; Vice Presidents Richard Pfutzenreuter and Pamela Wheelock; Executive Director Brian Steeves; and Associate Vice President Michael Berthelsen.

Student Representatives present: Callie Livengood.

Chair Johnson introduced Vice Presidents Pamela Wheelock and Richard Pfutzenreuter, Assistant Vice President Suzanne Smith, and Monique MacKenzie, Director of Planning, to provide context for discussion of a proposed development framework for the Twin Cities campus. Wheelock presented an overview of the 30-year vision for campus planning based on specific planning principles and assumptions. She discussed several recent campus plans, which have helped guide decisions about land use and intensity; shape transportation; and support academic, athletic, and research activities. Pfutzenreuter discussed the University’s strategy and process for land acquisition.

Smith and MacKenzie described the campus development framework, discussed several development strategy areas, and identified land that is available for campus growth and expansion. They detailed two specific areas of focus: the Southeast Gateway district, which serves as a main entrance to campus, and the East Gateway district, which is an area of high density and activity. MacKenzie detailed land use focused on health care, patient access, and outreach. She outlined several areas of opportunity including partnerships with the city of Minneapolis, development in the Prospect North Innovation District, and additional acquisition by the University of Minnesota Foundation Real Estate Advisors (UMFREA).

Regent Simmons observed the high volume of visitors to clinics and athletic facilities on the East Bank, asking whether there is a way to work with the city to improve traffic flow and access to campus. Wheelock agreed that the flow of traffic is challenging, even without additional development. She emphasized the importance of working with the city of Minneapolis and the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) to improve the flow of traffic over time. She explained that understanding transportation routes into campus is another challenge, noting that difficulties and delays have resulted from the Light Rail Transit (LRT) crossing on University Avenue. She stressed the need for balance between vehicular and pedestrian traffic, as well as collaboration with the city and neighborhoods to understand the capacity of existing systems.

In response to a question from Chair Johnson, Pfutzenreuter replied that the most recent land acquisitions are the Murphy Warehouse and grain elevators near TCF Bank Stadium. He commented that the University is in active discussions with railroad companies for acquisition
of additional land in that area. Wheelock reported that several surface lots currently used for
tailgating will remain, at least in the short term.

Regent Hsu observed that the current plans allow Pioneer Hall to remain and do not include the
athletic track. He asked for the total square footage and related costs for the proposed
development plan. Wheelock replied that the University is investigating possible renovation and
restoration of Pioneer Hall, noting the historical value of the building. She explained that the
goal is to reinvest in first- and second-year residence halls along the river corridor to provide a
greater sense of community. Since the track is in predesign phase, and since some of the
proposed land is not currently owned by the University, it was not included in the
presentation. Wheelock stated that she did not know the total square footage of the plan, and
that it was difficult to speculate on the costs involved. MacKenzie added that one purpose of
the plan is to understand the implications of development such as infrastructure needs,
subsequent development, and costs.

Regent Devine noted that campus planning has long been a Board priority and thanked the
administration for helping address it. He reflected on the opportunity to shape the development
doing of campus for years to come. He suggested that the Board should emphasize innovations like
health care delivery to the legislature during the 2016 session to help further partnerships with
the state. Devine noted that the Board has looked to other land-grant institutions for best-practices and remarked that public-private partnerships could be an important way to advance campus development. He suggested that Mayo provides a template for the concept of a
destination medical facility.

Regent Rosha commented that by placing student housing along the river, students are
relegated far from the center of campus. He suggested that housing could be placed closer to
the campus core, with medical facilities at the edge. He added that student safety should be an
important consideration in the location of housing. Rosha observed a lack of green space and
landscaping in the current plan, a contrast to the architecture of the historic mall. Wheelock
responded that the intention is to cluster housing near student core areas, such as academic
buildings, study spaces, or athletic facilities. She agreed that student safety is an important
consideration in the placement and design of buildings, as are continued partnerships with law
enforcement. Wheelock acknowledged that creating green space is a challenge, but suggested
that the few current green space options could grow following the demolition of some buildings.

In response to comments from Chair Johnson, Wheelock remarked that the LRT created
significant displacement of vehicular traffic, especially on the northern edge of campus. She
explained that there are long-established neighborhoods in the areas that offer more
throughways and freeway access. She stressed the need to work with the city and the
Metropolitan Council on future plans to avoid creating traffic problems for those
neighborhoods.

Regent Beeson noted that the proposed residential facilities could be considered prime housing,
given their adjacency to the river, but that design would be key to a facility’s success. He
agreed that green space is important in design, adding that the pressure to build new academic
centers should not overshadow the need for adequate landscaping. He commented that the
increase in development will require additional focus on transportation. Beeson offered that the
most transformative part of the plan will be the health care services, adding that health care
facilities should be easily accessible to the public.

Regent Simmons commented on the long-term importance of the location of health care
delivery facilities. She noted patient care, needs, and experience should be the primary focus,
rather than the needs of faculty and staff. She suggested looking to previous public-private
partnerships to help guide planning. Wheelock responded that the proposed location for the
hospital is merely a suggestion; the placement is not final.
Regent Anderson recounted that his student experience was enhanced by accessibility to a variety of venues including markets, restaurants, and coffee shops. He urged consideration of these businesses as the University acquires additional property, emphasizing the importance of the total campus experience.

Regent Lucas asked what the University is doing to nurture its relationship with the city. She suggested ways to work with surrounding neighborhoods that would encourage strong partnerships, such as programs to encourage faculty to live in the area, or alumni housing facilities. Wheelock remarked that partnerships with the city are being considered but that further opportunities exist. She commented that infrastructure needs must be considered given the increase in population in the area.

Student Representative Livengood commented that most students are eager to be close to the heart of campus, not relegated to the edges. She added that the placement of medical buildings between residence hall clusters limits the sense of community.

In response to a question from Regent Omari, Wheelock reported that the likely use for development in the center of campus would be for teaching and learning, with some student support.

President Kaler noted that though the focus of the presentation is on two key areas, there are other areas of development to consider. He remarked that buildings on the main knoll, which have much historic value, could be repurposed for housing. Buildings such Appleby and Frasier on the East Bank and Anderson Hall on the West Bank could offer housing development opportunities as well.

Regent Beeson remarked that the area of the city adjacent to campus is underdeveloped. He noted that partnerships with Minneapolis would be beneficial, and could help focus attention on infrastructure and transportation needs. He suggested inviting city representatives to present their development needs to the Board. MacKenzie remarked that the city is currently reviewing its own comprehensive plan, and that this could be a perfect time to pursue collaboration.

In response to a question from Chair Johnson, Pfutzenreuter explained that the University and UMFREA interact regularly to coordinate acquisition strategy and to determine development plans. He added that this is a positive working relationship with strong collaboration. Johnson called on University of Minnesota Foundation (UMF) president and CEO Kathy Schmidlkofer to provide her feedback. Schmidlkofer agreed that a strong relationship exists, and noted that the relatively new UMFREA provides complimentary, rather than competitive, services to the University. She noted the importance of leveraging UMF to advance the University’s mission and goals.

In response to a question from Regent Hsu about the capacity of the new power plant, Wheelock replied that the plant should accommodate campus energy needs for the next 15-20 years. She stressed the need to consider additional facilities as the campus grows. She remarked that a possible location for a new plant would be closer to the research facilities, but stressed that much depends on need and land acquisition. She noted that there will be much coordination with the city and surrounding neighborhoods.

Chair Johnson commented that the presentation provided a concise overview of long-term planning and urged sharing it with donors and the legislature. He suggested that it could help the community better understand campus planning and its positive impact on the state.

Regent Devine pointed out that the Board’s 2015-16 priorities include a focus on the land-grant mission and the availability of medical services. He agreed that it is important to communicate this plan to the public and to create a vision to guide long-term development of
key campus areas. He offered that the Board is demonstrating a commitment to the core priorities of the institution and the state.

Regent Lucas asked about ways to increase energy efficiency and sustainability as buildings are renovated or decommissioned. Wheelock reported a focus on sustainability throughout the system, to mitigate the need for power. She commented on innovations in research spaces, as well as efficiencies in the footprint and design of specific buildings. Lucas stressed the need for action and urged serious consideration of alternative technologies such as solar power.

Regent Devine commented that many projects are underway on the St. Paul campus, mentioning research facilities development, the new Bell Museum, and development of the golf course. He added that the Facilities, Planning & Operations Committee has focused much effort on development in St. Paul.

Chair Johnson called on Colin Campbell, chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee, for his comments on the discussion. Campbell remarked on the challenge of connecting the biomedical district at the edge of campus to the academic health buildings in the heart of campus, expressing a desire for a better way to connect those facilities. He reported that the faculty’s concerns include parking and proximity to their classrooms as well as spaces to gather and eat.

In response to a question from Regent Lucas, Wheelock reported that the University is considering future uses for the Murphy Warehouse site. She explained that the space is currently used for bookstore storage and could also be used for collections storage in the interim.

Regent Hsu asked about timing for acquisition of railroad land, and how that land might be used. Wheelock replied that parking or green space could be an interim use, but noted possible contaminants from railroad use. She added that no infrastructure or utilities are in place. Pfutzenreuter explained that many factors are involved in the acquisition – the land is located in multiple cities and under multiple jurisdictions, with a variety of companies involved in its ownership. Kaler emphasized the challenges involved in acquiring land from the railroads. He commented that he is optimistic about the land immediately north of campus, given the placement of the railroad tracks, and noted additional possibilities for connecting the Murphy Warehouse site to the rest of campus.

The meeting adjourned at 11:44 a.m.

BRIAN R. STEEVES
Executive Director
and Corporate Secretary
A meeting of the Facilities, Planning & Operations Committee of the Board of Regents was held on Thursday, February 11, 2016 at 1:15 p.m. in the West Committee Room, 600 McNamara Alumni Center.

Regents present: David McMillan, presiding; Thomas Anderson, Thomas Devine, Dean Johnson, Peggy Lucas, and Darrin Rosha.

Staff present: President Eric Kaler; Vice Presidents Richard Pfutzenreuter and Pamela Wheelock; Interim Vice President Bernard Gulachek; Executive Director Brian Steeves; and Associate Vice Presidents Michael Berthelsen, Laurie Scheich, and Mike Volna.

Student Representatives present: Samantha Jensen and Chase Taylor.

A motion was made and seconded to recommend approval of the following actions:

The schematic plans for Veterinary Isolation Facility – Twin Cities campus are approved and the appropriate administrative officers authorized to proceed with the award of contracts, the development of construction documents, and construction.

Vice President Wheelock invited Suzanne Smith, Assistant Vice President for Capital Planning & Project Management (CPPM), and Dean Trevor Ames, College of Veterinary Medicine, to present the schematic plans, as detailed in the docket.

Ames shared the project rationale, stating that the existing facilities are inadequate, do not comply with code, and constrain research. He noted that the new facility would support a growing emphasis on infections disease research, allow collaboration among University departments, and ensure year-round research. Smith detailed the project description, noting that the total cost is estimated at $29.5 million with an anticipated completion date of December 2017. She also presented the site plan, floor plan, and exterior design.

Regent Lucas expressed her appreciation for having the building’s carbon footprint included in the project description.

Regent Devine asked if the federal Food and Drug Administration or U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) was expecting this type of facility to perform infectious disease research. Ames responded that the new building will allow the University to perform research on a number of infectious diseases that the current facility does not allow. He added that while this facility would not hold the highest isolation accreditation, the University already works with USDA researchers at a facility in Ames, Iowa, to perform higher isolation research.
Regent Rosha wondered if there is anything the college would have liked to include in the building that was not due to budget constraints. Ames responded that upgrading the facility to the highest level of isolation was a possibility, but it would double the annual operating budget for the facility. Given that expense and the fact that the USDA facility in Ames has the highest level accreditation, it was decided that the extra cost was not worth the added research that could take place onsite. Rosha commented that as long as the faculty agreed with using the USDA facility in Ames, he was comfortable with the schematic design.

The committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the schematic plans for the Veterinary Isolation Facility – Twin Cities campus.

**UPDATE ON JOINT VENTURE ACTIVITIES**

Regent McMillan invited Vice President Pfutzenreuter; Susan Carlson Weinberg, Director of Real Estate; and Monique MacKenzie, Director of Planning, to update the committee on joint venture activities with United Properties, as detailed in the docket.

Pfurzenreuter outlined the background and benefits of the partnership, and defined for the committee how the University enters into public-private partnerships. He indicated that the University retains a defined role in all or some aspect of ownership or regulation, and has the ability to seek remediation of non-performance. Pfutzenreuter stated that the partnership is designed to leverage the skills and assets of each party, with appropriate sharing of risks and rewards.

Weinberg reviewed the history of the partnership. She noted that the property was put on the market in June 2013. The University made an offer, but was outbid by United Properties. Given the University’s ownership of parking lots on the north side of the block, United Properties and the University agreed to enter into a joint venture, creating 2407 University Investment LLC. United Properties controls 51 percent of the jointly owned site; the University controls 49 percent. The University maintains full control of the other adjoining sites, but is willing to combine those sites with the joint site to create a 6.5-acre site.

MacKenzie put the joint venture site into the context of its surroundings and neighborhood. She detailed the Prospect North neighborhood objectives, the opportunities and challenges facing the University and the neighborhood, and how the joint venture factors into campus planning. She noted that the joint venture is studying market demand in the area to define the project type and potential size, adding that a project would most likely include residential, retail, office, and hotel space. Pfutenreuter commented that if the site were to include University office space, it would allow Facilities Management to eliminate current office space that does not meet the University’s needs.

MacKenzie suggested that transportation infrastructure planning with landowners and other jurisdictions would be critical as the project moves forward. She explained that expanding Huron Boulevard would help to improve traffic flow and access.

In response to a question from Regent Rosha, Pfutzenreuter explained that the land fully owned by the University would be included within the joint venture, but how ownership of the land is maintained may depend on the use of the land. If the land is used for joint venture development, the University could maintain equity in the land and enter into a long-term lease. If the University were to transfer ownership of the land, it could trade it for increased equity in the joint venture. Wheelock added that the Board would need to approve the University giving equity in the land to the joint venture.

Rosha commented on the University seeking to collaborate on power systems with the city of Minneapolis. MacKenzie clarified that the University would collaborate as a landowner that
would generate demand and create viability for the creation of additional power system infrastructure. She added that there has been no discussion on who would finance the additional infrastructure, nor has the University indicated any desire to do so.

In response to a question from Rosha, MacKenzie responded that the joint venture would work with the anticipated tenant or tenants to design a project and facility to meet their needs. In response to another question from Rosha, MacKenzie indicated that Minneapolis would be interested in development of the Prospect North area but has taken a low-key approach to the grassroots organization within the neighborhood. Rosha commented that this may be an opportunity to partner with the city to develop the area.

Regent Devine remarked that this discussion aligns with the Board’s 2015-16 priorities and highlights the need to ensure that transportation infrastructure is created to enable the increased density being proposed. He wondered if this project would be added to the University’s heating and cooling system. Wheelock responded that it is too early to tell, and noted the desire for a system in that part of campus in the future.

**LONG-RANGE CAMPUS PLANNING: UNIVERSITY HOUSING**

Regent McMillan invited President Kaler, Vice President Wheelock, Vice Provost Robert McMaster, Assistant Vice President Brian Swanson, and Laurie McLaughlin, Director of Housing and Residence Life, to discuss long-range campus planning for University housing on the Twin Cities campus, as detailed in the docket.

Kaler connected this presentation with previous discussions by the Board and committee. He stated the important role that housing plays in the lives of first- and some second-year students. He noted that the Twin Cities campus offers the most affordable housing in the Big Ten, but is facing significant capital needs. He offered his appreciation that members of the Board have challenged the administration to think more deeply about this topic and expressed that he shares their passion.

Wheelock reminded the committee of the role of housing and outlined the assumptions underlying the housing strategy framework. She reviewed the supportive services matrix and offered context regarding development within the neighborhoods around campus. She stressed that the University has valued affordability.

Swanson reviewed the past 25 years of campus housing. He outlined enrollment and housing trends, defined the economics of housing, and showed the relationship between tuition and room and board. Swanson described the current housing stock, indicating that residence halls on average are in better physical condition than academic and research facilities. He updated the committee on the current public-private partnerships and the possibility of master leases of private apartment buildings that would give the University flexibility as demand and housing stock change.

McMaster summarized the proposed enrollment strategy. He reminded the committee that students who lived in University housing have increased retention rates, higher 4-year graduation rates, and higher grade point averages. McMaster stressed the connection between academic success and residential housing.

McLaughlin outlined the 30-year vision and proposed housing locations along the Mississippi River. She offered that a riverfront housing neighborhood would meet expected enrollment growth while creating a community experience for first-year students. Centennial and Territorial residence halls would be demolished and replaced with other buildings.
The committee engaged in a conversation on University housing, discussing how enrollment impacts housing, the desire to keep students in University housing through their second year, the role of public-private partnerships, housing guarantees for students, the trade-off between affordability and increased supply, expansion of the Greek loan program to housing owned by other student groups, student frustration with what they perceive as low-quality housing, and the appropriateness of establishing a residency requirement.

**OPTIMIZING OUR PHYSICAL ASSETS: IT NETWORK INFRASTRUCTURE REFRESH AND ISSUES RELATED TO CYBERSECURITY**

Vice President Wheelock introduced Interim Vice President Gulachek; Brian Dahlin, Chief Information Security Officer; and Kemal Badur, Senior Director for Infrastructure and Operations, to discuss the proposed information technology (IT) network infrastructure refresh and issues related to cybersecurity, as detailed in the docket.

Gulachek outlined the overview, history, and context of the current IT network infrastructure. He noted that the goal is to maintain a network that is right-sized to meet current and future demands, while ensuring stability and security. He defined usage requirements, highlighting a significant increase in demand from 2010 to 2015.

Gulachek compared the composition of the network from 2005 to 2015 and offered projections for 2025. He shared Wi-Fi usage trends, explaining that the Office of Information Technology (OIT) has seen a decrease in wired Internet access while Wi-Fi Internet access has significantly increased due to the prevalence of mobile devices and the use of multiple mobile devices per individual account.

Gulachek described the usage trends in research. He noted that current research is more data-intensive due to the proliferation of digital technologies. The movement toward collaboration both within and outside of the University is requiring researchers to move large quantities of data across networks. Gulachek emphasized that this type of data movement requires significant bandwidth.

Badur discussed the need for a stable, reliable network. He noted that the current network is now beyond its predicted lifespan, with some components nearing the end of usefulness with no replacements available. The new network will be built for a 10-year lifespan.

Dahlin detailed how the new network will ensure security with advanced infrastructure. He noted its advanced intrusion detection, denial-of-service attack defense, updated firewalls for the data center, and other security capabilities.

Gulachek outlined the estimated cost of the upgrade, highlighting $19.075 million for security. He stressed that this is only an estimate, having just started the bidding process.

Regent McMillan wondered how to confirm if this is the right security strategy. Gulachek responded that OIT interacts with peers across the Big Ten to collaborate and learn from what they are doing. He emphasized that OIT also turns to experts in the field to validate the University’s strategies.

In response to a question from Regent Johnson, Dahlin agreed that there is an arms race in cybersecurity and no system is able to completely control for all risks and possible intrusions. He stressed the importance of due diligence to mitigate the most significant risks.
REAL ESTATE TRANSACTIONS

A. Amendment to Phased Aggregate Mining Lease with Dakota Aggregates, LLC covering 1,722 Acres in Rosemount and Empire Township, Dakota County – UMore Park

A motion was made and seconded to recommend approval of the following action:

On recommendation of the President and the Vice President for University Services, the appropriate administrative officers are authorized to execute the proposed second amendment to the lease with Dakota Aggregates LLC for aggregate mining at UMore Park:

Vice President Wheelock explained the amendment as follows:

• The second amendment to the Dakota Aggregates phased aggregate mining lease will delay mining on certain parcels in Empire Township included in the leased premises to allow continued use by the College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences for agricultural research purposes; extend the lease term by 20 years; and modify the Initial Advanced Minimum Royalty amounts related to the delayed mining.

• Basis for Request: The University now desires to retain the use of certain portions of the leased premises in Empire Township for agricultural research purposes beyond the dates anticipated when the 2011 lease and previous amendment and letter agreement were executed, and in exchange, Dakota Aggregates has requested a 20-year extension of the lease to provide additional time for completion of its mining activities in Empire Township.

• Detail of Transaction: The second amendment to the Dakota Aggregates lease will modify the June 8, 2011 lease to extend the lease term for mining in Empire Township for 20 years, expiring June 30, 2073. The Operations Plan and accompanying Phasing schedule for the Empire Township property will be revised to delay mining of portions of the leased premises located in Empire Township to 2017 for 166.1 acres, to 2030 for 301.34 acres, and to 2040 for 240.12 acres. The Initial Advanced Minimum Royalty amounts to be paid by Dakota Aggregates will be revised, base royalty adjustments will be made every 5 years by escalator, agreement or arbitration for lease years 11 through 60, the University’s use of the ROC building will end December 31, 2016, and the Dakota Aggregates and University annual meeting will now occur in October of each Lease Year.

Wheelock indicated that there had been no changes to the amendment since the committee reviewed it in December.

The committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the second amendment to the lease with Dakota Aggregates LLC for aggregate mining at UMore Park

B. Sale of 36.87 Acres, Carlton County – Cloquet Forestry Center

A motion was made and seconded to recommend approval of the following action:

On recommendation of the President and the Vice President for University Services, the appropriate administrative officers are authorized to execute the appropriate documents providing for the following real estate transaction:
• The subject property consists of 36.87 acres of vacant land. The property is located approximately three (3) miles east of the Cloquet Forestry Center. The property is low, wet ground with no road access and a railroad track cutting through the western part of the property.

• Basis for Request: In May 2002, the Board of Regents reviewed a plan to offer for sale a number of parcels assigned to the Cloquet Forestry Center located in Carlton and Lake of the Woods Counties totaling 475 acres. The properties were then offered for sale to the State of Minnesota, and the county and municipality or township within which the property is located. As a result of that offering, Carlton County purchased 123.64 acres. The remaining parcels were then offered for sale by public bid. The subject property is one of three parcels that remained unsold following the public bid offering. These three parcels have been marketed since that time on the University’s Real Estate Office website. The buyers recently offered to purchase the property for the advertised price.

• Detail of Transaction: The sale price is $7,400, with the buyers paying all closing costs to complete the transaction. The buyers have requested that closing occur immediately after the February 2016 Board meetings.

The committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the real estate transaction for the sale of 36.87 Acres, Carlton County to Daniel and Gina Brethorst.

NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY UPDATE

Regent McMillan invited President Kaler, Vice President Wheelock, and Chief Matt Clark, University of Minnesota Police Department (UMPD), to update the committee on neighborhood safety.

Wheelock reported that University Services has been working over several years to improve the safety of students on and off campus. She highlighted the focus on education for students, improved enforcement, better engagement, and changes to infrastructure to increase lighting and camera coverage.

Clark stated that his philosophy to counter crime is to catch the robbers. To do that, UMPD is working with the Minneapolis Police Department to track down the perpetrators and feels there is good evidence to pursue those involved in recent incidents. He explained that statistical data for the 2nd Precinct of Minneapolis, which includes the University area, shows a more than 100 percent increase in robberies from the previous year. Clark noted that often one or two teams of individuals commit these types of crimes. He shared his belief that the perpetrators are not targeting students, but rather those easiest to target. He noted that UMPD has increased patrols and is working closely with Minneapolis to coordinate efforts.

Clark stressed that UMPD is focusing on fair and impartial policing balanced with enforcement and investigation. Wheelock added that a placeholder for two additional officers is included in the proposed operating budget framework for next year.

McMillan thanked Wheelock and Clark, noting the importance of receiving an update given the recent increase in incidents near campus.

In response to a question from Regent Devine, Clark agreed that there is always room for educating students. He noted that students do educate themselves and look out for each other, but added that UMPD and the Office for Student Affairs strive to reinforce the message of safety. He stressed that he would first prioritize criminal investigations, then high-visibility patrols, physical security, and student education.
Rosha referenced recent conversations he has had or heard about with community members and state leaders who expressed concern about sending their students to the Twin Cities campus given the recent safety issues. He wondered if the University tracks the impact of crime on student academic performance and retention, noting that it may be a question better posed to the Provost’s Office. Rosha asked Clark what one resource he wished he had at his disposal to improve safety. Clark responded that while he could wish for a number of resources, the addition of two beat officers is an important first step. He explained that the perception of safety is key, and that creating a positive perception needs to be the focus of a comprehensive campaign to students, faculty, staff, and visitors. With a multi-faced approach and a strong connection between UMPD, other security officers, and students, Clark expressed his belief that security and the perception of security would increase.

Kaler agreed with Clark and Wheelock and thanked them for their work. He emphasized that the key elements to ensure safety are educating students, effective enforcement, and arresting perpetrators. He stressed that progress is being made in all areas.

**INFORMATION ITEMS**

Vice President Wheelock referred committee members to the following information items:

- Annual Update on Sustainability Efforts in Facilities, Planning, and Operations
- Final Project Review: Minnesota Poultry Testing Lab (West Central ROC)
- Final Project Review: Bell Museum (Twin Cities Campus)
- 2015 State Capital Appropriations Report

The meeting adjourned at 3:21 p.m.

\[signature\]

BRIAN R. STEEVES
Executive Director
and Corporate Secretary
A meeting of the Faculty & Staff Affairs Committee of the Board of Regents was held on Thursday, February 11, 2016 at 1:15 p.m. in the East Committee Room, 600 McNamara Alumni Center.

Regents present: Patricia Simmons, presiding; Michael Hsu, Richard Beeson, Linda Cohen, and Abdul Omari.

Staff present: Chancellor Stephen Lehmkuhle; Senior Vice President and Provost Karen Hanson; Vice Presidents Katrice Albert and Kathryn Brown; and Executive Director Brian Steeves.

Student Representatives present: Nikki Ripp and Cory Schroeder.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS WITH AFSCME LOCALS 3800 & 3801, AFSCME LOCAL 3260, AFSCME LOCALS 3937 & 3801, AND TEAMSTERS LOCAL 320

Regent Simmons invited Vice President Brown and Patti Dion, Director of Employee Relations, to present the following collective bargaining agreements, as detailed in the docket:

- AFSCME Locals 3800 and 3801 Clerical, Unit 6
- AFSCME Local 3260 Health Care, Unit 4
- AFSCME Locals 3937 and 3801 Technical, Unit 7
- Teamsters Local 320 PELRA, Unit 3

Dion summarized each collective bargaining agreement, noting their similarities and differences. Each is a two-year, mature contract covering July 2015-June 2017. The contracts provide the terms of employment for over 4,050 employees who are clerical, health care, technical, service and maintenance workers on all five campuses. The contracts also include an agreement to a single health insurance plan, and changes to the parental leave program that enable birth mothers to use four weeks of paid parental leave in place of sick time.

In response to a question from Regent Beeson, Dion noted that AFSCME and Teamsters will receive 1.5 percent and 2 percent overall salary increases, respectively, due to the inclusion of step increases. This compares to 2-2.5 percent salary increases offered generally by public employers. Following a second question from Beeson, Dion replied that the compensation packages are commensurate with those in the public sector and include no health insurance premium increases. Beeson inquired about universal employee eligibility and the length of paid parental leave, and Dion explained that all employees above a certain hourly threshold qualify for the benefit. Brown distinguished the University’s maternal-specific leave policy from the Governor’s recent proposal to extend a 6-week parental leave policy for men and women.

For each of the four collective bargaining agreements, a motion was made and seconded, and the committee voted unanimously to recommend approval.
CONSENT REPORT

Regent Simmons invited Vice President Brown to present the Consent Report for review and action, which included the following items:

- Granting of faculty emeritus status to Dr. Daniel Zismer.
- Conferring tenure for Mary Fran Tracy.

A motion was made and seconded, and the committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the Consent Report.

HIRING TOP TALENT

Regent Simmons invited Vice President Brown to present on the University’s strategy for hiring top talent, as outlined in the docket.

Brown provided an overview of the University’s strategic goals to address grand challenges, embrace excellence, and recruit field-shaping faculty. She reviewed a list of recent job openings by employee group and campus, noting efforts to create an inclusive and unbiased atmosphere that is welcoming to a diverse candidate pool.

Brown outlined a four-phase process that provides a roadmap for consistent, equitable and fair hiring practices system-wide. She described steps to launch the process and recruit, evaluate and select the most qualified candidates. She also highlighted special considerations such as internal versus external candidate selection, cultural fit, and factors specific to various hiring classifications. Brown additionally described a process map employing the four phases.

Regent Hsu asked about the distinction between internal and external student hires. Brown asked Laura Negrini, Director of Graduate Student Hiring, to respond. Negrini stated that newly hired students are defined as external in contrast to those hired from within the University; Brown added that movement between departments is common and classified as internal hiring. Simmons clarified that all of these student hires are from within the University system, and Hsu suggested that this method skews the data on total number of external hires. Brown agreed, noting that the goal is to understand current practices to inform intentional selection and achievement of desired external and internal hiring levels. Simmons and Hsu recommended that student numbers be separated from overall hiring totals, and Brown agreed.

Hsu requested information about methods to ensure satisfactory levels of diversity within candidate pools. Regent Omari asked how those procedures ultimately affect hires. Brown described a process for ensuring that the composition of candidates considered for a position matches an analysis of statewide diversity levels within each particular job classification. She added that search committee members are beginning to receive training to address implicit bias, with the goal to provide an equal opportunity to all qualified candidates.

Regent Hsu asked about actions to bring the University’s hiring closer to the state’s level of diversity. Brown invited Katrice Albert, Vice President for Equity and Diversity, to respond. Albert explained that the University’s process is about establishing a culture, not about setting hiring quotas. She talked about focusing on candidate sourcing and establishing a robust pool of diverse candidates for interviews. Albert noted that the University has improved in this area, allowing for increased numbers of underrepresented groups to be selected for jobs.

Regent Cohen inquired how soft skills are assessed during the hiring process. Brown responded that job descriptions identify such items as collaboration, leadership and communication skills, and that the interview process is designed to draw out these characteristics. Research-based assessments are also conducted by psychologists for some
positions, with the Office of Human Resources (OHR) and Office for Equity and Diversity (OED) working collaboratively on these efforts.

Omari noted the intersection of this top talent discussion with the Twin Cities strategic plan and recent Finance Committee discussions, questioning whether staff receives adequate training to be promoted as top talent. He also inquired about the level of hiring decentralization. Brown responded that all positions move through the Office of Human Resources for classification and posting and are forwarded to appropriate appointing authorities, where the process becomes more decentralized. She noted that the University has improved efforts to train and promote internal candidates, using succession management tools to create pools of capable candidates.

Beeson stated his preference for standardized assessment tools within the University’s decentralized system, requesting additional future conversation on this topic. He suggested an increased use of private sector participation in the hiring process. Simmons commented that high-level searches incorporate the practice of using private sector participation already. Brown concurred that this is standard practice, while not mandated.

In response to a question from Student Representative Schroeder, Brown explained that most assistant professors are external hires and that there is no established pathway for post-doctorate promotion to those positions. Albert noted that a bridge program exists to target and increase diversity within pre-doctoral programs.

Simmons complemented OHR and OED for aligning their hiring efforts to meet strategic objectives, increase diversity, and attract top talent.

**EMPLOYEE VALUE PROPOSITION AND TOTAL REWARDS STRATEGY**

Regent Simmons invited Vice President Brown to present on the employee value proposition and total rewards strategy, as detailed in the docket. Brown introduced Kenneth Horstman, Director of Total Rewards, and Mary Rohman Kuhl, Director of Compensation.

Kuhl defined the employee value proposition broadly as the elements received and delivered by University workers, including mission, purpose, values, culture, and the full portfolio of the institution’s total rewards program. She discussed the factors for successful employee engagement, including the strength and fit of staff to the mission, environment and culture, and competitive rewards. She noted the importance of the University’s brand in attracting and retaining top talent and achieving the University’s strategic goals.

Horstman pointed to the link between the employee value proposition and the role that staff play as ambassadors for the University. He highlighted the strategic goals to address grand societal challenges, support excellence and reject complacency, recruit and retain field shaping researchers and teachers, establish a culture of reciprocal engagement, and capitalize on the unique location of the Twin Cities campus. Horstman also introduced a four-step employee value proposition process.

Regent Hsu asked for an explanation of the Merit Pay Program. Horstman provided historical context and an overview of current practice, which provides an average level of financial resources to each department for performance-based merit increases. In response to a question from Hsu regarding the uniformity of distributions, Brown explained that various units use a range of evaluation tools, which results in a variety of merit pay allocations.

Regent Omari asked about the influence of a single lever on employee decision making, using the Affordable Care Act and its effect on the University’s health benefit as an example. Brown responded that a variety of changes can be affected by various levers, emphasizing link to
mission as most impactful. Horstman noted the significant impact of the University’s reputation as an employer offering an attractive health plan.

Regent Beeson voiced concern about a lack of standardized evaluation assessment tools. Regent Simmons pointed to the Mayo Clinic’s similar individualized process. Brown described OHR’s efforts to assist in the development of localized evaluation tools without prescribing a single standard. Simmons concurred with Beeson that a standardized tool provides an objective and consistent assessment, and Brown agreed that equity and fairness is also an outcome.

**2015 EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT RESULTS AND ACTION STEPS**

Regent Simmons invited Vice President Brown to present a report on the results of the 2015 Employee Engagement survey, as detailed in the docket. Simmons introduced Connie Delaney, Dean of the School of Nursing, then handed the gavel to Vice Chair Hsu and left the meeting for another engagement. Brown introduced Brandon Sullivan, Director of Leadership and Talent Development, to present the engagement results with Delaney.

Sullivan provided an overview of the survey administration process, key metrics, and strategic priorities. He described increased survey participation, faculty- and staff-specific results and areas of greatest change, and employee engagement strengths and opportunities. Sullivan noted that the University has a highly committed and dedicated workforce and that faculty scores increased most in areas.

Delaney described how survey results for the School of Nursing exceeded those from 2013 across the board, noting significant increases in areas of commitment and dedication. She relayed steps taken to address negative outcomes from the initial survey, including the introduction of listening sessions, development of work teams, creation of new training and multi-year contracts, clarification of benchmarks, and workload reductions.

Brown noted Delaney’s courage in addressing staff-identified problems. Regent Cohen concurred, commenting on the significance of follow-up and action to positive results.

Regent Omari asked about the ability to drill deeper into the data. Sullivan responded that the University owns the data and can provide additional analysis as requested.

In response to a question from Beeson, Brown reported that OHR works with units, when invited, to assist with engagement activities. She acknowledged that follow-up is not required and there are no disciplinary actions for inaction. Beeson wondered about OHR’s interest in following up with unsatisfactory responses. Brown explained that a planned year-long break in the survey’s administration will allow for such additions to the survey process.

**INFORMATION ITEMS**

Vice President Brown referred the committee to the information items. She highlighted the Workforce Metrics Report, which includes updates from the ninth payroll of the 2015-16 fiscal year. Regent Omari thanked Brown for a third year of comprehensive reporting on workforce metrics, noting the utility of the collected and analyzed data to strategic staff placement.
The meeting adjourned at 3:14 p.m.

BRIAN R. STEEVES
Executive Director and
Corporate Secretary
A meeting of the Audit & Compliance Committee of the Board of Regents was held on Thursday, February 11, 2016, at 3:30 p.m. in the West Committee Room, 600 McNamara Alumni Center.

Regents present: Peggy Lucas, presiding; Richard Beeson, Michael Hsu, and Abdul Omari.

Staff present: President Eric Kaler; Senior Vice President and Provost Karen Hanson; Vice Presidents Katrice Albert, Kathy Brown, Brian Herman, Brooks Jackson, and Richard Pfutzenreuter; Interim Vice President Bernard Gulachek; Executive Director Brian Steeves; and Associate Vice Presidents Terry Bock, Gail Klatt, and Michael Volna.

Student Representatives present: Dalton Javener

EXTERNAL AUDITOR’S REVIEW OF COMPLETED AUDIT WORK AND NCAA AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Regent Lucas invited Associate Vice President and Controller Volna to introduce the external auditor's review, as detailed in the docket. Volna introduced Katie Knudtson from Deloitte and Touche LLP (Deloitte), noting that this report completes the annual audit cycle provided by Deloitte.

Knudtson provided an overview of the results of the four remaining 2015 audits. She noted that the Federal A-133 compliance audit of the University's federal expenditures had been concluded and reported in December 2015 with no significant findings. Knudtson summarized the outcomes of the Minnesota Office of Higher Education financial aid programs examination, highlighting one remedied finding at Duluth involving a student who received aid prior to approval. She provided results of student fee-funded organizations, describing findings consistent with prior years with regard to deficient account reconciliation and documentation.

Knudtson also provided a report on NCAA agreed-upon procedures. She noted two findings related to financial recording practices for non-University events at TCF Bank Stadium, and two findings involving financial aid practices linked to student athlete aid recipients.

Regent Omari asked about efforts to improve student organization accounting procedures. Knudtson responded that while training has been delivered, student turnover presents an ongoing barrier to significant change. Omari asked about one of the student athletes noted in the findings. Knudtson reported that eligibility for the student’s athletic scholarship had expired during the student’s fifth year.

Regent Hsu commented that the overall report findings, and specifically the student fee and NCAA reviews, appeared to be minimal. Knudtson concurred, noting that these minor findings were the first in several years and presented no concerns.
UPDATE ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
HUMAN RESEARCH PROTECTION PROGRAM WORK PLAN

Regent Lucas invited Vice President Brian Herman to provide an update on progress made since December 2015 on the Human Research Protection Program work plan, as detailed in the docket.

Herman introduced Paul Mattesich, Executive Director of Wilder Research and Chair of the Community Oversight Board, and offered a brief history of steps leading to the creation of that oversight board. Mattesich shared highlights from the group’s first meeting, where members were oriented to their charge and discussed their role as an independent body focused on remedying identified weaknesses in the Human Research Protection Program.

Regent Beeson commented on the strong reputation the Wilder Foundation brings to this work. President Kaler expressed his gratitude to Mattesich for his leadership with the oversight board.

Herman highlighted a number of updates:

- Departmental review replaced with a new Human Research Protection Program process designed to eliminate real or perceived conflicts.
- Annual research ethics conference launched.
- The first of three phases completed toward building an Institutional Review Board (IRB) system to accelerate researcher review and ensure proper documentation.
- Conflict of interest work team produced a proposal for upcoming University Senate review.
- New monthly newsletters and workshops initiated to provide updates to the research community.
- Fairview University Research Oversight Committee reconstituted to include its medical officer and M Health’s chief nursing executive.
- Compass Point Research engaged to conduct a random review of active studies.

Herman added that Legislative Auditor Jim Nobles will be initiating a follow-up review to his earlier report.

Herman introduced Vice President Brooks Jackson to present on items related to the Department of Psychiatry and continued monitoring of clinical trials. Jackson reported that the Clinical and Translational Science Institute (CTSI) continued its evaluation and management of drug and device trials in psychiatry, and hired Clinical Research Clients Consulting (CRCC) to inform the development of a management plan and make recommendations. Jackson noted that CRCC’s findings validated internal monitoring and that the University is aggressively investigating specific CRCC findings for corrective action, reminding the committee that a final report was distributed to Regents on February 10.

In response to a question from Regent Omari, Jackson noted that the final CRCC report was delivered to CTSI in January.

Regent Hsu expressed concern about the University’s ability to fix all of the problems identified in CRCC’s report. Jackson acknowledged Hsu’s concern, but offered that some of the more serious concerns were unfounded. He noted that issues related to uncorrected documentation practices were immediately investigated, with such actions taken as additional training and ongoing monitoring by several teams.

Regent Beeson expressed the need to ensure zero tolerance for any exceptions to best practices, which Jackson affirmed.
In response to a question from Regent Omari, Herman stated that Compass Point randomly selected 100 trials, but he was unsure of the total number of all Psychiatry Department trials reviewed. He explained that some trials are survey or behavioral in nature compared to the highest-risk trials involving drugs or interventions, which were suspended and outsourced to an independent, nonprofit IRB one year ago. Herman added that ongoing trial monitoring is provided by IRB review and CTSI.

**UPDATE ON IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS RECOMMENDATIONS**

Regent Lucas invited President Kaler and Vice Presidents Albert, Brown, and Pfutzenreuter to provide an update on the implementation of intercollegiate athletics recommendations, as detailed in the docket.

President Kaler provided an overview of the external review of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics on the Twin Cities campus (Athletics) and its recommendations, previously delivered to the Board. He reminded the committee that the results of an Athletics financial management internal audit also were shared at an earlier meeting.

Kaler reported that his action plan charged Albert with developing an implementation plan to address recommendations related to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action; aligning that plan with work underway to implement the University’s resolution with the Office of Civil Rights; and recommending system-wide policy changes.

The action plan charged Brown with proposing a plan for the search for the next Director of Intercollegiate Athletics (AD), including recommendations on use of a search firm, size and scope of the search committee, and the vetting process. Kaler added that Brown was charged with working with Pfutzenreuter to examine reporting relationships for the Athletics Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and appropriate financial oversight.

Kaler reported that his plan charged Pfutzenreuter with chairing a financial oversight committee to ensure good financial controls, ensure that policies and procedures are understood and adhered to, strengthen the culture of financial compliance, and strengthen protocols for procuring alcohol for Athletics functions.

Kaler asked each of the vice presidents to speak on their work. Albert outlined the committee of faculty and administrators who helped shape the implementation plan. She noted that while the external review’s recommendations focused on Athletics, the committee worked to expand the scope of responses system-wide in several areas. Albert highlighted increased accessibility to sexual harassment training. She noted that a new policy requires all advisors and staff with supervisory responsibility to report sexual assaults involving students. In keeping with the Office of Civil Rights recommendations, Albert pointed out that the policy should be expanded to include mandatory reporting of sexual harassment that they learn of involving students. The plan also calls for investment in software to provide timely automated updates, and requesting evidence of actions taken as a way to measure the outcomes of investigations.

Brown provided an overview of the AD search process and recommendations suggested by the external review. She highlighted action steps that include creating a larger search committee, using an RFP to select a search firm, clarifying roles and responsibilities with the selected entity, and seeking candidates’ written disclosure about previous NCAA-related complaints. Brown recommended that the Athletics CFO should continue to report to the AD, with a dotted line to the University’s CFO. She urged continued cross-functional financial oversight group efforts for one year after an AD is hired; creation of a policy requiring University financial officers to sign an annual financial certification; and involvement of the University’s CFO in all decisions to discipline or involuntarily separate a campus, college or unit financial manager to protect against fear of retaliation.
Pfutzenreuter provided updates from the financial oversight committee’s work. He reported on a risk-based review of Athletics around high-risk areas of travel, hospitality, and employee reimbursements. He noted that the Athletics financial staff role in review and approval has been strengthened, and that employee communications are underway to address questions about what exactly staff should be doing.

Pfutzenreuter explained the concept of an annual certification process for the approximately 50 system-wide financial managers with a dotted-line relationship to the CFO. Such a process is currently used by a number of Big Ten peers. Pfutzenreuter noted that among other things, as part of this process these staff would certify that their units were in compliance with University policies and internal controls related to payroll, benefits, purchasing, and cash. He suggested that this process would help ensure financial accountability across the system.

Pfutzenreuter praised Interim Athletics Director Beth Goetz for her leadership during this time, calling a good “tone at the top” a fundamental, critical piece of this work. He noted the department’s enthusiasm and willingness to change. Pfutzenreuter presented several additional ongoing tasks, noting significant overall progress but pointing out that much remains to be done.

Regent Hsu inquired about the reason for delivering sexual harassment training in the spring versus the fall. Regent Omari clarified that Hsu’s question was in reference to student athletes. Lucas invited Goetz to respond. Goetz reported that sexual harassment training occurs for all freshmen student athletes and the department offers an all-student athlete training annually on a varied schedule. She additionally reported that each team receives individual training, which is coordinated with the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action and timed to coincide as necessary with early arrival on campus, such as with football. In response to an additional question from Hsu, Goetz confirmed that student athletes who arrive on campus in January receive timely training.

Regent Hsu referenced the University of Illinois athletics director search and wondered if the University could enter into a similar agreement whereby a search firm would be compensated only for evaluating those candidates sourced by the University. Brown responded with her recommendation that a search firm be retained to expedite the process. She noted the University would negotiate a contract with reasonable costs and clear roles and responsibilities for each party. Hsu reiterated his belief that the University should not pay a search firm for work it conducts on its own; Brown agreed that this was reasonable and noted it would be kept in mind when negotiating the contract.

Regent Beeson shared his preference to have the Athletics CFO report directly to the University’s Vice President for Finance and CFO, but offered that the proposed dotted-line arrangement works. He expressed approval of developing a process for certifying the 50 or so University chief financial managers to share in compliance responsibilities. He affirmed use of a search firm to select an AD, asserting that doing so will yield the best field of local and national candidates.

Regent Omari offered that the implementation plan is a thoughtful response to improving departmental practice. He highlighted mandatory reporting, financial certification, and the cultural and personal courage aspects of speaking out without fear of retaliation. Omari requested Klatt’s feedback on the plans. She agreed with Pfutzenreuter’s view of leadership’s tone, and praised Athletics staff for a remarkable amount of demonstrated progress on plan implementation.
COMPLIANCE PROGRAM REVIEW PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Regent Lucas invited Associate Vice President Klatt and Chief of Staff Amy Phenix to share draft recommendations regarding the University's compliance program, as detailed in the docket.

Phenix provided a brief overview, including the historical context that precipitated the review. She described the review’s goals and the process for data collection, which included meetings with several Regents. She added that the University’s compliance program – particularly the compliance partners model – does well in comparison to peer universities and the private sector, and that there is significant structural variation across programs.

Phenix identified three attributes identified as best practices in compliance programs: strong relationships between compliance staff and others across the organization; active engagement and support of the President; and program reviews for compliance. She reported that the University’s peers were more likely to have oversight of administering compliance training across the organization; responsibility for a formal ethics program; and use a formal “chief compliance officer” title.

Klatt outlined the following key recommendations of the work group:

- Create a formal institutional ethics program.
- Create a system to inventory and monitor employee compliance training requirements.
- Conduct periodic program compliance reviews.
- Elevate the compliance director role to Chief Compliance Officer, position the role within the President’s senior leader team, and eliminate the dotted-line relationship to the Office of the General Counsel.
- Continue semi-annual reporting to the Board’s Audit & Compliance Committee and build in an annual meeting with the Board chair and with the Audit & Compliance chair.
- Maintain the compliance partners program and establish common understanding of responsibilities by entering into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with each partner.
- Base the program on the nine core components of the federal sentencing guidelines.

Regent Beeson shared his belief that compliance partners should certify the past-year’s results and wondered about the timing of the MOU being developed before year-end. He additionally stated his preference for keeping the compliance office tied to the Office of the General Counsel given conflict of interest concerns that arise, but expressed his general support for moving forward with other recommendations. Klatt responded that a process is already in place to ensure twice-annual reporting by compliance partners to the compliance office on emerging issues, and that the MOA structure is intended to clarify roles and responsibilities upfront. In response to an additional question from Beeson, Klatt indicated that compliance reports are issued and signed with great care.

Regent Omari expressed appreciation that the proposed MOU structure would largely continue the compliance partners model. He asked about human and technology resources needed to implement what was proposed; Klatt responded that the committee would hear more about that at a future date.

Regent Hsu asked about the cost and process for formalizing an institutional ethics program. Phenix responded that an additional communications staff member; training; and software focused on promoting an ethical atmosphere could likely be added without significant costs. Hsu asked for more information about the dotted-line relationship. Phenix responded that the dotted-line relationship between compliance and the Office of the General Counsel dates to the one-time belief that regulatory and legal issues would play a more prominent role in
compliance activities. Phenix noted that this structure is operationally problematic and creates a lack of clarity around roles and responsibilities. She added that the chief compliance officer should report directly and solely to the President. President Kaler agreed.

INTERNAL AUDIT UPDATE

Associate Vice President Klatt presented the Internal Audit Update, as detailed in the docket.

Klatt reported that her office is behind schedule in work plan completion due to additional time spent on investigations and projects related to the Athletics Department and Boynton Health Service. As a result, seven audits likely will be delayed. Since the last update to the committee, University departments implemented 41 percent of outstanding recommendations rated as essential, a notably higher rate than the previous two updates. Six units fully implemented all their remaining essential recommendations. Eight audit reports containing 59 recommendations rated as essential were issued in the last five months. Nine audits are in process.

Klatt noted that one of two financial auditors will retire in April, and another will leave due to spousal relocation. Progress is being made on filling these positions. She additionally noted that audits continue to identify vulnerabilities associated with information technology controls.

Regent Omari requested that a recommendation be brought to the committee regarding the number of Internal Audit staff and resources needed to catch up and adequately serve the schedule of audits. Klatt responded that this information will be included in the presentation of next year’s plan to the committee.

INFORMATION ITEM

Associate Vice President Klatt referred the committee to the information item contained in the docket materials:

- Report of engagements less than $100,000 require after-the-fact reporting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
A meeting of the Litigation Review Committee of the Board of Regents was held on Thursday, February 11, 2016 at 3:30 p.m. in the East Committee Room, 600 McNamara Alumni Center.

Regents present: Thomas Devine, presiding; Thomas Anderson, Linda Cohen, Dean Johnson, David McMillan, and Darrin Rosha.

Staff present: General Counsel William Donohue and Executive Director Brian Steeves.

Others present: Arnie Frischman, Timothy Pramas, and Brian Slovut.

The meeting convened in public session at 3:30 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO CONDUCT NON-PUBLIC MEETING
OF THE LITIGATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

At 3:33 p.m. a motion was made and seconded that the following resolution be adopted:

WHEREAS, based on advice of the General Counsel, the Board of Regents Litigation Review Committee has balanced the purposes served by the Open Meeting Law and by the attorney-client privilege, and determined that there is a need for absolute confidentiality to discuss litigation strategy in particular matters involving the University of Minnesota;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that in accordance with Minn. Stat. § 13D.01, Subd. 3 and 13D.05 Subd. 3(b), a non-public meeting of Litigation Review Committee be held on Thursday, February 11, 2016 at 3:30 p.m. in the East Committee Room, 600 Mcnamara Alumni Center, for the purpose of discussing attorney-client privileged matters including the following:

I. Preeti Kaur Rajpal v. Regents of the university of Minnesota, Aaron L. Friedman
II. University of Minnesota v. AT&T, et al.
III. University of Minnesota v. MD Anderson
IV. Miller, Banford and Wiles v. University of Minnesota
V. Minnesota Alpha Chapter of Sigma Alpha Epsilon, on its own behalf and in its representative capacity for its members v. University of Minnesota

The committee voted unanimously to adopt the resolution and the meeting was closed.

The meeting adjourned at 4:59 p.m.

BRIAN R. STEEVES
Executive Director and
Corporate Secretary
A meeting of the Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota was held on Friday, February 12, 2016 at 8:45 a.m. in the Boardroom, 600 McNamara Alumni Center.

Regents present: Dean Johnson, presiding; Thomas Anderson, Richard Beeson, Linda Cohen, Thomas Devine, Michael Hsu, Peggy Lucas, David McMillian, Abdul Omari, Darrin Rosha, and Patricia Simmons. Laura Brod participated by phone.

Staff present: President Eric Kaler; Chancellors Jacqueline Johnson, Stephen Lehmkuhle, and Fred Wood; Senior Vice President and Provost Karen Hanson; Vice Presidents Katrice Albert, Kathy Brown, Richard Pfutzenreuter, Pam Wheelock; Interim Vice President Bernard Gulachek; General Counsel William Donohue; Executive Director Brian Steeves; and Associate Vice President Michael Volna.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made and seconded, and the Board of Regents voted unanimously to approve the minutes of the following meetings:

- Board of Regents Special Meeting – December 8, 2015
- Board of Regents Work Session – December 11, 2015
- Academic & Student Affairs Committee – December 11, 2015
- Finance Committee – December 11, 2015
- Facilities, Planning & Operations Committee – December 11, 2015
- Faculty & Staff Affairs Committee – December 11, 2015
- Audit & Compliance Committee – December 11, 2015
- Governance & Policy Committee – December 11, 2015
- Board of Regents – December 12, 2015

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

President Kaler reported on the importance of being a land-grant institution and the responsibility the University has to its students. He discussed several upcoming events that will address the strength of the University’s curriculum and research priorities. Kaler reviewed the accomplishments of staff, students, and leadership at each of the system campuses. He stressed the importance of the upcoming legislative session and the budget requests that will be submitted by the University.

A copy of the Report of the President is on file in the Board Office.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR

Chair Johnson reported on topics discussed at the Board’s winter retreat. He highlighted several important priorities being addressed by the Board, including Twin Cities campus planning and the M Health partnership. He called on Regent Simmons to provide an overview.
of the M Health work group’s activities. Simmons discussed the group’s recent work and outlined next steps in the integration process. Johnson announced the three members of the M Health ‘nucleus board’ to be appointed by the Board of Regents.

A copy of the Report of the Chair is on file in the Board Office.

**RECEIVE AND FILE REPORTS**

Chair Johnson noted the receipt and filing of the Annual Capital Financing and Debt Management Report.

**CONSENT REPORT**

Chair Johnson presented for action the Consent Report as described in the docket materials, including:

- Report of the All-University Honors Committee;
- Summary of Gifts through December 31, 2015;
- Summary of Expenditures;
- University of Minnesota Health Board of Governors.

A motion was made and seconded, and the Board of Regents voted unanimously to approve the Consent Report.

**2015 UNIVERSITY PLAN, PERFORMANCE, AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT**

Chair Johnson invited President Kaler and Senior Vice President and Provost Hanson to present the 2015 University Plan, Performance & Accountability Report (Report) for action, as detailed in the docket. Hanson offered examples from the past year of how students, faculty, staff, and alumni helped fulfill the University’s threefold mission of education, research and discovery, and outreach and public service.

Several Regents expressed appreciation to the Provost’s Office for the significant work involved in producing the report.

A motion was made and seconded, and the Board of Regents voted unanimously to approve the 2015 University Plan, Performance & Accountability Report.

**RESOLUTION ON ENROLLMENT PRINCIPLES AND TUITION/AID PHILOSOPHY**

Chair Johnson invited Senior Vice President and Provost Hanson and Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education Bob McMaster to present for review the resolution on enrollment principles and tuition/aid philosophy, as detailed in the docket materials. Hanson and McMaster provided background and articulated the 10 points of the plan:

1. Modest total enrollment growth.
2. Admit for success. There is no single metric for acceptance – it is a holistic review with primary and secondary characteristics.
3. Affordability and access for Minnesota residents.
4. High-quality education and student experience. Housing is a key characteristic of the student experience.
5. Maintain a commitment to transfer students.
6. Value ethnic, social, economic, geographic diversity.
7. Support timely graduation.
8. Adjust enrollment levels and tuition rates to provide revenues.
10. Direct attention to workforce needs.

Regent Simmons commented that it is difficult for prospective out-of-state students and families to compare the University to other institutions. She observed that tuition is certainly an important factor, but that there are many additional factors beyond the sticker price.

McMaster responded that overall, the University is considered a good value for non-resident non-reciprocity (NRNR) students. He noted that as NRNR tuition increases, the administration will need to pay close attention to the impacts on NRNR enrollment. Hanson added that the administration has heard much feedback from current NRNR students about the determining factors in their decision to attend the University. She noted that there is concern among the current student body about proposed increases to NRNR tuition rates.

Regent Beeson suggested that several segments of students need greater consideration: urban, rural, and highly prepared, private high school students. He argued that these groups are just as important to the University as other groups of resident students. He added that the goals of the proposed plan have costs and he does not feel there is adequate consideration of these costs, given the timing of the plan. Beeson suggested that the new expenses will need to be funded by tuition, unless external funding can be secured.

Regent Devine remarked that the most critical parts of the plan are student debt, housing and facilities, and a focus on transfer students. He commented that student fees can differ across the system, and these fees greatly affect the total cost of attendance. Hanson agreed that student fees are an important consideration. She added that fees support many valuable programs, but it is important to do so in a balanced way.

Regent Anderson commented that much of greater Minnesota is not being considered in recruitment. He noted that the University of North Dakota (UND) has a very high non-resident student body, given the reciprocity agreement with Minnesota. Anderson suggested a goal of reducing the University’s resident tuition, while increasing net tuition for NRNR students.

Regent Cohen commented that the plan is reasonable. She stressed the importance of national and international students to the overall student experience, and suggested keeping the percentage of resident students attending the Twin Cities campus around 65 percent. Cohen disagreed that NRNR tuition should increase by 15 percent each year, even with planned annual monitoring. She asked for clarification on Big Ten data for new freshman receiving aid. McMaster responded that the metrics show cost of attendance minus gift aid for all students who receive any form of aid. He added that this is a standard national metric used across peer institutions. Cohen clarified that the data are not representative of the entire student body, only students who receive the gift aid, and McMaster agreed.

Regent Hsu remarked that the University should focus on creating value for Minnesota students. He added that debt reduction strategies are merely avoidance and suggested the best way to ease student debt is to lower tuition. Hsu expressed his belief that the total cost of attendance should be a priority. He added that he is comfortable with the proposed tuition increases and believes they could go up faster if discounting strategies are implemented. Hsu stated that the University emphasizes ACT scores far too much, which can make it difficult to achieve other goals such as increasing diversity.

Regent Lucas remarked that as the state’s only research institution, the University should make excellence a top priority. She expressed dissatisfaction with the plan for increasing NRNR sticker price.

Regent Rosha noted that despite a drop in total dollars provided by the state, the University is still better supported than its peers. He cautioned that a model of high resident tuition with
high discounts may not accurately factor in parent contributions for a given student. He voiced concern with high levels of student debt, noting its impact on career decisions. Rosha added that one of the reasons the University's net tuition is in the middle of the Big Ten is due to the poor quality of its housing. He asserted that students are getting less value in terms of housing. He stressed the importance to respecting the funding provided by the state, and making education more accessible for resident students.

Regent Omari commented that the transfer component of the plan is key and that he would like to see an increase in the Promise Scholarship program. He wondered whether STEM research, programs, and curriculum would still have as much demand in 30 years. He remarked on the importance of state funding, but added that much of that funding goes toward research and not necessarily to reduce tuition.

Hanson responded that the administration believes that the value of an education at the University is key. She remarked that there is a necessary balance of the University's ideals and the empirical factors of recruitment, adding that the dynamic is complicated and she appreciates the Board’s comments.

McMaster disagreed that the ACT is a poor predictor of student success, emphasizing that a benchmark metric is needed to bring in a quality class. ACT scores are also used to compare the University to other institutions. McMaster reported that the administration is focused on rural and Greater Minnesota student populations, noting a slight increase in admissions from those groups. McMaster added that there is a growing collaboration with Minneapolis schools and greater focus on financial aid for lower-income students. He pointed out that state demographics should be carefully considered; fewer college-age students in coming years will affect future enrollment. He noted that the STEM facilities are being designed for multiple uses, not just those in STEM disciplines.

OPERATIONAL EXCELLENCE UPDATE

Chair Johnson invited Vice President Kathryn Brown, Vice President Richard Pfutzenreuter, Interim Vice President Bernard Gulachek, and Associate Vice President Michael Volna to present an update on operational excellence (OpEx). The group provided an overview of progress made in the areas of human resources, finance and procurement, and information technology. They outlined changes in business processes and cost-saving initiatives across those areas, including information regarding recommendations from the June 2013 Huron Consulting Services report, and the status of the President’s goal to reallocate $90 million in administrative costs over six years.

Chair Johnson acknowledged Vice President Pfutzenreuter’s upcoming retirement and thanked him for his years of service to the Board. Several Regents echoed Johnson’s comments.

Regent Simmons applauded the improvement in HR management practices. She noted that the travel practice improvements represent a change, but will have a remarkable and positive effect. She observed that OpEx’s goal seemed bold when first proposed, but has yielded great savings and reinvestment back into the University’s mission.

Regent Beeson commented that annual reports should be maintained in the form of metrics and ways of measuring success. He noted the late Regent Larson’s legacy regarding human resources given that people are so critical to the University. He suggested more standardization around the assessment and evaluation of metrics.

Regent Hsu asked about plans for cybersecurity improvements if the legislature does not grant the full budget request. Pfutzenreuter replied that without the full allocation from the state, the project may take longer and alternative strategies may be needed to meet the goals. He added that he is concerned about not getting the full amount.
REPORT OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Regent Omari, Vice Chair of the committee, reported that the committee voted unanimously to recommend:

1. Approval of the Consent Report for the Finance Committee as presented to the committee and described in the February 11, 2016 committee minutes.

A motion was made and seconded and the Board voted unanimously to approve the recommendation of the Finance Committee.

Omari added that the committee also reviewed the finances of the Twin Cities athletics department; discussed the faculty retirement plan; received an analysis of cost of mission activities at the unit level; reviewed long-range financial planning for the Law School; and received several information items as outlined in the docket materials.

REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC & STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Regent Cohen, Chair of the committee, reported that the committee voted unanimously to recommend:

1. The following University Progress Card metrics for Minnesota students:
   a. The percent of Minnesota high school graduates who elect to attend college in Minnesota and enroll at the University as freshmen.
   b. The percent of University undergraduate students who are Minnesota high school graduates.
   c. The percent of freshmen enrolling who are Minnesota students.

2. Approval of the Consent Report for the Academic & Student Affairs Committee as presented to the committee and described in the February 11, 2016 minutes.

A motion was made and seconded and the Board voted unanimously to approve the recommendations of the Academic & Student Affairs Committee.

Cohen reported that the committee also received an update on the medical school; discussed the K-12 achievement gap; reviewed academic advising task force recommendations; and received several information items as outlined in the docket materials.

REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE & POLICY COMMITTEE

Regent Cohen, Chair of the committee, reported that the committee did not meet this month.
REPORT OF THE FACULTY & STAFF AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Regent Simmons, Chair of the committee, reported that the committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of:

2. Collective Bargaining Agreement for AFSCME Local 3260 Health Care, Unit 4.
5. Approval of the Consent Report for the Faculty & Staff Affairs Committee as presented to the committee and described in the February 11, 2016 committee minutes.

A motion was made and seconded and the Board voted unanimously to approve the recommendations of the Faculty & Staff Affairs Committee.

Simmons reported that the committee also reviewed employee engagement survey results and action steps; discussed hiring top talent; and received several information items as outlined in the docket materials.

REPORT OF THE FACILITIES, PLANNING & OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

Regent McMillan, Chair of the committee, reported that the committee voted unanimously to recommend:

1. Approval of Schematic Design for the Vet Isolation Facility (Twin Cities) as presented to the committee and described in the February 11, 2016 minutes:
2. Approval of the following real estate transactions as presented to the committee and described in the February 11, 2016 minutes:
   A. Amendment to Phased Aggregate Mining Lease with Dakota Aggregates, LLC covering 1,722 Acres in Rosemount and Empire Township, Dakota County – UMore Park.
   B. Sale of 36.87 Acres, Carlton County – Cloquet Forestry Center.

A motion was made and seconded and the Board voted unanimously to approve the recommendations of the Facilities, Planning & Operations Committee.

McMillan reported that the committee discussed long-range campus planning; received an update on information technology infrastructure and cybersecurity; reviewed joint venture activities; and received several information items as outlined in the docket materials.

REPORT OF THE AUDIT & COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE

Regent Lucas, Vice Chair of the committee, reported that the committee discussed the external auditor’s review of audit work and NCAA agreed-upon procedures; received an update on implementation of the human participant research protection program work plan; reviewed compliance program recommendations; received an update on implementation of Intercollegiate Athletics recommendations; and received several information items as outlined in the docket materials.
REPORT OF THE LITIGATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

Regent Devine, Chair of the committee, reported that pursuant to notice sent by the University, the Litigation Review Committee met on February 11, 2016. A resolution was considered and adopted that authorized the closing of the meeting. In the closed meeting a discussion was held on matters subject to the attorney-client privilege.

NEW BUSINESS

Administrative Restructuring

President Kaler reported on a proposal to restructure the senior leadership of the University. He outlined the changes in reporting structure and relationships. He explained that he would like to proceed with restructuring and seek formal Board approval at the March Board meeting.

Regent Simmons noted that the plan provides needed support for the President and preserves direct reporting between the President and the chancellors, as well as a direct connection to the faculty.

Regent McMillan commented on several dotted-line reporting relationships, which he feels are never ideal. He added that dotted lines lead to dotted responsibility.

Regent Hsu agreed. He asked if the search for the new senior vice president of finance and operations would proceed before Board approval of the plan. Kaler expressed hope that there would be general support for the plan. If so, he indicated intent to develop the job description and establish a search committee. If there were Board opposition to the plan, he would seek a different approach.

Regent Omari appreciated that the vice president for equity and diversity, as well as the faculty, still have a direct relationship with the President.

Resolution Related to Glensheen

Chair Johnson called on Regent Devine to introduce the Resolution Related to Glensheen. The resolution was moved and seconded and Devine discussed the importance of the Glensheen estate to the University and the state. He noted that though the University has invested considerable private money into the property, necessary repairs may require additional funding from the state. He emphasized that the resolution does not displace funding requested as part of the six-year capital improvement plan or the state capital request.

Regent Simmons commented that she will not support the resolution because a highly thoughtful six-year capital plan has already been proposed. She expressed concern that supporting the resolution could send an inappropriate message to the legislature.

Beeson moved to amend the last paragraph of the resolution by changing the words “fully support” to “would accept.” The motion was seconded.

Regent Devine accepted the amendment and clarified that the resolution would not replace the six-year plan.

Regent Rosha added that the resolution is simply a statement of understanding that the legislature has the opportunity to provide the funds, and that the University feels there is value in supporting the asset of Glensheen.

Regent McMillan noted that museums present unique challenges, but added that Glensheen adds value to the University’s mission.
Regent Simmons observed that the University owns other museum facilities but that the funding has come from different means, adding that this method of seeking funding is unusual. She emphasized the importance of the language that the funding would not displace funding for other projects. She added that she is uncomfortable with this method of seeking funds, but would be willing to accept the money, should it be allocated.

The Board of Regents voted unanimously to adopt the resolution related to Glensheen, the Historic Congdon Estate, as follows:

WHEREAS, the Glensheen mansion and grounds in Duluth were donated to the University of Minnesota in 1979 by the Congdon family with the charge that this historic home be preserved and cared for; and

WHEREAS, under the management of the Duluth campus (UMD), Glensheen has become the state’s most visited historic home and an important gathering place for Northeast Minnesota communities while also serving to advance the education, research, and outreach missions of the University; and

WHEREAS, strong attendance and improved programming in recent years have enabled UMD to improve revenues to a point where essential operating expenses are met; and

WHEREAS, the University has invested significant resources from private donations and endowment earnings in Glensheen operations and maintenance since it was accepted by the Board of Regents on February 9, 1979; and

WHEREAS, Glensheen still has significant and increasingly urgent deferred maintenance issues that need to be addressed; and

WHEREAS, since this beautiful home belongs to all Minnesotans, the Board of Regents has fiduciary responsibility to look for opportunities to expand the financial resources available to maintain it;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that while Glensheen is not included in the University’s current Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan or State Capital Request, the Board of Regents would accept new state investment in this facility as long as it does not displace other priorities that have been endorsed by the Board, notwithstanding the Board’s January 9, 1981 resolution restricting use of General Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Fund resources in support of Glensheen.

System-wide Strategic Planning

Regent Rosha commented that the lack of a system-wide strategic plan has made it difficult for him to consider actions over the past year. He asked the administration to develop such a plan, which could be used to gain support from the legislature and community.

President Kaler replied that he takes seriously the suggestion for stronger system-wide planning and reported that a planning framework needs to be established.

Regent Beeson suggested that the Board discuss the concept at one of its upcoming work sessions. He added that the Board already considers existing plans and how the budget requests fit into that framework.

Regent McMillan agreed that a system-wide strategy is necessary. He remarked that the enrollment plan reviewed earlier did not have a great enough emphasis on the total University system in that it focused primarily on the Twin Cities campus.
Regent Cohen agreed that the full Board should discuss the issue and ensure majority support before setting it as a priority.

Kaler proposed bringing a plan to the Board in March.

**Athletic Director Search Process**

Regent Rosha expressed concern about the athletic director search process, noting that he does not support use of an outside search firm. He commented that with strong internal and community candidates, money should not be allocated for a large, nationwide search. He called for an evaluation of the athletics department and its relationship with the state, adding that he does not believe athletics should be subsidized by the state.

Regent Simmons remarked that the Faculty & Student Affairs committee discussed hiring top talent, referring to Vice President Kathy Brown’s evaluation of when and why the University uses search firms. Simmons noted the importance of maintaining a diverse candidate pool and added that a firm should be used when it can help find the best talent.

Regent Anderson agreed that there are strong internal and local candidates, but that if the institution wants to raise the profile of athletics, the search process should not be restricted in finding the best candidate. He commented that the cost of the search is a small fraction of the annual budget.

Regent Devine commented that the administration should be allowed to do what is best for the University. He cautioned against the Board micromanaging the process, adding that getting too involved in the process is beyond its scope.

The meeting adjourned at 11:37 a.m.

_BRIAN R. STEEVERS_  
Executive Director  
and Corporate Secretary
A special meeting of the Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota was held on Thursday, February 25, 2016 at 8:30 a.m. in the Boardroom, 600 McNamara Alumni Center.

Regents present: Laura Brod, presiding; Thomas Devine, Michael Hsu, Abdul Omari, Darrin Rosha, and Patricia Simmons. Thomas Anderson, Linda Cohen, Dean Johnson, Peggy Lucas, and David McMillian participated by phone.

Staff present: President Eric Kaler; Vice Presidents Brooks Jackson and Richard Pfutzenreuter; General Counsel William Donohue; and Executive Director Brian Steeves.

APPOINTMENTS TO NEW UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA HEALTH BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Chair Brod introduced President Kaler and Keith Dunder, Academic Health Center Counsel, to provide context for discussion of appointments to the new University of Minnesota Health Board of Directors. They shared background and explained that the purpose of the resolution is to appoint three members of a ‘nucleus board’ who, along with three Fairview Health Services appointees, will help select a CEO for the new M Health.

Chair Brod invited Regent Simmons to summarize the progress of the M Health work group. Simmons recognized Regent Emeritus John Frobenius and Regent McMillan for their dedication to the work group. She noted that the work group feels the most important step in the negotiation process is selecting the right leader for the new M Health. She stressed that the CEO should be in place soon to bring value to the final steps of negotiation. Simmons commented that the CEO can only officially begin employment after the M Health entity exists, but that he or she may participate in the process, possibly in a consulting role.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Resolution Related to Naming Board Members with Authority to Select UMH CEO.

Regent McMillan voiced support for the resolution. He noted that while the CEO selection process may not be occurring in typical order, the resolution provides some needed structure.

Regent Rosha asked about the conditions under which the CEO would be officially hired into the position. Simmons responded that the full M Health board would be established in time to begin contract negotiations, but clarified that signing the official offer letter would not occur until the new entity was legally formed. Dunder confirmed that since the CEO position would report to the M Health board, the employment relationship would not begin until M Health is officially created. He pointed out that the final appointment of the CEO would not return to the Board of Regents.

Rosha voiced concern about the CEO search being conducted by a minority of the M Health board. Simmons noted that a step could be added between the initial search and candidate acceptance to accommodate participation by the full board. She explained that it is relatively common for a candidate not to know all members of the board during the selection process. She re-emphasized that official employment in the CEO position will not take place until the
entity is legally formed. Simmons clarified that the nucleus board will not be a board per se, rather a kind of selection committee of the full M Health board.

Regent Devine commented that the situation is a good start given the desired outcomes. He expressed confidence that the nucleus board members know what is needed and will forge a strong partnership with the Fairview appointees. He observed the limited responsibilities of the nucleus board and emphasized that there is much to be done before the entity’s formation. He asked for an update on the status of the search process.

Chair Brod invited Vice President and Medical School Dean Brooks Jackson to provide an update on the CEO search process. Jackson reported that initial candidate interviews are underway and the search committee will begin scheduling second interviews with the most qualified candidates. He added that the candidates would meet with the nucleus board during the second round, which will provide some assurance that they know who will be on the new M Health board.

Regent Hsu observed that a candidate would likely not consider a position before an agreement is signed, since this person would be leaving another job, and agreed that the full M Health board should be in place before a final offer is made. He asked how a CEO could be hired before the deal is completed. Dunder noted that the person would not be employed as CEO of the entity until it exists, but might come in as a consultant or other position. He agreed that while some candidates might not want to begin until a deal is final, others would prefer to begin while decisions are being negotiated. He stressed the importance of finalizing appointments to the full M Health board as soon as possible.

Hsu asked for clarification about what happens with the interim CEO of Fairview, noting his belief that the individual will step aside. Simmons replied that the search process has been delayed beyond what was initially planned. The letter of intent articulated that definitive agreements would be finalized by March, but July 1 is more likely. She explained that Fairview could bring in a new CEO before the entity is finalized. She encouraged selection of a leader with a background in academic medicine, noting that the strongest academic health centers in the country are led by such individuals.

Hsu asked for clarification on timing. Jackson responded that the committee would like to suggest a finalist by April. He emphasized that the candidates will want to know to whom they will report, even if it is only a minority of the full M Health board. He agreed that the interviews could wait, but that the candidates are going to want to at least meet the nucleus board.

Regent Cohen agreed that a candidate with a background in academic medicine is important.

Regent Johnson commented that formation of the nucleus board moves the Board of Regents closer to one of its key priorities: for the University to be a nationally recognized institution within the medical field. He agreed that the new CEO should have a background in academic health. He expressed trust in the members of the nucleus board, and offered his support for the resolution.

Regent Lucas voiced her support for the resolution.

Regent McMillan commented that though the situation is not ideal, it is what can be done at this time. He stressed the importance of moving forward. He agreed that an academically focused leader is key.

Regent Devine addressed the delay in timing of the final agreement, noting that finding the right candidate and making the right decisions is more important than meeting an arbitrary deadline.
Regent Hsu moved to amend the final paragraph of the resolution to remove the words “and hiring” from the responsibilities of the nucleus board. The motion was seconded.

Dunder commented that the proposed amendment would diminish the authority of the nucleus board, could place the committee out of sync with what Fairview is planning, and might discourage candidates since they will be meeting with individuals who do not have authority in the hiring process. He clarified that it would remove authority from the nucleus board in making a recommendation. Hsu disagreed, stating that it would inspire more confidence since they would be considered by the full M Health board, not just a minority.

Regent Omari voiced concern that the amendment could potentially create friction in the relationship with Fairview.

Regent Rosha observed that the words “and hiring” are inconsistent with what had previously been explained: that the CEO would not be officially hired until the entity is legally formed. He noted that the nucleus board should not have the ability to hire until the entity is official.

Hsu suggested there is plenty of time to appoint the full M Health board by April, given the timing of the final agreement, and that the full M Health board could appoint a candidate.

Simmons cautioned that recruiting additional members of the full M Health board might be a challenge without a fully formed entity. She stated how fortunate it is to have six people who believe in the process and are committed to the ultimate outcome; others may not be as inclined to participate without clear organizational parameters. She expressed her disappointment if the Board determines that its appointees to the nucleus board are unable to fully participate in the selection process. Simmons emphasized that the proposed language modification would give Fairview a stronger hand in the negotiations, when it is supposed to be an equal partnership.

Regent McMillan commented that Fairview is creating an opportunity for the University to be directly involved at a formative stage in the negotiations. He cautioned that Fairview could still appoint a CEO without University input if it wanted to do so. He stated his discomfort with the amendment since it takes away authority from the nucleus board. McMillan added that he is willing to rely on the expertise of the six nucleus board members.

In response to a question from Regent Hsu about the Fairview appointees, Regent Simmons responded that the Board and Fairview have discussed moving in a parallel way, and that the Board resolution is contingent upon equal representation from both entities. Jackson emphasized that for the faculty, it is critical to have a CEO in place at the start of the new entity. He noted concern that without new leadership in place at Fairview, the negotiations will be greatly complicated.

Hsu commented that he does not believe his amendment removes the ability to hire the finalist as a consultant, or in an interim position.

Regent Anderson suggested that physicians are eager for new leadership and noted the difference between a CEO with an academic background and one with a business background. He felt that the nucleus board would be limited by the ability to select but not hire a new CEO. He reminded the Board that it asked Fairview to slow their CEO search so that the Board could participate in the process.

Hsu clarified that his amendment limits authority of the nucleus board short term, but that there is time to change the authority and the composition of the full M Health board.

Executive Director Steeves explained that the amendment proposes to remove the words “and hiring” from the second to the last line of the resolution.
Simmons expressed her opposition to the amendment, noting the common practice for a minority group of a board to lead a search process and clarifying that the final appointment and hiring would be approved by the full M Health board. Simmons agreed there are many undecided factors, but that maintaining momentum is important.

Hsu stated there is no need for the nucleus board to have hiring authority at this time, since that authority can be granted later.

The Board of Regents voted 2-9 against the motion. Hsu and Rosha voted yes. The motion failed.

Regent Rosha stated that he would not support the resolution as drafted. He voiced several concerns with the language, summarizing that there are too many unknowns to feel comfortable supporting it.

Regent Simmons recused herself and left the room.

After questions and comments from several Regents about the formation of the new M Health board, Dunder clarified that the appointees to the nucleus board are not official appointments to the new M Health board. The Board of Regents will vote to formally approve those appointments at a later date.

Regent Rosha indicated that the resolution implies that the appointees to the nucleus board will be members of the full M Health board, and noted that it is binding. He suggested changing the language in the first line of the sixth paragraph from “will” to “may.”

Chair Brod asked if changing the language of the resolution would compromise the trust of the partnership with Fairview. Jackson responded that he does not believe the Fairview board would object. Brod clarified that the discussion is about aligning the language with the action, not changing the plan.

Regent Rosha moved to change the language of the sixth paragraph of the resolution to read “may” rather than “will.” The motion was seconded.

The Board of Regents voted unanimously to approve the motion to amend the resolution.

Regent Johnson voiced his confidence that Regent Simmons is the best person to guide negotiations, adding that he does not have any concern about her appointment.

Regent McMillan agreed, emphasizing her commitment and dedication to the process.

Regent Rosha clarified that he does not question Regent Simmons’ expertise and experience. He stated his belief that the discussion needs to be clear and deliberate, given the seriousness of the decisions being made.

The Board of Regents voted 9-1 to approve the Resolution Related to Naming Board Members with Authority to Select UMH CEO as follows. Regent Hsu voted no.

WHEREAS, the University of Minnesota (“University”), the University of Minnesota Physicians (“UMP”), and Fairview Health Services (“Fairview”) have a mutual goal to form an integrated academic health system, to be identified pursuant to a license/branding agreement as University of Minnesota Health (“UMH”), dedicated to high quality patient care, leading edge research and training of tomorrow’s workforce; and

WHEREAS, this system will require a new Chief Executive Officer and a new Board of Directors; and
WHEREAS, it is important to the success of the integrated academic health system that the new CEO, with the required qualifications, be in place by July 1, 2016, and that that CEO be chosen by a board with equal representation appointed by the Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota and Fairview; and

WHEREAS, in order to achieve the selection of the new CEO, the University and Fairview agree to now each appoint three members of the new UMH board, the remaining eight members to be appointed four each by the Board of Regents and Fairview prior to the Closing Date of the Transaction; and

WHEREAS, the combination of the initial six appointees and the remaining eight appointees will collectively serve as the initial Board of Directors of UMH as of the Closing Date; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Regents hereby appoints the following individuals who may serve as the first three (of seven) of the Board of Regent’s appointees to the Board of Directors of UMH:

• Brooks Jackson, M.D., MBA
• Kenneth Roering, Ph.D.
• Patricia Simmons, M.D.

The Board of Regents delegates to its appointees the authority, subject to the creation of a parallel appointment and delegation of authority from the Board of Directors of Fairview, and subject to a written agreement between the University and Fairview described below, to select a final candidate for the CEO position of UMH from the recommended candidate(s), provided that such candidate is determined to satisfy the requirements set forth in the UMH CEO Job Description, and to negotiate and finalize the terms of his or her employment agreement, which shall be at fair market value and commercially reasonable terms, and which shall be effective only after definitive transaction agreements have been entered into; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Regents authorizes the President of the University, on behalf of the Board of Regents, to execute a binding agreement with Fairview acknowledging the delegated authority of the initial three appointees from each organization and setting forth the arrangements and processes by which the initial six appointees shall carry out the selection and hiring of the UMH CEO, subject to the terms stated above.

The meeting adjourned at 9:56 a.m.

BRIAN R. STEEVES
Executive Director
and Corporate Secretary

Board of Regents Special Meeting
February 25, 2016
AGENDA ITEM: Report of the President

☐ Review  ☐ Review + Action  ☐ Action  ☒ Discussion

☐ This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: President Eric W. Kaler

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

It is customary for the President to report on items of interest to the University community at each Board of Regents meeting.
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March 31, 2016

AGENDA ITEM: Report of the Chair

☐ Review  ☐ Review + Action  ☐ Action  ☑ Discussion

☑ This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: Regent Dean Johnson

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

It is customary for the Chair to report on items of interest to the University community at each Board of Regents meeting.
AGENDA ITEM: Receive & File Reports

X This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: Regent Dean Johnson

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

The following items are included for receipt and filing:

A. Quarterly Report on Grant and Contract Activity

B. Academic & Student Affairs Committee Information Item
Meeting of the Board of Regents

Quarterly Report of Grant/Contract Activity

Fiscal Year 2016

Second Quarter Data: October - December, 2015
Quarter 2 Summary

Award activity is up $20M (12.3%) this quarter compared with the second quarter in FY2015. Contributors are NIH awards which are up $12.8M (59.8%) with both more and larger awards, and NSF awards, up $2.9M (25.7%), largely due to one $4M award to CSENG (M. Hillmyer). Funding from Other Federal and State and Local groups were down nearly $7M each compared with the same period last year. Awards from Other Private sources were up considerably, $18.2M (41.6%), due to increased funding from Foundations ($7.4M, 44.26%) and Universities and Colleges ($10.6M, 37.4%). There were 27 awards totaling $1M or more. The average award amount during the second quarter FY2016 was $180K compared with $168K in FY2015.

Slightly more colleges show increases than decreases this quarter. The Medical School is up $11.1M (37.6%) largely due to an increase in awards from Universities and Colleges, and NIH. Funding to College of Science and Engineering is up $4.6M (15.5%) with increased awards from Business and Industry, NIH, and NSF. The College of Pharmacy increase is due to a $6.6M award from the University of Kansas (S. David). The increase in the coordinate campus group is due to a UM Duluth award totaling $1.9M to Donald Fosnacht from Xcel Energy for his project “Demonstrating the Potential for Distributed Power Generation Using Converted Biomass: a Platform for the Future.” Receipt of two awards of over $2M this quarter results in a $3.7M (168.8%) increase for the College of Liberal Arts this quarter. CFANS, CEHD, Other Health Sciences, and School of Public Health had drops in funding this quarter compared with the same period in FY2015.

Comparison of FY16 Q2 to FY15 Q2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor Group</th>
<th>FY15 Q2 Number</th>
<th>FY15 Q2 Amount</th>
<th>FY16 Q2 Number</th>
<th>FY16 Q2 Amount</th>
<th>$ Change (Amount)</th>
<th>$ Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal NIH</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal NSF</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Other Federal</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>-6.9</td>
<td>-14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Business &amp; Industry</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Other Private</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State &amp; Local State &amp; Local</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
<td>-38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>161.9</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>181.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Medical School       | 362            | 29.6           | 339            | 40.7           | 11.1              | 37.6%        |
| College of Science and Engineering | 128    | 29.9           | 145            | 34.5           | 4.6               | 15.5%        |
| Public Health        | 48             | 15.0           | 58             | 12.3           | -2.7              | -18.1%       |
| CFANS                | 70             | 13.4           | 64             | 8.0            | -5.4              | -40.1%       |
| Other                | 35             | 4.0            | 43             | 7.0            | 3.0               | 74.8%        |
| CEHD                 | 43             | 12.4           | 53             | 9.5            | -2.9              | -23.2%       |
| Other Health Sciences| 104            | 31.1           | 153            | 25.9           | -5.2              | -16.7%       |
| UMC, UMD, UMM, UMR   | 38             | 2.4            | 26             | 4.4            | 2.0               | 81.7%        |
| Dentistry, Nursing, Pharmacy & Vet Med | 77      | 16.5           | 63             | 23.6           | 7.1               | 43.0%        |
| Other TC Provost     | 27             | 1.5            | 34             | 6.8            | 5.3               | 347.5%       |
| CBS                  | 15             | 3.8            | 16             | 3.1            | -0.8              | -19.6%       |
| CLA                  | 19             | 2.2            | 18             | 5.9            | 3.7               | 168.8%       |
| Total                | 966            | 161.9          | 1012           | 181.9          | 20.0              | 12.3%        |

NOTE: Amounts are represented in millions, therefore details may not sum to totals due to rounding.
NOTE: Amounts are represented in millions, therefore details may not sum to totals due to rounding.
Quarter 2 Award Dollars by College/Campus

Figure 3: Units with Greater than $10 Million Awarded Annually
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Figure 4: Units with Less than $10 Million Awarded Annually
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*Other Units includes: College of Continuing Education, Global Programs & Strategy, Office of Information Technology, System Academic Administration-Senior Vice President, The Graduate School, UM Crookston, UMN-Rochester, Undergraduate Education, University Health & Safety, University Libraries.
Fiscal Year-to-Date Summary

Fiscal Year 2016 award activity is up $35.9M (8%) overall with much of the increase due to receipt of a $30M award to J. Neaton during first quarter. Adjusting that award out, the overall increase to date is 1.2%. NIH activity is up $36.5M (31.5%) due to receipt of more and larger awards. NSF activity is down year-to-date due to first quarter activity as FY2016 Q2 activity is higher than FY2015 Q2. The first quarter drop in awards from Other Federal sponsors continues during the second quarter due to fewer and smaller awards. Funding from Business and Industry sponsors rebounded somewhat from a first quarter drop of $5.6M (24.9%) resulting in a smaller percentage drop overall of 13.5% to date. Awards from Other Federal sources fell this quarter resulting in a total drop of $9M (9.4%) to date. Funding from Other Private sources recovered from a Q1 drop of $3.8M (11.6%) to an overall increase of $14.4M (18.8%) through the second quarter. Although State of Minnesota awards are down Q2 compared with FY2015, activity is up $5.9M (10.9%) FY2016 year-to-date.

Most of the increases and decreases seen first quarter in specific colleges were tempered somewhat by quarter two funding levels. Medical School and College of Science and Engineering awards, down first quarter, recovered some of those deficits this quarter. The College of Biological Sciences, CLA, School of Public Health, Other Health Sciences, and Other TC Provost continue to be up compared with FY2015 year-to-date award activity. The coordinate campuses are up year-to-date after being down first quarter. Alternately, CEHD and the Other group continue their first quarter trend with continued lower funding levels second quarter. CFANS funding also fell this quarter resulting in an overall drop of $4.2M (11.7%) year-to-date after a slight increase last quarter.

### Comparison of FY16 Fiscal Year-to-Date (Q2) to FY15 Fiscal Year-to-Date (Q2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor Group</th>
<th>Sponsor Group</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>$ Change (Amount)</th>
<th>$ Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY15 YTD</td>
<td>FY16 YTD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>NIH</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>117.1</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>153.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>NSF</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
<td>-10.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Other Federal</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>-9.0</td>
<td>-9.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Business &amp; Industry</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
<td>-13.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Other Private</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State &amp; Local</td>
<td>State &amp; Local</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2427</td>
<td>449.0</td>
<td>2398</td>
<td>484.9</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### by College/Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By College/Campus</th>
<th>FY15 YTD</th>
<th>FY16 YTD</th>
<th>$ Change (Amount)</th>
<th>$ Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>113.9</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>107.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Science and Engineering</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Sciences</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry, Nursing, Pharmacy &amp; Vet Med</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFANS</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEHD</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other TC Provost</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMC, UMD, UMM, UMR</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2427</td>
<td>449.0</td>
<td>2398</td>
<td>484.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Amounts are represented in millions, therefore details may not sum to totals due to rounding.
Figure 5: 10-year trend of second quarter award dollars
Showing actual amount and rolling 3-year average.
Includes ARRA awards.

Quarter 2 Award Dollars with ARRA

Figure 6: 10-year trend of second quarter award dollars
Showing actual amount and rolling 3-year average.
Excludes ARRA awards.

Quarter 2 Award Dollars without ARRA
Academic & Student Affairs Committee
Information Item – March 31, 2016
Update on Accreditation from the Higher Learning Commission

The University's accrediting body, the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), has formally accepted the conclusions of the evaluation team that visited the Twin Cities and Rochester campuses from October 25-28, 2015.

The evaluation team determined that the campuses met all 21 requirements within the Higher Learning Commission's five criteria – Mission, Integrity, Teaching and Learning, Evaluation and Improvement and Resources – with no follow-up activity or monitoring related to accreditation or federal compliance criteria. This follows a comprehensive process that included reviewing the University's accreditation reports; meeting and interviewing dozens of campus faculty, staff, and students; and analyzing countless University documents and data.

The accreditation team noted that the University is "well supported by the Board of Regents"; faculty are "deeply engaged in scholarship, teaching, and service"; and "all sectors of the University are firmly committed to continuous improvement based on the results of internal and external evaluation processes." Specific to the Rochester campus, the report added that "the quality of teaching and learning, as well as student support services, are found to be exceptional."

The Twin Cities and Rochester campuses will now continue through the normal review timeline, which requires submission of a written update in academic year 2019-20, and another comprehensive evaluation, including a campus visit, in academic year 2025-2026.

Thank you to members of the Board who met with the HLC review team during the site visit last October.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

September 10, 2015, Preparations for Twin Cities and Rochester Campus Accreditation and Assessment of Student Learning Efforts, Academic & Student Affairs Committee

May 8, 2014, 2015–16 Reaccreditation of the Twin Cities & Rochester Campuses: Staff Preparations & Board Responsibilities, Academic & Student Affairs Committee

February 7, 2013, Assessment of Undergraduate Student Learning, Academic & Student Affairs Committee

October 12, 2012, University Accreditation, Educational Planning & Policy Committee
BOARD OF REGENTS
DOCKET ITEM SUMMARY

Board of Regents March 31, 2016

AGENDA ITEM: Consent Report

☐ Review  ☑ Review + Action  ☐ Action  ☐ Discussion

This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: Regent Dean Johnson

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

To seek Board of Regents approval of items in the Consent Report, as required in Board of Regents Policy: Reservation and Delegation of Authority.

Items for consideration:

A. Report of the All-University Honors Committee
The President recommends approval of the All-University Honors Committee recommendations forwarded to the Board of Regents in a letter dated March 24, 2016.

B. Report of the Naming Committee
The President recommends approval of the Naming Committee recommendations forwarded to the Board of Regents in a letter dated March 24, 2016.

C. Gifts
The President recommends approval of the Summary Report of Gifts to the University of Minnesota through February 29, 2016 (attached).

D. Finance Committee Consent Report
The President recommends approval of the Finance Committee Consent Report items, as follows:

- General Contingency – The purpose of this item is to seek approval for allocations from General Contingency greater than $250,000. There are no items requiring approval this period.

- Purchase of Goods and Services $1,000,000 and Over – The purpose of this item is to seek approval for purchases of goods and services $1,000,000 and over. The following expenditure requires approval of the Board:
To Fairview Specialty Services for an estimated $174,750,000 to provide specialty pharmacy benefits for UPlan participants for the Office of Human Resources Employee Benefits for the period of January 1, 2017, through December 31, 2019, with contract extensions through December 31, 2022. The contract will be funded on an annual basis out of the Fringe Benefits Recovery. Supplier was selected through a competitive process.

To Prime Therapeutics, LCC for an estimated $144,672,000 to provide Pharmacy Benefits Management for UPlan participants for the Office of Human Resources Employee Benefits for the period of January 1, 2017, through December 31, 2019, with contract extensions through December 31, 2022. The contract will be funded on an annual basis out of the Fringe Benefits Recovery. Supplier was selected through a competitive process.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Approvals are sought in compliance with Board of Regents Policy as follows:

- General Contingency: Reservation and Delegation of Authority, Sec.VII, Subd. 1.
- Purchase of Goods and Services $1,000,000 and Over: Reservation and Delegation of Authority, Sec.VII, Subd. 6

PRESIDENT’S RECOMMENDATION

The President recommends approval of the Consent Report.
### MEETING OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS

**GIFTS TO BENEFIT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA**

**SUMMARY REPORT**

March 2016 Regents Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>February</th>
<th>Year-to-Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of M Gift Receiving</td>
<td>$164,347</td>
<td>$69,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H Foundation</td>
<td>80,965</td>
<td>35,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arboretum Foundation</td>
<td>1,103,700</td>
<td>438,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of MN Foundation</td>
<td>12,268,044</td>
<td>17,662,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gift Activity</td>
<td>$13,617,056</td>
<td>$18,205,468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Detail on gifts of $5,000 and over is attached.

Pledges are recorded when they are received. To avoid double reporting, any receipts which are payments on pledges are excluded from the report amount.
## Gifts to benefit the University of Minnesota

### Gifts received in February 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Rec'd by</th>
<th>Gift/Pledge</th>
<th>Purpose of gift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$1 Million and Over</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Cancer Research Fund</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Pledge</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Pledge</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$500,000 - $1,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M Fdn. Inc.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Science and Engineering, Carlson School of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard C. Hoeft Estate</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Minnesota Landscape Arboretum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold E. G. Arneson Estate</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$250,000 - $500,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Dental of Minnesota Fdn.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Pledge</td>
<td>School of Dentistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$100,000 - $250,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald M. and Joanne E. Moquist Charitable Fund-SFACF</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard W. Trenkner Estate</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Carlson School of Management, School of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hormel Fdn.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Hormel Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Garofalo Education Fund-St. Paul Fdn.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Pledge</td>
<td>College of Education and Human Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huawei Technologies</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Science and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle and Eileen Heitkamp</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Pledge</td>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Wyckoff Rein in Sarcoma Fdn.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Academic Health Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth District Eagles Cancer Telethon Fund</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Academic Health Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin V. Chorzempa</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Academic Health Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Turkey Research and Promotion Council</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Veterinary Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$50,000 - $100,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M Co.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>School of Dentistry, Scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Marzolf Jr. Fdn.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Academic Health Center, Medical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felice E. Kronfeld Estate</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Academic Health Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### $50,000 - $100,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Sylvester</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson Electric Co.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Veterinary Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mosaic Co.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Mills Inc.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edna Bashara</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecolab Inc.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>School of Public Health, College of Science and Engineering, Carlson School of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dai Nippon Printing Co. Ltd</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Science and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David R. and Kathleen Q. Carlsen</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey and Mary Werbalowsky Philanthropic Fund</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Institute on the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Lions Vision Fdn. Inc.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul J. Scipioni</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Pledge</td>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Patch Fdn.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William R. Laney</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Pledge</td>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### $25,000 - $50,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cy and Paula DeCosse</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Weisman Art Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane C. Nordquist</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>University of Minnesota Duluth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sappi</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Science and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Bruins Fdn.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Hormel Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joleen H. Durken</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>4H Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodi A. Teske</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>University of Minnesota Duluth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ames Construction Inc.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman D. Olson Estate</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSDZ Inc.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affymetrix Inc.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Tribune Media Co. LLC</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The McKnight Fdn.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Office for Public Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xerox Corp. USA</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Science and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Heart of the Beast</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Charles A. Weyerhaeuser Memorial Fdn.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Science and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. J. Taylor Distributing of Minnesota</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilead Sciences Inc.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton S. Visnick</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Computer-Assisted Legal Instruction</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlson Meadows Renewal Center</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Center for Spirituality and Healing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $50,000</td>
<td>David and Mary Anderson Family Fdn.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Pledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George J. Tichy II</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Timothy O'Connell Fdn.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Walton Family Fdn.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRACON Pharmaceuticals</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zoetis/Pfizer Animal Health</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $25,000</td>
<td>Minnesota Livestock Breeders Association</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helen S. Henton Trust</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret Rivers Fund</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard B. Carroll and Barbara A. Roach</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zinpro Corp.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robertet Flavors Inc.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benno and Gertrude Wolff Family Fund-St. Paul Fdn.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Douglas W. Hoefer</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keith H. Clark Jr.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bruce Bergman Family Charitable Fund-Ayco Charitable Fdn.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ergodyne Corp.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medtronic Inc.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whole Foods Market</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hubbard Broadcasting Inc.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land O'Lakes Inc.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helen Iverson</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Saskatoon Colostrum Co. Ltd</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICM Inc.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AgStar Financial Services</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CoBank</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smaby Family Fdn.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The James Ford Bell Fdn.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bon-Ton Stores Inc.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wells Fargo Fdn.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift/Pledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
$10,000 - $25,000

KPMG Fdn.  UMF  Pledge  Carlson School of Management, College of Science and Engineering
J. E. Dunn Construction Co.  UMF  Gift  Intercollegiate Athletics
Alison M. Fox  UMF  Gift  Undetermined
Gardner Kivnick Family Fund-BoA Charitable Gift Fund  UMF  Gift  College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences
Land O'Lakes Inc. Fdn.  UMF  Gift  College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences
Lisa A. Peterson  UMF  Gift  Academic Health Center
Mozo-Grau  UMF  Gift  School of Dentistry
Pine Cone Fund-St. Paul Fdn.  UMF  Gift  College of Biological Sciences, College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences
AgXplore International Inc.  UMF  Gift  College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences
Agrium Advanced Technologies (US) Inc.  UMF  Gift  College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences
Hullsiek and Allen Memorial Share-St. Paul Fdn.  UMF  Gift  Medical School
Towers Watson  UMF  Gift  Intercollegiate Athletics
Charles W. Taylor  UMF  Gift  University of Minnesota Duluth
Arvid Olson Estate  UMF  Gift  Medical School
Bremer Bank  UMF  Gift  Intercollegiate Athletics
Wesley R. and Sonja M. Swanson  UMF  Gift  College of Science and Engineering
AMVAC Chemical Corp.  UMF  Gift  College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences
Anonymous  UMF  Gift  Scholarships
Anthony Ostlund Baer and Louwagie PA  UMF  Gift  Medical School
C. Charles Jackson Fdn.  UMF  Gift  Institute on the Environment
C. H. Robinson Worldwide Inc.  UMF  Gift  Minnesota Landscape Arboretum
CarVal Investors LLC  UMF  Gift  Medical School
Christine H. Moen  UMF  Gift  College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences
CHS Fdn.  UMF  Gift  College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences
David L. Ekstrand  UMF  Gift  Intercollegiate Athletics
Diamond V. Technologies Inc.  UMF  Gift  College of Veterinary Medicine
Harriet T. Ludwick  UM  Gift  Minnesota Landscape Arboretum
Headwaters Fdn. for Justice  UMF  Gift  Libraries
Jack and Gretchen Norqual Fdn.-MN Community Fdn.  UM  Gift  Minnesota Landscape Arboretum
John R. Pfommer Jr.  UMF  Gift  School of Public Health
### $10,000 - $25,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Gift</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis Radiology Associates Ltd</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Academic Health Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocon Inc.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Science and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paustis Wine Co.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert J. and Delores E. Isaacson</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Minnesota Landscape Arboretum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland W. Theisen</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>University of Minnesota Duluth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Jude Medical Fdn.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Academic Health Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Schur Kaufman</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd E. Jackman</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William H. Wendel Jr.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### $5,000 - $10,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Gift</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Butcher and the Boar</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Medical School, Academic Health Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendell J. Josal</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith A. Wolfe Estate</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Carlson School of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene U. Frey</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipestone Applied Research LLC</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Veterinary Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hormel Foods Corp.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences, Hormel Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syvilla M. Turbis Estate</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Medical School, Academic Health Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John and Jean Drawz</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bon-Ton Stores Fdn.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Academic Health Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Scientific Corp.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accenture LLP</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Carlson School of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monsanto Fund</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>4H Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVT Associates Inc.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Science and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMMC Medical Staff Services</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eberle Scholarship Fund-St. Paul Fdn.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoot and Ole's LLC</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Hormel Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim and Cathy Gray Fund-Fidelity Investment Charitable Gift Fund</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Minnesota Landscape Arboretum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson Reuters</td>
<td>UMF/UM</td>
<td>Gift/Pledge</td>
<td>Various Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick R. Scott</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Hobby Beekeepers Association</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Vikings Football LLC</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satoshi Otake</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Veterinary Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John R. Finnegan Jr.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryella S. Strane Estate</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Education and Human Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name/Company/University Of Minnesota Foundation</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Department/Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsden Building Maintenance - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredited Investors Inc. - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>Weisman Art Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann M. Brill - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrowhead Healthcare Supply - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>University of Minnesota Duluth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Milk Producers Inc. - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betsy A. Hauser - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty and Rodney Hestekin - UM</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>Academic Health Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles L. and Iris P. Fried - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>College of Education and Human Development, College of Science and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles R. S. Shepard and Derry A. Moritz Fund - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>Center for Spirituality and Healing, School of Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Leadership Fund-Mpls Fdn. - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>College of Education and Human Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle C. Mercurio - UMF</td>
<td>Pledge</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>University of Minnesota Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane C. Hoey - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>College of Science and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily C. Anderson - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estee Lauder Inc. - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank C. and Frances B. Newman Family Fund - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain Millers Inc. - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard O'Connell Charitable Fund-Bank of America - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>College of Biological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingersoll-Rand Co. - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>Carlson School of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane E. Lansing - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>College of Science and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean D. Kinsey - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse and Lindsey Botker - UMF</td>
<td>Pledge</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joann E. and Dennis L. Johnson - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John and Marla Simmet Family Fund - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetouch Inc. - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maurices Inc. - UMF</td>
<td>Pledge</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>University of Minnesota Duluth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perten Instruments Inc. - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJM Interconnection - UMF</td>
<td>Pledge</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raytheon Co. - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehael Fund-Roger Hale/Nor Hall--The Mpls Fdn. - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>Humphrey School of Public Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLBCI Operating Fund - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>University of Minnesota Duluth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald and Janet Schutz Family Fdn. - UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>Law School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### $5,000 - $10,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Gift</th>
<th>College or Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saputo Dairy Foods USA LLC</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Care Communities Inc.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Center for Spirituality and Healing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SipcamAdvan</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Meadow Nursery Inc. / Proven Winners</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stinson Leonard Street LLP</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Carlson School of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dencker Trust</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Science and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Driscoll Fdn.</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Minnesota Landscape Arboretum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas F. and Barbara D. Votel</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy J. Forstad</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Carlson School of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Queen Cheese Factory Inc.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Enterprises Inc.</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William R. Dircks</td>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## General Contingency

**Fiscal Year 2015-16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 FY2016 General Contingency</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Carryforward from FY15 to FY16</td>
<td>8,496</td>
<td>1,008,496</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 UM Crookston</td>
<td>186,000</td>
<td>822,496</td>
<td>Offset UMC FY15 tuition shortfall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Reversal of JE0000702057 from FY15</td>
<td>954,496</td>
<td>(132,000)</td>
<td>Transfer in FY15 did not post properly and was deleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Office of Real Estate</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>822,496</td>
<td>Purchase of 120 acres in Isanti County for Cedar Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 University Services</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>810,996</td>
<td>Reconstruction of Eastcliff Event Lawn space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 CFANS</td>
<td>166,400</td>
<td>644,596</td>
<td>Beef Feedlot relocation and renovation in Rosemount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Small Project Balances Returned to General Contingency</td>
<td>663,358</td>
<td>(18,762)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 CPPM</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>588,358</td>
<td>Rare Books Relocation Predesign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 New items this reporting period:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Office of Real Estate</td>
<td>45,200</td>
<td>543,158</td>
<td>Electric Steel Elevator Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Office of Real Estate</td>
<td>$35,200</td>
<td>507,958</td>
<td>Purchase BNSF RR Easement for 8th St Improvement Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 CPPM</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>487,958</td>
<td>Additional funding for Rare Books Predesign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14 FY 2015-16 Ending Balance</strong></td>
<td>487,958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Subject to Board approval due to cost of $250,000 or more

FY16 r. 2016 Mar
Purchase of Goods and Services $1,000,000 and over

To Fairview Specialty Services for an estimated $174,750,000 to provide specialty pharmacy benefits for UPlan participants for the Office of Human Resources Employee Benefits for the period of January 1, 2017 through December 31, 2019 with contract extensions through December 31, 2022.

*Fairview Specialty Services will administer the specialty pharmacy benefit program that will be offered to all UPlan Medical Program participants. They will work with the University to encourage effective specialty pharmacy care for plan members, and cost effective program management for both employees and the University. Fairview Specialty Services will be supported by Prime Therapeutics, LLC on the Pharmacy Benefits Management of the program.*

*Fairview Specialty Services was selected as a provider for specialty pharmacy as a result of a request for proposal conducted mid-2015 through January 2016. The initial contract will be for three years, with three one-year options to renew the contract.*

*The contract will be funded on an annual basis out of the Fringe Benefits Recovery.*

Submitted by: Ken Horstman
Director, Benefits and Compensation

Approval for this item is requested by:

Kathryn F. Brown
Vice President, Office of Human Resources

March 30, 2016
Purchase of Goods and Services $1,000,000 and over

To Prime Therapeutics, LLC for an estimated $144,672,000 to provide Pharmacy Benefits Management for UPan participants for the Office of Human Resources Employee Benefits for the period of January 1, 2017 through December 31, 2019 with contract extensions through December 31, 2022.

Prime Therapeutics, LLC will administer the single pharmacy program that will be offered to all UPan Medical Program participants. They will work with the University to encourage effective pharmaceutical care for plan members, and cost effective program management for both employees and the University. Prime Therapeutics, LLC will be supported by Fairview Specialty Services on the specialty component of the program.

Prime Therapeutics, LLC was selected as a provider for Pharmacy Benefits Management as a result of a request for proposal conducted mid-2015 through January 2016. The initial contract will be for three years, with three one-year options to renew the contract.

The contract will be funded on an annual basis out of the Fringe Benefits Recovery.

Submitted by: Ken Horstman
Director, Benefits and Compensation

Approval for this item is requested by:

Kathryn F. Brown
Vice President, Office of Human Resources

March 30, 2016
AGENDA ITEM: Report of the Student Representatives to the Board of Regents

☐ Review ☐ Review + Action ☐ Action ☒ Discussion

☐ This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: Callie Livengood, Chair, Student Representatives to the Board of Regents
Cory Schroeder, Vice Chair, Student Representatives to the Board of Regents

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

The report of the Student Representatives to the Board of Regents provides a student perspective on issues and concerns facing University students.

The theme of the 2016 report is diversity and inclusivity. The report will discuss and make recommendations regarding the following issues:

- Mental Health
- Retention and Attraction of Students and Faculty of Color
- Transfer Students

A statement on proposed non-resident non-reciprocity tuition increases and an update from campus student government organizations is also included.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Board of Regents Policy: Student Representatives to the Board of Regents states that the student representatives may make a report to the Board each semester. The group chose to present only one report for the year.
INTRODUCTION

This report is one of the best opportunities that the student representatives have to inform the Regents on important, relevant student topics of interest. The focus of this year’s report has been driven by a diverse set of student perspectives on each of the five campuses, as well as discussions with administration and additional stakeholders. The theme of this year’s report is diversity and inclusivity, and it specifically addresses each of the following three topics:

1. Mental Health
2. Retention and Attraction of Students and Faculty of Color
3. Transfer Students

MENTAL HEALTH

The purpose of this section is to detail significant student mental health challenges across the University system. The ramifications of student mental health on the University are immense. Our existing mental health services are likely being underutilized, despite already being overburdened. As demand continues to grow, the way we prioritize and support mental health services must change.

Background

Mental health problems are diverse, prevalent, and growing among University students. The most common diagnoses include depression, anxiety, mood disorders, and personality disorders, and each has unique treatment challenges and educational impacts. The implications of these problems for graduation rates, learning outcomes, and the future of Minnesota are significant.

Nationally, 19.4 percent of 18 to 25 year olds have at least one mental health problem, but in higher education the situation is even worse. The most recent College Student Health Survey, which included all campuses, shows approximately one in three students (36.2 percent) report at least one diagnosed mental health condition. One in five (22.7 percent) report two or more. Approximately one in five students reported being diagnosed with anxiety (21.7 percent) or depression (23.8 percent), and one in four (28.1 percent) reported being unable to manage their stress level. These rates are even worse among many historically marginalized communities that the University is committed to serving. Women, students of color, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT)
students\textsuperscript{4}, international students\textsuperscript{5}, first-generation students, and low-income students each face unique challenges, and all have high rates of incidence both in University surveys and national studies. Both administrators\textsuperscript{6} and medical professionals\textsuperscript{7} find that the prevalence of these problems at post-secondary institutions is increasing nationwide. This is creating new resource challenges for mental health service providers.

What makes mental health an issue of particular relevance to University decision makers is the immediate impact it has on the research, teaching, and outreach missions of the institution. An alarming 56.3 percent of Minnesota students report mental health issues have affected their academic performance\textsuperscript{2}. This is consistent with national findings that the learning outcomes of students with mental health problems are worse than their peers\textsuperscript{8,9}. A survey conducted by the Minnesota Student Association of undergraduates at the Twin Cities campus (Appendix pg.32) found 30 percent of all students, and 56 percent of students seeking or receiving treatment, indicated that progress toward their degree completion had been delayed or impacted by mental health problems. Indeed, graduation rates nationally for students with mental health problems are thought to be lower\textsuperscript{10}. Among students that do drop out, mental health concerns are a leading cause\textsuperscript{11}. Further, students struggling with the stigma of mental health problems have a more limited sense of inclusivity and are less involved within the campus community\textsuperscript{12}. Until these trends are addressed, the University will continue to lose talented students, produce under-prepared graduates, and create an exclusive educational environment.

A strong commitment to protect student safety, health, and wellness is fundamental to achieving the University’s mission, and in line with Board of Regents policies. The University must respond to mental health problems the same way it would any other physical health problem with similar incidence rates, mortality rates, and mission-related impacts. Unresolved mental health problems can have significant consequences on long-

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{10} Hunt, Justin, Daniel Eisenberg, and Amy Kilbourne. "Consequences of Receipt of a Psychiatric Diagnosis for Completion of College." Psychiatric Services 61.4 (2010). Web.
\end{itemize}
term quality of life\textsuperscript{13}, or literally become an issue of life and death. Suicide is a leading cause of death among college students\textsuperscript{14}. The number of University students that report attempting suicide each year is nearly 300, and between two and five students commit suicide annually. The Board of Regents and Administration have an obligation to do everything possible to ensure this number is reduced to zero.

**Barriers to Treatment**

Despite the clear importance of mental health, a number of major barriers still exist for students navigating the University system of resources for treatment. Initially, students must correctly identify that a mental health problem exists, and recognize that successful treatments are available. They must overcome any stigma associated with this treatment and know where and how to seek help. Then they must be able to get a timely appointment with a qualified mental health provider, and have further access to care if needed. At each point in this process there are opportunities for the University to improve outcomes for students.

**Stigma and Awareness**

For many students, the sudden independence, location change, and social adjustments when transitioning to post-secondary education are difficult to balance with the increased scholastic rigor and large financial burden\textsuperscript{15}. The competitive environment can enable the development of new mental health problems for students, and many underlying mental health problems manifest by college age\textsuperscript{16}. The majority of students’ educational and social experiences during their four years at the University will take place on or near the campus. This defined location and unique window of time to intervene in mental health problems endow the University with additional responsibilities and opportunities.

The most basic barrier to treatment is education. Students, faculty and staff all have limited formal education on mental health problems\textsuperscript{17}. It is challenging to self-identify deteriorating mental health, and students often rely on their newly established network of peers, community advisors, and instructors to help recognize problems. In University-owned housing, community advisors are given minimal training on how to respond to mental health problems, and are expected to share relevant information with their residents. Several community advisors on the Twin Cities campus interviewed for this report expressed concerns that the training was inadequate and that students did not have


\textsuperscript{15} Cleary, Michelle, Garry Walter, and Debra Jackson. "‘Not Always Smooth Sailing’: Mental Health Issues Associated with the Transition from High School to College." Issues in Mental Health Nursing Issues Ment Health Nurs 32.4 (2011): 250-54. Web


an appropriate understanding of how to identify problems or utilize University resources. Nonetheless, community advisors appear to be the only significant attempt by the University to address the underlying educational problem among students; instructors remain under-involved, and student peers suffer from all the same gaps in knowledge of resources. Evidence-based training programs for faculty have proven successful in promoting early intervention in student mental health problems in other states\textsuperscript{18}. Courses like “Mental Health First Aid” are used in California, Pennsylvania, Texas, Michigan, and elsewhere\textsuperscript{19}. The University should consider expanding its utilization of these types of programs, in combination with additional student specific education.

For many, the immediate impacts on class performance will be enough to recognize something might be wrong, but few have a strong awareness of the existing treatment services. A survey conducted by the Minnesota Student Association of undergraduates at the Twin Cities campus (Appendix pg.32) found nearly one in four students (24 percent) who were seeking resources, but had not yet received treatment, did not know where to find them. Existing online compilations of resources, like “mentalhealth.umn.edu,” were only known by 42 percent of these students, and even major service providers, like Student Counseling Services, were only known by 64 percent of these students. Additionally, almost all of these students (98 percent) had not used Disability Resources to seek class accommodations for their mental health problems. It is likely these rates of awareness are even worse in the general student population.

Conversations with mental health providers confirmed this problem is not unique to the Twin Cities campus. Existing compilations of resources, like the Twin Cities specific “mentalhealth.umn.edu,” are either missing entirely or insufficiently developed on the system campuses. As a result, the potential for students system-wide to discover all available resources independently is severely constrained. Expanded and alternative resource promotion approaches, including direct integration with online University services like Moodle, must be reviewed for deployment across all University campuses.

Even among students that are aware of services, stigma remains a major barrier to effective utilization. In the same survey, about one in four (27 percent) undergraduate students on the Twin Cities campus who were seeking resources cited the stigma associated with utilizing mental health services as the reason they had not yet received treatment. These trends hold in other states\textsuperscript{20}, and are likely to exist at all campuses across the University system. This presents further challenges; smaller communities—

\textsuperscript{18} Osilla, Karen Chan, Michelle W. Woodbridge, Rachana Seelam, Courtney Ann Kase, Elizabeth Roth and Bradley D. Stein. Mental Health Trainings in California's Higher Education System Are Associated with Increased Confidence and Likelihood to Intervene with and Refer Students. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, (2015).
\textsuperscript{19} www.mentalhealthfirstaid.org/cs/about/ See also: www.ucop.edu/student-mental-health-resources/suicide-prevention/certified-training.html
like our Rochester, Crookston, and Morris campuses—report higher concerns around stigma than larger communities\textsuperscript{21}. Each campus culture will face different stigma related challenges, and require specialized solutions to reduce the problem.

\textit{Resource Access}

Beyond the challenges of education, awareness, and stigmatization are significant problems with actual access to treatment resources. One would expect some kind of delay between when a student contacts a mental health service and when they receive an appointment. However, our mental health services are in such high demand on some campuses that both primary care providers and counseling services quickly resort to waitlists to manage the load. Information provided by the Chief Medical Officer of the Boynton Mental Health Clinic showed waitlists were in use on the Twin Cities campus by October 1 in fall 2015—less than one full month into the academic year. Approximately half (54.3 percent) of the students on this list were able to schedule an appointment within three business days, and nearly four out of five students (77.6 percent) were able to schedule an appointment within eleven business days. However, this is just the wait \textit{list} time, not the total wait time to receive treatment. Appointments themselves may be up to two weeks later, meaning that for most students, the actual wait time between seeking and receiving treatment is nearly a month. For some it can be even longer.

It’s important to keep this time frame in perspective: for many students, over a fourth of the semester will elapse before they are able to even begin treatment. Mental health stressors and class obligations will continue to build over this time frame with major academic consequences. Follow-up appointments are under similar levels of overutilization, forcing some providers to resort to lower appointment frequencies than they would otherwise have deemed appropriate. Further, the service load is not evenly distributed over the course of the semester. Exams, midterms, and finals all create more demand, meaning few students get appropriate care during the times most significant to their education.

This problem is most acute on our largest campus, but it is also a problem on the other four campuses. Consider the Morris campus, where interviews with mental health administrators revealed similar trends to the Twin Cities: typical wait list times ranged from three to fourteen days. Further, after-hours mental health crises resources have been utilized at nearly six times the frequency of the prior decade. The largest self-identified barrier to providing timely service was that student demand for counseling services often exceeded staffing capability. Only at the Crookston campus did mental health service providers report that sufficient resources were available to meet demand. For this report, we contacted all the mental health medical services and counseling services on each campus during Fall 2015. On every campus except Crookston, we were unable to schedule an in-person meeting within a two-week time frame, confirming the trends noted above.

Another access problem exists in the hours of service available to students. Class, work, and activity schedules for many students are quite full, particularly during normal business hours. However, almost all mental health services across the system are only open during these times, meaning students must either choose not to receive care or to skip academic or extracurricular obligations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Medical Services</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Counseling Services</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twin Cities</td>
<td>Boynton Health Service</td>
<td>M,T,W,F: 7:45AM–12:45AM, 1:45PM–4:30PM, Th: 9:00AM–12:45PM, 1:45PM–4:30PM</td>
<td>Student Counseling Services</td>
<td>M-F: 8:00AM–4:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duluth</td>
<td>Birch Tree Center</td>
<td>M,T,W,F: 8:00AM–4:00PM, Th: 9:00AM–4:00PM</td>
<td>UMD Counseling Services</td>
<td>M-F: 8:00AM–3:00PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>Stevens Community Medical Center</td>
<td>M-F: 8:30AM–5:00PM</td>
<td>Student Counseling</td>
<td>M-F: 8:00AM–12:00PM, 1:00PM–4:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crookston</td>
<td>UMC Student Health Services</td>
<td>M-F: 8:30AM–4:00PM</td>
<td>Counseling Services</td>
<td>M-F: 8:00AM–5:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>Olmsted Medical Center</td>
<td>M-F: 8:00AM–5:00PM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternatively, students may seek out private resources on their personal insurance plan. However, many students are not in a position to utilize private services with the same ease or discretion as University services. This is particularly true for non-resident students, members of historically marginalized groups, and students in communities where few private resources are available. Though alternative hours of operation can be challenging to manage and staff, they represent a significant benefit to students. Evening hours, weekend appointments, and other novel service methods have the potential to provide more students with care, reduce tradeoffs with valuable instruction time, and even minimize stigma concerns.

Each of the preceding problems is fundamentally a resource problem. Nearly all of the campuses face extreme demand pressures with stagnant budgets. Some campuses, like Morris, Crookston, and Rochester, offer fewer types of services (e.g. psychiatric services) due to budget constraints as well. The risks from this may be even greater in smaller communities with fewer external resources. In the short term, significant financial relief is necessary to abate these challenges across the system. However, long-term solutions are also needed. This challenge is particularly complex, as conversations with mental health administrators on each campus have revealed that no single funding model is utilized for mental health services across the system. Some services, like primary care clinics, rely on a combination of insurance payments, internal revenue generation, and
student service fees. Others, like Twin Cities Student Counseling Services, are funded though the Student Services Cost Pool. In a mental health system that is characterized by overloaded access points, the existing approach to resource provision must be strongly scrutinized. There are many factors to be balance, including service provider autonomy, student representation in decision-making, minimum insurance standards, the administrative unit structure within the institution, and more. Additionally, a number of on-campus providers have highlighted physical space itself as one of the larger resource challenges. Next to funding constraints, space was consistently mentioned in interviews with mental health administrators as one of the most significant barriers to service expansion. This was especially common on the Twin Cities campus from both Boynton Health Clinic and Student Counseling Services. Short to medium-term space prioritization must be granted for these groups, but long-term solutions will require new infrastructure, as well as deeper and earlier integration with facilities planners in University Services.

Resource Outcomes
Even when students are able to access treatment, there are still obstacles in assessing and tracking mental health outcomes for students. It remains unclear what appointment frequency and wait time frame is appropriate to respond to the scale of mental health problems at the University. Part of this is a data problem; little support is granted for cross-provider, cross-campus, or community comparisons of treatment outcomes. Many service providers attempt to track outcomes internally, yet without appropriate comparisons or publication the implications for University planning are hard to determine. This is particularly true at the system level. More consistent tracking and reporting will be a prerequisite to developing long-term solutions to the aforementioned access and awareness problems. In each case, a data-driven approach will be required to determine the appropriate course of action.

Priority and Leadership
The above challenges are not the unique fault of any single actor within the University, but the Board of Regents is in a unique position to correct them. To maintain the status quo would be a willful disservice to student health. From our many conversations with students, mental health administrators, and even the president himself, it has become clear that the priority the mental health crisis receives in University decision-making does not reflect the scale of the problem. Indeed the response can only be described as reactionary. The lack of strategic direction at all levels of the institution enables persistent under-allocation of resources and needless delays in action while the problems continue to grow.

It is apparent that the operating assumption among the Board of Regents and higher-level administrators is that problems are being dealt with at lower levels through the appropriate channels. They maintain an uninvolved presence in the development of solutions to these problems. The operating assumption among lower-level administrators and mental health providers is that they do not have sufficient capacity, direction, or authority to respond to the scope of the crisis, despite their best efforts. Meanwhile, the actual mechanisms through which detailed campus-wide and system-wide solutions can
be created are decentralized, ill-suited to act, or missing entirely. There is broad confusion within existing advisory bodies, like the Provost’s Committee on Student Mental Health, on their exact role in the decision-making process. Ultimately, this confusion causes widespread inaction at the expense of students.

Recent efforts by some administrators to prioritize mental health should be commended. In particular, the Provost’s commitment of short-term bridge funding to hire four new staff members on the Twin Cities campus is an important step in the right direction. However, while these steps are necessary they are not sufficient. Insulating mental health services from budget cuts and sporadically supplementing their budgets does not solve the underlying resource problem. Instead, the University must proactively assess the scale and growth of the mental health crisis and appropriate sufficient resources to address it. An emphasis on outcomes for students must drive decision-making. While many competing interests and factors must be balanced in the pursuit of operational excellence, the University must ensure that appropriate investments are made in the services most vital to student success.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON MENTAL HEALTH
The student representatives to the Board of Regents recommend:

- **The Board should provide additional sources of funding for mental health services, and evaluate alternative financing models to ensure sustained support.**

  Short-term financial relief should be committed to support our overburdened mental health services while long-term funding solutions are debated and created. Recent efforts, like those of the University of California system\(^{22}\), demonstrate that renewed commitments to mental health funding are not only possible, but can produce real benefits for students in a short time frame. Interim solutions need be utilized, but this mode of response should not become routine. The University must work to ensure more sustained resources exist to combat these problems in the future.

- **The Board should establish a comprehensive, system-wide strategy on student mental health by Spring 2017.**

  The University can ensure it is a national leader on student mental health by working to proactively integrate mental health considerations into its long-term strategic planning. The formulation of a comprehensive strategy would address the minimum acceptable standards of care and outcomes for student mental health, determine if additional types of mental health services should exist, detail how to confront existing and future space constraints, and evaluate potential changes to the academic curriculum. Other institutions, including the University

of California system\textsuperscript{23}, have followed this approach. It would send a strong signal to both students and the greater educational community that mental health is priority for the University.

- **The Board should establish an unambiguous mandate for the administration to develop campus-specific action plans on student mental health by Spring 2017.**

Challenges to mental health look different on each campus and require specific solutions. The creation of a single, representative, and empowered group on each campus will eliminate widespread confusion and diffusion of resources to ensure that real solutions to immediate problems can be developed and implemented. Other institutions, including the University of Wisconsin\textsuperscript{24}, have followed this approach. These specific action plans should be developed as quickly as possible with the direct involvement of the President, Chancellors, medical community, students, and other relevant stakeholders.

- **The Board should commission the development of an annual report on student mental health risks, trends, and service outcomes.**

A report will ensure the University remains responsive to changing developments in student mental health across the system, and enable decision makers to quickly identify opportunities for action. A formal reporting requirement could be added to Board of Regents Policy: *Health and Safety*, analogous to the annual sustainability report in the Board of Regents Policy: *Sustainability and Energy Efficiency*. At minimum, enhanced data collection and collaboration will allow medical providers to better coordinate care and service.

---

**RETENTION AND ATTRACTION OF STUDENTS AND FACULTY OF COLOR**

The purpose of this section is to outline the importance of attracting talented students and faculty of color to the University of Minnesota, and to ensure their success and support during their time here.

**Students**

Currently, 26.8 percent of students enrolled at the University of Minnesota are students of color, with this number varying on each of the different system campuses at both the undergraduate, graduate, professional levels\textsuperscript{25}. This represents a large portion of the students attending the University, and their continued enrollment and achievement is vital to the success of every campus. The presence of this diversity on campus vastly improves

\textsuperscript{23} Regents of the University of California "Report of the University of California Student Mental Health Committee" (2006, September). http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/sept06/303attach.pdf


\textsuperscript{25} http://www.oir.umn.edu/student/enrollment/term/1159/current/13235
the quality of learning and breadth of perspectives that are provided to students during their time at the University. In a recent survey conducted by the Minnesota Student Association of undergraduates at the Twin Cities campus (Appendix pg.32), it was found that 52 percent of students felt additional diversity on campus would significantly benefit their learning experience on campus. This section of the report is aimed at improving how the University can continue to attract students of color, and give them the resources necessary to ensure their success here.

**Understanding the Campus Climate**

A key component of being able to attract and retain students of color at the University is having a better knowledge base of the day-to-day experiences of students of color on all of the five system campuses, and how these experiences differ across groups of students. In a report by Susan R. Rankin called “Differing Perceptions: How Students of Color and White Students Perceive Campus Climate for Underrepresented Groups”, which analyzed the campus climate at 10 different Universities, it was consistently found that students of color experience the campus culture and climate very differently than white students. Additionally, it was found that different groups of students of color also experience campus climate very differently from one another. A good example of this can be seen in the results of the Minnesota Student Association survey that was administered to the Twin Cities campus undergraduate population (Appendix pg.32). Only 47 percent of white students answer “yes” to the question, “Do you feel additional diversity in the student body would improve your academic experience?” however, 66 percent of students of color answered “yes” to the same question. This demonstrates that, at least on the Twin Cities campus, students of color and white students do experience the campus climate differently from one another.

It is clear that the University knows the importance of understanding the campus climate, as can be seen through various initiatives on some of its system campuses. On the Twin Cities campus, the “Improving Campus Climate” initiative has been ongoing for two years. This initiative is focused on understanding the campus climate, and finding where improvements need to be made by holding listening sessions with students, faculty and staff, and members of the University community. This campus climate working group has created a document with recommendations for improvement, gathering the evidence for their recommendations from campus engagement programs such as four “World Cafes” and one “Open Space” event, as well as past data from the Student Experience in the Research University (SERU). However, there has been criticism from students about these events due to the lack of clarity as to how the information from these sessions is being used, and the frequent inaccessibility of these sessions due to classes and other conflicts.

---


28 https://campus-climate.umn.edu/initiatives-projects
Rankin and Associates, an external consulting firm that specializes in understanding and improving campus climate at institutions of higher education, is completing a full-scale assessment of the campus climate on the Duluth Campus. This assessment will be fully completed this coming summer, with preliminary results in May. It is important that external assessments like the one being completed at Duluth be completed at the other four campuses and that all campuses are given the necessary time and resources to holistically survey the student body.

Another method of obtaining information on campus climate, one that would consider the experiences of a diverse set of students at every University campus, would be through a broad campus climate survey and evaluation. There are many peer institutions that are completing this type of external assessment of campus climate. Schools they have recently conducted full-scale campus climate assessments include the entire University of Wisconsin system, numerous schools in the University of California system, and the entire North Dakota State University system. No holistic survey of the campus climate at every University campus has been done before, and this understanding is important and meaningful for students and administration. Due to the importance of understanding the campus climate at every University campus, and the high prevalence of campus climate surveys occurring at peer institutions, the student representatives recommend the implementation of a system-wide campus climate survey and evaluation completed by an external party. In addition to obtaining the data collected through these campus surveys, it is also important to utilize that data by creating action plans for change on each campus. Therefore, upon the completion of these campus climate surveys, the student representatives recommend that the University utilize that data to recommend changes to current practices that would benefit the individualized needs of different communities on campus.

Resources and Programming

The University of Minnesota strives to provide resources and support for its students, and there are various programs across the system that are designed specifically for students of color. In 2014, students at the University, along with 26 other universities, created a list of “Diversity Demands.” These serve as guidelines for the types of support and programming that students of color want to see on their campus. These include: academic and financial support for students of color, funding for programming and physical gathering space on campus, and increased recruitment of students of color within the community. These are crucial components of programming for students of color, and while some campuses in the University system are able to meet at least some of these requirements, not all fulfill them. There are gaps in the types of services being provided at each campus that need to be addressed in order to ensure academic and social support is being given to all students of color at every campus.

---
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There is a wide variety of programming offered at our two largest campuses, Duluth and the Twin Cities. Duluth has the Multicultural Center, which sponsors several student cultural groups, as well as professional offices for different ethnicities. The Twin Cities campus has a large variety of programming available to students through the Office of Equity and Diversity, many of which are included in the Multicultural Center for Academic Excellence (MCAE). However, at the smaller University campuses, there are often not as many programs available to students of color. The Morris campus has the Equity, Diversity & Intercultural Programs office, which sponsors a few resources including the Gateway program. The Crookston campus has a few resources for students of color that are offered through the Diversity Programs office in Student Affairs. Finally, at this time, Rochester has no formal office to support students of color on their campus. Rochester shares some resources with the Twin Cities campus, and has a few student cultural groups.

It is clear from the current state of programming available for students of color on each of the University campuses that there are different levels of available resources across the system. By creating a coordinated, system-wide effort to standardize the types of resources being offered at each campus, there will be improved uniformity and overall service for students. This would involve not only creating a standard of quality for what type of services are available to students of color on any given campus, but a method of coordination to disseminate information about valuable system-wide resources to students on every University campus.

This increased coordination could benefit students across the system by providing more information about University scholarships and academic enrichment opportunities. One example of this is the SEED scholarship, which is offered through the Office of Equity and Diversity on the Twin Cities campus. This scholarship is available to all University students, although it is not advertised as widely as it could be to system campuses. By creating more equal resources and better disseminating valuable information to students of color at all campuses, we would create opportunities for students of color to grow and thrive in the University system.

In order to equalize resources and programming for students of color across the University system, the student representatives to the Board of Regents recommend the creation of a standard of quality for resources and programming for students of color to which all campuses in the University must adhere. Additionally, in order to ensure that all students of color at the University have an equal chance at the valuable resources available to them, the student representatives to the Board of Regents recommend the creation of a mechanism to disseminate valuable system-wide financial and programmatic resources to all students of color at the University.

---
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Faculty
Faculty is a vital part of the community on each University of Minnesota campus. They are the foundation of discovery and learning, and their work greatly impacts the lives of the students they teach. It is exceptionally important that this forward-facing population of faculty is diverse in numerous ways in order to foster creativity and differences in thought. One important component of this diversity is faculty of color. Faculty of color is important to the campus community because elite positions in academia have historically been more difficult to access by minority populations. We as an institution of higher education have a duty to promote fair access to these positions within our own community. Additionally, the representation of faculty of color is vital to the experience of students on campus. In a recent survey administered by the Minnesota Student Association of the Twin Cities undergraduate student body, a question was asked regarding the level of importance having a diverse group of faculty was to students in making their college decision (Appendix pg.32). In this survey it was found that 39 percent of students stated that faculty diversity was either very important or important to their decision to attend this University (Appendix pg.32). However, it was found that among students of color who answered this same survey question 49 percent considered faculty diversity to be either important or very important in making their college decision (Appendix pg.32).

Mentoring of Faculty of Color
The University of Minnesota, through the Office of Equity and Diversity, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, and various other campus resources, has a wide variety of programs designed to support the retention of faculty of color at its five campuses. These programs range from grants for research to social gatherings. However, one vital component to the successful retention of faculty of color is mentoring, and the University currently has no formal mentoring program that is consistent across colleges and academic programs. Mentoring is considered one of the best methods of retaining faculty of color, and it is especially important at predominantly white institutions

Currently, there is not a mentoring program that is campus wide at any University campus, much less a program that supports faculty mentoring at all University campuses. There may be mentorship programs that exist in individual campus departments, but they are currently not offered equally to each college on every campus. There are numerous studies that demonstrate the importance of mentoring for faculty of color. One such study, by Christine Stanley at Texas A&M, collected the narratives of 27 faculty of color who are teaching in predominantly white universities across the nation. This study found mentoring to be critically important to retention of faculty of color, as mentors helped

with research, teaching, adjusting to campus culture, and building both formal and informal networks within the University.\textsuperscript{38}

The University of Michigan did a full study and report in 2000 on the state of faculty mentoring on their campus. Michigan found that faculty continuously cited mentoring programs as being important to their campus experience. Additionally, they found consistent problems with the severity of segmentation of the existing mentoring programs across departments and the inequities in programming across departments. These are not inconsistent with the attributes of the University of Minnesota’s mentoring programs for faculty. The University of Michigan then made recommendations for further improvement to their mentoring program, not just at the individual department level, but also to holistically improve mentoring programs through structural and formal support from administration.\textsuperscript{39} The University of Michigan is not unique in the emphasis they are placing on faculty mentoring. In fact, in a 2009 report completed by Western Washington University called “Best Practices: Recruiting & Retaining Faculty and Staff of Color,”\textsuperscript{40} several universities with exemplary mentoring programs, including the University of Michigan, Notre Dame, the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, the University of Iowa and many more, were recognized for their successful programs. And while the University of Minnesota’s efforts to retain faculty of color are called out for excellence in other areas, they are lacking in the area of mentoring.

There have been efforts in the past to try and create a holistic mentoring program for faculty of color. In the fall of 2012, the Office for Equity and Diversity helped to facilitate an advisory committee that was charged with evaluating the mentoring programs on the Twin Cities campus and creating recommendations for best practices.\textsuperscript{41} This committee benchmarked current mentoring practices in various parts of the Twin Cities campus, researched best practices across the nation, and created characteristics for a more robust program that could be implemented campus wide. However, due to resource constraints, this program never came to fruition.

Due to the demonstrated importance of mentoring for faculty of color, the impact this may have on the retention of these faculty, and the importance of faculty of color to students the student representatives to the Board of Regents recommend the allocation of funding for the creation of a mentoring program for faculty of color. In order to find the most fitting format of the mentoring program, each campus should also be given the necessary support to evaluate current practices and develop best practices in mentoring for their faculty. These mentoring programs are vital to the success of faculty of color on campus, and the representation and diverse perspectives of these faculty members are essential to attracting and retaining talented students to the University.

\textsuperscript{38} Stanley. "Coloring the Academic Landscape: Faculty of Color Breaking the Silence in Predominantly White Colleges and Universities."
\textsuperscript{39} https://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/faculty_mentoring_study/report.html
\textsuperscript{41} z.umn.edu/facultymentoring
Expand the Diversity Predoctoral Fellowship and Bridge Funding

Currently, the Morris campus has approximately 9 percent faculty of Color, Crookston has approximately 16 percent, Duluth has approximately 15 percent, Rochester has approximately 31 percent and Twin Cities has approximately 17 percent faculty of color actively teaching on each campus. As for graduate assistants, the Twin Cities campus has approximately 10 percent who are people of color, and Duluth has about 6 percent. Since the graduate assistant numbers for the Duluth and Twin Cities campuses are both nearly 10 percent below their faculty of color proportions, there is a clear need to try to expand and grow from within. By examining the funding options that the University system has in place for faculty of color and graduate students of color, we can see that there is a need to allocate more resources.

The Diversity Predoctoral Fellowship program is one way that the University of Minnesota as a system is able to recruit and prepare up-and-coming faculty of color. Both the Morris and the Duluth campuses participate in this program, which aids in bringing dedicated, skilled, and intelligent predoctoral candidates to campuses who benefit greatly from having a more diverse faculty. These candidates are able to contribute greatly to a wide array of disciplines, which allows for a diversification of thought, knowledge, and experience on the coordinating campuses. As the University strives to increase the number of faculty of color system-wide, the expansion of the Diversity Predoctoral Fellowship should be taken into account. This program is an excellent way for us to recruit from within, retain from within, and grow from within.

The second program that needs expanded funding and support is Bridge Funding for Faculty of Color hires. This program provides financial support to academic departments that have identified highly desirable candidates of color to fill full-time tenured or tenure-track positions, but do not immediately have adequate funding available to extend an offer of employment. Similar to the Diversity Predoctoral Fellowship, Bridge Funding is essential to recruiting and retaining talented and exceptional faculty to the University system. As it is noted in the policy guidelines, “the recruitment and retention of faculty of color provides role models for students and faculty, which should improve the University’s success in recruiting and graduating students of color and retaining faculty. The effective recruitment and retention of faculty of color requires the University to be proactive, and to identify and target particular individuals who fill an academic need and strengthen the faculty.” In order for the University to remain proactive, it is imperative that the Bridge Funding and the Diversity Predoctoral Fellowship programs are supported as fully as possible.

Many other universities in the Big Ten have predoctoral fellowships and programs established. However, the Diversity Predoctoral Fellowship at the University is unique among our Big Ten peers. The only other program similar to ours is the President’s

---

42 There are only 13 faculty members total for the Fall 2015 count.
43 http://www.oir.umn.edu/hr
44 https://diversity.umn.edu/idea/bridgefunding
Diversity Doctoral Scholars Program at Indiana University.\textsuperscript{45,46} Many of the predoctoral fellowships in the Big Ten are open to all students (not solely for people of color). Many of those fellowships target incoming graduate students only. Additionally, those fellowships focus on research and dissertation support. The Diversity Predoctoral Fellowship is unique because it supports Ph.D. candidates with research, dissertation and also teaching. By supporting Ph.D. candidates in those three areas, the University is truly preparing them for a promising career in academia. Lastly, the Diversity Predoctoral Fellowship program is designed specifically for Ph.D. candidates of color, studying in any field. Many predoctoral fellowships at other universities are not designated for Ph.D. candidates of color, thus not meeting the need to support up-and-coming faculty of color.

Due to the importance of attracting diverse faculty of color and the importance a diverse faculty holds for students the student representatives to the Board of Regents recommend the establishment of hiring tracks for Ph.D. candidates that are enrolled in the Diversity Predoctoral Fellowship program. By establishing tracks for those candidates, the University can better foster budding and talented researchers, educators, and ambassadors. The student representatives to the Board of Regents also recommend increasing the amount of bridge funds available to all campuses to hire talented faculty of color, which would increase the presence of these faculty in different departments across the University. Both of these initiatives would greatly improve our ability to hire talented faculty of color, this is a necessary component of being able to attract talented students of color to the University.

**RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE RETENTION AND ATTRACTION OF STUDENTS AND FACULTY OF COLOR**

- Implement a system-wide campus climate survey and evaluation to better understand the needs of students of color at every University of Minnesota campus
  - Utilize the data from this survey to recommend changes to current practices that would benefit the individualized needs of different communities on campus
- Create a standard of quality for resources and programming for students of color to which all campuses in the University must adhere
- Create a mechanism with which to disseminate valuable system-wide financial and programmatic resources to all students of color at the University
- Allocate funding for each campus in the system to have a campus-wide faculty mentoring program.
- Establish hiring tracks for Ph.D. candidates that are enrolled in the Diversity Predoctoral Fellowship program
- Increase bridge funding that is available to departments and campuses across the system, in order to increase the ability of these units to provide competitive job offers to talented, prospective faculty of color

\textsuperscript{45} http://graduate.indiana.edu/doc/shared/presidents-diversity-initiatives-brochure.pdf
\textsuperscript{46} http://www.indiana.edu/~gradgrnt/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/Presidents-Diversity-Doctoral-Scholars-Program-Application-Form.pdf
TRANSFER STUDENTS
The University of Minnesota is unique among its peers because of its commitment to transfer students. The University is proud to have transfer students represent a substantial portion of the undergraduate student population. At the Twin Cities campus, roughly 33 percent of incoming students are considered transfer students. While many resources are in place to help transfer students acclimate to the University47, there is an opportunity to further strengthen these programs and ensure that incoming students consistently understand and participate in all that the University has to offer. At the University, there are two main classifications of transfer students; those students who transfer from inside of the University system, and those who transfer from outside of the University system. These two populations have somewhat similar needs in terms of campus integration and support systems, but do not have the same level of needs regarding familiarization with the University.

Intra-University Transfer Students (IUT)
Intra-University Transfer students are those students who transfer campuses within the University of Minnesota system. These students are classified outside of the traditional transfer student programming and overall receive a different experience. Due to this difference in classification, IUT students are sometimes left to acclimate themselves to their new campus without the full support given to traditional, external transfer students. On average, over the period from 2008 to 2013, there were 281 total IUT incoming students each fall across the University system.

External Transfer Students (New Advanced Standing - NAS)
External Transfer students are students who come into the University of Minnesota from outside institutions, and are referred to as New Advanced Standing (NAS) students. Discussions of transfer student numbers and programs typically reflect NAS students exclusively. On average, over the period from 2008 to 2013, there were 2,759 total NAS incoming students each fall across the University system.

Graduate and Professional Transfer Students
Graduate and professional programs overall have far fewer transfer students than do undergraduate programs. In general, these transfers are based on availability of academic specialties and school rankings. At this level of education, orientation resources and integration into the campus community appear to play a relatively insignificant role. Our research has not revealed any major issues or areas for improvement in working with graduate and professional transfer students. To remain attractive and welcoming to graduate and professional transfer students, the University should focus on preserving or increasing rankings of graduate and professional academic programs.

Support Programming

---

47 http://admissions.tc.umn.edu/admissioninfo/trans.html
The University of Minnesota brings together a wide range of students from both outside institutions and system campuses. When students transfer into or between the five University campuses, programs have been established to support the success of each student through the process of transition. Each campus has created programs to fit the needs of the students they serve. Although each campus may have different programs, the overall mission of these programs is to support and provide the necessary resources for each student as they progress toward degree completion.

Listed below are the programs that are in place at the different campuses to assist transfer students in their transition, along with a short description of each program.

**University of Minnesota Twin Cities**

- Transfer Student Network
  - Mentorship program designed to connect transfer students with a “Transfer Inside” to help answer questions, give advice or someone to talk to.\(^{48}\)

- Living Learning Communities\(^{49}\)
  - Leaders in Transition (also known as “Transfer House”) gives new transfer students the opportunity to grow both personally and professionally during their first year at the U of M.\(^{50}\)
  - One transfer student commented on the best aspect of their experience as a transfer student: “I was a part of the Transfer Student LLC in Centennial Hall, and it immediately allowed me to bond with fellow transfer students who could relate to what I was going through. It was like making an instantaneous group of friends.”\(^{51}\) A different student commented on the worst aspect of their experience: “Not many people are new to the campus and so it is hard to find someone who understands what you are going through.”\(^{52}\)

---

\(^{48}\) [http://ofyp.umn.edu/more/first-year-programs/transfer-student-network](http://ofyp.umn.edu/more/first-year-programs/transfer-student-network)

\(^{49}\) Living Learning Communities address both academic and social fit within the University. D’Amico, et al. (2014) stated “perceived academic fit served as the most consistent predictor of outcomes.”

\(^{50}\) [http://ofyp.umn.edu/more/first-year-programs/leaders-transition](http://ofyp.umn.edu/more/first-year-programs/leaders-transition)


\(^{52}\) Id.
● Tau Sigma Honors Society
  ○ National Honors Society designed exclusively for transfer students to promote academic excellence and involvement of transfer students on the Twin Cities campus.53

● Monthly Newsletters
  ○ A monthly letter sent to transfer students to inform the new students of upcoming events and opportunities for them.54

University of Minnesota Duluth
● Transfer Connect: Peer-to-Peer Mentoring Program
  ○ Help transfer students ease into the Duluth campus through social and academic connections. The program is not mandatory for students, but highly encouraged.55

University of Minnesota Crookston
● Transition Crookston
  ○ Transfer students are invited to participate in a one-day program that is designed to meet their needs while transitioning to a new campus. Transfer students are not required to attend any formal orientation.56

University of Minnesota Morris
● No programs are currently in place in Morris for transfer students. If a student is having troubles or needs assistance, it is on the student to seek help

University of Minnesota Rochester
● No programs are currently in place in Rochester for transfer students. If a student is having troubles or needs assistance, it is on the student to seek help.

Orientation
In addition to the programs discussed above, the University currently offers different orientation programs for IUT and NAS students, and these orientation programs vary based on campus. IUT students are seen as roughly equivalent to students who would be transferring colleges within the same campus. While these programs in large part meet the needs of transfer students, students do not always feel fully engaged in the culture and spirit of the University.

53 http://www.transfer.umn.edu/programs/board/index-copy.html
54 http://www.transfer.umn.edu/programs/tsemonthly/
55 http://www.d.umn.edu/sit/transfer/
56 http://www1.crk.umn.edu/services/studentexperience/orientation/
University of Minnesota Twin Cities

- Parents of Transfer Students
  - Provide an overview of University resources and services, and help answer any questions that parents have about life at the University.\(^\text{57}\)
- Transfer Student Orientation
  - Program for all external and internal transfer students to understand the academic and community expectations of a University student. Orientation helps students become aware of the resources available while meeting new and current transfer students.\(^\text{58}\)

University of Minnesota Duluth

- Transfer Welcome Week and Bulldog Welcome Week
  - Provide students with the chance to learn about the campus culture and get connected with other transfer students. Transfer students have the opportunity to participate in Bulldog Welcome Week with all new students, but are not required to.\(^\text{59}\)

University of Minnesota Crookston

- Transfer Orientation
  - One-day required program in both the spring and fall. Provides the transfer students with the necessary information to be successful, such as laptop distribution, class locations, and meeting with an advisor.\(^\text{60}\)

University of Minnesota Morris

- Each transfer student goes through the same process that a new student would go through at the beginning of the Fall semester with a day of orientation, registration and becoming familiar with the campus.\(^\text{61}\)

University of Minnesota Rochester

- A one-day orientation during the summer leading into Fall semester to help students register for classes, meet professors, assign laptops and take a campus tour. There is no orientation for Spring semester transfer students.\(^\text{62}\)

In our research, students indicated a lack of a cohesive campus culture and spirit as a current dissatisfaction with the University. While many different factors play into school spirit, a consistent introduction to the University would help to establish a baseline identity, which individual campuses could then build upon to reflect their unique culture. As students adjust to new environments, especially if they transfer to the Twin Cities

\(^{57}\) http://ofyp.umn.edu/parents-families/parents-transfer-students
\(^{58}\) http://ofyp.umn.edu/orientation/transfer-student-orientation
\(^{59}\) http://www.d.umn.edu/sit/transfer/
\(^{60}\) http://www1.crk.umn.edu/admissions/prospective/transfer/
\(^{61}\) http://admissions.morris.umn.edu/transfer/
\(^{62}\) http://r.umn.edu/admissions/transfer
campus, which is in a major metropolitan area, culture shock can be a significant impediment to success. Information regarding culture, including ways to adapt, are critical components of successful orientation programs for transfer students. On average, IUT students typically receive more limited orientation resources through condensed or optional programs, especially when it comes to cultural transitions. Therefore, the student representatives recommend the University create a standardized orientation program that introduces transfer students to fundamental aspects of the University, while leaving opportunities for individualization to each campus to shape this orientation to display their unique culture and available resources. Furthermore, the student representatives recommend that all orientation programs available to NAS students be made available to and promoted to the IUT student population. These recommendations will ensure that all transfer students have an equal opportunity to learn about and become active participants in their campus communities.

MnCAP Program

The MnCAP program provides guaranteed admission to certain degree programs at the University of Minnesota Twin Cities campus. To participate, students must complete either a two-year degree or the Minnesota Transfer Curriculum at local colleges, and meet certain other academic requirements. This program has been operating for sixteen years. In 2010, the University expected roughly 50 of the incoming 2,100 to 2,200 transfer students to have been admitted through MnCAP. The number of incoming MnCAP students has remained relatively constant in recent years. The baseline requirement for admission is a grade of C or higher in prerequisite courses and the completion of an online form. There is certainly room to increase these admissions requirements, such as implementing a cumulative GPA threshold of 2.5 for admission—which certain degree programs have already done, while still maintaining the program as an option to increase the accessibility of the University to Minnesota residents.

Based on initial research, we believe that increasing admissions requirements would allow the University to increase the number of degree programs available through MnCAP, without taking on additional risk. In addition to increasing Minnesota resident access to the University, this program also historically attracts more diverse transfer students than other transfer admissions programs. While we do not have sufficient

---

63 http://admissions.tc.umn.edu/admissioninfo/mncap_intro.html
64 http://admissions.tc.umn.edu/admissioninfo/mncap_chart.html
67 http://admissions.tc.umn.edu/admissioninfo/mncap_requirements.html
68 Research points to skills acquired at community colleges (e.g., note taking, time management, problem solving, etc.) as a major factor in transfer student success. See: D’Amico, et al. (2014); Laanan, et al. (2010). While GPA does not specifically address these skills, we believe that it can be a useful proxy.
69 From 2011-2015, MnCAP transfer students had larger percentages of student or color compared to other types of transfer students. MnCAP transfer students were 2.2% American Indian, 17% Asian, 10.9% Black,
evidence to recommend specific action regarding this program, it has stood out as an interesting program, and one that should certainly be reviewed further. This program could potentially increase the accessibility of our University, expand the pool of applicants, and strengthen our relationships with other local institutions. Therefore, the student representatives recommend that additional research be conducted regarding the MnCAP program to determine benefits, consequences, and feasibility of expanding the number of degrees and campuses available to incoming students.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON TRANSFER STUDENTS

- Include Intra-University Transfer (IUT) students in orientation programs currently being offered to external transfer (NAS) students.
- Offer on-campus living learning communities for both IUT and NAS transfer students on coordinate campuses, similar to the one available on the Twin Cities campus 70.
- Create a standardized orientation program that introduces transfer students to fundamental aspects of the University of Minnesota, while leaving broad discretion to individual campuses to shape any orientation above and beyond the minimum, and to showcase their school’s unique culture.
- Allocate resources for additional research regarding the MnCAP program to determine the benefits, consequences, and feasibility of expanding the number of degrees and campuses available to incoming students.

STATEMENT ON PROPOSED NON-RESIDENT NON-RECIROCITY TUITION INCREASES

Affordable tuition rates are vitally important for recruiting and retaining diverse and talented student populations. The University of Minnesota set itself apart from its peers when it made the strategic decision to lower non-resident, non-reciprocity (NRNR) student tuition rates in 2011-2012, in combination with intentional forms of tuition relief for in-state students. The proposed increases in NRNR student tuition rates may rollback the progress the University has made to improve its standing among post-secondary institutions. These strategic choices have significantly changed the campus’s demographic and academic characteristics, and have improved our standing as a nationally ranked institution. This increase would be the largest annual percentage increase in NRNR student tuition since 1995-1996 71. It would be the largest inflation adjusted increase since 1991-1992, approaching a rate seen only three times in the last 40 years (see chart below). This is a dramatic reversal from the strategy chosen just five years ago, and does little to address long-term concerns about college affordability.

and 8.3% Hispanic, compared to other transfer students at 1.7% American Indian, 6.5% Asian, 6.6% Black, and 3.4% Hispanic. Percentages are based on 230 MnCAP transfer students and 10,508 non-MnCAP transfer students. Meyer, Heidi. "Re: Quick Question about MNCAP/transfer Admissions." Message to Janet Mwanyika. 11 Feb. 2016. E-mail.
70 https://housing.umn.edu/llc/transfer-llcs
71 http://www.oir.umn.edu/static/tuition/TuitionUMNTC.pdf
Additionally, students are greatly concerned by the impact that this tuition increase may have on the University’s ability to attract diverse groups of students. One of the first factors that persuades NRNR students to consider the University is the affordable NRNR tuition rate. The strength of its programming, urban setting, and prestige ultimately draws these students to the University. However, the proposed changes will severely lower the likelihood that qualified NRNR students will initially consider attending the University. Students have not been adequately consulted during this change of strategy. The factors and considerations motivating the increase have not been articulated transparently, while critical details—especially for tuition waivers and buy downs—have not been vetted by the greater campus community. Future students deserve to know the full extent of planned increases in tuition, and enrolled students cannot plan for their future finances without a better understanding of how the proposed increases will affect them. The student representatives strongly caution the Board of Regents on the rapid increases in NRNR student tuition rates. Additionally, the student representatives ask for additional transparency in decision-making and communications with students and families relating to this topic.
CAMPUS UPDATES

Council of Graduate Students
The defining campus challenge that the Council of Graduate Students (COGS) has worked to address this year is mental health. Graduate students are involved in every aspect of the university—from teaching assistants and instructors in the classroom, to research and grant writing, to public outreach, and even administrative assistantships. Unfortunately, poor mental health and mental illness impact graduate students’ work in all these areas. In a 2014 survey administered by COGS, 51 percent of graduate students reported that their mental health impacts their work. We have also heard this repeatedly at town halls and other meetings throughout the year. Mental health is the defining campus challenge of this year for graduate students.

Counseling waitlists
We believe that the waitlists for mental health services, which are often followed by wait times once an appointment is finally scheduled, severely impact the quality of life, retention, and productivity of graduate students. COGS has been working with the Minnesota Student Association, the Office of Student Affairs, and Provost’s Committee on Student Mental Health to address this concern.

Implicit bias training for graduate admissions committees
COGS has requested that implicit bias training become a part of the training for graduate admissions committees. The University of Minnesota should recruit the best and brightest from a diverse set of backgrounds, and implicit bias negatively impacts our ability to do so.

Graduate student support groups and graduate student department-level surveys
COGS has worked to expand the number of graduate student support groups and mental health surveys at the department-level. From discussions with the departments that have implemented these surveys, they are important for increasing awareness, fostering a sense of community, and providing support for graduate students.

Student Code of Conduct
After the administrations attempted prosecution of the demonstrators involved in the the Whose Diversity? Demonstration at Morrill Hall in February of 2015, COGS is vigorously pursuing reform in the Student Code of Conduct. We are hoping for stronger protections for dissent, protesters, and direct action as well as clarification of retaliation protections. This is particularly important for graduate students who often choose not to speak up in regard to problems on campus in order to protect their positions at the university.

Graduate Student Parents
With the help of the Student Parent Help Center and the Women's Center, COGS has started a graduate and professional student parent support group. A persistent concern of graduate students is a need for greater access to affordable childcare. The university’s
current childcare centers are at capacity, and wait lists of multiple years are normal in order to gain access. This situation has caused many parents to consider leaving the university to care for their families, a problem which disproportionately affects women. Long-term planning to increase access to childcare would help us to retain talented female academics that do not wish to sacrifice their families to have a career.

**Crookston Campus Update**

**Community relations**

In 2014, the campus as a whole put a large focus on improving community relations with the community of Crookston and surrounding area, in 2015-2016 we continued the efforts and have been succeeding in leaps and bounds. By continuing, “Paint the Town” as a homecoming event that allows businesses around the community to show their “Golden Eagle Pride” it made homecoming not just an event for the college, but also an event for the entire community. Community and campus relations have improved even further through the work of Crookston Campus Community Connection (C4), which conducts monthly meetings and has held an open forum for students and community members where participants brainstormed ways to make Crookston a “college town”. As a result of that forum three sub-committees were formed that are working on ways to increase local internship opportunities for students, are looking for ways to engage students in patronizing local businesses and providing students with local social opportunities.

**Student Rating of Teaching Workgroup**

Throughout the year Crookston Student Association (CSA) has played an active role in discussions with Chancellor Fred Wood regarding student input on the use of the written comment portion of Student Ratings of Teaching in course evaluations. After the Chancellor decided that the Student Ratings of Teaching (SRTs) comments would be used in the evaluation of faculty, a work group was formed to clarify how the written student comments will be used. Two students have been asked to serve on this work group to ensure that student opinion is included in any further recommendations put forth by the group.

**Midterm-Alert Policy**

A student concern was submitted to the CSA regarding the use of the midterm alert system and the confusion students were experiencing with what classes they would receive a midterm alert for. A midterm alert is the input of grades as of the fourth through seventh week of classes, and can be used to gauge progress in the course. After meeting with all four department heads on campus, attending department meetings, and meeting with the registrar’s office and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs Barbara Keinath, it became evident that changes technology would need to occur to alter current practices. Specifically, the A-plus and People Soft system have made it difficult for the faculty at Crookston to advise their students; a result of which is students having less access to their midterm grades. The relationship between advisor and student at Crookston is what makes students form strong ties to our university. When advisors feel their ability to advise their students is being hindered, it takes away one of the things that
gives Crookston the close knit community atmosphere that draws students from all walks of life. CSA will be presenting to the Faculty Assembly a resolution that makes clear the wants and needs of the student body while keeping the faculty’s concerns in mind.

Protecting the Unique Needs at Each University of Minnesota Campus
The CSA recognizes that there is value, uniqueness and talents at each of the campuses in the University of Minnesota System. We believe that it needs to be recognized that system-wide changes affect all the campuses in different ways, and this needs to be taken into account when decisions are made regarding system-wide policies.

Duluth Campus Update
There are changes throughout the Duluth campus occurring in administration, new spaces opening up and increased efforts in improving the campus climate. Students, staff and faculty are engaged in conversations to better the University and move in the right direction.

Positivity
With negative news filling the media regarding Duluth, the UMD Student Association strives to bring positivity to the students and the community we are in. As an organization, we are continuously working with the student body to share stories about the positive events on campus and what makes Duluth special to them. Students expressed their love for athletics, research opportunities and relationships with faculty and staff. It has been at the forefront of the UMD Student Association to lessen the negativity on campus and share the things we believe are unique to the campus and its surrounding community.

Mid-Term Grade Alerts
The voices of the student body were heard on the Faculty and Staff Council this year pushing for instructors to release midterm grades for students who are in danger of receiving a grade of D, F or N based on their academic performance through the first half of the semester. Although the student body would love to see midterm grades for all courses, 1xxx or 2xxx level courses are the only ones to be required at this point. It is important for students to be successful on our campus and that professors and academic advisors work with the students to achieve ultimate goal of graduation.

Student Life Improvements
The experience for students at the University of Minnesota Duluth has been of the highest priority for the UMD Student Association. Within the past year, the final renovation of the Kirby Student Center was opened and the first stage of the Dining Center remodel began. Students continue to praise the new areas as they allow for connectivity and success. In summary, we continue to strive for a diverse student government, with this year’s congress exceeding Duluth’s total student body with a higher percentage of under-represented students. Our student organizations engage students on our campus and allow for participation in the Duluth and surrounding communities.
Morris Campus Update

Non-Resident Non-Reciprocity Tuition
The Morris Campus Student Association (MCSA) spent a large portion of the academic year working on a resolution in opposition to the proposed $1,000 tuition differential for non-resident non-reciprocity students and international students. After numerous meetings, discussions, and amendments, the final resolution proposed an equal tuition increase for all students, in state included, as an alternative source of revenue.

Health and Wellness
MCSA has participated in discussions on changes in student meal plans on campus and expressed support for a model that allows students to receive unlimited meals with varying quantities of Dining Dollars. Additionally, MCSA representatives met with the director of the Morris Regional Fitness Center and exchanged ideas for future renovations, in particular the re-purposing of one of the racquetball courts.

Technology Fee Deliberations
In a few weeks, MCSA will begin the process of technology fee deliberations and will determine what forms of new technology on campus to fund for the upcoming year. In November, MCSA discussed whether or not annual software licensing fees should continue to be eligible for technology fee funding. No changes in eligibility have been made at this time.

“What to Fix” Morris
In addition, MCSA recently hosted "What to Fix" Morris. At this event, Morris students were encouraged to bring forward issues that they have with the campus. Students had a variety of complaints, ranging from poor snow/ice removal and lack of signage in certain buildings to lack of diverse faculty members and poor support for queer students. Many of these problems will be addressed in the upcoming MCSA administration.

Support the U Day
Currently, MCSA is gearing up for Support-the-U Day, when students will travel to the state capitol and ask legislators for funding to support a variety of critical campus updates, including: a centralized HVAC system in the Humanities building, accessibility in Camden, a gender-inclusive restroom in the library, an elevator in Blakely Hall, and renovations for the Regional Fitness Center.

Professional Student Government
Professional Student Government (PSG) had a strong and productive year after restructuring the Graduate and Professional Student Association (GAPSA). Most importantly, PSG has improved the union between its ten member student councils from the various professional schools at the University. PSG brings these ten separate councils together under one organization and combines the voices of over 11,000 students. PSG also provides financial, programmatic, and advocacy support to these councils and students.
We have improved the inter-professional union of our councils by improving communication, coordination, and partnerships. We’re very proud that our efforts have been successful and have developed a healthy sense of unity in professional student governance as well as a sense of inter-professionalism and fellowship. We have also improved our knowledge management so that leadership transition and a continuation of these efforts will be smoother and effective.

University Advocacy
Throughout the year, we have advocated for professional students on a number of issues. For example, we actively pursued expansion of the Student Health Benefit Plan’s pharmacy coverage to include the University Medical Center ER’s pharmacy. We also were instrumental in pushing for the inclusion of the drug Truvada to the Plan’s formulary. PSG continues to engage in discussions with students and the Plan to ensure that the program meets the needs of students.

PSG also called for improvements to the Paratransit Service, which provides transportation to disabled students, faculty, and staff. We asked for a pilot program that would involve the Service picking-up and dropping-off students at residences within close proximity to campus—a service that is already informally provided by certain drivers. Despite continued efforts and student access problems, the Service declined to provide a pilot program to test the concept. The primary justification for refusing to provide a pilot program was the potential to delay services. This justification is unfounded, as there are already two stops off campus, and the service we are requesting is being selectively provided with no apparent negative outcomes. Other student government bodies, including the Student Senate, have issued similar calls for improving the accessibility of our University to our students. We still hope, and will continue to advocate for, the implementation of a pilot program in the future.

Finally, PSG supports efforts to improve access to mental health resources on campus, and the PSG Congress passed an Act to this effect.

Legislative Advocacy
PSG has been working with the Minnesota Student Legislative Coalition to lobby for additional student-parent resources for professional students. We have formed our own Advocacy Corps. to organize advocacy at the State Legislature. Our Corps. will be advocating for the University’s requests and asking for continued legislative support.

PSG is also actively seeking an expansion of the Postsecondary Child Care Grant Program, which currently only provides financial assistance for child care to undergraduate student parents. We have investigated expanding the grant to include graduate and professional students, and we’re very optimistic that an expansion will be possible this session.
Programming
While PSG focuses on advocacy and supporting its councils, we also host one large-scale event per semester to bring professional students together in a fun and informal setting to build genuine friendships across disciplines. This fall, we hosted the first PSG Brewery Tour for over 300 students. This event earned PSG a nomination for a Tony Diggs Excellence Award. This spring, PSG will be hosting a Twins baseball game outing for over 1,000 professional students. We are expecting a great time, new friendships, and a Twins win against the Cleveland Indians!

Rochester Campus Update
The 2015-2016 academic year marks the 5th year the Rochester Student Association (RSA) has been present on our campus. Throughout the organization’s history, we have been involved in many important decisions made regarding our campus. This past year we had the opportunity to hear from our Chancellor and Chief of Staff about the proposed campus improvement plan and offer our personal insights. This plan has now been approved and the next steps include efforts toward land acquisition. This year, the RSA’s main focus has been increasing student engagement on campus. Below we have highlighted a few of our student’s favorite current events and a few others we are excited to embrace in the coming academic year.

Trick or canning
In the fall of 2015, the RSA hosted our fifth annual Trick or Canning food drive. Trick or Canning is an event that occurs at the end of each October and invites students to gather together and go door to door downtown asking for non-perishable food donations to be given to the Channel One Food Shelf in Rochester. This year we updated our routes so as to cover more of the downtown area and its surrounding communities. More than doubling our participation from last year, we were able to collect a total of 817 pounds of food.

Pennies for Patients
This spring, the RSA will host our third Pennies for Patients campaign. After huge success last year, we have decided to continue our method of penny collecting by nominating five faculty members to participate in this event. Based on the dollar amount donated per jar, the faculty with the largest dollar amount will be pied in the face at our Annual Talent Show on Tuesday, March 29th. Last year we raised $105.42 and we hope to increase that this spring.

Living and Learning Communities
Starting in fall 2016, Rochester will be introducing their first living and learning communities which include Global connections, Health CORE, and ROC! Recovery on Campus. Incoming students have the opportunity to apply to live on one of these three floors for the 2016-2017 academic year.
- Global Connections: The Global Connections Community enhances internationalization of the Rochester student experience through intentional community development and support. Students who commit to and are selected
for this special program are future health care professionals who seek to develop as global citizens, increasing cultural understanding, competency, connections, and knowledge. The ultimate aim of this Global Connections Community is to support the success of international and domestic Rochester students who will infuse the healthcare field with their intercultural competence, global citizenship, and commitment to solving global health challenges.

- Health CORE: The Health CORE (Community of Respect and Empowerment) enhances diversity and inclusivity in the Rochester student experience through intentional community development and support. Students who commit to this special program are future health care professionals who are diverse, active, accountable, respectful, and empowered. The ultimate aim of the CORE is to support the success of underrepresented, undergraduate students who will infuse the healthcare field with their distinct perspectives, a necessary development to solve the grand healthcare challenges.

- ROC! Recovery on Campus: The Rochester ROC! Community enhances the success of Rochester students in long-term recovery from alcohol or drug addictions through intentional community development, accountability, belonging, and support. Students who commit to and are selected for this special program are passionate future health care professionals and leaders who seek to maintain sobriety through a 12-step program and a supportive, undergraduate learning environment. The ultimate aim of this ROC! Community is to support the success of Rochester students in recovery who will infuse the healthcare field with their transformational living, civic engagement, and high-integrity leadership.

Health Care Scholars Day
Health Care Scholars Day is a new way of awarding Rochester scholarship dollars. This scholarship competition includes three categories for admitted, incoming first-year students: Passion (storytelling), Difference Makers (poster or video), and HealthCORE (interview). Scholars are selected competitively based on their admissions application materials. This competition took place on Saturday, February 20th, 2016. We're grateful to Rochester student organizations, Chancellor's representatives, Admissions Ambassadors and other students for assisting us on that day.

Twin Cities
The Minnesota Student Association (MSA) has been working on multiple initiatives this year with specific focuses on mental health, tuition, campus climate, and sexual assault prevention. Many of our initiatives are reflected in the system-wide student representative report to the Board of Regents.

Mental Health
Mental health has been MSA’s top priority in the 2015-2016 school year and we have seen many successes. First, we successfully updated the administrative policy on Makeup Work for Legitimate Absences to include mental health as a legitimate absence. Second, we have provided the Office for Student Affairs with our priorities for the year and have established a working group to continue to address these issues. Finally, MSA
successfully launched the stigma reduction and awareness campaign how are you? in March. Our premiere video garnered over 50,000 unique views and reached over 150,000 individuals, with many of those individuals signing up to stay involved and viewing our training videos as well. We look forward to the Board’s increased attention to this issue and prioritization of the issues detailed in the full report.

Tuition
MSA has played an active role in advocating for transparency in tuition rates, specifically, advocating against the proposed non-resident non-reciprocity tuition increase. Students have expressed concern with these increases in meetings with administration, on student advisory boards, and in the MSA Forum. On December 15th, the MSA Forum passed a statement of opposition. MSA is concerned about the impact this increase could have in attracting a diverse population of students as well as concerns about how this will be applied to current students in coming years. MSA feels greater transparency, long term planning, and consultation with students to understand the extent of the impact are important steps moving forward.

Campus Climate
MSA has increased the priority of representation and inclusion in our work with the creation of the Committee on Diversity and Inclusion, the creation of the International Student Advisory Board and active involvement in the Campus Climate Student Subcommittee. Our Vice President was involved in the search committee for the new Director for the Multicultural Center for Academic Excellence. We are currently involved in conversations about changes to the student service fees process with hope that changes will prioritize all communities in the funding process, with a specific focus on underrepresented communities.

Sexual Assault Prevention
MSA has been continuing to advocate for measures to prevent sexual assault on campus and provide support to victim-survivors. Last summer, we successfully implemented a new consent policy referred to as “Affirmative Consent.” MSA is working toward creating recommendations involving the continuation of sexual assault evaluations on campus and continuation of the adjudication process. Additionally, we are involved in gathering and providing feedback to the Office for Student Affairs in changes being made to the Student Conduct Code, specifically around definitions of sexual assault and harassment. Finally, we are active in conversations and a working group through the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action aimed at creating a new process for adjudicating sexual assault cases on campus. Moving forward, we hope to continue to strengthen educational programming around affirmative consent, clarify the language in the student conduct code, and provide an adjudication process that is efficient and fair to both reporting and accused parties.
APPENDIX Minnesota Student Association Survey of Twin Cities Undergraduates

This poll was administered from December 15th- 21st, 2015 via an all campus email to all of the undergraduate student body at the Twin Cities campus. A total of 2,214 students responded. Below are the demographic breakdown of respondents and questions asked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics of Poll Respondents</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Binary</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic, White</td>
<td>1,806</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, African American</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino, Hispanic American</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian, Asian American</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian, South-Asian American</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American, American Indian</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose not to identify</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year in School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State (MN)</td>
<td>1,452</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of State (including reciprocity states)</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions Pertaining to the Transfer Student Experience

1.) Have you ever transferred schools during your higher education career?
2.) What was your reason for transferring?
3.) Can you describe the ease of your transfer experience? (keep in mind credits, financial aid, culture change, etc)
4.) Did you transfer to the U of M Twin Cities from another U of M system school?
   a. When applying to your original U of M system school, did you utilize the Share My App feature? (Share My App allows you to apply to all system schools without separate applications)
   b. When entering your original U of M system school did you intend on transferring to the Twin Cities campus?
5.) What type of institution did you transfer from?

Questions Pertaining to Diversity

1.) How do you feel this university compares in terms of diversity in the student body to other 4 year public universities?
2.) Do you feel additional diversity in the student body would improve your academic experience?
3.) With what importance did you consider the following factors in choosing to attend the U of M?
   a. Diversity of the Student body
   b. Availability of ethnic studies classes
   c. Diversity of faculty
   d. Availability of support services and programs (example MCAE, President’s emerging scholars, student cultural groups)
4.) Please explain why you feel additional diversity in the student body would be beneficial to your academic experience.

Questions Pertaining to Mental Health

1.) Have you ever utilized on campus mental health resources?
2.) Why have you not utilized any mental health resources?
3.) Which of the following on campus mental health resources are you aware of?
4.) Have you ever utilized the Disability Resource Center for mental health reasons?
5.) Has your progress toward degree completion ever been delayed or impacted by your mental health?
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Report Presentation 2015-2016

Callie Livengood, Chair
Cory Schroeder, Vice Chair
Report Topics Overview

1. Mental Health
2. Retention and Attraction of Students and Faculty of Color
3. Transfer Students
**Recommendations—Mental Health**

1. Provide additional sources of funding for mental health services, and evaluate alternative financing models to ensure sustained support of mental health resources.

2. Develop a comprehensive, system-wide strategy on mental health by Spring 2017.

3. Establish an unambiguous mandate for the administration to develop campus-specific action plans on student mental health by Spring 2017.

## Recommendations—Retention and Attraction of Students and Faculty of Color

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Students</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Implement a system-wide campus climate survey and evaluation to better understand the needs of students of color at every campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Utilize the data from the campus climate survey to recommend changes to current practices that would benefit the individualized needs of different communities on each campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Create a standard of quality for resources and programming for students of color to which all campuses must adhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Create a mechanism with which to disseminate valuable system-wide financial and programmatic resources to all students of color at the University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations—Retention and Attraction of Students and Faculty of Color

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations—Transfer Students

1. Include Intra-University Transfer (IUT) students in orientation programs currently being offered to external transfer (NAS) students.

2. Offer on-campus living learning communities for both IUT and NAS transfer students on coordinate campuses, similar to the one available on the Twin Cities campus.

3. Create a standardized orientation program that introduces transfer students to fundamental aspects of the University, while leaving discretion to individual campuses to tailor the program to fit their needs.

4. Allocate resources for additional research regarding the MnCAP program to determine the benefits, consequences, and feasibility of expanding the number of degrees and campuses available to incoming students.
AGENDA ITEM: Resolution on Enrollment Principles and Tuition/Aid Philosophy

☐ Review  ☐ Review + Action  ☒ Action  ☐ Discussion

☐ This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS:
President Eric W. Kaler
Karen Hanson, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost
Robert B. McMaster, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

Following discussions at the Board’s October and December 2015 work sessions, a resolution was drafted to affirm the underlying values and principles around undergraduate enrollment for all five system campuses. Accompanying the resolution is the Twin Cities campus five-year undergraduate enrollment plan for 2016-2021. These materials were reviewed by the Board at its February meeting.

A strong relationship among the strategies for enrollment management, financial aid, and tuition is essential for success in recruiting, enrolling, retaining, and graduating the best students. The proposed resolution reflects institutional goals and priorities across all campuses, including the following:

- Attract the best and brightest students from the State of Minnesota
- Maintain financial access and affordability
- Maintain a diverse student body
- Maintain strong need-based and merit-based financial aid programs
- Keep resident tuition and fee rates as low as possible
- Ensure a high quality student experience

The 2016-2021 Undergraduate Enrollment Plan for the Twin Cities outlines a five-year plan, describes specific goals, and incorporates elements of the University Progress Card.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Board has engaged in the following discussions on the topic of enrollment management:
• Resolution on Enrollment Principles and Tuition/Aid Philosophy (Review) – Board of Regents, February 2016

• Aligning Tuition / Aid Philosophy with Enrollment Strategy – Board of Regents Work Session, December 2015

• Principles and Objectives to Govern Enrollment Management Through 2025 – Board of Regents Work Session, October 2015

• University Enrollment Management – Academic and Student Affairs Committee, October 2015

• Tuition and Financial Aid Management – Academic and Student Affairs Committee, October 2015

• Balancing UMTC Strategies around Enrollment and Financial Aid – Academic and Student Affairs Committee, February 2015

• Demographic Trends & System-wide Enrollment Management – Board of Regents, October 2014
WHEREAS, the University of Minnesota has five campuses, each with distinctive enrollment strategies and goals; and

WHEREAS, the University of Minnesota wishes to attract the very best and brightest students from the State of Minnesota; and

WHEREAS, the University of Minnesota wishes to maintain financial access and affordability for those students qualified to enroll; and

WHEREAS, the University of Minnesota wishes to maintain diversity, broadly defined, including ethnic, racial, geographical, socio-economic, and gender, in the undergraduate student body; and

WHEREAS, the University of Minnesota wishes to maintain strong need-based (including middle-income) and merit-based financial aid programs; and

WHEREAS, the University of Minnesota wishes to keep resident tuition and fee rates as low as possible, and competitive non-resident tuition rates;

WHEREAS, the University of Minnesota wishes to ensure that students have the highest-quality student experience and graduate on time (normally four years for Freshmen, three years for Transfers).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board directs the administration to develop five-year enrollment plans for the Crookston, Duluth, Morris and Rochester campuses.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Regents supports the Twin Cities campus five-year enrollment plan.
University of Minnesota - Twin Cities
2016-2021 Undergraduate Enrollment Plan

1. **Plan for modest undergraduate growth over the next five-year period.** Given current collegiate enrollment targets on the Twin Cities campus, total undergraduate enrollment should increase to approximately 32,000 to 33,000 students (from the current 30,500 students enrolled in Fall 2015).

2. **Admit for success.** Given the strong relationship between academic performance and student success, the University should continue to admit to its campuses, colleges, and degree programs those students who will benefit from the curriculum, and who have a strong probability of graduating in a timely manner. To do so, Admissions should continue to conduct a holistic review of prospective students' records, considering both primary factors (academic characteristics such as ACT, coursework, and GPA) and secondary factors (personal characteristics such as leadership, Veterans status, and extracurricular activities). Programs, colleges, and campuses must maintain appropriate levels of selectivity to ensure students' preparation for success at the University. The UMTC campus should attempt to maintain an average ACT of 28 in the entering class (established in the BOR Progress Card).

3. **Maintain affordability and access for Minnesota students.** The University’s undergraduate degree programs must remain affordable and accessible to a broad cross-section of students from Minnesota. By **affordability**, we refer to stabilizing or reducing the average inflation-adjusted indebtedness at graduation. By **access**, we emphasize the point that, as a land-grant university, the University is committed to enrolling and graduating a broad, diverse spectrum of students, especially from Minnesota. The UMTC campus should continue to enroll approximately 65% Minnesota residents in the freshman class and approximately 68% in the transfer class. **However, the University needs to be mindful of the total number, not only the percentage, of Minnesota students who are enrolled (e.g., the percentage could decrease while the total number of Minnesota students might increase).** The UMTC should continue to attract students from all parts of the state, and be attentive to enrolling students from Greater Minnesota.

Minnesota residents have access to five University of Minnesota campuses. In discussions around the UMTC enrollment of Minnesota students, it is important to note that many Minnesotans enroll on the system campuses as well; in fall 2015, 30,860 (71%) of the 43,457 undergraduates enrolled system-wide were Minnesota residents.

4. **Provide a high-quality education and student experience.** The University must adjust enrollment levels within the capacities of its financial, intellectual, and physical resources (curriculum, advising, housing, classrooms), with the goal of providing a very high-quality undergraduate educational experience. Curricular planning and scheduling, as well as student support services, and the resources of the physical campuses, must be closely coordinated with enrollment management.
Some of our goals over the next five years include the following:

a. **Housing**: Accommodating 90% of freshmen, 25% of sophomores continuing in housing, and 10% of new Fall Transfers in University housing (would require approximately 6,800 beds for undergraduates in 2020-2021).

b. **Advising**: Based on the recently-completed Academic Advising Report, moving the University closer to the recommended 250 students per advisor ratio.

c. **Classrooms**: Migrating additional classrooms to the Active Learning format, in response to increasing demand from faculty and instructors.

d. **Chemistry**: Increasing the capacity for basic and advanced chemistry seats, which represent a major bottleneck for enrollment growth and degree completion.

e. **Academic Support**: Enhancing specialized student support units, including the Center for Planning and Exploration (CAPE), which assists “undecided” students in finding a major, and the SMART Learning Commons, which provides tutoring for the most difficult classes.

f. **Co-Curricular**: Expanding the capacity for co-curricular opportunities, including undergraduate research (UROP and other programs), internships, study abroad, and service learning. A specific goal is to increase the number of Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program (UROP) grants awarded annually from 700 to 1,000.

Providing an exceptional educational experience and improving student success for all undergraduates (as measured by improved timely graduation rates) will require continued investments. The likely source for such investments would be undergraduate tuition and housing fees.

5. **Maintain commitment to transfer students**. Educating transfer students is an important and integral part of the University's mission. Currently, the UMTC campus enrolls a much higher percentage of transfer students than our peers, providing hundreds of students an opportunity to complete a UMTC degree after having started at another institution. This higher education path is particularly important for students completing two-year degrees at the MNSCU institutions. The UMTC campus should enroll a balance of new high school students and transfer students who can benefit from completing a degree program at the University of Minnesota. **Facilitating transfer among the University of Minnesota campuses, as well as from MNSCU institutions, is an important part of serving Minnesota students.** The U of M should continue to enroll at least 33% of its students as transfers and to monitor specific pipelines where students have had the most success at the University. The University should work with the MNSCU system (which currently provides between 40-45% of transfers) to make certain transfer between the systems is as simple and straightforward as possible.
The UMTC will:

a. Increase campus-wide collaboration of transfer student admission, recruitment, and enrollment efforts.

b. Enhance efforts to ensure students a seamless transition to the University through central orientation and welcome programs, communication, and connections with transfer student peers.

c. Increase transfer student engagement in high-impact experiences such as research, internships, service-learning, and study abroad.

d. Streamline and enhance transparency of transfer credit processing to promote transfer student degree progress.

e. Continue to monitor the APLU’s newly developed Student Achievement Measure (SAM), which is an “unofficial” graduation rate that accounts for students who leave, and complete a four-year degree elsewhere. The UMTC four-year SAM graduation rate is 3-4 percentage points higher than the official IPEDS rate (IPEDS counts only students who start and complete at the same institution).

6. **Value ethnic, social, economic, and geographic diversity.** The educational experiences of all students are significantly enhanced by interactions with students from different backgrounds, other states, and other countries. The University should maintain a national and global presence, as part of attracting a broad range of undergraduate students and serving as a talent magnet for the state. As the diversity of the state of Minnesota increases, the University must continue to attract, retain, and graduate students from multicultural backgrounds. The University should be attentive to the diversity in Minnesota high schools in its admissions’ process. The enrollment plan should continue to build pipelines from other states where students will be attracted to the University of Minnesota and continue to geographically diversify our international student body.

7. **Support timely graduation.** The University should allocate resources to help ensure that the students admitted to its campuses, colleges, and degree programs are adequately supported to be able to complete the degree programs and graduate in a timely way. Strategies for financial aid must be closely linked to strategies for enrollment management. The UMTC four-year graduation rate for New High School (NHS) students should reach/exceed 65%, the six-year graduation rate should reach/exceed 82%, the three-year transfer graduation rate should reach/exceed 65%, and the four-year graduation rate for Pell-recipient students should reach/exceed 54% (established in the BOR Progress Card).

8. **Adjust enrollment levels and set tuition rates to provide revenues.** The University should establish and adjust enrollment levels and set tuition rates to provide adequate revenue to support high-quality educational programs within the overall mission of each campus and its colleges. Each year the University should carefully consider both resident
and non-resident rates based on maintenance and enhancement of quality academic programs, market forces, peer comparisons, available financial aid resources, and adequacy of state support.

a. **Non-resident non-reciprocity tuition (NRNR).** The University will attempt to raise non-resident tuition rates (NRNR) to the mid-point of the Big 10. The increases will be incremental, with an evaluation of impact on national and international applications and enrollments each year. As part of this plan, the University will evaluate the role of “tuition discounting” and other strategies to ensure the U of M remains accessible to non-resident students. The University greatly values the geographical diversity that our national and international students bring to campus and wants to continue to maintain and enhance this.

b. **Resident tuition.** The University will keep the resident tuition rate increases to a minimum. A specific goal will be to maintain the Minnesota resident tuition and fees amount in the middle half of our Big 10 peer group (our current position is very near the mid-point).

9. **Continue to enhance need-based and merit-based financial aid programs.** The University maintains a variety of financial aid programs, which can be categorized roughly into need-based (including middle-income support) and merit-based financial aid. To ensure fiscal access for Minnesota students, and to attract the very best students, the University should continue to provide both need-based (including middle-income) and merit-based financial aid. The general allocation of financial aid resources should be biased towards need-based financial aid, but strong support for merit-based scholarships is also needed to attract the best and brightest students, who often have multiple competing offers. The general allocation of financial aid resources should be 2/3 toward need-based aid and 1/3 towards merit-based aid. A major priority should be increasing institutional aid for all categories.

Some of the additional goals for financial aid policy/practice include:

a. As a public institution, the University supports access for all qualified students, and its review of applicants for undergraduate admissions is need-blind. A student’s ability to pay is not a factor in determining admissibility.

b. In support of retention and timely graduation, multi-year financial aid packages (four years for freshmen, two years for transfer students) will be offered whenever possible. Financial aid will be targeted to degree-seeking students, and continuation of aid for a student will depend upon the student making satisfactory and timely academic progress toward a degree.

c. Financial aid packages will be tailored to each student’s circumstances and may include a variety of forms of need-based and/or merit-based aid from numerous funding sources including, but not limited to, University funds, federal and state aid programs, external scholarships, and donor-directed funds.
d. The University of Minnesota financial aid package for an individual student will not exceed the federal cost of attendance for any given year.

e. The University should strive to grow institutional gift aid to $275 million (established in the BOR Progress Card).

10. **Be attentive to state, national, and global workforce needs.** As a state land-grant university, the University’s enrollment planning must be attentive to the workforce needs of the future for the state, the nation, and the world. Over the next five years, the University should increase the number of STEM graduates (including fields outside of the traditional STEM areas), be attentive to fields important to the State of Minnesota’s future (e.g., food science, health disciplines, environmental science, climate change), and be responsive to emerging fields and new technologies (e.g., data science). For the current year, the UMTC expects to graduate 3,300 STEM majors. Given recent trends in STEM enrollments, a reasonable goal is to graduate 3,600 STEM majors in 2020-2021.

**STEM definition:** For federal reporting purposes, each degree program at the University of Minnesota (and other institutions) is assigned a six-digit Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) code representing its field of study. The first two digits of that code represent the broadest categorization of fields. The University of Minnesota uses the following two-digit CIP codes to represent STEM:

- 01: Agriculture, Agriculture Operations, and Related Sciences
- 03: Natural Resources and Conservation
- 04: Architecture and Related Services
- 11: Computer and Information Sciences and Support Services
- 14: Engineering
- 15: Engineering Technologies and Technicians
- 26: Biological and Biomedical Sciences
- 27: Mathematics and Statistics
- 40: Physical Sciences
- 41: Science Technologies/Technicians
- 51: Health Professions and Related Programs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference to Item #</th>
<th>UMTC Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Total undergraduate enrollment</td>
<td>Approximately 32,000 to 33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Average ACT</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Minnesota residents in fall freshman class</td>
<td>Approximately 65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minnesota residents in transfer class</td>
<td>Approximately 68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a.</td>
<td>Accommodate freshmen in UMTC Housing</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accommodate sophomores continuing in housing</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accommodate Fall transfer students in housing</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beds in UMTC Housing</td>
<td>6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b.</td>
<td>Advising ratios</td>
<td>&lt; 250 students per advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f.</td>
<td>Annual UROP grant awards</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Proportion of undergraduate enrollment who started at UMTC as transfer students</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Four-year graduation rate for NHS</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Six-year graduation rate for NHS</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four-year graduation rate for Pell-recipient students</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a.</td>
<td>Non-resident, non-reciprocity tuition</td>
<td>Move to mid-point of the Big 10, approximately $35,000 in tuition and fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b.</td>
<td>Maintain Minnesota resident tuition + fees</td>
<td>Middle half of Big 10 peer group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>General allocation of financial aid</td>
<td>2/3 need-based and 1/3 merit-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9e.</td>
<td>Total institutional gift aid (system-wide)</td>
<td>$275 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Number of UMTC degrees granted 2020-2021 in STEM fields</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM: FY 2017 Budget Framework

☐ Review  ☐ Review + Action  ☐ Action  ☒ Discussion

☐ This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: President Eric W. Kaler
Richard Pfutzenreuter, Vice President and CFO
Julie Tonneson, Associate Vice President

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

The purpose of this discussion is to address budget planning assumptions for FY 2017. The presentation will build on the September 2015 Board work session and will:

- Outline the budget framework components.
- Identify fixed, variable and strategic cost and investment categories.
- Detail resource options.
- Engage the Board in a discussion of next steps in FY 2017 budget development.

Key questions related to the development of preliminary budget assumptions include:

- What are the known fixed cost increases related to facilities, contractual obligations, and student aid?
- What are the categories of variable cost increases and how should they be considered?
- What is the appropriate level of new academic investment in support of the strategic plan?
- What is the appropriate level of strategic investment in academic and mission support units?
- What is the current plan for repurposing resources through administrative and other reallocations?
- What is an acceptable level of increase for the resident undergraduate tuition rate? What should the non-resident/non-reciprocity (NRNR) rate plan be? What changes in student aid should accompany the tuition plans?
- What is an acceptable level of increase for the graduate and professional tuition rates?

Clarification of budget assumptions for FY 2017 is critical for development of the president’s recommended annual operating budget, which will be presented to the Board for review in May.
BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The recommended annual operating budget is brought to the Board for review and approval each year in late spring or early summer, depending on the adjournment date of the Minnesota Legislature. Due to the shortened 2016 legislative session, it is anticipated that the FY 2017 annual operating budget will come before the Board for review in May 2016 and for approval in June 2016.

The recommended annual operating budget for FY 2017 will include recommendations regarding tuition and fees and internal reallocations to support compensation plans, strategic investments, including new academic investments in support of the strategic plan, facilities and capital expenses, and ongoing operations.
Outline

• Next Installment of Budget Framework Discussion
• Focus First on Expenditures
• Focus Second on Resources
• Next Steps
University of Minnesota Non-sponsored Revenue Sources
All Funds FY16: $3.1 Billion

- Fed. Appropriations ($16.3m) - 1%
- Tuition ($898.2m) - 28%
- State Support ($650m) - 21%
- ICR ($133m) - 7%
- Internal Sales ($221.6m) - 11%
- Grants, Contracts, Misc. ($342.3m) - 11%
- Gift & Endowment ($216.2m) - 7%
- Sales, Fees, & Misc. ($330.3m) - 10%
- Auxiliary Enterprises ($342.1m) - 11%
- Sales, Fees, & Misc. ($330.3m) - 10%

Primary Focus Framework Revenues
$1,548.2M - 49%
Budget Development Process
Defining the **Budget Framework** & Balancing the Budget

Part 1: Available Resources
- State Appropriation
- Internal Reallocation
- Tuition
- Other Resources

Part 2: Costs & Investments
- Compensation
- Strategic Choices
- Student Aid
- Facilities & Capital Expenses
- Operations

Part 3: Balancing the Budget
Recurring Expense Drivers

Framework Costs

Fixed Costs
- Utilities
- New Building Ops.
- Debt
- Leases
- Contractual/Licensing
- HRPP

Variable Costs
- Compensation (Salary & Fringe)
- Facility Repairs & Replacement
- Network Upgrade
- Financial Aid (Need & Merit)

Strategic Pools
- TC Strategic Plan Pool
- System-wide Investment Pool – Academic Units
- System-wide Investment Pool – Mission Support Units
## Recurring Expense Drivers

### Fixed Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>($57,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Building Ops.</td>
<td>$537,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt</td>
<td>$3,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual/Licensing</td>
<td>$613,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRPP</td>
<td>$2,475,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Financial Aid (merit match)</td>
<td>$61,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Incremental Framework Costs

- **Total**: $7,295,000
# Debt Impact: FY2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt Sale March 2016</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combined Heat &amp; Power (CHP)</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate Science &amp; Teaching</td>
<td>$33,546,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Lab</td>
<td>$1,588,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Museum *</td>
<td>$54,913,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bee Lab</td>
<td>$2,118,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMC Wellness Center</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>147,165,013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Issuance</td>
<td>$923,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addl proceeds</td>
<td>$1,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>148,090,641</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 8,519,627</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjustments

- CHP In utility rates: $2,873,052
- State Appropriation Based Adjustment: $3,218,485
- Land Sales, Misc. (net): $1,170,847

Total Framework Impact: $3,598,937

*Note: State of Minnesota provided base adjustment of $3.5M to support debt issue related to construction of new Bell Museum.*
Recurring Expense Drivers

Variable Costs

- Compensation (Salary & Fringe)
- Facility Repairs & Replacement
- Network Upgrade
- Financial Aid (Need/Promise)
Recurring Expense Drivers

Variable Costs

Incremental Framework Costs

Compensation

Target Pool: $13.9m @ 2.5%*

*Note: Prior Board approved contracts total $1.6m included in this incremental compensation estimate for “framework” funds
Salary & Benefit Expenses – 2017 Annual Merit Increase Percentage

- The annual merit increase percentage must be competitive with local general industry and education industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Name</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Higher Ed</th>
<th>Public Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aon Hewitt</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altura</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpepper</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denarius</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCCN</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towers Watson</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.96</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.97</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.65</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.63</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• New DOL regulations likely implemented by 9/5/16 requiring employees to be paid $50,440 in order to be exempt (salaried – today the requirement is approximately $24k)
• Initial high-level estimates by the University of Minnesota and Penn State both suggest added costs of up to $12M annually
• We will be seeking optimal system assignment of Exempt/NonExempt status with the goal of minimizing this expense to $5M or less

Salary & Benefit Expenses – FY18 Issues

• Fringe pool cost will bounce back after FY17 held “artificially” low due to legal settlement in FY15 – framework funds increase for fringe alone (no salary increase) estimated at $15m
• Change in MSRS – state may require employer contribution to increase from 5.5% to 7% to reflect longer life expectancy – all funds increase in cost estimated to be $6.2m+
Recurring Expense Drivers

Variable Costs

- Facility Repairs & Replacement
  Target: $2.0M to $4.0M

- Network Upgrade
  Target: $2.0M to $4.0M

- Financial Aid (Need/Promise)
  Target: $2.0m - $4.0m
What does $3M additional R&R buy?

- Current R&R allocation: **approx. $8.5M**
- Additional $3M increases allocation by **26%**
- Helps close renewal funding gap & raises R&R investment from $0.43/sf to **$0.58/sf**
- Completes **30 more critical projects** at average cost of $100k
  
  - Roof Repairs
  - Accessible Restrooms
  - Plumbing / Electrical Repairs
  - Window Replacements
  - Security Improvements
  - Ventilation and Air Quality
Network Upgrade

- UMN Core Network was implemented in 2004.

- Two risks are driving this replacement:
  - The equipment has reached end of life and will no longer be supported by the vendor.
  - The equipment is out of capacity to meet growing needs of mobile devices

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Estimate</td>
<td>$79.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Reserved</td>
<td>$20.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net</strong></td>
<td><strong>$59.0M</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Legislative Request</td>
<td>$19.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net</strong></td>
<td><strong>$40.0M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Network Upgrade

• RFP process underway
• Costs to be finalized by June, 2016
• University funding strategy and timing depends on state support of $19M in 2016 Session
• Reserved $20M in Plant Fund
**Financial Aid – Promise Program**

- Provides automatic aid to low and middle income Minnesota resident undergraduate students.
- Available on all campuses.
- 2015-16 awards from $750 - $4000 annually, scaled to family income.
- Provides awards for families up to $100,000 in family income.
- Guaranteed for 8 semesters for incoming freshmen, 4 semesters for transfer students.
- Must maintain satisfactory academic progress.

**Option – Additional Middle-Income Tier**
- Family incomes from $100k-$120k
- Cost dependent on award level (e.g., $300/yr = $715,000)

**Option - Hold Recipients Harmless from Tuition Rate Increase**
- Combine with increases in PELL and MN State Grant Program to offset tuition rate increase
- Cost dependent on rate increase (e.g., TC 2.5% = $1.8m)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC Strategic Plan Investments</td>
<td>$4.0m - $6.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System-wide Investments – Academic Units</td>
<td>$4.0M - $6.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System-side Investments - Mission Support Units</td>
<td>$3.0m - $5.0m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resource Drivers

Framework Resources

Group I
Repurposing Resources

Group II
New Resources
Resource Drivers

Group I
Repurposing Resources
Target $19.5m - $21.5m

- Administrative Reallocation
  Target $13.0m*

- HRPP Reallocation
  Target $2.5m**

- TC Strategic Plan Reallocation
  Target $4.0m - $6.0m***

*Represents “framework revenues” share of the $15M administrative reallocation across all funding streams

** Pays for incremental investment in HRPP

*** Pays for incremental investment in initiatives supporting the TC Strategic Plan
President’s Goal – $90m Reduction in Admin Costs Over 6 Years
FY14 - FY16 and “balance”

Four components to date:

1. Appropriation law from the 2013 session (S.F. 1236) made 5% of the University’s FY15 appropriation (or $26.5m) contingent on meeting three of five performance goals, one of which was to decrease administrative costs by $15,000,000 in FY14 (Final list compiled & communicated 2015 session)

2. The FY15 approved budget included unit level reallocations to support the costs and investments in the O&M/Tuition/State Specials portion of the budget and cost increases in the other non-sponsored funds – (Final list to be reported after close of the fiscal year)

3. The FY16 proposed budget includes unit level reallocations to support the costs and investments in the O&M/Tuition/State Specials portion of the budget a portion of the $30.5m on previous slide

4. The FY16 proposed budget also includes unit level reallocations in the other non-sponsored funds to reduce administrative costs – pay for cost increases and reduce the pressure on increased revenues in those funds (sales, fees, etc.)

Progress to Date:

- $18.8m
- $21.6m
- $13.4m
- $4.0m

Total to Date: $57.8m
Total Remaining: $32.2m
FY2017 Target: $15.0m
Balance FY18 and FY19: $17.2m
Resource Drivers

Framework Resources

Group II
New Resources

- NRNR Undergrad. Tuition
- Resident Undergrad. Tuition
- Graduation & Professional Tuition
- Other Income
Non-Resident/Non-Reciprocity Tuition Rates

Options to Consider:

• Tuition and fees to be at the mid-point of the Big 10 by 2020-2021, approximately $35,000 - Increase by $3,200 per year (~15%) for the next 4 years
• Tuition and fees to move up from the bottom of the Big 10 over time – Increase by 7.5%-10% annually
• Use “tuition discounting” in recruitment of new freshmen
• Use “tuition discounting” to particularly lower the effects of any tuition rate increases for continuing students
• Monitor effects closely to ensure geographical diversity of national and international students
Resident Undergraduate, Graduate and Professional

- **Resident Undergraduate Rate** *(assume stable enrollment)*
  - each 1% change (TC) = $3.2m
  - each 1% change (system campuses) = $1.4m

- **Graduate & Professional Rate** *(assume stable enrollment)*
  - each 1% change = $1.8m
Budget Development Process
Defining the **Budget Framework**
& Balancing the Budget

**Part 1: Available Resources**
- State Appropriation
- Internal Reallocation
- Tuition
- Other Resources

**Part 2: Costs & Investments**
- Fixed Costs
- Variable Costs
- Strategic Pools

**Part 3: Balancing the Budget**

Target Date: May 12-13, 2016
AGENDA ITEM: Resolution on Restructuring System-Wide Operations Leadership

This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: President Eric W. Kaler

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

The purpose of this item is to approve a reorganization of the University's operations leadership. Responsibility for system-wide University operations is currently distributed across three offices, each of which reports to the president: the Office of Human Resources (OHR), the Office of Information Technology (OIT), and University Services. The Office of Budget and Finance (Finance) also reports to the president.

The upcoming retirement of the Chief Financial Officer and Vice President for Finance creates an opportunity to align the finance and operation functions strategically to foster collaboration, create greater efficiency and effectiveness, and reduce the number of direct reports to the president (currently at 17).

Proposed Reorganization

The resolution proposes creation of a new position of Senior Vice President for Finance and Operations (SVP F&O). University Services, Finance, OHR, and OIT will report to the SVP F&O.

System-wide budget development, investments, accounting, financial policy and legislative support will continue to be provided through Finance. The vice presidents for University Services and OHR will continue to staff their respective Board committees.

The responsibilities of the SVP F&O will include:

- Strategic financial leadership and operational leadership system-wide.
- Service as the Board Treasurer and staff liaison to the Finance Committee of the Board.
- Oversight of the budget process.
- Leadership to ensure that operations functions are serving the institution’s mission and academic priorities.
- Facilitation of system-wide long- and short-term financial planning and analysis.
The title of the University's chief academic officer will be changed from Senior Vice President and Provost to Executive Vice President and Provost. This recognizes the position's responsibilities for global programs and civic engagement, and reflects the primacy of the University's academic mission.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Board reviewed the resolution at its February 12, 2016 meeting. The president has since consulted with faculty governance leadership and the senior leadership team about the proposal.

PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATION

The President recommends approval of the Resolution Related to Restructuring System-Wide Operations Leadership.
REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

RESOLUTION RELATED TO

Restructuring System-Wide Operations Leadership

WHEREAS, the Regents of the University of Minnesota recognize and reaffirm the President’s responsibilities and accountability for developing, recommending, and administering the policies of the Board of Regents; and

WHEREAS, the Regents recognize and reaffirm the importance of providing the President with flexibility in the organization, reporting lines, and position descriptions of central administration; and

WHEREAS, the University of Minnesota must continue to pursue a comprehensive agenda of assessing the improving administrative structure, processes, and procedures in order to improve quality, efficiency, effectiveness, and public accountability; and

WHEREAS, the University of Minnesota’s strategic planning and decision making processes are best served by designing and implementing administrative structures that ensure clear responsibility, authority, and accountability at the college and campus levels; and

WHEREAS, the organization of central administration and appointment of senior leaders at the University shall be consistent with University and Board policies and procedures; and

WHEREAS, senior leadership transitions create an opportunity to achieve greater alignment, efficiency and coordination of the University’s system-wide operating units; and

WHEREAS, the responsibilities of the current Office of Academic Affairs and Provost have expanded to include global programs and civic engagement, and in recognition of the primacy of the academic mission.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the organization of the University’s central administration shall consist of the following executive officers reporting to the President:
Executive Vice President and Provost
Senior Vice President for Finance and Operations
Dean of the Medical School and Vice President for Health Sciences
Vice President for Research
Vice President for Equity and Diversity
Crookston, Duluth, Morris, and Rochester Chancellors
Chief of Staff
Athletics Director, Twin Cities Campus
Special Assistant for Government and Community Relations
General Counsel (also reports to the Board of Regents)
Associate Vice President for Internal Audit (dotted line report)
Chief Executive Officer, University of Minnesota Foundation (dotted line report)
Chief Executive Officer, University of Minnesota Alumni Association (dotted line report)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Regents accepts the reorganization of the University’s operational leadership as described in this resolution, which shall become effective April 1, 2016, and directs the Secretary to make any necessary revisions to Board policy.
Proposed system-wide operations leadership redesign
BOARD OF REGENTS
DOCKET ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM: System-wide Strategic Planning: UMM

☐ Review  ☐ Review + Action  ☐ Action  ☒ Discussion

☐ This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: President Eric W. Kaler
Jacqueline Johnson, Chancellor, University of Minnesota Morris

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

The purpose of this item is to discuss the following:

1. The strategic planning process on the Morris campus.
2. Key elements in, and accomplishments associated with, the Morris strategic plan.
3. The connections between the Morris and Twin Cities strategic plans.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The strategic planning process at University of Minnesota Morris (Morris) began in 2005. It was driven by a 17-person campus governance committee whose membership was intended to ensure broad constituent representation of faculty, staff, students, and administrators. This committee was chaired by a faculty member.

The planning process involved formal committee participation through the governance process, as well as campus-wide forums intended to set priorities and to review documents. A draft of the strategic plan was submitted to President Robert Bruininks and Executive Vice President Robert Jones in April 2006, and was subsequently revised and endorsed by the Morris Campus Assembly on October 24, 2006. The full Morris strategic plan is included in the docket materials.

The plan has served as a blueprint for campus initiatives since 2006. It has been formally reviewed and progress noted by campus administrators and campus governance on several occasions, most recently during the current academic year.

The overarching goal of the Morris strategic plan is “To position the University of Minnesota, Morris as the best public liberal arts college in the nation, in the top tier of national liberal arts colleges and as a public honors college.” The “public honors college” brand was subsequently discontinued when the Twin Cities campus launched its own undergraduate initiatives, which included establishing an honors program.
Key Elements of the UMM Plan

The plan contains 84 initiatives organized under three headings:

1. Ensuring the future: viability, sustainability, and visibility. This section contains goals related to:
   - Improving student recruitment and retention, the first-year experience, and graduation rates.
   - Leveraging green initiatives and becoming an energy self-sufficient campus.
   - Deepening relationships with donors and alumni.
   - Aggressively pursuing support for the Native American tuition waiver.
   - Instituting a more rigorous system for aligning and allocating faculty and staff with university needs and student body size.
   - Enhancing partnerships and seeking external funds to support capital projects.
   - Branding UMM as a public liberal arts college offering an honors experience.

2. Doing it right: teaching, research and outreach. This section includes goals related to:
   - Improving already-selective admissions standards.
   - Incorporating unique academic opportunities like first-year seminar and senior capstone.
   - Hiring, retaining and developing excellent faculty and staff.
   - Creating a new scholarship program to support enhanced activities like undergraduate research and study abroad.
   - Expanding the undergraduate research symposium and UROP.
   - Increasing the national student of color population.
   - Expanding partnerships that transfer knowledge to the region.
   - Expanding cultural presence in the region.

3. Making it happen: organization and operations. This section includes goals related to:
   - Increasing opportunities for professional development.
   - Securing additional money to support faculty research and creative activity.
   - Offering “life planning” support for undergraduates.
   - Promoting intercultural awareness.
   - Supporting international students.
   - Creating an Academic Center for Enrichment.
   - Investing in the area of strategic financial management.
   - Offering facilities and grounds comparable to top-tier liberal arts colleges.

Sample of Major Accomplishments

- Racial and ethnic diversity among students exceeds plan goals.
- International student population exceeds plan goals.
- Multiple areas of enhanced student support/student success initiatives.
- Enrollment increases in a 10-year period with selectivity factors constant.
- Increases in graduation rates over a 10-year period.
- Facilities improvements.
- Multiple areas of progress in “green” and sustainability initiatives and curriculum.
• National brand recognition and reputation enhancement.
• Enhanced regional presence and significance.
• Increased and improved donor and alumni relationships.

**Connections to the Twin Cities Strategic Plan**

The Morris plan interfaces with the Twin Cities strategic plan in several ways:

1. It serves as a laboratory for *"assuming a preeminent role in solving grand challenges in a diverse and changing world"* especially in areas related to sustainability and climate change.

2. It continues to *"capitalize on location"* through its Center for Small Towns and its role as an intellectual and cultural center in west central Minnesota.

3. It focuses on student retention, recruitment, diversity, and academic programming. Key components of the plan focus on the need to *"recruit and retain field shaping faculty"* as a strategy for accomplishing its undergraduate mission for a diverse student population.
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Executive Summary

The University of Minnesota, Morris Strategic Positioning Task Force was charged by Senior Vice President Robert Jones and Chancellor Sam Schuman to identify Morris’ unique contribution to the University’s goal of becoming one of the top three public research universities in the world and recommend new ways to serve our students and the state while engaging in bold and visionary thinking to identify strategies that will propel us forward.

University of Minnesota, Morris Mission – Draft Version

The University of Minnesota, Morris provides an undergraduate liberal arts education of uncompromising rigor for a diverse student body. As a public honors college, UMM is committed to outstanding teaching and learning, undergraduate research, faculty scholarship, creative activity, genuine outreach, engagement and diversity. Our small, residential academic setting fosters authentic relationships, and the University serves as an educational and cultural resource for the region, nation, and world. A personalized educational experience prepares graduates to be global citizens who are interculturally competent, civically engaged, and effective stewards of their environments.

University of Minnesota, Morris Strategic Goal

To position the University of Minnesota, Morris as the best public liberal arts college in the nation, in the top tier of national liberal arts colleges, and as a public honors college.

Recommendations

After extensive input from UMM stakeholders, the Strategic Planning Task Force presents the following recommendations for becoming a public honors college and the nation’s best public liberal arts college.

Ensuring the Future: Viability, Sustainability, and Visibility

The University of Minnesota, Morris is facing demographic, competitive, and financial challenges. In order to be viable and successful in reaching our strategic goal, we must restructure our academic programs, leverage our strong green campus initiatives, and reorganize the curriculum to reflect a richer international and multicultural perspective. To sustain UMM, we must:

- Achieve a student body of 2,100 by 2013, through more active coordination of and focus on recruitment and marketing, increasing scholarship funding, and improving retention.

- Provide an honors environment that includes an exceptional student experience, which begins with a culture of accomplishment, and culminates with graduation and development of active alumni. Our strategic goals include a comprehensive First Year Experience, campus-wide expectation of graduation in four years, and opportunities for all students to participate in activities to enrich academics, research, and outreach in a personally engaging community environment.

- Enhance private and nontraditional revenue by deepening our relationships with a growing pool of mature alumni and donors, achieving energy self-sufficiency through renewable energy investments, and pursuing creative sources of revenue such as expanding wind energy production and facility use during non-peak times. We must also continue to aggressively pursue state funding and acquire federal support for the Native American Tuition Waiver program.
• Institute a more rigorous system for aligning and allocating faculty and staff with University needs and student body size, develop a strong campus community, enhance recruitment and retention efforts, and provide competitive compensation for faculty and staff.

• Enhance partnerships with other institutions, organizations, and our regional community.

• Seek external funds in order to support capital projects imperative to our mission and sustainability.

In order to increase our visibility as a public honors college, we must continue to brand UMM as a public liberal arts college offering an honors experience, increase student participation and success in national scholarship competitions, improve the visibility of faculty research and creative activity, improve the visibility of undergraduate research, and increase faculty success in external scholarly awards and grants.

**Doing it Right: Teaching, Research, and Outreach**

Academic rigor and innovation in teaching, research, and creative activity must continue to be at the heart of our work. This requires that we improve our already selective admissions standards and continue to incorporate unique academic opportunities such as first-year seminar and senior capstone courses and undergraduate research opportunities. We must also achieve significantly higher student participation in service learning, leadership and study abroad programs and provide the required support to ensure success. We must obtain the necessary support for the hiring, retention, and development of excellent faculty and staff. Additionally, we need to maintain a strong focus on providing all students with a broad educational experience and continue our support for students who wish to pursue interdisciplinary and/or multiple majors.

Faculty scholarship and exceptional student experience are paramount to our public honors college mission. We will seek opportunities to increase faculty and staff leaves for professional development and enhance funding opportunities for and visibility of faculty research and creative activities. We will create a new scholarship program to support undergraduate research, study abroad, internships, and other enrichment opportunities. Furthermore, the campus needs to provide support to expand the Undergraduate Research Symposium and the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program, and improve the Morris Academic Partner and Morris Student Administrative Fellowship programs.

Relationships, connections, and contributions form the core of the UMM experience. To build on these, we must increase our U.S. students of color population, actively recruit international students, expand partnerships that transfer University knowledge and resources, provide cultural partnership for the region, and meet lifelong educational goals of area residents.

**Making it Happen: Organization and Operations**

In order to achieve our strategic goal, UMM must provide adequate organizational support and operational structure for our campus community.

• To help faculty and staff accomplish their professional goals, we must offer increased opportunities for professional development, secure additional money to support research and creative activity, provide effective mentoring, and develop ongoing programming to enhance intercultural awareness.

• To retain and graduate outstanding students, we must offer ‘life planning’ support, promote intercultural awareness, enhance support and transition services for international students, promote activities that meet contemporary expectations of faculty, staff, and students, evaluate and improve student life services, and facilitate the integration of student involvement portfolios.

To maximize the efficiency with which we can deliver a strong set of programs, we must create an Academic Center for Enrichment, continue to rely on a proven model of shared governance, invest in the
area of strategic financial management, offer facilities and grounds comparable to top tier national liberal arts colleges, better utilize our existing facilities during non-class periods, and regularly update and implement a technology plan.

**Implementation of Recommendations**

To position ourselves for the future, we must provide an exceptional student experience, reach our graduation rate goals, increase student enrollment, achieve a balanced budget, provide strong support for faculty research and creative activity, and provide effective professional development for faculty and staff. To achieve these goals and deliverables, the campus should undertake the following initiatives:

- **Teaching and Outreach:** Broad integration of liberal learning outcomes and integration of green initiatives and global and multicultural perspectives into the curriculum.
- **Viability & Sustainability:** Increase scholarship funds and non-traditional revenue sources, leverage our Green Campus initiatives, and secure full funding for the Native American Student Tuition Waiver.
- **Student Initiatives:** Develop a cohesive, year-long First Year Experience, create the Academic Center for Enrichment, and strengthen student ‘life planning’ and academic support.
- **Faculty & Staff Initiatives:** Provide comparable and competitive salaries for faculty and staff and secure additional funds to support faculty scholarship and creative activity.
- **Visibility:** Develop a brand identity for the campus and implement a campus-wide integrated marketing plan to enhance our national and international recruitment.
- **Capital Plan:** Update the Campus Master Plan to align with strategic initiatives of visibility, outreach, and exceptional campus community experience.

Several of these initiatives have begun, but many still require additional resources, consultation, and planning. (See Appendix L)
### Introduction and Process

Beginning in fall 2005, the University of Minnesota, Morris Strategic Positioning Task Force began the process of developing a ten-year strategic plan for our campus that would establish our direction and align us with the University of Minnesota’s goal of becoming one of the top three public research universities in the world.¹

The Task Force began by identifying critical challenges facing UMM. These included a decline in student enrollment, changing demands and expectations of enrolling students, declining regional population, statewide drop in the number of high school graduates, continued cost increases, decreasing state financial support for higher education, and increased competition for high ability students.

We conducted a comprehensive review that included previous studies of UMM enrollment, the honors program, and athletics; a marketing and communications audit; the facilities master plan; the institutional data book; Admitted Student Questionnaire for UMM and peer institutions; the student satisfaction survey for UMM and the University system; the Continuing Education, Regional Programs and Summer Session Task Force Report.

The University of Minnesota, Morris Analysis and Background Data provided by Central Administration, containing demographic, student, faculty, staff, academic, technology, partnership, ranking, finance, and planning data, is located at http://www.morris.umn.edu/strategic/UMM_data_report.pdf.

To provide an ethical foundation and broad based support for the final recommendations, we engaged a broad group of internal and external stakeholders to identify our strengths and comparative advantages and establish mechanisms to leverage these to meet our challenges. Beginning with a campus-wide kickoff event in October we proceeded to host over 60 focus groups attended by over 650 campus and community members to identify core values, strengths, and key issues. Mail-in and web-based surveys supplemented this effort and were distributed to several thousand stakeholders, 210 of whom responded. Individual interviews with University of Minnesota Regents and senior administration and legislative representatives provided a broader context and perspective. Since publication of the March document, additional meetings with standing Campus Assembly committees, academic divisions, Morris Campus Student Association, and public fora have been held for broader discussion, input, and shared ownership of the plan. A website keeps the process transparent and communicated current information.²

We also researched the strategic plans and missions of peer institutions to better understand the competitive marketplace facing UMM. In our research on comparable public and private liberal arts colleges, we found ourselves to be unique, given our rural location, declining population base, part of a land grant system, and our mission as a solely undergraduate liberal arts college compared to comprehensive liberal arts colleges which have graduate programs. (See Appendix E) Research based on the Admitted Student Questionnaire highlights that two of the primary reasons students choose not to come to UMM are financial aid and competition from the U of M Twin Cities and other competitive private schools in Minnesota. (See Appendix F)

Working from the ideas generated through the focus groups and background research, the Task Force prepared a series of recommendations for UMM’s future. We solicited advice from UMM senior administration and campus leaders, modified the plan, and sought input from campus and community members.
UMM Mission and Strategic Goal

As part of the broader University system, the University of Minnesota, Morris mission and goals are fully consistent with the University’s mission of research and discovery, teaching and learning, and outreach and public service, as well as the strategic goal of being one of the top three public research universities in the world.

The University of Minnesota, Morris will position itself for the future by offering our students a distinctive honors experience while maintaining our core mission as a public liberal arts college. This is an affirmation of our history and our legacy of providing an outstanding educational experience for a selective group of students in the context of the public domain. The identity of a public honors college reaffirms who we are and truly reflects the student experience at UMM. The public honors college designation gives a clear and distinct message in the higher education market. Through our strategic positioning process, we will further strengthen and emphasize areas of excellence, deliver on the continuing promise of a high quality educational experience, and fulfill our mission to our region as a public institution of higher learning.

UMM Mission – Draft Version

The University of Minnesota, Morris provides an undergraduate liberal arts education of uncompromising rigor for a diverse student body. As a public honors college, UMM is committed to outstanding teaching and learning, undergraduate research, faculty scholarship, creative activity, genuine outreach, engagement and diversity. Our small, residential academic setting fosters authentic relationships, and the University serves as an educational and cultural resource for the region, nation, and world. A personalized educational experience prepares graduates to be global citizens who are interculturally competent, civicly engaged, and effective stewards of their environments.

UMM Strategic Goal

To position the University of Minnesota, Morris as the best public liberal arts college in the nation, in the top tier of national liberal arts colleges, and as a public honors college.

Recommendations

Ensuring the Future: Viability, Sustainability, and Visibility

As we move toward maturity as an institution, this strategic plan will position UMM for a great future. To do this we must ensure a viable mission and direction, maintain a sustainable financial position, build upon our image, and increase our visibility to ensure that we attract our target constituents. As a public honors college offering uncompromising rigor and a personalized education, we must seek additional state support to remain accessible to all students.

Viability and Appeal

Fundamental to UMM’s viability as a world-class public liberal arts institution is maintaining the highest academic standards while continuing to provide substantial financial assistance to qualified students. (See Appendix F) As a rigorous, undergraduate institution, UMM is committed to the liberal arts tradition that educates students to think critically, prepares them to contribute in meaningful ways, and helps them to develop as interculturally competent citizens who embrace both multicultural and international perspectives. The campus recognizes the strategic importance of clearly articulating the contemporary
relevance of the liberal arts and liberal learning as essential dimensions of the baccalaureate experience in the twenty-first century. This is particularly important in the context of changing preferences of a public concerned about the costs of higher education and interested in seeing outcomes related to employment. To do this, the Task Force recommends the following:

- Restructure academic programs to better support our liberal arts focus and current strengths, as well as recognize changing demands and needs. Responsibility: Appropriate standing committees and the Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer. Timing: Review and revise within a year of installation of the new Chief Academic Officer.

- Leverage our strong green campus initiatives and partnerships to integrate environmental issues into the curriculum and campus opportunities, while becoming an energy self-sufficient campus. Responsibility: Appropriate standing committees, Chief Academic Officer, Associate Vice Chancellor for Physical Plant and Master Planning, West Central Research and Outreach Center, community partners, and others. Timing: Since 2000, these initiatives have become nationally recognized and will be aggressively pursued.

- Formally restructure the curriculum to reflect rich international and multicultural perspectives and opportunities in response to student and faculty needs, changing demographics and global expectations while reaching out to our region and community. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Academic Center for Enrichment, and others. Timing: Initial steps began in 1996 and are continuing; this will accelerate in 2008 following the installation of the new Chief Academic Officer.

**Sustainability**

To sustain UMM, we must find the appropriate balance among student enrollment and retention, revenue enhancement, faculty and staff recruitment and retention, partnerships, and capital investments.

**Student Enrollment**

The majority of our current students are from Minnesota. During the past ten years, overall student enrollment has declined by 14.6 percent due to changing regional demographics, increased competition for high-ability undergraduates, increased tuition costs, flat scholarship resources, and insufficient attention to marketing, recruitment, and retention. The three most effective ways to increase student enrollment are to effectively position ourselves as a public honors college and better articulate our strengths, to increase the size and improve the quality of our first-year and transfer classes, and to improve our retention rates. The Task Force believes it is critical to both increase new student enrollment and retain and graduate students by focusing on the following objectives:

- Achieve and maintain a student body of 2,100. Students will continue to be highly qualified and increasingly diverse in their backgrounds and interests. We will increase the percentage of students from outside Minnesota from 13 to 25 percent by actively marketing the competitive advantages of our flagship liberal arts curriculum, personalized educational experience, and single tuition rate. (See Appendix G) Responsibility: Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment, Director of Communications, Multi-Ethnic Student Program, and appropriate standing committees. Timing: Enrollment increasing steadily over time, reaching the optimum 2,100 level by 2013.

- Meet enrollment goals while maintaining access by leveraging increased scholarship funds to attract, support, and retain high ability students. Stakeholder input emphasized maintaining access by holding tuition increases to less than six percent per year, and focus on closing the financial gap for a significantly higher percentage of low- and middle-income students.
Responsibility: Chancellor, Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment, Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations, and others. Timing: Beginning fall 2006.

- Retain a significantly higher proportion of students by reducing both transfers out and dropouts. Increase first-year retention from 86 to 90 percent, and second-year retention from 77 to 85 percent. Increase the four-year graduation rate from 40 to 60 percent, the five-year rate from 56 to 75 percent, and the six year rate from 57 to 80 percent. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment, Retention Work Group, Registrar, faculty advisors, and others. Timing: Ongoing.

**Development and Revenue Enhancement**

Much of our ability to remain sustainable depends on increasing private and nontraditional financial support for our initiatives. The Task Force recommends the following:

- Increase UMM’s self-sufficiency by strengthening private philanthropic support. Increase UMM scholarship endowment contributions from $6 to $20 million, and UMM’s overall endowment value from $9 to $28 million. (See Appendix H) Hiring additional staff and renovating the Community Services Building will allow us to dramatically increase the number of donors and their contribution levels. (See Appendix I) Responsibility: Chancellor, Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations. Timing: Beginning spring 2006 with targets achieved by 2016.

- Seek additional state support to maintain access to a public honors college for all students. Responsibility: Chancellor, Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations. Timing: Ongoing.

- Increase and strengthen relationships with potential benefactors and our increasing number of prominent and financially able alumni to leverage fiscal and non-fiscal resources. Responsibility: Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations, Alumni Association.

- Develop sufficient capital building matching funds to meet legislative requirements for renovation and expansion projects. Continue to build legislative relationships to support capital investments. Responsibility: Chancellor, Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations, Associate Vice Chancellor for Physical Plant and Master Planning, and others. Timing: Ongoing.

- Seek full University support for the unfunded Native American Student Tuition Waiver mandated in both the 1909 transfer of the campus grounds by Congress (Laws 1909, Chapter 184) to the state of Minnesota and in Minnesota statute establishing UMM on the site (Laws 1961, c. 312 § 1). This waiver amounts to over one million dollars in unrealized tuition revenue each year and continues to increase with improved retention and enrollment. Support University efforts to secure federal funding for the mandate. Responsibility: Chancellor. Timing: Immediate.

- Achieve energy self-sufficiency through wind generation, biomass heating and cooling, local foods initiative, green vehicles, recycling, and conservation. Invest resulting savings in strategic initiatives. Responsibility: Associate Vice Chancellor for Physical Plant and Master Planning, Senior Administrative Director for Finance and Administration, Campus Resources and Planning Committee. Timing: Initiatives have begun, additional steps beginning fall 2007.

- Aggressively pursue nontraditional revenue sources to provide scholarships, limit tuition cost increases, and enhance operating funds. These include the wind farm initiative to generate energy for resale, increased UMM summer programming, and increased facility rentals. Responsibility: Chancellor, Associate Vice Chancellor for Physical Plant and Master Planning, Senior Administrative Director for Finance and Administration, Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations, Continuing Education and Regional Programs.
• Seek external grants to support increased levels of faculty and student research. Responsibility: Chancellor, Chief Academic Officer, Grants Development Office, Senior Administrative Director for Finance and Administration.

Facility and Staff Recruitment, Retention, Alignment, and Diversity

To achieve our objectives, UMM must have strong and diverse faculty and staff, appropriately aligned, with a strong commitment to teaching, research, and outreach. The Task Force recommends the following:

• Institute a more rigorous system for aligning and allocating faculty and staff with University needs and student body size. On a regular basis, analyze staffing levels across all units in order to identify areas where realignment is needed, and compare UMM staffing levels in all units to those of peer institutions. Also, regularly compile and analyze class sizes and student-faculty ratios in all disciplines to ensure efficiency and effectiveness and use this data to define priorities in hiring of new faculty and staff. Continue to support small class sizes by limiting classes with 50-plus students to no more than five percent of our total course offerings. Responsibility: Chancellor, Chief Academic Officer, Senior Administrative Director for Finance and Administration, Division Chairs, Office of Human Resources, in consultation with Campus Resources and Planning Committee. Timing: Ongoing, began fall 2006.

• Develop a strong faculty community, as recommended by focus groups, by maintaining at least 85 percent tenure track positions. Retain personnel and enhance faculty and staff community by developing and supporting formal mentorship and professional development programs for all personnel. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Division Chairs, Directors, Office of Human Resources. Timing: Ongoing.

• Intentionally attract diverse faculty and staff who enrich our campus and regional community. This supports University goals of intercultural competence. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Division Chairs, Directors

• Enhance our recruitment efforts by creatively addressing consideration of joint appointments, spousal and partner needs, employee and family educational support, and transitions. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Division Chairs, Directors, Office of Human Resources. Timing: Begin within a year of installation of the new Chief Academic Officer.

• Provide faculty and staff salaries comparable to the upper tier of the Morris 14 Comparison Group in order to reach our goal of becoming a top tier national liberal arts college. (See University of Minnesota, Morris Analysis and Background Data and Appendix J) Responsibility: Chancellor, Chief Academic Officer, Campus Resources and Planning Committee, Office of Human Resources, Faculty Affairs Committee. Timing: Beginning fall 2006.

Partnerships

Enhance academic, research, and community synergies through regional, national, and international partnerships. Continuing Education and Regional Programs, the Center for Small Towns, and other campus units will play a major role in forging these partnerships to serve the campus and regional communities. (See Appendix K) The Task Force recommends the following:

• Leverage regional and international academic partnerships that provide opportunities for program enhancement and continued commitment to meeting our mission. Strengthening relationships with other universities such as those in China, South Korea, Japan, and others around the world, as well as campuses of the University of Minnesota, will serve to sustain UMM and continue to foster an academic honors community. Responsibility: Chancellor, Chief
Enhance existing research partnerships with federal, state, and University efforts like the West Central Research and Outreach Center while building our international research opportunities in the developing world and elsewhere. This will strengthen our commitment to undergraduate research, faculty scholarship and creative activity. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Grants Development Office. Timing: Ongoing.

Meet the needs of our community by developing partnerships with regional organizations like the Community Outreach Partnership Center Program and other University campuses and programs like the University of Minnesota’s Office of Public Engagement. This will ensure access to educational opportunities for all University stakeholders and meet our obligations to incorporate engagement and outreach into research, teaching, and learning. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Continuing Education and Regional Programs, Academic Center for Enrichment. Timing: Ongoing.

**Capital Investments**

Sufficient capital investments are essential for UMM to support academic and research requirements and meet student and community expectations. The Task Force recommends the following:

- Update and modernize residential life facilities to meet student expectations and needs. Responsibilities: Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Associate Vice Chancellor for Physical Plant and Master Planning, Office of Residential Life.

- Locate units whose primary interaction is with external audiences in a renovated Community Services Building. This will improve the efficiency and visibility of admissions and external relations by creating an attractive and welcoming entrance to campus. This enhancement will help us achieve our goal of increasing student enrollment and fund development. Responsibility: Chancellor, Associate Vice Chancellor for Physical Plant and Master Planning, Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations, Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment.

- Renovate and modernize the Food Service Building to improve preparation and serving facilities to offer a greater variety of fresh, healthy, locally provided food of improved quality that is attractive to a more diverse student body. This was strongly recommended by the focus groups. Responsibility: Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Associate Vice Chancellor for Physical Plant and Master Planning, Senior Administrative Director for Finance and Administration.

- Renovate Briggs Library to enhance library services, provide more space for group collaboration, solitary study, expanding collections, special events and technological demands. This will support our goal of being a top tier national liberal arts college by providing the academic support for student and faculty instruction and research. Insurance carriers are citing this building for significant potential health and safety liability issues. Responsibility: Chancellor, Chief Academic Officer, Associate Vice Chancellor for Physical Plant and Master Planning, Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations, Director of Rodney A. Briggs Library.

- Support the commitment to be a regional cultural center by completing the Humanities/Fine Arts complex. The project was repeatedly highlighted by campus and community focus groups. Responsibility: Chancellor, Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations, Associate Vice Chancellor for Physical Plant and Master Planning.

- Update the Campus Master Plan to propose a prioritized timetable for renovation of all instructional space, offices, and other facilities. The Campus Master Plan should include a plan.
for future technology and utility upgrades. Responsibility: Chancellor, Associate Vice Chancellor for Physical Plant and Master Planning, Campus Resource and Planning Committee, Director of Computing Services, Director of Media Services.

## Visibility

For our excellence to be recognized through higher enrollment, increased donations, and continued strong public funding, UMM must significantly improve our image and visibility. The Task Force recommends the following:

- Brand UMM as a top-tier, nationally recognized, public honors liberal arts college with uncompromising academic rigor in order to increase enrollment and financial support. Responsibilities: Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations, Director of Communications. Timing: Immediate.

- Increase levels of student participation and success in national scholarships, and promote these in multiple venues. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations. Timing: Expanded efforts with creation of Academic Center for Enrichment.

- Increase publicity for faculty and student research efforts and successes. Visibility of faculty scholarship, creative activity, and student research should be enhanced with greater publicity and the addition of a digital institutional repository which will aid in national recognition. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations. Timing: Immediate.

- Increase levels of faculty participation and success in external scholarly awards, honors, and grants. Promote these in multiple venues and provide sufficient institutional support. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations. Timing: Ongoing.

- Enhance summer and break programs to attract regional, national, and international groups and events that will build UMM’s image as a leader in a variety of arenas. This will better serve our community and increase efficiency of facility use. Responsibility: Continuing Education and Regional Programs, Senior Administrative Director for Finance and Administration, Office of Residential Life, Regional Fitness Center. Timing: Ongoing.

## Doing it Right: Teaching, Research, Outreach

To become the best public liberal arts college in the nation and remain consistent with the University’s mission, we are committed to our focus on teaching, research, and outreach.

## Academic Rigor and Innovation

The heart of UMM’s work is our dedication to academic rigor and innovation. The Task Force recommends the following:

- Improve the student academic profile while expanding the range of measures to evaluate student likelihood of success. Retain selective admissions standards, admitting students in the top quarter of their graduating class with average ACT scores of at least 25, and students who reflect focus group priorities of diverse backgrounds and interests that contribute positively to the campus community. Responsibility: Chancellor, Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment, Scholastic Committee. Timing: Immediate.

- Create an Academic Center for Enrichment. This will build on our core values – a rigorous residential undergraduate education providing many enriching opportunities to our students,
which include superior student and faculty interaction and a high level of undergraduate research activity. The Academic Center would provide enhanced opportunities for visibility, participation, and program collaboration. It would oversee Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program, study abroad, National Student Exchange, support of national scholarship competitions, Undergraduate Research Symposium, Morris Academic Partners and Morris Student Administrative Fellows programs, Honors Program, civic engagement and outreach. It would serve as a resource to encourage students and faculty to initiate and engage in research and other academic enhancements. This initiative would require a recurring strategic investment for administrative programs and support to enrich and expand these programs to reach UMM’s goal of being a top tier national liberal arts college. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer. Timing: Immediate.

- Expect that all UMM students participate in first year and senior capstone seminars, as well as achieve higher participation in service learning and leadership experiences. Our successful service learning program, which has a fifty percent student participation rate, is grant funded until 2007, and must have institutional support if we want to reach our goal of increased student participation. Further development and curricular integration of these innovative and rigorous components will ensure fulfillment of our responsibility to incorporate teaching, learning, and civic engagement in UMM’s honors experience. This approach ensures a unique academic experience for all students regardless of their academic priorities and financial abilities. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs. Timing: The service learning program is currently grant funded and will require institutional support beginning fiscal year 2008. Other academic, service, and leadership elements should be developed and evaluated continually.

- Provide opportunities for all students to study abroad which prepares them to be global citizens. Make this central to the curriculum by creating and supporting a new initiative providing mini grants to help defray student study abroad costs. This also boosts our ability to recruit students with increasingly demanding expectations of their undergraduate experience. Responsibility: Chancellor, Chief Academic Officer, Center for International Programs, appropriate standing committees. Timing: Ongoing, with goal to be achieved by 2008.

- Sustain high teaching quality by hiring and supporting faculty with outstanding credentials and terminal degrees, improving our tenure review process, supporting new faculty to improve their teaching skills, and providing them with effective mentoring. This supports our commitment to being a nationally recognized public honors college. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Division Chairs. Timing: Continual goals to be further implemented with installation of the new Chief Academic Officer.

- Enhance the academic curriculum of all majors by regularly evaluating all coursework to include effective written and oral communication skills across the discipline and encourage every discipline to promote service learning, study abroad programs and undergraduate research. Integrate sustainability principles, multicultural and international perspectives across the curriculum. This will help to better prepare students and strengthen our mission as a public honors college. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Division Chairs, Curriculum and appropriate standing committees. Timing: Ongoing.

- Continue and enhance opportunities for all students to receive maximum benefit from UMM by continuing to support interdisciplinary students and those who pursue multiple majors and/or minors. This will support our role as a public honors college and help fulfill our mission of graduating students with a broad academic background and the potential for pursuing advanced studies in any field. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Academic Advising, Registrar. Timing: Ongoing.
- Create a new scholarship initiative to provide new enrichment opportunities for outstanding UMM students who show significant potential. This supports our efforts to recruit and retain high ability students and to meet the research goals of the University. Additional resources will be required for this program. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer. Timing: Groundwork to start in fall 2006 with expansion to follow.

- Provide sufficient institutional support to expand and improve the Undergraduate Research Symposium and other opportunities for students to present their research. This increases research depth and highlights the success of our students. Promote giving to the Bos and Tate travel funds. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Undergraduate Research Symposium Committee. Timing: Groundwork to start in fall 2006 with expansion to follow.

- Improve the Morris Academic Partnership and Morris Student Administrative Fellows programs that provide students with opportunities to partner with faculty on research. This supports faculty scholarship and student research experiences in line with the University’s strategic goal, and better prepares students for graduate-level research. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer. Timing: Continual goals to be further expanded with the installation of the new Chief Academic Officer.

- Seek additional support for the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program in order to expand these enriching and demanding opportunities for students and faculty. Responsibility: Chancellor, Chief Academic Officer. Timing: Immediate.

- Provide sufficient institutional funding and infrastructure to assist and expand research and creative activity. Enhanced library and information technology resources support vigorous and innovative undergraduate research, capstone seminars, course work, writing initiatives and information literacy skills. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Director of Briggs Library, Director of Computing Services, Director of Media Services.

### Faculty Scholarship and Creative Activity

Faculty scholarship and creative activity is essential to UMM’s mission. If UMM is to position itself in the top tier of national liberal arts college, we must better support these efforts. The Task Force recommends the following:

- Provide institutional funding – such as internal grants, seed money, summer stipends and infrastructure – comparable to top tier liberal arts institutions, in order to assist and expand faculty scholarship and creative activity. Responsibilities: Chief Academic Officer, Grants Development, Division Chairs. Timing: Continual goals to be further implemented with the installation of the new Chief Academic Officer.

- Improve opportunities for and increase participation in single semester and sabbatical leaves to support faculty scholarship and creative activity. Responsibilities: Chief Academic Officer, Division Chairs. Timing: Continual goals to be further implemented with the installation of the new Chief Academic Officer.

- Increase recognition and visibility of faculty scholarship and creative activity, both on and off campus, by expanding travel support and providing opportunities for collaborative work. Responsibilities: Chief Academic Officer, Division Chairs. Timing: Continual goals to be further implemented with the installation of the new Chief Academic Officer.

### Outreach: Relationships, Connections, and Contributions

Building relationships and connections helps prepare our students to contribute in meaningful ways by being interculturally competent, socially responsible, and effective stewards of their environments. These
form the core of what makes the UMM experience exceptional both on campus and in the broader community. The Task Force recommends the following:

- Increase U.S. students of color from 15 to 25 percent of total enrollment. UMM has a long tradition of attracting diverse students, faculty, and staff, who enrich our campus and regional community in countless ways. This supports UMM and University goals and commitments to diversity and intercultural competence. Responsibility: Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment and Multi-Ethnic Student Program, in consultation with appropriate committees. Timing: Ongoing, with goal to be achieved by 2016.

- Actively recruit more international students and visiting faculty who will enrich campus life, help create a sense of an international campus, and improve the intercultural competence of the campus and broader community. Appropriately support recruitment efforts, academic performance, and transition to reach our campus goal of five percent international students. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment, Center for International Programs, appropriate standing committees. Timing: Ongoing, with goal to be achieved by 2016.

- Integrate civic engagement, a strength of our campus community, and needs to be further integrated into our teaching, learning, and research responsibilities through opportunities for students and faculty to serve the local, national or global community. Expand institutional support for partnerships that transfer university knowledge and resources to support the public and private sectors, enrich our mission, and contribute to the public good through formalized civic engagement and service learning and informal community service and volunteerism. Responsibility: Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Chief Academic Officer, Center for Small Towns, University of Minnesota Associate Vice President for Public Engagement. Timing: Beginning fall 2006.

- Explore opportunities for partnerships, development opportunities, and expanded programming for a cultural center for west central Minnesota. To best serve our region and honors college mission, top tier creative and performing arts events and facilities should be available at UMM. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations, Associate Vice Chancellor for Physical Plant and Master Planning, and appropriate standing committees. Timing: Development to begin immediately with capital project in 2010 bonding.

- Provide opportunities to meet the current and lifelong educational goals of area residents, high school students, and other stakeholders. Continuing Education and Regional Programs will actively work to develop programs to meet these needs. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Director of Continuing Education and Regional Programs. Timing: Ongoing.

- Enhance our direct engagement with the community of west central Minnesota by providing outreach to benefit the public and private sectors through our Center for Small Towns. This will provide our students, faculty and staff the opportunity to actively collaborate with the community and build experiences to prepare them for ongoing success. Responsibility: Director of Center for Small Towns. Timing: Ongoing.

- Collaborate for the benefit of area residents through academic support and mentoring relationships provided by UMM students to PK-12 students. This will support the University’s mission of engaging in support of PK-12 education and provide a broader experience for UMM students. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs. Timing: Ongoing.
**Making it Happen: Organization and Operations**

Strong organizational and operational support is required to ensure success of the strategic goals and initiatives outlined in this document.

**Organization**

Organizational support provides faculty, staff, and students with the administrative infrastructure necessary to meet UMM’s mission and strategic goal.

**Faculty and Staff Support**

To help faculty and staff accomplish their professional goals while advancing UMM’s mission, it is necessary to provide adequate resources, programming, and encouragement. The Task Force recommends the following:

- Promote intercultural awareness, respect, and appreciation throughout the campus community. Highlight the importance of this effort and provide faculty and staff with incentives to participate in learning opportunities and actively practice their skills. This will improve the climate both on campus and in the community, help achieve both the University’s and UMM’s missions, improve student campus life, and increase faculty, staff, and student retention. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Division Chairs, Directors, Office of Human Resources. Timing: Immediate.

- Offer in-depth opportunities for professional development in order to ensure that personnel are able to exert leadership in their areas of expertise, deliver strong research programs, and become better teachers and service providers. Reallocate internal funds to support this effort. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Division Chairs, Directors, Office of Human Resources. Timing: Ongoing.

- Provide effective mentoring, guidance, peer support, and opportunities for faculty and staff to advance within UMM’s employment system. Focus particularly on new employees, but also offer ongoing assistance to improve performance and enhance opportunities for all employees. This promotes good morale, increases productivity, and improves retention of high-performing personnel. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Division Chairs, Directors, Office of Human Resources. Timing: Ongoing.

**Student Support**

In order for UMM to retain and graduate outstanding students, we must ensure that they are represented in our campus shared governance structure, acclimated to our rural campus setting, and comfortable with campus life, social atmosphere, and intercultural competencies. To continue to lead the University system in student satisfaction ratings, the Task Force recommends the following:

- Offer ‘life planning’ support to students entering college who have limited recognition of the relevance of a liberal arts education, including top quality academic counseling such as *The Deciding Project*, career guidance, internships, mentoring programs, alumni networking, campus community building programs, and other resources. This will improve student retention, satisfaction, graduation rates, and future success. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs. Timing: Ongoing, with expansion to begin fall 2006.

- Promote intercultural awareness, respect, and appreciation throughout the campus community. As a campus, assess, design, and implement an inclusive, contemporary multicultural campus life structure and lead campus-wide strategies to advance participation as a multicultural leader, like those offered by the Multicultural Student Leadership Retreat. Actively advance efforts to
equip graduates for lives of leadership and service in a diverse, global society. This will improve the climate both on campus and in the community, help achieve our mission, enhance campus life, and increase student retention. Responsibility: Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs. Timing: To begin fall 2006.

- Develop campus and community partnerships to meet the needs of students, faculty, and staff from communities underrepresented in west central Minnesota. Address needs from travel to personal care products and services to provide a respectful and comfortable environment that fosters diversity. Responsibility: Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs. Timing: To begin fall 2006.

- Enhance academic support and environmental transition services for international students. These will improve the experience of all students, faculty, and staff by ensuring opportunities for success to a diverse student body. A supportive infrastructure, requiring additional staff, will be necessary to best serve an increasing international student population. Responsibility: Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs. Timing: To begin fall 2006.

- Promote activities on campus and in the community that meet the expectations of contemporary students. As mentioned extensively in focus group discussions, given our location, the campus community requires more weekend activity variety for students. This will help to enrich student life and preserve a close campus community while meeting our student retention and graduation goals. Responsibility: Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Chief Academic Officer. Timing: To begin fall 2006.

- Evaluate and improve effectiveness and modernity of student life services including housing, health care, transportation, and dining. These programs are integral to undergraduate life at UMM and need to continue to improve support for all students. This will help to better serve international and out-of-state students as well as improve the campus experience while meeting matriculation, retention, and graduation goals. Responsibility: Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs. Timing: To begin fall 2006.

- Improve student credentials upon graduation by offering a student involvement portfolio to support students’ out-of-class experience. Recording leadership activities as well as academic, media, social, political, arts, athletic, cultural, religious, governing, service, and honorary activities could be used in conjunction with academic transcripts, resumes, and career portfolios to provide prospective employers with a multi-faceted record of student accomplishments. This will serve to better equip UMM graduates with the tools needed for success, while creating a measure for accomplishing our multi-faceted mission. Responsibility: Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Registrar. Timing: To begin 2007.

**Commitment to Diversity**

The campus commitment to educating a diverse student body and building a respectful inclusive culture is rooted in the public liberal arts college mission articulated in the 1960s and in the campus history as an American Indian Boarding School (established in the 1890s). Diversity (including but not limited to GLBT, individuals with disabilities, international, veterans, racial and multi-ethnic, and spirituality) in students, faculty and staff is an important commitment for the University. To maintain and strengthen this commitment, we have interwoven strategies and goals within this document.

Over the past decade, UMM has expanded efforts to build an inclusive respectful campus community in partnership with the Anti-Defamation League’s *A World of Difference Institute*, established an annual Multicultural Student Leadership Retreat and created the Diversity Community Outreach Program.
Our future will build on this strong foundation to sustain a position of leadership in Minnesota’s higher education while educating a diverse student population for intercultural competence and leadership in a global community. The task force recommends the following:

- Affirm a campus mission statement that more specifically articulates our commitment to diversity in a small, rural residential academic setting.
- Endorse the idea that bridging academic and student life is necessary to build a truly inclusive campus that educates interculturally competent graduates.
- Operationalize our goal to increase US students of color from 15 to 25% of total enrollment.
- Expand campus and community efforts to meet student needs and provide a respectful and comfortable environment that fosters diversity.
- Adopt and fully implement a plan to promote intercultural awareness, respect, and appreciation throughout the campus community, including professional development for faculty and staff.
- Assess, design and implement an inclusive, contemporary multicultural campus life structure and lead campus-wide strategies to advance participation as a multicultural leader.

**Operations and Structure**

In order to maximize the efficiency with which we can deliver a strong set of programs, we continue to rely on a proven model of shared governance\(^{18}\) that enhances our academic curriculum, provides comfortable facilities, and ensures financial stability, the Task Force recommends the following:

- Given the increasing complexity of budgets in higher education, the need to strategically reallocate resources in key areas, and seek new sources of revenue, UMM needs to invest resources in the area of strategic and analytical management of financial resource allocation across campus. Responsibility: Chancellor. Timing: Ongoing.
- As we seek to become a top tier national liberal arts college, we must offer facilities that are comparable to our peers. We must have a well-maintained, safe, and accessible physical plant, an aesthetically appealing campus landscape, and create a physical UMM identity. Several of our buildings are in need of renovation and modernization including Briggs Library, Multi-Ethnic Resource Center, Education building, Camden Hall, Humanities building, and Residential Life facilities. We must revitalize our Campus Master Plan to encompass appropriate expansion of academic and service buildings. Responsibility: Chancellor, Associate Vice Chancellor for Physical Plant and Master Planning, Campus Resources and Planning Committee.
- To enhance our financial resources, we must better utilize our existing facilities during the summer and breaks. The future renovation of Blakely Hall will allow for the use of our existing facilities for non-credit residential programming to off campus constituents. Also, garnering non-residential programs such as marching band practices, sports camps, and Regional Fitness Center programming would capitalize on many of our strengths. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Associate Vice Chancellor for Physical Plant and Master Planning, and collaboration between academic programs, student life, and athletic departments.
- Support the entire educational enterprise by regularly analyzing and updating a technology plan to ensure efficient and effective use of campus resources consistent with our mission to be a top tier national liberal arts college. Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer, Associate Vice Chancellor for Physical Plant and Master Planning, in consultation with appropriate directors and the Morris Campus Student Association.
**Implementation of Recommendations**

In order to position ourselves for the future, we must provide an exceptional student experience, reach our graduation rate goals, increase student enrollment and maintain a balanced budget. To achieve these goals and deliverables, the campus should undertake the initiatives outlined below, developed through an extensive and open campus process. Decisions regarding administrative responsibilities for implementation will be made by the Chancellor, with ongoing input from the Strategic Positioning Task Force and relevant campus committees and constituents.

### Teaching & Outreach Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Consultation</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrate green initiatives into curriculum through interdisciplinary activity</td>
<td>Planning to begin Spring 2007</td>
<td>Curriculum Comm., Campus Resources &amp; Planning Comm. (CRPC), West Central Research &amp; Outreach Center (WCROC)</td>
<td>Increased campus recognition from external rating organizations and through broad integration into curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad integration of liberal learning outcomes just as writing, speaking, and critical thinking</td>
<td>Planning to begin Spring 2007</td>
<td>Curriculum, Disciplines, Scholastic, First Year Seminar (FYS)</td>
<td>Improved NSSE results and graduate exit survey results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve participation in and documentation of civic engagement, public service, and leadership</td>
<td>Plan to be developed Fall 2007</td>
<td>Curriculum, Disciplines, Student Affairs, FYS</td>
<td>Increased participation, Improved NSSE results and graduate exit survey results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of current global perspectives across curriculum</td>
<td>Part started (Bush Grant), Develop plan for Fall 2007</td>
<td>Curriculum, CRPC, Scholastic Comm., IPC, DSAAG</td>
<td>Integration into curriculum, improved NSSE results and graduate exit survey results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Faculty & Staff Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Consultation</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase support, recognition and visibility of Faculty Scholarship</td>
<td>Continual implementation</td>
<td>Faculty Center, Faculty Affairs &amp; Consultative Committee</td>
<td>Number of external grants received, number of national presentations supported and number of publications, exhibitions, and performances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop professional development and mentoring opportunities</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Division Chairs, Administrative Committee</td>
<td>Retention of faculty and staff, attendance at conferences, hosting relevant campus workshops and meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide comparable salaries for faculty and staff</td>
<td>Beginning Fall 2006</td>
<td>CRPC, Faculty Affairs, Consultative, USA</td>
<td>Increase standing on salary listing in Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a campus-wide technology plan</td>
<td>Beginning Spring 2007</td>
<td>Appropriate directors, MCSA, CRPC</td>
<td>Secure ongoing funds to improve and maintain our technology advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiatives</td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>Measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop cohesive year-long “First Year Experience”</td>
<td>Begin Discussions Fall 2006 (Reestablishment of the FYE Subcommittee)</td>
<td>Scholastic, Curriculum, FYS, Residential Life, Student Services</td>
<td>Increased retention, improved experience, improved graduation rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Multi-cultural Campus Life and Interculturally competent graduates</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>Faculty Development, Multi-Ethnic Experience, Student Services, IPC, etc.</td>
<td>Increase recruitment and retention of traditionally underserved students, improve student satisfaction survey results for this group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create academic enrichment office</td>
<td>Task Force formed Fall 2006</td>
<td>CRPC, Scholastic, Curriculum, Consultative, Honors Program, CIP, etc.</td>
<td>Increased awareness (internally and externally) and success in research, study abroad, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen “life planning” student support</td>
<td>Discussions begin immediately</td>
<td>Student Services, Scholastic, Retention Work Group, External Relations and Alumni Office</td>
<td>Increased satisfaction in life planning area of the graduate exit survey, Increased % of students using alumni career networks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Viability & Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Consultation</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create a scholarship program for additional merit scholarship funds and</td>
<td>Beginning Fall 2006</td>
<td>CRPC, Retention Work Group, SAP</td>
<td>Increase percentage of high ability students enrolled and graduated, endowed funds to support these scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enrichment opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase non-traditional revenue – private donors, facility use, grants,</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>CRPC, CERP, Student Affairs, Administrative Committee, Student Services,</td>
<td>Increased percentage of total budget supported from these sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wind energy funds, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultative, Physical Plant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop additional green energy initiatives and integrate into master plan</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>CRPC</td>
<td>Increased energy self-sufficiency, increased research opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure full funding for Native American Tuition Waiver</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>CRPC, Enrollment Area, American Indian Advisory Committee, MSP, CERP</td>
<td>Ongoing secured funds to cover tuition to improve graduation rates of Native American students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Visibility Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Consultation</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand development - market research, e.g. honors college, honors experience</td>
<td>Immediately begin research and plan</td>
<td>CRPC, Curriculum, External Relations, IMG, CCG</td>
<td>External recognition and understanding of brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit and retain national and International students</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>CRPC, Scholastic, Retention Work Group, IPC</td>
<td>Increased numbers of students and graduates from these markets, track cohorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement campus-wide integrated marketing plan</td>
<td>Immediately following market research</td>
<td>CRPC, IMG, CCG, Athletics, Student Affairs</td>
<td>External recognition and understanding of UMM experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Campus Master Plan to align with strategic initiatives</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>CRPC, Divisions, ASSC</td>
<td>Better understanding of use and renovation of physical facilities, increased pride in campus facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiatives</td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>Measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway to Campus: Community Services Building</td>
<td>2008 Capital Request</td>
<td>CRPC</td>
<td>Inclusion in U of M Capital Request, lobby efforts, secure funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Facility and Conference Center: Blakely, Food Service</td>
<td>2008 Capital Request</td>
<td>CRPC, Blakely Hall Planning Committee</td>
<td>Inclusion in U of M Capital Request, lobby efforts, secure funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAPR Funds to make all buildings accessible</td>
<td>2008 Capital Request and beyond</td>
<td>CRPC</td>
<td>Secure funds, accessible and modern space across campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briggs Library Renovation</td>
<td>2010 Capital Request</td>
<td>CRPC, Library planning committee</td>
<td>Inclusion in U of M Capital Request, lobby efforts, fundraising goals achieved, secure funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFA Phase III</td>
<td>2012 Capital Request</td>
<td>CRPC, HFA Phase III planning committee</td>
<td>Inclusion in U of M Capital Request, lobby efforts, fundraising goals achieved, secure funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below are listed internet addresses and other resources used by the Task Force.

1. The framing goal, vision, mission, and values of the University’s Strategic Positioning process are outlined in *The University of Minnesota: Advancing the Public Good*, available at: http://www1.umn.edu/systemwide/strategic_positioning/goal.html

2. A complete reporting of kick off, focus groups, survey, and interview feedback, available at: http://www.morris.umn.edu/strategic/


4. The framing concepts for respective coordinate campuses are outlined in *The University of Minnesota: Advancing the Public Good*, available at: http://www1.umn.edu/systemwide/strategic_positioning/campuses.html


9. Information regarding the UMM First Year Seminar program, available at: http://www.morris.umn.edu/academic/is1001/
   Information regarding the UMM Service Learning program, available at: http://www.morris.umn.edu/academic/sl/

10. Information regarding the UMM Undergraduate Research Symposium, available at: http://www.morris.umn.edu/urs/


12. Information regarding faculty research and creative activity, see survey results of Faculty Opinion of Administration Survey, Faculty Quality of Life Survey, and Faculty Affairs Committee Research & Scholarship Survey. Information regarding UMM faculty leaves, available at: http://www.morris.umn.edu/services/acad_affairs/leaves.html


15. Complete information regarding the Center for Small Towns, available at: http://www.morris.umn.edu/cst/
16. Information regarding *The Deciding Project*, a UMM program geared toward students with undecided major in order to help with retention efforts, available at: http://www.morris.umn.edu/academic/advising/undecidedmajor.htm
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Appendix A

Strategic Positioning Task Force Membership

The Morris campus chose the Campus Resources and Planning Committee, one of five standing Campus Assembly committees, to fill the role of the Strategic Positioning Task Force. The Committee has a broad membership of faculty, staff, students, and administrators, so using this existing committee reduced the workload for members while ensuring a diverse range of insights.

Task Force Chair

- Angel (Andy) Lopez, Professor of Computer Science

Task Force Members

- James (Jim) Carlson, Professor of Music (2005-2006)
- Jonathan Bringewatt, Student, Political Science and History (2006-2007)
- LeAnn Dean, Director, Rodney A. Briggs Library
- Michele Handlin, Student, Environmental Science and Social Science (Spring Semester 2006)
- Sara Haugen, Coordinator, Commission on Women
- Bryan Herrmann, Assistant Director of Admissions
- Kenneth Hodgson, Associate Professor of Music (2006-2007)
- Kristi Kehrwald, Student, Global Studies and Political Science (Fall Semester 2005)
- Arne Kildegaard, Associate Professor of Economics
- Pareena Lawrence, Associate Professor of Economics & Management
- Tim Lindberg, Student, History and Political Science (2005-2006)
- Sarah Mattson, Human Resource Director
- Madeline (Maddy) Maxeiner, Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations
- Cassie McMahon, Student, Environmental Studies and Economics (2006-2007)
- Daniel Moore, Student, Global Business and World Politics
- Lowell Rasmussen, Associate Vice Chancellor for Physical Plant and Master Planning
- Tim Soderberg, Assistant Professor of Chemistry (2005-2006)
- Sharon Van Eps, Program Advisor, Center for International Programs
- Roger Wareham, Pre-Award Coordinator, Grants Development Office (Fall Semester 2006)
- Theresa Wivinus, Student, Sociology and Women’s Studies (2005-2006)
- Peter Wyckoff, Associate Professor of Biology
Thank you for agreeing to serve on the University of Minnesota, Morris Strategic Positioning Task Force. The University’s Strategic Positioning process presents a remarkable opportunity for our campus to reaffirm its mission and set a new direction that will build upon its excellence and ensure its future vitality. With your help, we will identify what Morris’ unique contribution can be to the University’s goal of becoming one of the top three public research universities in the world, and recommend new ways to serve our students and the state. As you pursue your charge, I ask that you engage in bold and visionary thinking and identify strategies that will propel us forward.

President Bruininks has asked that each strategic positioning task force consider the following strategic action areas that were identified in the University’s strategic positioning recommendations, Transforming the University of Minnesota, endorsed by the Board of Regents on June 10, 2005.

- Recruit, nurture, challenge, and educate outstanding students who are bright, curious and highly motivated.
- Recruit, mentor, reward and retain world-class faculty and staff who are innovative, energetic, and dedicated to the highest standards of excellence.
- Promote an effective organizational culture that is committed to excellence and responsive to change.
- Exercise responsible stewardship by setting priorities and enhancing and effectively utilizing resources and infrastructure.
- Communicate clearly and credibly with all of our constituencies and practice public engagement responsive to the public good.

During the development of the University’s strategic positioning plan, certain common themes have been identified and are important to keep in mind as we begin our work. The themes are:

- Strong academic programs and leadership.
- Improved access to success for students demonstrating that a better education leads directly to better results.
- Excellence in research.
- Lowered economic costs through improved services and strengthened core investments.
- Greater alignment across all programs and services.

As you pursue your work, please also keep in mind the following questions:

- What role should the Morris campus play as part of the University’s goal of being a top 3 public research institution?
- What strategic directions will Morris need to take to maximize this role?
• What are the actions recommended to achieve these directions, including opportunities for reallocation of resources?
• What special contributions should the Morris campus make to our region of the state?
• How will demographic, economic, and enrollment trends affect the future of UMM and what steps must be taken as a result?
• What are our areas of excellence and/or comparative advantage?
• What are the measures of progress and expected impact?
• What are the incentives necessary to achieve success?
• What are the barriers to success? What strategies exist to overcome the barriers?

**The Task Force Charge**

Each campus in the University system has a responsibility, consistent with its history and mission, to move toward making the University one of the top three public research institutions in the world. This task force is asked to conduct a thorough evaluation of the mission, priorities, strengths, and future direction of the Morris campus as part of this institutional commitment. This evaluation should carefully examine the current status of the campus and its programs, and determine where change is needed to address current trends and anticipate future needs. The task force is asked to conduct this evaluation under the following operating principles:

• Recognition and attribution of full costs and cost increases;
• Rationalization of level of state support;
• Revenue expectations and enhancements;
• Academic enhancement and accountability;
• Enrollment models, expectations, and plan;
• Enhanced regional service and programs;
• Increased connection with relevant Twin Cities campus initiatives and resources.

Specifically, the task force should:

• Evaluate background data about demographic, programmatic, and fiscal issues facing the campus;
• Address enrollment issues and associated financial considerations;
• Identify ways to partner with the other campuses and with Twin Cities campus colleges and units to leverage complementary strengths and identify efficiencies;
• Establish a financial and academic accountability framework under which the campus will operate;
• Develop operating assumptions that lead to successful implementation of goals;
• Develop measures by which progress toward goals will be assessed.
Appendix C

University Criteria for Review of Programs

The following distinct criteria that have been established over the past 20 years at the University were identified to review programs and establish new priorities:

- Centrality to Mission: A program or service is more highly valued if it contributes significantly to the core mission of the University.
- Quality, Productivity, and Impact: A program or service should meet objective and evaluative standards of high quality, productivity, public engagement, and impact.
- Uniqueness and Comparative Advantage: A program should be evaluated based on characteristics that make it an exceptional strength for the University compared to other programs in Minnesota or at other peer institutions.
- Enhancement of Academic Synergies: A program/service should be organized to promote and facilitate synergies that build relationships and interdisciplinary, multicultural, international and other collaborations.
- Demand and Resources: Evaluation of a program or service should consider current and projected demand and the potential and real availability of resources for funding program or service costs.
- Efficiency and Effectiveness: A program or service should be evaluated based on its effectiveness and how efficiently it operates.
- Development and Leveraging of Resources: Any new or existing program or service should be evaluated on its potential to develop new resources and leveraging existing resources.
Appendix D: University of Minnesota, Morris Background Data

The Task Force reviewed the following data, prepared by Institutional Research and Reporting and supplemented with data from UMM’s Institutional Research Office, February 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA</th>
<th>MORRIS CAMPUS</th>
<th>14-Feb-06</th>
<th>UMNMO</th>
<th>Page 1 of 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Headcount Students (Fall)</td>
<td>1,952</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>1,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>1,859</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>1,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Freshmen (NHS)</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Rank</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Score</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR Score</td>
<td>133.6</td>
<td>133.1</td>
<td>130.7</td>
<td>132.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Headcount Students by Ethnicity (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano/Hispanic</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Headcount Students by Gender (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Post-Doctoral Associates</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FYE Students</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>1,897</td>
<td>1,841</td>
<td>1,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>1,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate &amp; Professional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Degrees Awarded</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Degrees</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degrees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral and 1st Prof Degrees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Rates (for Freshmen Admitted Fall of Fiscal Year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Retention</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year Retention</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rates (for Freshmen Admitted Fall of Fiscal Year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA</th>
<th>MORRIS CAMPUS</th>
<th>14-Feb-06</th>
<th>UMNMO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscal Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY1996</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY1997</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY1998</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total FTE Employees</strong></td>
<td>296</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Faculty</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Head Count Employees</strong></td>
<td>318</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Faculty</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty HC</strong></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employees of Color (% Tot HC)</strong></td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Faculty</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Student Employees (HC)</strong></td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Activity</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuition Revenue</strong></td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Activity</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Activity</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures by Fund Source</strong></td>
<td>$26,225,904</td>
<td>$25,794,951</td>
<td>$27,114,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost Recovery</td>
<td>$45,358</td>
<td>$57,977</td>
<td>$50,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Reserves</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary &amp; ISOS</td>
<td>$4,758,224</td>
<td>$4,381,549</td>
<td>$4,502,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Current Unrestricted Funds</td>
<td>$445,799</td>
<td>$218,671</td>
<td>$395,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Appropriations</td>
<td>$1,899,799</td>
<td>$1,931,138</td>
<td>$2,028,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriations</td>
<td>$1,947,757</td>
<td>$1,966,927</td>
<td>$1,310,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of MN Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>$1,896,680</td>
<td>$1,481,008</td>
<td>$1,674,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Current Restricted Funds</td>
<td>$908,504</td>
<td>$774,270</td>
<td>$768,680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Groups as % of Total Employees (Head Count)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Faculty</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC T/TT Faculty as % of Tot Fac</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Measures per T/TT Head Count Faculty | | | | | | | | | | |
| Undergraduate Students | 26.3 | 21.8 | 22.6 | 22.5 | 19.9 | 18.1 | 20.1 | 17.5 | 15.7 | 15.6 |
| Graduate/Professional Students | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lower Division FYE Students | 16.0 | 13.0 | 13.2 | 13.9 | 10.9 | 10.0 | 11.0 | 9.2 | 8.3 | 7.8 |
| Upper Division FYE Students | 9.8 | 8.1 | 8.7 | 8.6 | 9.4 | 8.6 | 9.3 | 8.3 | 8.7 | 8.8 |
| Grad & Prof FYE Students | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total FYE Students | 25.8 | 21.1 | 21.9 | 22.4 | 20.3 | 18.6 | 20.3 | 17.5 | 17.0 | 16.6 |
| Civil Service Staff | 2.15 | 1.91 | 2.02 | 2.08 | 2.09 | 2.09 | 2.28 | 2.03 | 1.76 | 1.77 |
| Administrative Staff | 0.36 | 0.40 | 0.44 | 0.40 | 0.39 | 0.35 | 0.41 | 0.38 | 0.35 | 0.33 |
| Other Faculty | 0.45 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.33 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.42 | 0.25 | 0.14 | 0.16 |
| Professional Staff | 0.34 | 0.36 | 0.32 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.55 | 0.45 | 0.51 |
| Total Other Staff | 3.30 | 2.98 | 3.10 | 3.26 | 3.26 | 3.26 | 3.67 | 3.21 | 2.70 | 2.77 |
| Grant & Contract Proposals: # | 0.38 | 0.26 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.22 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.19 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Grant & Contract Awards: $ | $6,723 | $1,368 | $2,358 | $1,415 | $7,532 | $1,296 | $7,778 | $5,842 | $4,849 | $5,987 |
| Grant & Contract Awards: # | 0.27 | 0.14 | 0.20 | 0.18 | 0.20 | 0.12 | 0.20 | 0.14 | 0.11 | 0.12 |
| Undergraduate Degrees | 4.9 | 4.1 | 4.6 | 4.1 | 3.8 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.2 |
| Graduate/Professional Degrees | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Degrees | 4.9 | 4.1 | 4.6 | 4.1 | 3.8 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.2 |

| Measures per Total Head Count Faculty | | | | | | | | | | |
| Undergraduate Students | 18.2 | 16.6 | 17.3 | 16.9 | 15.3 | 14.0 | 14.2 | 14.1 | 13.8 | 13.5 |
| Graduate/Professional Students | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lower Division FYE Students | 11.1 | 9.9 | 10.1 | 10.4 | 8.4 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 7.4 | 7.3 | 6.7 |
| Upper Division FYE Students | 6.8 | 6.2 | 6.6 | 6.4 | 7.2 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 6.7 | 7.6 | 7.6 |
| Grad & Prof FYE Students | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total FYE Students | 17.9 | 16.1 | 16.7 | 16.9 | 15.6 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 14.1 | 15.0 | 14.4 |

| Non-Sponsored Carry Forward as % of Total Unrestricted Expenditures | | | | | | | | | | |
| na | na | 6.5% | 12.1% | 10.6% | 5.4% | 7.9% | 7.5% | 8.4% | 8.8% |
# Appendix E: Strategic Comparisons to Peer Institutions

The following list compares institutions sharing membership in the Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges (COPLAC), prepared by Pareena Lawrence, Associate Professor of Economics & Management, assisted by Adam Turgeon, student.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Distance from Metro Area (miles) (city over 50,000)</th>
<th>Population of Town</th>
<th>Student Population</th>
<th>Number of Programs/Majors</th>
<th>Graduate Programs?</th>
<th>Professional Programs?</th>
<th>Year Established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ramapo College of NJ</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma State University</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>42,236</td>
<td>6,481</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern CT State University</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>15,823</td>
<td>4,606</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keene State College</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>22,563</td>
<td>4,370</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's College of MD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>1,656</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New College of Florida</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>52,715</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass. College of Lib. Arts</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>14,681</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of NC, Asheville</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>68,889</td>
<td>3,124</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY College at Geneseo</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>9,654</td>
<td>5,292</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Charleston</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>96,650</td>
<td>9,501</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wis.-Superior</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>27,368</td>
<td>2,507</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truman State University</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>16,988</td>
<td>5,474</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia College &amp; State U</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>18,757</td>
<td>4,782</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Minnesota, Morris</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>5,068</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson State University</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>10,912</td>
<td>2,728</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon University</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>19,522</td>
<td>4,238</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Maine at Farmington</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>7,410</td>
<td>2,278</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Montevallo</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>4,869</td>
<td>2,557</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lewis College</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>160.6</td>
<td>13,922</td>
<td>3,829</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen State College</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>42,514</td>
<td>3,962</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Washington College</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>19,279</td>
<td>3,951</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following list compares institutions included in the “Morris 14” peer comparison group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Distance from Metro Area (miles) (city over 50,000)</th>
<th>Population of Town</th>
<th>Student Population</th>
<th>Number of Programs/Majors</th>
<th>Graduate Programs?</th>
<th>Professional Programs?</th>
<th>Year Established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carleton College</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>17,147</td>
<td>1,936</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramapo Coll New Jersey</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macalester College</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>287,151</td>
<td>1,843</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's Coll. of Maryland</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>1,656</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint John's U</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>3,516</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Olaf College</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>17,147</td>
<td>3,007</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustavus Adolphus Coll</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>9,747</td>
<td>2,545</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U North Carolina-Asheville</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>68,889</td>
<td>3,124</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coll Saint Benedict</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>1,992</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamline U</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>287,151</td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia Coll-Moorhead</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>32,177</td>
<td>2,686</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Minnesota-Morris</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>5,068</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Maine-Farmington</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>7,410</td>
<td>2,278</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Washington Coll</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>19,279</td>
<td>3,951</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Admitted Student Questionnaire

Prepared by The College Board, a study of students admitted to UMM who chose to attend other institutions. Questionnaire results for fall 2003 and fall 2005.

ASQ Plus 2003 Summary – Non-Enrolling Students

Number of Students Surveyed: 383/Respondents: 87/Percent: 23%
Gender: 72% female/28% male
Race/Ethnicity: 86% White/6% Asian American/5% African American
Median Income: $69,000
Geographic Origin: 82% Twin Cities/6% Northern Minnesota/4% Western South Dakota
Top Zip Codes: 553/554/551/550/563
Median ACT Score: 28

Most Important College Characteristics:  Least Important College Characteristics:
1. Availability of Majors   1. Availability of recreational facilities
2. Personal Attention      2. Attractiveness of campus
3. Value for the Price      3. Special academic programs

Ratings for UMM on Certain College Characteristics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Poor/Fair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Surroundings:</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quality of Campus Housing:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Access to Off-Campus Activities:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Availability of Majors:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Images Most Frequently Associated with our College:
2. Friendly
3. Isolated
4. Intellectual
5. Inexpensive

Average Aid Awarded:                         By Our College (Enrolling) By College Attending (Non-Enrolling)
Work Study:                                 $1,418          $1,868
Loans:                                      $4,676          $5,446
Need-Based Aid:                              $3,162          $9,731
Merit Aid:                                   $3,902          $7,044
Total Award:                                 $7,287          $15,983
ASQ Plus 2005 Summary – Non-Enrolling Students

Number of Students Surveyed: 435/Respondents: 30/Percent: 7%
Gender: 68% female/32% male
Race/Ethnicity: 90% White/5% American Indian/5% Hispanic
Median Income: $68,000
Geographic Origin: 75% Twin Cities/20% Northern Minnesota/5% Central Minnesota
Top Zip Codes: 553/562/563/551/566
Median ACT Score: 26

Most Important College Characteristics:  Least Important College Characteristics:
1. Availability of Majors   1. Availability of recreational facilities
2. Quality of Academic Facilities  2. Attractiveness of campus
3. Academic Reputation   3. Special academic programs
4. Personal Attention   4. Access to off-campus activities

Ratings for UMM on Certain College Characteristics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Poor/Fair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surroundings:</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Campus Housing:</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Off-Campus Activities:</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Majors:</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Images Most Frequently Associated with our College:
1. Friendly
2. Isolated
3. Intellectual
4. Comfortable

Average Aid Awarded: By Our College By College Attending
(Enrolling) (Non-Enrolling)
Work Study: $2,737 $2,100
Loans: $7,962 $2,998
Need-Based Aid: $5,226 $8,194
Merit Aid: $3,696 $8,833
Total Award: $10,432 $15,409
## Appendix G

### University of Minnesota, Morris Enrollment Growth Projections

Prepared by James Morales, Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment, February 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NHS</th>
<th>NAS</th>
<th>Non-Degree</th>
<th>Total New</th>
<th>Total Continuing</th>
<th>Total UMM Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>1603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>1082</td>
<td>1665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>1103</td>
<td>1682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>1774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>1463</td>
<td>2041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>1484</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>1364</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>1299</td>
<td>1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>1293</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>1325</td>
<td>1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>1211</td>
<td>1842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>1283</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>1684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>1706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>1757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>1309</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>2041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td>2104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### University of Minnesota, Morris Endowment Growth Projections

Prepared by Maddy Maxeiner, Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations, assisted by Pareena Lawrence, Associate Professor of Economics & Management, March 2006. These projections are based on figures that include UMM’s fundraising efforts and the performance of our endowment from 1992 to 2005. Assuming a similar average rate of growth, we project the following endowment growth:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Projected Total Endowment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$8.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$10.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$11.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$12.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$14.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$16.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$18.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$21.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$24.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$27.6 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix I: Review of External Relations Staffing Resources

Prepared by UMM’s Office of External Relations, a comparison of external relations, alumni relations, and development staff resources at other small colleges and universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Alumni Base</th>
<th>Alumni Relations</th>
<th>Annual Giving</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>Annual Giving Dollars Raised FY05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina, Asheville</td>
<td>3,572</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$155,000-phonathon &amp; direct mail &amp; $150,000-scholarships and personal solicitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Charleston</td>
<td>9,866</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia College, Moorhead</td>
<td>2,812</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$3,227,749-unrestricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maine, Farmington</td>
<td>2,349</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AR/AG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$3.3 million total over 2 years of campaign, $1.5 million from alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustavus Adolphus</td>
<td>2,577</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$951,000 unrestricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Washington University</td>
<td>4,130</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$2,057,774-unrestricted and restricted for current use $1,088,945- specifically to the Fund for Mary Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramapo College of New Jersey</td>
<td>5,278</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AR/AG</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$183,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota, Morris</td>
<td>1,684</td>
<td>16,688</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>AR/AG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$374,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of St. Benedict/St. John's University</td>
<td>CSB-2,033</td>
<td>CSB-12,921</td>
<td>CSB-2 SJU-7(AR/AG combined)</td>
<td>CSB-2 SJU-10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>CSB-$916,971-unrestricted, $1,320,603-restricted(incl. annual giving to scholarship funds) SJU-$2,163,000-unrestricted to the Annual Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's College of Maryland</td>
<td>1,935</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>$40,000,000-Completed campaign total. Annual giving figures rolled into campaign totals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Olaf College</td>
<td>3,046</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$3.5 million-unrestricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truman State University</td>
<td>5,616</td>
<td>47,936</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Military Institute</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$2.1 million annual giving dollars raised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
1. Alumni base is defined as living, addressable alumni.
2. Head counts include professional and support staff. Head counts may include individuals with responsibilities in multiple departments.
Appendix J

Summary of “Morris 14” Comparison Group

Below are listed the institutions that the University of Minnesota, Morris considers to be our peers.

- Ramapo College of New Jersey
- Macalester College, Minnesota
- Carleton College, Minnesota
- St. Mary’s College of Maryland
- Hamline University, Minnesota
- University of North Carolina at Ashville
- St. Olaf College, Minnesota
- University of Mary Washington, Virginia
- Concordia College (Moorhead), Minnesota
- St. John’s University, Minnesota
- Gustavas Adolphus College, Minnesota
- University of Maine at Farmington
- College of Saint Benedict, Minnesota
- Evergreen State College, Washington
### Comprehensive Listing of Existing Partnerships

Below are listed a sampling of relationships between the University of Minnesota, Morris and academic, research, and outreach partners.

#### Academic Partners
- Beijing Union University, Beijing, China
- Capital Normal University, Beijing, China
- GenEdWeb Collaboration for Post Secondary Education Opportunities
- Shanghai University, Shanghai, China
- University of Minnesota China Center
- University of Minnesota, Duluth

#### Research Partners
- Agricultural Utilization Research Institute
- West Central Research and Outreach Center
- University of Minnesota College of Agriculture, Food, and Environmental Sciences
- USDA North Central Soil Conservation Research Laboratory

#### Outreach Partners
- Center for Small Towns
- City of Morris
- Community Outreach Partnership Center Program
- Henjum Institute for Creative Study
- Minnesota Public Radio
- Minnesota State Arts Board
- Morris Area School District
- Morris Chamber of Commerce
- Pioneer Public Television
- Pride of the Prairie Local Foods Initiative
- Rodney A. Briggs Library
- Stevens County Medical Center
- TREC (Tutoring, Reading, Enabling Children) Program
- UMM Big Friend/Little Friend Program
- University of Minnesota Regional Sustainable Development Partnership
Strategic Positioning At UMM

Presentation for Information
at
October 4, 2006
Campus Assembly
Background

• U of M Initial Strategic Planning – August 2004
• UMM Strategic Planning began Summer 2005
• Kickoff event, focus groups, consultant, open forums, online surveys, consultation with external audiences – Fall 2005
• Initial Report submitted March 31, 2006
• Feedback from Central Administration - August 2006
• Response to feedback - September 15, 2006
• Consultation with all assembly committees, MCSA, divisions.
• Upcoming open forum - October 9, 2006
• Revised Report due November 1, 2006
• Implementation Phase - ongoing
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Responsibilities

Task Forces

Existing Committees
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Task Forces
Vision for UMM’s Future

• The University of Minnesota, Morris provides an undergraduate liberal arts education of uncompromising rigor for a diverse student body. As a public honors college, UMM is committed to outstanding teaching and learning, faculty scholarship and undergraduate research, genuine outreach and engagement. Our small, residential academic setting fosters authentic relationships, and the University serves as an educational and cultural resource for the region, nation, and world. A personalized educational experience prepares graduates to be global citizens who are interculturally competent, civically engaged, and effective stewards of their environments.

Strategic Goal

• To position the University of Minnesota, Morris as the best public liberal arts college in the nation, in the top tier of national liberal arts colleges, and as a public honors college.
Defined Deliverables

- Exceptional student experience
- Goal for 4 Year graduation rate is 60% (currently 44%), 5 Year graduation rate is 75% (currently 56%)
- A student body of 2100 students
- A balanced budget

To achieve these goals and deliverables the strategic positioning process suggests undertaking the following initiatives
# Teaching and Outreach Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Administrative &amp; Implementation Responsibility</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Consultation Process</th>
<th>Metrics and Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrate Green Initiatives – Interdisciplinary Activity</td>
<td>Dean, AVC Physical Plant, Divisions, Curriculum, Sustainability Coordinator</td>
<td>Begin Planning Spring 2007</td>
<td>Curriculum, CRPC, WCROC,</td>
<td>Increased recognition from external rating organizations, Integration into curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of liberal learning outcomes - Writing, speaking and critical thinking</td>
<td>Dean, Divisions, Curriculum</td>
<td>Begin Planning Spring 2007</td>
<td>Curriculum, Disciplines, Scholastic, FYS</td>
<td>Improved NSSE results and graduate exit survey results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve participation in and documentation of civic engagement, public service, and leadership</td>
<td>Dean, VCSA, Curriculum</td>
<td>Develop plan Fall 2007</td>
<td>Curriculum, Disciplines, Student Affairs, FYS</td>
<td>Increased participation, Improved NSSE results and graduate exit survey results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of current global perspectives across curriculum</td>
<td>Chancellor, Dean, Curriculum</td>
<td>Part started (Bush Grant), Develop plan for Fall 2007</td>
<td>Curriculum, CRPC, Scholastic, IPC, DSAAG</td>
<td>Integration into curriculum, improved NSSE results and graduate exit survey results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Faculty and Staff Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Administrative &amp; Implementation Responsibility</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Consultation Process</th>
<th>Metrics and Measurements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase support, recognition and visibility of Faculty Scholarship</td>
<td>Chancellor, Dean, Division Chairs, Grants</td>
<td>Continual implementation</td>
<td>Faculty Center, Faculty Affairs &amp; Consultative Committee</td>
<td>Number of external grants received, number of national presentations supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop professional development and mentoring opportunities</td>
<td>Chancellor, Dean, Human Resources, Division</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Division Chairs, Administrative Committee</td>
<td>Retention of faculty and staff, attendance at conferences, hosting relevant campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chairs, Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>workshops and meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide comparable salaries for faculty and staff</td>
<td>Chancellor, Dean, Division Chairs, Directors,</td>
<td>Beginning Fall 2006</td>
<td>CRPC, Faculty Affairs, Consultative, USA</td>
<td>Increase standing on salary listing in Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a campus-wide technology plan</td>
<td>Chancellor, Dean, AVC for Physical Plant,</td>
<td>Beginning Spring 2007</td>
<td>Appropriate directors, MCSA, CRPC</td>
<td>Secure ongoing funds to improve and maintain our technology advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computing Services, Media Services, Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Student Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Administrative &amp; Implementation Responsibility</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Consultation Process</th>
<th>Metrics and Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop cohesive year-long “First Year Experience”</td>
<td>VCSA, Dean, AVC Student Life, Student Activities, Residential Life</td>
<td>Begin Discussions Fall 2006 (Reestablishment of the FYE Subcommittee)</td>
<td>Scholastic, Curriculum, FYS, Residential Life, Student Services</td>
<td>Increased retention, improved experience, improved graduation rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Multicultural Campus Life and Interculturally competent graduates</td>
<td>Chancellor, VCSA, Dean</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>Faculty Development, Multi-Ethnic Experience, Student Services, IPC, etc.</td>
<td>Increase recruitment and retention of traditionally underserved students, improve student satisfaction survey results for this group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create academic enrichment office</td>
<td>Dean, Discussion Committee on Academic Enrichment</td>
<td>Task Force formed Fall 2006</td>
<td>CRPC, Scholastic, Curriculum, Consultative, Honors Program, CIP, etc.</td>
<td>Increased awareness (internally and externally) and success in research, study abroad, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen “life planning” student support</td>
<td>VCSA, Dean, Advising, Career Center, Counseling</td>
<td>Discussions begin immediately</td>
<td>Student Services, Scholastic, Retention Work Group, External Relations and Alumni Office</td>
<td>Increased satisfaction in life planning area of the graduate exit survey, increased % of students using alumni career networks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Viability and Sustainability Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Administrative &amp; Implementation Responsibility</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Consultation Process</th>
<th>Metrics and Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase Morris Scholars Program (additional merit scholarship funds and for enrichment opportunities)</td>
<td>Chancellor, Enrollment, AVC External Relations, Fund Development</td>
<td>Beginning Fall 2006</td>
<td>CRPC, Retention Work Group, SAP</td>
<td>Increase percentage of high ability students enrolled and graduated, endowed funds to support these scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase non-traditional revenue – private donors, facility use, grants, wind energy funds, etc.</td>
<td>AVC External Relations, Fund Development, CERP, VCSA, AVC Physical Plant</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>CRPC, CERP, Student Affairs, Administrative Committee, Student Services, Consultative</td>
<td>Increased percentage of total budget supported from these sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop additional green energy initiatives and integrate into master plan</td>
<td>Chancellor, AVC Physical Plant</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>CRPC</td>
<td>Increased energy self-sufficiency, increased research opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure full funding for Native American Tuition Waiver</td>
<td>Chancellor, Institutional Research</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>CRPC, Enrollment Area, American Indian Advisory Committee, MSP</td>
<td>Ongoing secured funds to cover tuition to improve graduation rates of Native American students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Visibility Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Administrative &amp; Implementation Responsibility</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Consultation Process</th>
<th>Metrics and Measurements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand development - market research, e.g. honors college, honors experience</td>
<td>Chancellor, Dean, Division Chairs, Enrollment, AVC External Relations, Communications</td>
<td>Immediately begin research and plan</td>
<td>CRPC, Curriculum, External Relations, IMG, CCG</td>
<td>External recognition and understanding of brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit and retain national and International students</td>
<td>Enrollment Area, CIP, Dean, Student Affairs</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>CRPC, Scholastic, Retention Work Group, IPC,</td>
<td>Increased numbers of students and graduates from these markets, track cohorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement campus-wide integrated marketing plan</td>
<td>AVC External Relations, Enrollment Area, Athletics, Communications</td>
<td>Immediately following market research</td>
<td>CRPC, IMG, CCG, Athletics, Student Affairs</td>
<td>External recognition and understanding of UMM experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Campus Master Plan to align with strategic initiatives</td>
<td>AVC Physical Plant, VCSA, Dean, AVC External Relations, Communications</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>CRPC, Divisions, ASSC</td>
<td>Better understanding of use and renovation of physical facilities, increased pride in campus facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Capital Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Administrative &amp; Implementation Responsibility</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Consultation Process</th>
<th>Metrics and Measurements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gateway to Campus: Community Services Building</td>
<td>AVC Physical Plant, Chancellor</td>
<td>2008 Capital Request</td>
<td>CRPC</td>
<td>Inclusion in U of M Capital Request, lobby efforts, secure funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Facility and Conference Center: Blakely, Food Service</td>
<td>AVC Physical Plant, VCSA, Residential Life, Chancellor, Finance Officer</td>
<td>2008 Capital Request</td>
<td>CRPC, Blakely Hall Planning Committee</td>
<td>Inclusion in U of M Capital Request, lobby efforts, secure funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAPR Funds to make all buildings accessible</td>
<td>AVC Physical Plant, Chancellor</td>
<td>2008 Capital Request and beyond</td>
<td>CRPC</td>
<td>Secure funds, accessible and modern space across campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briggs Library Renovation</td>
<td>AVC Physical Plant, Library Director, Chancellor</td>
<td>2010 Capital Request</td>
<td>CRPC, Library planning committee</td>
<td>Inclusion in U of M Capital Request, lobby efforts, fundraising goals achieved, secure funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFA Phase III</td>
<td>AVC Physical Plant, Humanities Division, Chancellor</td>
<td>2012 Capital Request</td>
<td>CRPC, HFA Phase III planning committee</td>
<td>Inclusion in U of M Capital Request, lobby efforts, fundraising goals achieved, secure funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback

Attend the campus forum hosted by the Executive Committee, October 9, 2006 at 4:30pm in the Science Auditorium
University of Minnesota, Morris: Public Liberal Arts College

The University of Minnesota, Morris provides a rigorous undergraduate liberal arts education, preparing its students to be global citizens who value and pursue intellectual growth, civic engagement, intercultural competence, and environmental stewardship.
Morris Strategic Plan

Overarching strategic goal, October 2006

To position the University of Minnesota, Morris as the best public liberal arts college in the nation, in the top tier of national liberal arts colleges, and as a public honors college
Organizing framework for the Morris strategic plan

• Ensuring the future: viability, sustainability, and visibility

• Doing it right: teaching, research and outreach

• Making it happen: organization and operations
Key components

• Focus on students
• Enhance national brand, alumni and donor relations
• “Play a preeminent role in solving the grand challenges of a diverse and changing world”
• “Capitalize on location and build a culture of reciprocal engagement”
• Improve facilities
Strategic goal: increase enrollment

Enrollment gains, 2005-2015

- Degree seeking student enrollment has grown by 14 percent (1533 to 1741)
- Student of color numbers have nearly doubled (249 to 480)—27 percent of students*
- International student numbers have increased tenfold (from 19 to 193, currently at 9 percent)
- American Indian student numbers have doubled, now at 18 percent (N = 317)**

*Compared to 19 percent on Twin Cities campus
**Compared to 1.6 percent (N = 140) Duluth and 1.2 percent (N = 367, Twin Cities)
Minnesota
The competition factor

59,379 high school seniors / 2013-14*

119 institutions of higher education**

70.9% college continuation rate (42,100)***
(ranks 6th among states)

29.9% leave the state to go to college (12,589)****
(ranks 14th among states)

† In-state institutions receiving the largest number of in-state freshmen.
‡ Competition factor equals college continuation rate less number of students migrating and the three in-state institutions receiving the largest number of in-state freshmen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three Largest Institutions†******</th>
<th>Number of In-state Freshmen******</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota – Twin Cities</td>
<td>3,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota State University – Mankato</td>
<td>1,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota – Duluth</td>
<td>1,565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22,703 students ÷ 116 institutions = 195 students per institution††

Sources:
*Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Knocking at the College Door, 2012
***Postsecondary Education Opportunity, Chance for College by Age 19 by State 1986-2010, 2013
****Postsecondary Education Opportunity, Interstate Migration of College Freshmen 1986-2010, 2012
*****National Center for Education Statistics, IPEDS Fall Enrollment Survey (2010)
Strategic goal: Improve graduation rates

- Four year graduation rates have increased by 9 percentage points, 2011 cohort compared to the 2001 entering cohort (53 percent compared to 44 percent)
- Six year graduation rates have improved by 9 percentage points, 2009 entering cohort compared to 1999 entering cohort (68 % compared to 59%)
THE STANDOUTS: Most effective and efficient baccalaureate public college: University of Minnesota Morris

Most effective baccalaureate public college in the state: Minnesota, Morris
Strategic goal: enhance undergraduate opportunities and success

- Create Academic Center for Enrichment
- Expand undergraduate research and study abroad opportunities*
- Secure national scholarships and fellowships**
- Secure external funding (Federal TRIO student support services; Native American Serving Non Tribal Institution; Margaret A. Cargill Sustainable Leaders for the Future)

*51 percent of seniors in undergraduate research; 46 percent of seniors study abroad (NSSE 2014)
**Truman; Udall; Fulbright; Howard Hughes Medical Institute
Strategic goal: enhance national reputation
US News and World Reports

Winds of Change

Sierra Club

Kiplinger

Environmental Protection Agency
Strategic goal: expand and improve alumni and donor relations
Intersection with Twin Cities strategic plan

“Play a preeminent role in solving the grand challenges of a diverse and changing world”

“Capitalize on location and build a culture of reciprocal engagement”
Strategic goal: improve facilities
AGENDA ITEM: Primer on Minnesota Government Data Practices Act and Related University Procedures

☐ Review  ☐ Review + Action  ☐ Action  X Discussion

☐ This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: William P. Donohue, General Counsel
             Brent P. Benrud, Senior Associate General Counsel
             Susan McKinney, Director, Records and Information Management

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

The purpose of this item is to provide a primer on the requirements of the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act (DPA), Minn. Stat. Ch. 13. It will describe the process for fulfilling DPA requests made to the University and some enhancements to that process.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The DPA applies to all public agencies. It is a broad statute that covers all data, regardless of form, held by the University. The number and complexity of DPA requests to the University has increased significantly over the last several years, making timely response difficult. Additional staff and software enhancements will help the process become more efficient.
Primer on Minnesota Government Data Practices Act and Related University Procedures

March 31, 2016

William Donohue, General Counsel
Brent Benrud, Senior Associate General Counsel
Susan McKinney, Director, Records and Information Management
Introduction

• DPA Overview

• University Request Handling Process

• Developments
  • New DPA Portal/Software
  • New Staff Member
The DPA


- Government data means “all data collected, created, received, maintained or disseminated by any government entity regardless of its physical form, storage media or conditions of use.” M.S. § 13.02, Subd. 7

- What does this mean? All information sent or received as part of official government business is subject to the DPA. This includes, for example, correspondence, emails, reports and notes.
Information Policy Analysis Division (IPAD)

• Part of the Minnesota Department of Administration

• Functions Include:
  • Technical Assistance
  • Draft, Propose, and Track Legislation
  • Advisory Opinions
  • Workshops/Training
  • Information and Model Policies
  • Website: www.ipad.state.mn.us

• IPAD has issued over 970 advisory opinions on data practices matters (more than 25 of these dealt with the University of Minnesota)
Classifications of Data

• DPA Presumptions

  • “All government data ... shall be public unless classified by statute ... or federal law as nonpublic ...” M.S. § 13.03, Subd. 1

  • Public data must be disclosed. M.S. § 13.03, Subd. 3

• Examples of private data:
  • M.S. § 13.32          Education Data
  • M.S. § 13.37          Trade Secret Data
  • M.S. § 13.384         Medical Data
  • M.S. § 13.43          Private Personnel Data
  • M.S. § 13.792         Private Donor Gift Data
  • M.S. § 13.87          Criminal Justice Data
DPA Considerations

• Focus on the subject/content of the data, not where or how it is stored.

• University records on personal devices or computers are government data.

• E-mail and text messages used for University business are government data.

• Records that contain both public and private data are subject to the data practices act, though private data would be redacted.
Common Requests

• Contracts

• Issue-related E-mails/Correspondence

• Investigation Data

• Law Enforcement Data

• Research Data

• Personnel Data
Personnel Data

• “Personnel Data” includes data on current and former employees, applicants, volunteers, and independent contractors. M.S. § 13.43, Subd. 1

• Personnel Data is private unless designated public by the DPA. M.S. § 13.42, Subd. 2
Personnel Data - Examples

- Complaints and Discipline – M.S. § 13.43, Subd. 2(a)(4), (5), 2(b)
  - Existence and status of complaints is public
  - If discipline is imposed, data documenting the reasons for the discipline and data reflecting the basis for the action is public

- Public Officials – M.S. § 13.43, Subd. 2(e) and § 13.601 – High Level Officials
  - Upon completion of an investigation, or if the public official resigns or is terminated while an investigation is pending
  - All data related to the complaint is public

- Settlements are public. M.S. § 13.43, Subd. 2(a)(6)
Access to Data

• Requested data shall be provided in an “appropriate and prompt manner.” M.S. § 13.03, Subd. 2

• Requests from the “subject of stored data” must be answered within 10 working days. M.S. § 13.04, Subd. 3

• DPA specifies when and how fees can be collected in connection with requests, including copy fees.

• If requester only wants to view data, no fees may be charged.
Remedies and Penalties
Minn. Stat. § 13.08 and § 13.09

• Action for damages, costs, and attorneys fees – M.S. § 13.08, Subd. 1

• Injunction or action to compel disclosure – M.S. § 13.08, Subd. 2, 4

• Willful violation = exemplary damages of $1,000 to $15,000 – M.S. § 13.08, Subd. 1

• Willful violation = misdemeanor – M.S. § 13.09(a)

• Willful violation = just cause for dismissal or suspension from position – M.S. § 13.09(b)
University Process

• Office of Records and Information Management (RIM)
  • Susan McKinney, Director
  • University’s “Responsible Authority” as required by the DPA

• Administrative Policy: Public Access to University Information
  • http://policy.umn.edu/operations/publicaccess

• News Service – Media Requests

• Office of the General Counsel – Legal Oversight and Advice
Data Requests

• All requests must be in writing

• Currently, RIM Director Susan McKinney
  • Gathers and redacts data responsive to all requests
  • Responds to all non-media requests

• 203% increase in requests since 2004
  • 135 requests in FY2004
  • 410 requests in FY2015
  • 362 requests since July 1, 2015

• Most requests include multiple items
  • 100 requests from 15 news agencies re Norwood Teague resignation, including 133 individual items
DPA Process

• RIM gathers requested information

• RIM reviews all requested information for private data, and redacts as necessary.

• RIM sends response to requests from media outlets to News Service to be provided to the media.

• All other responses are sent out from RIM.

• Notifications to University personnel by News Service or RIM prior to release of data.
New Developments

Public Records Request Portal – New Software and Website

• Available starting April 7, 2016
• All requests will be made through portal
• Automatically sends receipt and updates to requester
• Requester can check on status of request via portal
• Sets and manages response deadlines
• Allows requests to be automatically logged, tracked, and distributed
• Generates schedules and reports
• Improve record keeping and provides accurate and up-to-date reports
PUBLIC RECORDS CENTER

Menu
- Home
- Submit a Request
- View FAQ
- My Records Center
- Public Records Archive

FAQ
- See All FAQs

Public Information FAQs
Browse frequently asked questions

Submit a Data Records Request
Submit a Data Records request to the University of Minnesota

My Data Records Request Center
Track the status of requests, manage account information, and download your records by logging into your account.

RECORDS AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT
360 McNamara Alumni Center, 200 Oak Street SE,
Minneapolis, MN, 55455-2006
P: 612-625-3497

© 2016 Regents of the University of Minnesota. All rights reserved. The University of Minnesota is an equal opportunity educator and employer. Privacy Statement.
New Developments

RIM Staffing

• Currently, one full-time professional (Susan McKinney) in RIM
  • Gathers, reviews, and redacts data responsive to all requests
  • Responds to all non-media requests

• Increase in number and complexity of requests

• New full-time staff position to be added in RIM in the 2016-2017 fiscal year

• Assist with data requests, redacting private data, preparing responses, etc. – improve response time
Questions?
BOARD OF REGENTS
DOCKET ITEM SUMMARY

Board of Regents March 31, 2016

AGENDA ITEM: Report of the Committees

☐ Review  ☐ Review + Action  ☐ Action  ☐ Discussion

☒ This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: Regent Dean Johnson

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

Pursuant to Board of Regents Policy: Board Operations and Agenda Guidelines, “The Board conducts business through meetings of the Board and its committees.... [and] Committees provide recommendations for action by the Board. Typically, standing committees have the following responsibilities:

Recommend action on matters where the Board has reserved authority to itself as outlined in Board of Regents Policy: Reservation and Delegation of Authority and other Board policies;

- Provide governance oversight on topics within the committee's purview;
- Review and make recommendations on relevant new and existing Board policies;
- Receive reports on policy-related issues affecting University departments and units;
- Receive information items (e.g., status reports on current issues of concern and administrative searches); and
- Review other items placed on the agenda by the Board chair in consultation with the president and Board vice chair.”

The Board chair will call on the chair of each committee to present recommended actions and provide a brief report.

BACKGROUND

Current committee chairs:

- Academic & Student Affairs Committee – L. Cohen
- Audit & Compliance Committee – L. Brod
- Facilities, Planning & Operations Committee – D. McMillan
- Faculty & Staff Affairs Committee – P. Simmons
- Finance Committee – R. Beeson
- Governance & Policy Committee – L. Cohen
- Litigation Review Committee – T. Devine