

**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
April 17, 2013**

Academic and Student Affairs Committee Members Present: Chair Duane Benson; Trustees Alexander Cirillo, Cheryl Dickson, Dawn Erlandson, Maria Peluso, Louise Sundin, Margaret Anderson Kelliher

Academic and Student Affairs Committee Members Absent: None

Other Board Members Present: Trustees Clarence Hightower, Philip Krinkie, Ann Anaya, Brett Anderson, David Paskach and Thomas Renier

Leadership Council Representatives Present: Chancellor Steven Rosenstone, Vice Chancellor Douglas Knowlton, President Earl Potter

The Minnesota State Colleges and Universities Academic and Student Affairs Committee held a meeting on April 17, 2013 at Wells Fargo Place, 4th Floor, McCormick Room, 30 East 7th Street in St. Paul. Chair Benson called the session to order at 8:00 a.m.

1. Minutes of January 16, 2013

The minutes from the January 16, 2013 Joint Study Session of the Academic and Student Affairs Committee and Diversity and Equity Committee were approved as written.

2. Amendment to Policy 3.18 Honorary Degrees (First Reading)

This proposed amendment streamlines the reporting process. Some language was updated and some was moved to procedure. A degree in Engineering and Technology was added to the list of awards in the procedure.

Associate Vice Chancellor Leslie Mercer noted that the language requiring the Chancellor to report twice a year to the Board is proposed to be stricken. The college or university awarding the honorary degree will report to the system office and the information will be posted on the system website. Four honorary degrees were awarded in 2012.

Trustee Dickson said the Board is charged with making policy and monitoring to ensure that the policy is carried out, but it is difficult to determine if the policy is adequate without knowledge of the procedure. She requested that a copy of Procedure 3.18.1 be included when the policy comes back to the committee for a second reading.

Trustee Sundin proposed the language be changed back to include an annual report to the Board. She said it was unrealistic to assume trustees will look on the web to find the information.

3. Amendment to Policy 2.2 State Residency (First Reading)

The recommended changes resulted from a scheduled five-year review. Changes were suggested through extensive consultation across the system and review by the Office of General Counsel. Associate Vice Chancellor Mercer stated the policy was reviewed due to changes to the residency requirements and to update the language regarding military personnel.

Trustee Sundin asked if these changes might impact some major changes in the Dream Act. A change in the definition of residency may be needed to allow acceptance of potential Dream Act individuals. Associate Vice Chancellor Mercer responded that she believed the proposed language would not be a problem but asked Chief Counsel Gail Olson to respond.

Chief Counsel Olson said this proposal does provide flexibility, but noted that it is difficult to predict what will be decided with the Dream Act. It may be necessary to revise the policy if legislation is passed. At this point, undocumented students are not accepted for admission.

Trustee Dickson asked how the system could determine peoples' motives for residing here. Trustee Anderson asked how residency can be determined. Associate Vice Chancellor Mercer noted that part C of the policy lists criteria used to determine residency.

4. Amendment to Policy 3.24 System and College and University Missions (First Reading)

The Board of Trustee requested that this policy and procedure be reviewed and the automatic five-year mission review requirement for system colleges and universities be removed. This request prompted some additional refinements and reordering to update the policy.

Associate Vice Chancellor Mercer said this policy has been renamed to Institutional Type and Mission and System Mission. The Board requested that the requirement that institutions come before the Board for an approval of their mission statement every five years be removed unless there was a significant change to the mission. The policy also was amended to clarify the requirements for mission approval. New policy language is now consistent with Higher Learning Commission language which requires approval of the mission statement, but no longer talks about mission values and purposes.

The proposed amendment also clarifies the process needed for a change in institutional type, such as a technical college requesting to become a comprehensive college.

Transfer of Credit – Report to the Legislature

Chair Benson highlighted a few of the items from the annual report to the Legislature.

Improving transfer is one of the reasons MnSCU was formed. There have been improvements made in the transfer process, including the development of a Smart Transfer Plan. New statewide transfer agreements have been developed for health sciences, engineering and nursing programs.

Chancellor Rosenstone said an audit done 18 months ago showed 91 percent of attempted transfers worked as expected. The system has reviewed the remaining nine percent that were identified as unsuccessful. In some cases, a mistake was made and students were not fully aware of the process. A high percentage of students are successful when they appeal a decision. And in some cases, students had unrealistic or unclear expectations about what classes would transfer.

Ultimately, the system needs to do a better job educating students when they enroll, particularly in system colleges, about which credits will or will not transfer toward a university baccalaureate degree. This is an aim of the Smart Transfer Plan.

Trustee Kelliher suggested a PowerPoint overview of the transfer process be given to Trustees at a future meeting.

Chair Benson agreed that the Board needs to be vigilant when it comes to transfer. He said the topic can be put on the next committee meeting agenda. Vice Chancellor Knowlton suggested that fall might be a good time to put that discussion on the schedule since the transfer policy is scheduled for review. A study session would be a good context for the Board before it considers the policies on transfer, he added.

Trustee Sundin asked if there any way to determine what portion of the courses that do not transfer from the colleges is the result of the hierarchal bias by universities.

Chancellor Rosenstone said there are some disagreements between university and college faculty about what courses should count toward certain baccalaureate degrees. In some cases, the disagreement is based on accreditation issues. As the system looks at certifying learning outcomes, some of these objections may dissipate.

Trustee Sundin asked if either the institutions or the system helps resolve disagreements.

Chancellor Rosenstone said it is his understanding the university faculty has control over the decision at the university level. He noted that he did not believe the either the Board or the Chancellor has asserted the authority to make that decision. That would require a policy change. He added that the state legislature also had not asserted its authority to make such decisions or mandated how the issues should be resolved.

Vice Chancellor Knowlton stated the system has a transfer oversight committee of faculty and administrators that reviews transfer issues and appeals and makes recommendations.

Chair Benson asked about the transfer appeal process. Chancellor Rosenstone responded that in some cases, students were not aware of the process. If an appeal is filed, it is often resolved in favor of the student's petition. That shows why it is important to communicate with students about the process.

President Potter stated they have identified the two-year colleges which have the largest percentage of transfer students enrolling in St. Cloud State University. University staff meet with college staff to inquire about transfer success. The answers were uneven and sometimes not very positive about the ease of transfer. As a result, the university has focused new resources in an undergraduate college and is working to remove barriers identified by the college.

5. Annual Program Inventory Report: Meeting Workforce Needs

Board Policy 3.36, Part 5 states that, “the chancellor shall maintain the academic program inventory and annually report to the Board of Trustees on the status of the inventory”. Associate Vice Chancellor Leslie Mercer and Senior System Director Mary Rothchild presented the annual inventory report and provided information on how to better align programs with employer needs and student interest.

Program Inventory:

The Program Inventory is our official repository for all of the programs we have in the system. It is the official source of information to keep track of our programs and is used for several purposes including:

- Go Places! Brochure distributed to high school and others across the state
- ISEEK, which is an online system that links employers, students and programs
- State and Federal reporting

The inventory is a listing of each program. Each program has a CIP code, which stands for Classification of Instructional Program. It is a federal code number that describes the kind of program. Each program also includes the award that is given (an associate’s degree, a bachelor’s degree or certificate); and the name of the school; number of credits; and a short description of the program. The inventory soon will be available online, searchable by each of those attributes. The program inventory has approximately 3,500 programs. Seventy-five percent of the programs are at the colleges, sixteen percent are at the bachelor’s level and about eight percent are master’s degrees, applied doctorates or graduate certificates.

A review of all the program activity from 1998-2012 shows the most volatility was in the redesign category. This includes credit length and program name changes.

Trustee Dickson asked about the parameters of a redesign. Associate Vice Chancellor Mercer explained one example of a redesign would be changing the length of a certificate from 18 to 24 credits. Vice Chancellor Knowlton said accreditation changes can necessitate a program redesign.

Trustee Kelliher said she thought the large number of inventory changes could be seen as a positive example of responsiveness.

Chair Benson asked if the data presented means the system is doing well in this area. Associate Vice Chancellor Mercer responded that the system is doing well; there is a lot of activity going on at the campus level; campuses are appropriately responsible for that redesign; and there is some shared responsibility with the system office.

Chair Benson asked if the program changes were prompted by workforce need or faculty politics. President Potter said he thought the creation and closure of programs is not the result of faculty politics. Enrollment, market forces and financial analysis are the biggest factors. Institutions choose new programs very conservatively, considering the potential market for students and institutional investment. He added people tend to get upset by closures and

suspensions, not by new programs. The Board should not take back the responsibility for program approval, especially closures, because trustees don't have the detailed knowledge of the factors that influenced the decision.

Trustee Dickson asked if this information reflects that MnSCU is a nimble system and is rapidly reflecting workforce students' needs. Vice Chancellor Knowlton said the system is getting "nimbler" and more responsive with its policies and procedures.

Associate Vice Chancellor Mercer described the new web-based program approval system called "Program Navigator". Since July 2012, the system has processed about 2,300 transactions from 32 campuses. In the first months of 2013, the system office has approved 143 applications. Program Navigator allows for a better understanding of the reasons for program requests. Some programs are created in response to a need – either an employer need or student interest. The key criteria considered for approval are:

- Is there a need for the program due to student interest or employer demand?
- Is this program unnecessarily duplicative?

Academic Affairs works in partnership with campuses on program approvals. The number of programs which are not approved is low.

Trustee Krinkie asked in working between the campuses and the system office, where does the autonomy lie? How many program requests have been denied? Associate Vice Chancellor Mercer responded that the number of times the system office formally says no is probably less than 10 per year. More often it is the campus that looks at the information and decides not to pursue the program. When there is a no, those decisions are made in consultation with the vice chancellor and chancellor.

Trustee Krinkie followed up regarding the tough decisions, asking how long is it before you know if it was a good decision or bad decision with regard to opening a program or closing a program. President Potter said the assessment process can take a long time and involves factors such as economic impact. Also, there is a legal obligation to go through a "teach-out" every 3 years. In that period, market conditions can change and the programs may end up not being aligned with the situation that existed at the beginning.

Trustee Sundin asked about the 79 new programs. She noted that while 90 percent of them were occupational, many were in fields where you don't get your hands dirty. What about needs for welders and engineers for the shop floor? Associate Vice Chancellor Mercer said there are new programs in Welding Technology and Construction Management.

Chancellor Rosenstone observed in many cases the problem is not that we don't have enough programs; the problem is we don't have enough students to fill the classroom. We need to understand how to engage more students to make sure the capacity is there to serve those students.

Associate Vice Chancellor Mercer introduced Senior System Director Rothchild to talk about workforce alignment.

Senior System Director Rothchild spoke of the chancellor's charge to the Workforce of the Future Workgroup. The workgroup is convened by President Ron Thomas of Dakota County Technical College and has been asked to recommend how the system should align academic programs to Minnesota's workforce needs. In 2012, the workforce assessment sessions were instrumental in identifying needs for new or expanded program areas or curriculum changes. College and university presidents are initiating approximately 85 new or expanded programs, but those programs are not currently included in the program inventory presented today. In addition, the workforce workgroup is looking at ways to enhance collaboration among colleges and universities and to improve services to businesses and industry through non-credit instruction and customized training for employers.

The workforce assessment sessions last year also identified a need to improve our understanding of labor market supply and demand data. The Itasca Workforce Alignment workgroup, chaired by Chancellor Rosenstone, is engaged in working on improving our data and information systems to inform program alignment. Trustee Cirillo asked whether other states are selective in identifying industry sectors for labor market needs. Senior System Director Rothchild said many states do what is called "asset mapping" or "industry analysis" to help understand future workforce and economic development opportunities. The Itasca project is addressing broad market conditions and the relationship between business and industry.

Trustee Benson asked Chancellor Rosenstone how the three workgroups will interact with the Board. Chancellor Rosenstone said there are two trustees on each workgroup. Draft recommendations from the workgroups will be given to the Board at its June meeting. Further discussion and consultation will take place between June and October, 2013. The final report will provide strategic directions for the system.

Trustee Dickson asked if business and industry could be persuaded to have more responsibility for addressing skills gaps and have them assist in getting students in the education "pipeline," perhaps through an enhanced public relations campaign between higher education and corporate Minnesota to alert people that education is the path to a good job. Senior System Director Rothchild agreed with Trustee Dickson, and stated that the Itasca project is an employer-led initiative to improve the relationship between business and higher education.

The meeting adjourned at 9:25 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Platt, Recorder