



ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

MAY, 22, 2013

10:00 A.M.

**MCCORMICK ROOM
30 7TH STREET EAST
SAINT PAUL, MN**

Please note: Committee/Board meeting times are tentative. Committee/Board meetings may begin up to 45 minutes earlier than the times listed below if the previous committee meeting concludes its business before the end of its allotted time slot.

- (1) Minutes of April 17, 2013 (pp. 1-6)**
- (2) Proposed Amendment to Board Policy 3.18 Honorary Degrees
(Second Reading) (pp. 7-12)**
- (3) Proposed Amendment to Board Policy 2.2 State Residency Requirements
(Second Reading) (pp. 13-16)**
- (4) Proposed Amendment to Board Policy 3.24 System and College and
University Missions (Second Reading) (pp. 17-20)**

Academic and Student Affairs Committee

Duane Benson, Chair

Louise Sundin, Vice Chair

Margaret Anderson Kelliher

Alexander Cirillo

Cheryl Dickson

Dawn Erlandson

Maria Peluso

Bolded items indicate action required.

**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

**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

Agenda Item Summary Sheet

Committee: Academic and Student Affairs

Date of Meeting: May 22, 2013

Agenda Item: Proposed Amendment to Board Policy 3.18 Honorary Degrees (Second Reading)

- Proposed Policy Change Approvals Required by Policy Other Approvals Monitoring
- Information

Cite policy requirement, or explain why item is on the Board agenda:

Policy amendments require Board action.

Scheduled Presenter(s):

Douglas Knowlton, Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

The proposed amendment transfers the honorary degrees reporting process from the policy to the accompanying procedure 3.18.1 Honorary Degrees.

Background Information:

On occasion, colleges and universities wish to recognize the contributions of an individual awarding an honorary degree. Some language in policy was moved to procedure; other language was updated; a degree in Engineering and Technology was added to the list of awards in the procedure. Systemwide, four honorary degrees were awarded in 2012. The chancellor will report to the Board annually. MnSCU will maintain a list of recipients of honorary degrees on the MnSCU website; institutions do this individually as well. The proposed amendment streamlines the reporting process. The procedure is included in this packet as requested.

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES
MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

BOARD ACTION ITEM
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO BOARD POLICY 3.18 HONORARY DEGREES (SECOND READING)

BACKGROUND

This is the second time the policy will be revised since its adoption in 1996. Some language in policy was moved to procedure and the procedure is attached. Other language was updated and a degree in Engineering and Technology was added to the list of awards in the procedure. The policy and procedure are not used very often; only four honorary degrees were awarded in 2012. The chancellor will make an annual report to the Board. MnSCU will maintain a list of recipients of honorary degrees on the MnSCU website; institutions do this individually as well. The proposed amendment streamlines the reporting process.

RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE ACTION

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee recommends the Board of Trustees adopt the following motion:

The Board of Trustees approves Board Policy 3.18 Honorary Degrees.

RECOMMENDED BOARD OF TRUSTEES MOTION:

The Board of Trustees approves Board Policy 3.18 Honorary Degrees.

Date presented to the Board of Trustees: May 22, 2013

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES
MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

BOARD POLICY
Chapter #3 Educational Policies
Section #18 Honorary Degrees

3.18 Honorary Degrees

Part 1. Purpose. ~~The purpose of t~~ This policy ~~is to~~ establishes the rationale for honorary degrees, authorizes colleges and universities to grant honorary degrees, and provides ~~for~~ standards and guidelines under which honorary degrees will be conferred.

Part 2. Definition. ~~An h~~ Honorary degree ~~is~~ means a degree ~~title~~ awarded as an honor for an outstanding contribution in some field, rather than as the result of matriculating and earning a degree based on studies at the institution.

Part 3. Rationale. The rationale for honorary degrees is to:

1. recognize and honor persons who have made exceptional contributions to a specific field or to society in general;
2. establish a public association between Minnesota State Colleges and Universities and such exceptional persons, thereby providing testimony to the values and quality of the state colleges and universities; and
3. assist the state colleges and universities with the goals and objectives of their educational programming, their service and outreach missions, and their institutional advancement.

Part 4. Authorization. Colleges and universities may confer honorary degrees according to procedures established by, and with the approval of, the chancellor.

Part 5. Internal Process. A college or university choosing to award an honorary degree shall establish its own internal process for determining honorary degree recipients consistent with the chancellor's procedure.

Part 6. Limits to Eligible Recipients. Honorary degrees may not be conferred on currently serving faculty or staff members within the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities system, current members of the Board of Trustees, or current holders of elected political office.

Part 7. Report to Board. The Chancellor shall provide an annual report to the Board on honorary degrees awarded ~~to the Board in January and July of each year.~~ The report shall include information about the number of degrees awarded, names of recipients, and degree designations. Colleges and universities shall report to the system office on the honorary degrees awarded each year.

Date of Adoption: 10/16/96,

Date of Implementation: 10/16/96,

Date & Subject of Revisions:

1/21/09 - most language was removed and will be placed in a procedure, language was clarified and format was corrected. New Part 7 was added.

There is no additional HISTORY for policy 3.18.

POLICY CONTENT FORMAT

Single underlining represents proposed new language

~~Strikeouts~~ represent existing language proposed to be eliminated.

MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
DISCUSSION DRAFT PROCEDURE DOCUMENT
DATED 1/29/13

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO PROCEDURE 3.18.1 HONORARY DEGREES

1 **3.18.1 Honorary Degrees**
2

3 **Part 1. Purpose and Applicability.** The purpose of the honorary degrees procedure is to
4 ~~specify~~ identify the awards that may be conferred, to provide guidelines for selection of
5 honorary degree recipients, provide limits to the number of honorary degrees, and specify
6 how awards are presented. ~~These procedures apply to~~ implements Policy 3.18 Honorary
7 Degrees.
8

9 **Part 2. Authorized Honorary Awards.** Colleges and universities may select from the
10 following categories of honorary degrees based upon the intended recipient's field(s) of
11 contribution, achievement, service, and distinction.

- 12 1. Honorary Doctor of Fine Arts (Hon. D.F.A.)
- 13 2. Honorary Doctor of Humane Letters (Hon. LH.D.)
- 14 3. Honorary Doctor of Laws (Hon. LL.D.)
- 15 4. Honorary Doctor of Literature (Hon. Litt.D.)
- 16 5. Honorary Doctor of Education (Hon. D.Ed.)
- 17 6. Honorary Doctor of Science (Hon. Sc.D.)
- 18 7. Honorary Doctor of Engineering and Technology (Hon. D. Eng. & Tech.)
19

20 **Part 3. Guidelines for Selection.**
21

22 **Subpart A. Intention.** Honorary degrees should recognize and honor persons who have
23 made exceptional contributions to a specific field or to society in general.
24

25 **Subpart B. Procedures.** Each college and university shall establish procedures for
26 recommending candidates for honorary degrees. These procedures should include
27 provisions for consultation with the institution's faculty.
28

29 **Subpart C. Justification for Awards.** Service or benefaction to the college or university
30 does not in itself provide justification for the award of an honorary degree. To be
31 recognized and honored, the candidate must be distinguished with a regional, national or
32 international reputation.
33

34 **Part 4. Limits to the Number of Honorary Degrees.**
35

36 ~~1.~~ **Subpart A.** Colleges and universities granting honorary degrees generally should limit
37 their award to no more than one per commencement ceremony.

1 ~~2.~~**Subpart B.** ~~No individuals shall ever~~ Colleges and universities may grant receive more
2 than one a second honorary degree in a different category to a person from the same
3 college or university when there are compelling circumstances.

4
5 **Part 5. Presentation of Honorary Degrees.** ~~Honorary degrees customarily shall be awarded~~
6 ~~during commencement exercises, and the recipient should agree to be present as a condition~~
7 ~~of receiving the award. On occasion, honorary degrees may be awarded at convocations, or~~
8 ~~presidential inaugurations, or other similar ceremonies. The recipient should agree to be~~
9 ~~present as a condition of receiving the award. An honorary degree may be awarded in~~
10 absentia in the case of compelling or extraordinary circumstances.

11
12 **Part 6. Report to System Office.** Colleges and universities that have awarded honorary
13 degrees will submit an annual report in September of each year to the System Office. The
14 report shall include information about the type of degrees awarded, the names of the
15 recipients, and the rationale for the award.

16
17 **Part 7. History of Honorary Degrees Awarded.** A history of honorary degrees awarded
18 shall be maintained on the MnSCU website at www.mnscu.edu.

Related Documents:

Policy 3.18 Honorary Degrees

Procedure History:

Date of Adoption: 01/30/09,

Date of Implementation: 01/30/09,

Date & Subject of Revisions:

3/18/09 - Language was corrected in Parts 1-3.

There is no additional HISTORY for procedure 3.18.1.

PROCEDURE CONTENT FORMAT:

Single underlining represents proposed new language.

Strikeouts represent existing language proposed to be eliminated.

Words not underlined represent existing language that is proposed to remain in procedure.

**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

Agenda Item Summary Sheet

Committee: Academic and Student Affairs

Date of Meeting: May 22, 2013

Agenda Item: Proposed Amendment to Board Policy 2.2 State Residency (Second Reading)

- Proposed Policy Change Approvals Required by Policy Other Approvals Monitoring
- Information

Cite policy requirement, or explain why item is on the Board agenda:

Policy amendments require Board action.

Scheduled Presenter(s):

Douglas Knowlton, Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

The proposed amendment clarifies the definition of state residency used for determining student eligibility to pay in-state tuition rates.

Background Information:

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. The first addition (lines 15-16) mirrors language that already exists in the procedure. The second addition (lines 31-32) provides for any possible future legislative or congressional actions. The third proposed change (lines 34-36) maintains the current intent and practice, clarifies the meaning and simplifies the language of this section.

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES
MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

BOARD ACTION ITEM
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO BOARD POLICY 2.2 STATE RESIDENCY (SECOND READING)

BACKGROUND

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. The first addition (lines 15-16) mirrors language that already exists in the procedure. The second addition (lines 31-32) provides for any possible future legislative or congressional actions. The third proposed change (lines 34-36) maintains the current intent and practice, clarifies the meaning and simplifies the language of this section.

RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE ACTION

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee recommends the Board of Trustees adopt the following motion:

The Board of Trustees approves Board Policy 2.2 State Residency.

RECOMMENDED BOARD OF TRUSTEES MOTION:

The Board of Trustees approves Board Policy 2.2 State Residency.

Date presented to the Board of Trustees: May 22, 2013

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES
MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

BOARD POLICY
Chapter #2 Students
Section #2 State Residency

1 **2.2 State Residency**
2

3 **Part 1. Purpose.** Determination of the state of residency of students is necessary for a variety of federal
4 and state reporting requirements, for institutional research purposes, and in some cases, determination of
5 the tuition to be charged to individual students. This policy provides standards for the initial
6 classification of students as state residents or non-residents, determination of appropriate tuition charges,
7 and the procedures to be followed in order to change the state residency status of students.
8

9 **Part 2. Classification as State Residents.** Students who meet one or more of the following conditions
10 on the date they apply for admission to a state college or university shall be classified as residents of
11 Minnesota.
12

- 13 A. Students who resided in the state for at least one calendar year immediately prior to applying for
14 admission, or dependent students who have a parent or legal guardian residing in Minnesota on
15 the date the students apply. Residency in the state during this period must not have been solely or
16 primarily for the purpose of attending a college or university.
17 B. Minnesota residents who can demonstrate that they were temporarily absent from the state
18 without establishing residency elsewhere.
19 C. Persons who moved to the state for employment purposes and, before moving and before
20 applying for admission to a public postsecondary institution, accepted a full-time job in the state,
21 or students who are spouses or dependents of such persons.
22

23 **Part 3. Tuition.** Students who are classified as Minnesota state residents shall be charged the resident
24 tuition rate. Students who are residents of states with which the state of Minnesota has a reciprocity
25 agreement shall be charged the appropriate reciprocity tuition rate. All other students shall be charged the
26 non-resident tuition rate, unless they qualify under one of the exceptions provided in Part 4. below.
27

28 **Part 4. Non-Resident Students Allowed to Pay the Resident Tuition Rate.**
29

30 **Subpart A. Required Exceptions.** Non-residents of Minnesota who meet one or more of the
31 following conditions shall be charged the resident tuition rate unless otherwise prohibited by
32 applicable state or federal law or regulations.
33

- 34 1. ~~Active Duty Military~~ Current and Former Service Members. Current and former members
35 of the U.S. military, personnel serving on active-duty assignment in Minnesota, veterans, and
36 their spouses, and dependent children.
37 2. **Migrant Farmworkers.** Students who have been in Minnesota as migrant farmworkers, as
38 defined in the Code of Federal Regulations, title 20, section 633.104, over a period of at least
39 two years immediately before admission or readmission to a Minnesota public postsecondary
40 institution, or students who are dependents of such migrant farmworkers.
41 3. **Minnesota High School Graduates.** A student who graduated from a Minnesota high
42 school, if the student was a resident of Minnesota during the student's period of attendance at
43 the Minnesota high school and the student physically attends a Minnesota State College or
44 University.

- 1 4. **Employment-related Relocation.** Persons who were employed and were relocated to the
- 2 state by the person's current employer.
- 3 5. **Refugees and Asylees.** Students who are recognized as refugees or asylees by the Office of
- 4 Refugee Resettlement of the United States Department of Health and Human Services.
- 5

6 **Subpart B. Discretionary Exceptions.** Non-residents of Minnesota may be charged the resident
7 tuition rate under one or more of the following exceptions.

- 8
- 9 1. **Single Tuition Rate.** With Board of Trustees approval, a college or university may adopt a
- 10 policy to charge one tuition rate to all students.
- 11 2. **International Students.** Colleges and universities may charge resident tuition to
- 12 nonimmigrant international students classified under 8, U.S.C. 1101 (a) (15) (B), (F), (H), (J),
- 13 and (M).
- 14 3. **Graduate Assistants.** Universities may charge resident tuition to graduate students appointed
- 15 to graduate assistant positions.
- 16 4. **Intergovernmental Agreements.** A college or university may have an agreement with a
- 17 governmental subdivision of another state to charge certain students resident tuition approved
- 18 by the Board of Trustees.
- 19 5. **High Ability Students.** Colleges and universities may adopt a policy to charge resident
- 20 tuition to high ability students who are in the top 15 percent of their high school class or who
- 21 score above the 85th percentile on a nationally-normed, standardized achievement test and
- 22 who reside in states that do not have reciprocity agreements with Minnesota.
- 23 6. **Other Categories.** With Board of Trustees approval, colleges and universities may charge
- 24 resident tuition to other specific categories of students.
- 25

26 **Part 5. Appeal of Initial Residency Classification.** Each college and university policy and procedure
27 shall provide for an appeal to an appropriate college or university administrator of a decision not to
28 classify a student as a Minnesota resident as described in this policy. The administrator's decision shall
29 be final. A student whose appeal is successful shall be charged the resident tuition rate retroactive to the
30 beginning of the first term of enrollment.

31

32 **Part 6. Change of Residency Status.** Under certain conditions, students who are initially classified as
33 not being Minnesota state residents may have their status changed to that of resident. The Chancellor shall
34 develop a system procedure that describes the conditions under which residency status may be changed.

Date of Implementation: 8/15/97;
Date of Adoption: 7/18/95,

Date of Subject of Revisions:

9/17/08, Policy completely revised. New sections developed for classification of residents and non-residents, appropriate tuition rates, exceptions and appeals. Process used to determine residency moved to a new system procedure.

7/21/99, Subpart C, added number 8, regarding military personnel serving on active duty assignment in Minnesota

12/18/96 Part 1 – Stricken language, Part 2A – Strict Definition of Domicile, Add Part 2C – Exceptions, Part 3 – Stricken

POLICY CONTENT FORMAT:

Single underlining represents proposed new language.

~~Strikeouts~~ represent existing language proposed to be eliminated.

**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

Agenda Item Summary Sheet

Committee: Academic and Student Affairs

Date of Meeting: May 22, 2013

Agenda Item: Proposed Amendment to Board Policy 3.24 System and College and University Missions (Second Reading)

- Proposed Policy Change Approvals Required by Policy Other Approvals Monitoring
- Information

Cite policy requirement, or explain why item is on the Board agenda:
Policy amendments require Board action.

Scheduled Presenter(s):
Douglas Knowlton, Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:
The proposed amendment to Policy 3.24 removes the five-year mission review requirement for system institutions and the associated report on alignment of college and university missions and visions. Other changes to the policy include refinements to better delineate the requirements of a change in institution type (mission) and to align the requirements for mission approval with the Higher Learning Commission criteria for accreditation.

Background Information:
The Board of Trustees 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.

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES
MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

BOARD ACTION ITEM
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO BOARD POLICY 3.24 SYSTEM AND COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY MISSIONS (SECOND READING)

BACKGROUND

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.

RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE ACTION

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee recommends the Board of Trustees adopt the following motion:

The Board of Trustees approves Board Policy 3.24 System and College and University Missions.

RECOMMENDED BOARD OF TRUSTEES MOTION:

The Board of Trustees approves Board Policy 3.24 System and College and University Missions.

Date presented to the Board of Trustees: May 22, 2013

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES
MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

BOARD POLICY
Chapter #3 Educational Policies
Section #24 System and College and University Missions

1 **3.24 Institution Type and Mission, and System and College and University Missions**

2
3 **Part 1. Purpose.** ~~Theis purpose of this policy is to~~ establishes conditions and processes for the
4 review of system and college and university missions, in accordance with Minnesota Statutes
5 section 136F.05 Missions.

6
7 **Part 2. Definitions.** The following definitions apply to this policy and related procedure.

8
9 **Subpart A. Mission:** Mission means the distinct purpose of the college or university, the
10 constituents served and the expected outcomes, values and goals, and aspects such as
11 institution culture, decision making processes, and the principles and behaviors to reach
12 aspirational outcomes.

13
14 **Subpart B. Vision:** Vision means the aspirations of the college or university, the primary
15 products or services, the distinctive or unique attributes of the college or university, and
16 assumptions about the college and university and its environment in the future that is
17 consistent with the institution type.

18
19 **Subpart C. Institution Type:** Institution type means technical colleges, community
20 colleges, consolidated community technical colleges, and state universities, as defined in
21 Minnesota Statutes section 135A.052, Subdivision 1.

22
23 **Part 53. Academic Award Change in Institution Type.** A request by a college or university
24 for a change in authority to confer an academic award institution type is subject to approval by
25 the Board, following a first and second reading in accordance with Policy 1A.1 Part 6, Subpart
26 A. The chancellor shall promulgate procedures to guide the Board of Trustees' review of a
27 change in institution type.

28
29 **Part 4. Review and Approval of College and or University Mission and Vision Statements.**
30 A college or university mission and vision statements requires Board of Trustees approval at
31 least once every five years. The Chancellor shall have authority to approve minor revisions to
32 an approved mission and vision statement. A college's or university's mission and vision shall
33 support achievement of the system mission and vision and shall provide a foundation for
34 evaluation, accountability, and regional accreditation. The Chancellor shall promulgate
35 procedures to guide the Board of Trustees' review and approval of a college or university mission
36 statement and vision. Each college or university, with consultation from faculty, students,
37 employers and other essential stakeholders, shall be given considerable latitude to express its
38 mission ~~and vision.~~

1 **Part 35. Review and Approval of the System Mission and Vision.** The Board of Trustees
2 shall periodically review, revise as appropriate, and approve the system mission and vision at
3 ~~least once every five years~~. The mission and vision shall advance the higher education needs of
4 the state. The Board of Trustees shall assure there is consultation with faculty, students,
5 employers and other essential stakeholders. The ~~C~~hancellor shall promulgate procedures for the
6 development of the system mission and vision.

7
8 ~~**Part 6. Alignment of College and University Missions and Visions.**~~ The Chancellor shall
9 report to the Board of Trustees on the alignment of college and university missions and visions
10 with the system mission and vision and with Minnesota's higher education needs, statutory
11 authority, structure and resources at least once every five years. ~~Based on this review which shall~~
12 ~~include consultation with faculty and staff, students, employers and other essential stakeholders,~~
13 ~~the Board may redirect a college's or university's mission and vision to advance regional and~~
14 ~~statewide higher education interests.~~

Policy History:

Date of Adoption: 6/16/99,

Date of Implementation: 7/01/99,

Date & Subject of Revisions:

04/21/10 - Changed Institutional to College and University in the Policy title as well as

throughout the policy. Added part 1 Purpose, Part 2 Definitions, and Part 5 Academic Award.

*Other amendments to ensure that college missions and visions clearly reflect the priorities set in
state law and decisions of the Board of Trustees.*

POLICY AND PROCEDURE CONTENT FORMAT:

Single underlining represents proposed new language.

Strikeouts represent existing language proposed to be eliminated.