

### Legislative Language

Minnesota Session Laws 2001, 1<sup>st</sup> Special Session, Chapter 1, Article 1, Section 4, Subd. 5

*By February 15, 2002, and each odd-numbered year thereafter, the board of regents of the University of Minnesota must submit a report to the commissioner of finance and the chairs of the higher education finance committees delineating:*

- (1) the five undergraduate degree programs determined to be of highest priority to the system, and the revenue necessary to advance each program to be a center of excellence;*
- (2) the reallocation of money and curricular and staffing changes, by campus and program, made to advance the system's priorities;*
- (3) baseline data, and the methodology used to measure, the number of first generation students admitted system wide, together with a plan to increase both the recruitment and retention through graduation of these students;*
- (4) progress towards increasing the percentage of students graduating within four, five and six years as reported in IPEDS. Data should be provided for each institution by race, ethnicity and gender. Data provided should include information on successful retention strategies and the money allocated to enhance student retention;*
- (5) progress towards increasing the revenue received, from all sources, to support research activities. Data provided should include information on the increase in funding from each source; and*
- (6) progress of the academic health center in meeting the goals and outcomes in paragraph (c)\* including how much money was appropriated from the medical endowment fund contributed to meeting specific workforce training and health education goals for the academic health center.*

*\*paragraph (c)*

*(c) The Academic Health Center, in cooperation with the department of health, shall:*

- (1) develop new strategies for health care delivery and professional training in this state that takes into account the changing racial and ethnic composition of this state*
- (2) develop new strategies to meet the health care workforce needs in the state; and*
- (3) base these strategies on analysis of the population's health status and opportunities for its improvement*



## **Executive Summary**

### **1. Undergraduate program areas of highest priority**

The University identifies the following areas, some of which are already targets for University investments, as those of highest priority: social and behavioral sciences; engineering and computer sciences; business; biological and life sciences; visual and performing arts; humanities (including communication); and, physical sciences and mathematics.

### **2. Reallocation of money for curricular and staffing changes to advance system priorities**

The University employs five primary strategies to create greater efficiency, balance the budget, and create internal investment capital to strengthen academic priorities and improve services.

### **3. First-generation students**

Among University of Minnesota students responding to a 2001 national survey, 12.2 percent indicated that their parents had only a high school diploma. Within this group, 28 percent of students of color identified themselves as first generation; 8.9 percent of white students did so.

### **4. Graduation rates**

The Twin Cities campus is making steady and substantial progress in increasing overall four-, five- and six-year graduation rates as well as for students of color: the overall four-year graduation rate increased from 15.2 percent for students matriculating in 1992 to 28.6 percent for students matriculating in 1998; five-year rates increased from 36.6 percent to 48.4 percent; and six-year rates increased from 45.0 percent to 54.1 percent. The Crookston campus showed similar improvements, while the graduation rates on the Duluth and Morris campuses were largely unchanged.

### **5. Progress toward increasing revenue to support research**

In FY 2002, the University received nearly \$526 million in sponsored awards, up 6 percent over FY 2001, and a 53 percent increase over the five-year period FY 1997-2002. Sponsored expenditures, the most consistent measure of external research support, totaled \$443.1 million for FY 2002, up 8 percent from FY 2001, and up nearly 70 percent over the five-year period FY 1997-2002.

### **6. Academic Health Center goals and outcomes**

The AHC is receiving funding from two new state endowments; the estimated total of payments from the endowment was originally set at \$720 million, beginning in April 2002. Due to the performance of the state's investments in the stock and bond markets, the amount of funding being received is significantly less than estimated. These funds will support health professional education, strengthen the Medical School faculty, support interdisciplinary academic initiatives, and the hiring of between 40 and 50 additional new faculty over the next four years in strategic growth areas.



## **Section 1: Undergraduate Program Areas of Highest Priority**

Over the past decade, the University of Minnesota has made a concerted effort to improve and strengthen its undergraduate programs and services for students. Our efforts have been based on the following fundamental principles:

- Strong undergraduate education requires integrated investments in academic programs and in-service enhancements, since a significant portion of undergraduate education is and should be broadly conceived rather than discipline specific.
- The strength of University undergraduate programs is tightly linked to the quality of its research and graduate/professional programs; investments in new faculty positions in key areas and in research facilities benefit undergraduates who can take advantage of new faculty, cutting-edge laboratories, and innovative academic programs.

Within this framework, which guides the University's investment strategies, it would be counterproductive to identify a very small, narrowly focused set of programs for emphasis from a much broader range of academic programs. The University has targeted its academic investments over the past several years and these investments will produce clear benefits for undergraduate students. Consistent with these principles, the University frames its undergraduate improvement initiatives broadly, as follows.

### **Commitment To an Integrated Approach**

Over the past decade, the University has implemented an integrated strategy to improve the undergraduate experience, with particular attention to the first-year experience (orientation, convocation, small freshman seminars, updated classrooms, undergraduate research, intensive writing, study abroad, etc.), and an integrated approach to faculty teaching development and teaching improvement (teaching development and award programs). (See Appendix A for a summary of these initiatives.)

### **Commitment To a Balanced Strategy To Strengthen Undergraduate Programs**

Students take courses not only in their own department, but also from other departments or even other colleges across the University. Because of the highly integrative nature of undergraduate education, universities that strive to offer the strongest undergraduate programs and attract the brightest undergraduate students demand excellence in as many programs as possible, particularly in the core arts and sciences that serve as the foundation for most undergraduate degree programs. For example, to strengthen biological sciences, the University must also have strong physical sciences, mathematics, and humanities programs.

### **Investing in Academic Programs**

To implement this balanced strategy, the University must invest, and has invested, in high-priority areas to maintain its academic strengths and contribute to the state's economic well being by preparing students for high-demand career areas. During the most recent four-year period, beyond investment in individual disciplines or program areas, the University has made a substantial investment, in excess of

\$313 million, to improve undergraduate education, including targeted capital investments. (See Table 1.) In addition, the University has an ongoing commitment to support programs that leverage resources across colleges and administrative units.

**Table 1. Major academic program investments to strengthen undergraduate programs, 1998-2002.**

| <u>Item</u>                           | <u>Amount</u>        |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Student System                        | \$25,600,000         |
| Undergraduate Improvement Initiatives | \$9,790,240          |
| Related Capital Investments           | \$198,350,000        |
| Residence Halls                       | \$75,905,000         |
| Scholarships / Financial Aid          | <u>\$3,517,531</u>   |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                          | <b>\$313,162,771</b> |

The University’s core budget and planning processes and principles govern these investments. Some of these principles are embodied within the University’s method for allocating tuition revenue and recovering indirect costs. Under this method, called Incentives for Managed Growth (IMG), tuition revenue is allocated directly to the collegiate units that generate the revenue. This has allowed resources to flow immediately to programs with high demand and growing enrollments. Likewise, it forces departments and colleges to immediately address programs with falling enrollment or shrinking demand.

All of the nearly \$300 million in current tuition revenue is allocated in this fashion. Over the past five years, IMG has allocated nearly \$93.7 million in new and recurring tuition revenue directly to collegiate units. Of this amount, almost 60 percent has gone to collegiate units that contain the programs listed below as high-priority areas.

The University’s Compact Process complements IMG by providing financial incentives for colleges and campuses to invest in system-wide priorities and special academic initiatives. It is used not only to direct a strategic pool of investment capital to advance University priorities, but also to shape and re-direct resources and revenue streams currently within colleges and departments in support of all-University goals.

**Identifying High-Priority Program Areas**

As requested by the legislature, the University followed a series of steps, criteria, and consultations to build on its current strengths and investment strategy, identify broad priorities with the potential to touch the greatest number of students, and help strengthen undergraduate program quality on all four campuses. The following areas, some of which are already targets for University investments, have been identified through this approach:

- **Social and Behavioral Sciences**
- **Engineering and Computer Sciences**
- **Business**
- **Biological and Life Sciences**

- **Visual and Performing Arts**
- **Humanities (including Communication)**
- **Physical Sciences and Mathematics**

These areas include academic programs that offer students a solid general education, as well as some that prepare students for careers in professions that will benefit the state's economy. The University's response to the legislature stresses the critical importance of providing support for foundational areas in the arts and sciences as well as high-quality, professionally oriented undergraduate degree options.

### **Methodology**

The University grouped undergraduate programs by area, based on the federal government's CIP (Classification of Instructional Programs) system. These areas reflected the fact that many undergraduate programs are mutually supporting, e.g., engineering and computer science, social and behavioral sciences, visual and performing arts, etc.

The criteria used to prioritize the program areas emphasized:

- Student interest. Enrollment data and numbers of degrees granted in each program area were used to assess student interest.
- Quality. The program areas also were sorted based on the University's core planning criteria of quality, comparative advantage, program efficiency, and priority for investment. The areas were then considered in the context of national rankings, since sustaining the quality of highly ranked programs is a key University goal. Two of these program areas – engineering, and social and behavioral sciences – have been consistently highly ranked by the National Research Council. Although focused on graduate programs, these rankings reflect the quality of faculty who serve as undergraduate instructors and mentors.
- State needs. The program areas were matched against the economic, educational, and cultural needs of Minnesota. This criterion recognized the importance of the University's role in preparing highly educated graduates for the state's workforce.
- Academic priorities and investment strategy. Finally, the program areas were compared with the University's current academic priorities and investments. Biological sciences, engineering and computer sciences, and social and behavioral sciences have been priority areas for investments through the compact and capital budget processes, and individual college investments. Investments in business and in engineering and computer sciences also reflect the University's responsibility to prepare its graduates for jobs in the state's workforce. Lesser but still significant investments have been made in physical sciences and arts and humanities, program areas once ranked highly by the National Research Council, but that have slipped over the past several decades.

For example, investments in 13 new faculty positions in computer science and 42 new positions in molecular and cellular biology are strengthening undergraduate as well as graduate programs. Through the University's digital technology initiative, new positions and courses in e-commerce

have been added to the Carlson School of Management, helping to strengthen the technology component of the undergraduate business program.

More recent investments include new faculty positions in economics, political economy, psychology, and freshman seminar positions in the College of Liberal Arts, Institute of Technology, College of Biological Sciences, Carlson School of Management, and at the Duluth and Morris campuses.

### **Revenue Needed To Advance These Areas To Centers of Excellence**

The University leverages investments from multiple sources to support its academic priorities. To advance the areas designated here, revenue would be necessary in the following forms:

- Continued support of the University's compensation strategy, which combines legislative and internal contributions to make faculty salaries nationally competitive and thereby sustain our existing areas of excellence while building others.
- Legislative support of the unfunded portions of the 2002-03 biennial budget for undergraduate improvements and 60 additional faculty positions to strengthen core academic areas, maintain the quality of academic programs, and strengthen the connection to Minnesota's economy and quality of life.
- Internal reallocations, through the Compact Process, to continue support of academic programs and undergraduate improvements such as additional freshman seminars, improved advising, increased research opportunities, etc.
- Progress on the University's six-year capital plan to build and renovate classrooms, labs, residence halls, and other facilities that support undergraduate education.

## **Section 2: Investment for Curricular and Staffing Changes To Advance System Priorities**

The University's academic priorities include: strengthening undergraduate education, supporting a strong faculty through competitive compensation, advancing its interdisciplinary initiatives, regaining its stature in the biological and medical sciences, assuring continued strength of top-ranked programs in social and behavioral sciences and engineering, and improving the University's service, technology, and physical resources that support the work of students, faculty, and staff.

### **Strategies To Advance Academic Priorities**

In support of these priorities, the University uses five primary strategies to promote greater efficiency, balance the budget, and create internal investment capital to strengthen academic programs and improve services system-wide:

- Planning and accountability. The system-wide planning framework involves a rigorous strategic planning and accountability process (the Compact Process) to improve program efficiency and effectiveness and to target longer-term investment. This process leverages significant college and coordinate campus resources that are reallocated to advance University-wide and collegiate priorities. The Compact Process also positions academic programs to attract external resources, e.g., grants, contracts, contributions, etc.
- Faculty recruitment. On average one-half of University faculty turn over every 10 years through resignation, retirement, and death. Replacing these faculty is key to the University's competitiveness by recruiting faculty whose research and teaching reflect the newest and best intellectual direction in their respective disciplines and professions.
- Efficiency. Selected units (central services, academic units, etc.) are regularly targeted for reduction to create efficiency and critical resources for investment.
- Process redesign. Self-financed business process redesign and technology-assisted management of key business processes (student administration, HR, and grants management) promise significant improvements in the quality of services and support for decision-making to improve efficiency and effectiveness.
- Resource allocation. The University annually taxes the budgets of all academic and service units to support all-University services and to make critical investments that cannot be supported fully by increases in tuition and state support.

### **Academic Priorities and Compact Process**

Through the Compact Process, \$69.4 million has been invested or reallocated, cumulatively, in the University's academic priorities over the past five years. (See Table 2.) This process governs specific agreements to allocate funds that complement institution-wide priorities. Over \$22 million has been invested in academic initiatives and top-ranked units; almost \$10 million has been targeted to improve the undergraduate experience; and over \$26 million has been invested in improved learning technology and infrastructure resources to support teaching and learning.

In addition, investments in one area often have a multiplier effect on other areas. For example, faculty positions funded through the freshman seminars also contribute to strengthening outstanding units and contribute to strengthening research, external funding, and graduate and professional education.

### **Interdisciplinary Initiatives**

The academic interdisciplinary initiatives begun by former President Yudof with Board of Regents approval expanded investments in five areas: digital technology, molecular and cellular biology, new media, design, and agricultural research and outreach. These initiatives were seeded with a 1998 supplemental legislative appropriation of \$18.6 million. Combined with internally invested resources of \$10 million, nearly \$111 million in externally leveraged funds, and \$221.8 million in

**Table 2. Cumulative Compact Process investments for 1998-2002, by institutional goal.**

| <u>Type</u>  | <u>Amount</u>       |
|--|---------------------|
| <b>Academic Excellence: Faculty and Reputation</b>             |                     |
| Initiatives  | \$22,370,369        |
| <b>Students: Undergraduate, Graduate, and Professional</b>     |                     |
| Undergraduate Initiative                                       | \$9,984,313         |
| Graduate and Professional Education                            | \$5,764,069         |
| <b>Engagement: Access and Outreach</b>                         |                     |
| Technology (Access)*   | \$9,501,524         |
| Outreach   | \$3,786,653         |
| <b>Strengthening the University Community: Human Resources</b> |                     |
| Diversity  | \$713,090           |
| Review/Training  | \$85,000            |
| International  | \$175,000           |
| <b>Facilities</b>  |                     |
| Facilities   | \$9,907,820         |
| <b>Institutional Efficiency and Effectiveness</b>              |                     |
| Technology Infrastructure                                      | \$7,156,936         |
| <b>TOTAL COMPACT INVESTMENTS</b>                               | <b>\$69,444,684</b> |

\*Total technology investments across all areas = \$15,010,374.

Source: Office of Budget and Finance, University of Minnesota

related capital investments, these initiatives, including new and renovated buildings, now represent an extraordinary investment of over \$362 million to date. A major consequence of these investments has been the ability to strengthen academic departments through hiring of new faculty. With 80 percent of the positions filled by fall 2002, by the end of 2002-03 a total of 87.5 positions will be added to the cadre of faculty in the five key areas.

There is significant overlap between these interdisciplinary initiatives and the high-priority undergraduate programs listed in Section 1 of this report. In addition, these investments have made an impact on the composition of the University's faculty, on its success in obtaining external funding, in new research, and in new academic programs, including undergraduate minors that extend the initiatives' impact to a broad group of students.

### **Open Faculty Positions**

On average, 120 faculty positions have become open each of the past four years. Authorization to fill them in a particular field is a college-level decision based on the institutional and college priorities developed through the Compact Process. The strategic replacement of these faculty can bring new strength and direction to academic disciplines. For example, new positions may be filled in genomics, rather than conventional biology, or in nanotechnology, rather than traditional electrical engineering. These faculty replacements complement investments through special initiatives to strengthen academic programs (e.g., computer science, economics, political science, Academic Health Center).

## Section 3: First-Generation Students

The University of Minnesota defines “first-generation students” to include those whose parents have a high school diploma, or less.

### Proportion of First-Generation Students in Freshman Class

“First-generation student” is not a common demographic characteristic used by universities in recruiting students or collecting data. However, through the national CIRP (Cooperative Institutional Research Program) survey of new freshmen, the University has data that can be used to estimate the proportion of students admitted in fall 2001 who are “first generation.” For those matriculating on the Twin Cities campus in fall 2001 (the most recent CIRP data available), 12.2 percent indicated that their parents had only a high school diploma. Among these students, there was a dichotomy: 28 percent of students of color identified themselves as first generation, while only 8.9 percent of white students did so.

### Recruitment Strategy for Under-Represented Groups

The University of Minnesota actively recruits students from populations that are under-represented among Minnesotans with college degrees. This recruitment strategy encompasses students of color and low-income students; both groups have a strong correlation with first-generation students. The University does not make admissions decisions solely on the basis of any single characteristic of prospective students. Rather, our current recruiting strategies include special efforts to recruit students of color and low-income students. Because of the dichotomy noted above between white students and students of color, this approach also has a positive impact on recruiting first-generation students.

## Section 4: Graduation Rates

Improving retention and graduation rates of its undergraduate students is a high priority for the University of Minnesota. The University measures graduation trends in two ways. First, it looks at graduation *productivity*, i.e., the number of degrees granted each year to students who entered as freshmen or as transfers. Second, it looks at graduation *rates*, i.e., University goals compared to the actual rates at which new entering freshmen classes graduate (in four, five, or six years). It is important to note that graduation rates are calculated (and reported nationally) only for new entering freshmen, not for transfer students.

### Graduation Productivity

Between 1997 and 2000, the University graduated between 6,568 and 6,881 undergraduates each year, reflecting the University’s ongoing enrollment management strategies and its active participation in programs that facilitate easy transfers by students within the University and from colleges in the state and nationally. A total of 39.9 percent of these degrees have gone to students who entered as transfer students (i.e., as students in their second or later year of study). As Table 3 illustrates, the Twin Cities and Crookston campuses accept and graduate more transfer students than Morris or Duluth. On all

campuses, the proportion of graduates who were transfer students has decreased each year between 1997 and 2000. This reflects, in part, the initial effects of strategies to increase the graduation rate of new entering freshmen.

**Table 3. Percentage of University of Minnesota undergraduate degrees granted to students entering as transfers, FY 1997-2002.**

| <u>Year</u> | <u>Twin Cities</u> |           | <u>Duluth</u> |           | <u>Morris</u> |           | <u>Crookston</u> |           | <u>Total</u>        |           |
|-------------|--------------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|
|             | <u>#</u>           | <u>%</u>  | <u>#</u>      | <u>%</u>  | <u>#</u>      | <u>%</u>  | <u>#</u>         | <u>%</u>  | <u>#</u>            | <u>%</u>  |
| FY 1997     | 4,946              | 47        | 1,138         | 31        | 390           | 18        | 94               | 45        | <b>6,568</b>        | 42        |
| FY 1998     | 4,984              | 47        | 1,157         | 28        | 397           | 16        | 143              | 33        | <b>6,681</b>        | 41        |
| FY 1999     | 5,172              | 42        | 1,301         | 29        | 358           | 15        | 163              | 39        | <b>6,994</b>        | 38        |
| FY 2000     | 5,132              | 39        | 1,270         | 25        | 349           | 14        | 139              | 37        | <b>6,881</b>        | 35        |
| FY 2001     | 4,804              | 37        | 1,164         | 22        | 315           | 16        | 164              | 31        | <b>6,447</b>        | 34        |
| FY 2002     | <u>5,332</u>       | <u>35</u> | <u>1,221</u>  | <u>23</u> | <u>304</u>    | <u>14</u> | <u>204</u>       | <u>44</u> | <b><u>7,061</u></b> | <u>33</u> |
| 6-yr total  | <b>30,370</b>      | <b>41</b> | <b>7,251</b>  | <b>26</b> | <b>2,113</b>  | <b>16</b> | <b>907</b>       | <b>38</b> | <b>40,641</b>       | <b>37</b> |

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Reporting, University of Minnesota

### **Graduation Rates of New Entering Freshmen**

The Twin Cities campus has been among the three Big Ten public institutions with the lowest four-, five-, and six-year graduation rates. In fall 2000, the University convened a task force on the Twin Cities campus to examine the reasons for its comparatively low graduation rates and to develop specific and practical recommendations to enhance retention and graduation. The 2001 task force report, *Improving Our Graduation Rates*, identified a combination of factors that have led to graduation rates at the University that fall short of its 50 percent goal. (See the complete report and appendices online at: <http://www.evpp.umn.edu/evpp/gradrate/>.) The University has adopted a combination of strategies to help more students graduate sooner. (See Appendix A.)

### **Aggregate Trends**

The data on four-, five-, and six-year graduation rates, in Table 4, show that the University is achieving improvements in this critical area. For Twin Cities students, the increases in four- and five-year graduation rates are from 15.2 percent to 26.0 percent and from 36.6 percent to 44.5 percent, respectively. The five-year graduation rate for freshmen entering in 1995 was 32.8 percent at Crookston; 44.5 percent for Duluth students; and 59 percent for Morris students. While there is still significant improvement required, progress is being made toward the system goal.

### **Students of Color**

Although graduation rates are somewhat lower for students of color, they have shown similar improvement on the Twin Cities campus. (See Table 4.) A total of 32.7 percent of students of color entering in 1995 graduated in five years on the Twin Cities campus; 29.1 percent in Duluth; and 37.3 percent in Morris. The overall six-year graduation rate for students of color entering in 1994 was 40.2 percent, reflecting an increase over the rates for students entering in 1992 (36.3 percent) and 1993 (39.5) percent. (The graduation rates for white students in these years was 50.5 percent for those entering in 1992; 52.0 percent for 1993 entrants; and 53.3 percent for 1994 entrants.)

**Table 4. University of Minnesota graduation rates for first-time, full-time new entering students, by year of matriculation and race, 1992-1998.**

| Year of Matriculation | Student Category  | Twin Cities Campus |             |             | Duluth Campus |             |             |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|
|                       |                   | 4-Year             | 5-Year      | 6-Year      | 4-Year        | 5-Year      | 6-Year      |
| Fall 1992             | White Students    | 17.1               | 39.2        | 47.1        | 23.5          | 45.8        | 52.2        |
|                       | Students of Color | <u>6.1</u>         | <u>24.6</u> | <u>34.9</u> | <u>8.7</u>    | <u>26.1</u> | <u>28.3</u> |
|                       | <b>Overall</b>    | <b>15.2</b>        | <b>36.6</b> | <b>45.0</b> | <b>22.9</b>   | <b>45.1</b> | <b>51.3</b> |
| Fall 1993             | White Students    | 19.3               | 43.1        | 51.0        | 21.7          | 44.7        | 50.9        |
|                       | Students of Color | <u>12.0</u>        | <u>27.7</u> | <u>36.8</u> | <u>17.3</u>   | <u>36.0</u> | <u>44.0</u> |
|                       | <b>Overall</b>    | <b>17.9</b>        | <b>40.3</b> | <b>48.4</b> | <b>21.5</b>   | <b>44.3</b> | <b>50.6</b> |
| Fall 1994             | White Students    | 19.4               | 45.7        | 52.2        | 23.4          | 45.5        | 51.7        |
|                       | Students of Color | <u>13.4</u>        | <u>32.1</u> | <u>40.2</u> | <u>16.2</u>   | <u>29.7</u> | <u>35.1</u> |
|                       | <b>Overall</b>    | <b>18.3</b>        | <b>43.3</b> | <b>50.1</b> | <b>23.0</b>   | <b>44.6</b> | <b>50.8</b> |
| Fall 1995             | White Students    | 25.8               | 47.4        | 53.9        | 27.8          | 45.6        | 51.2        |
|                       | Students of Color | <u>16.3</u>        | <u>33.1</u> | <u>40.3</u> | <u>14.0</u>   | <u>29.1</u> | <u>32.6</u> |
|                       | <b>Overall</b>    | <b>24.2</b>        | <b>45.0</b> | <b>51.6</b> | <b>27.0</b>   | <b>44.7</b> | <b>50.1</b> |
| Fall 1996             | White Students    | 27.7               | 49.8        | 56.2        | 26.9          | 48.4        | 52.7        |
|                       | Students of Color | <u>17.4</u>        | <u>35.6</u> | <u>42.6</u> | <u>7.1</u>    | <u>20.4</u> | <u>23.5</u> |
|                       | <b>Overall</b>    | <b>26.1</b>        | <b>47.6</b> | <b>54.1</b> | <b>25.8</b>   | <b>46.8</b> | <b>51.1</b> |
| Fall 1997             | White Students    | 29.2               | 50.3        |             | 24.2          | 47.4        |             |
|                       | Students of Color | <u>20.5</u>        | <u>38.8</u> |             | <u>7.3</u>    | <u>30.5</u> |             |
|                       | <b>Overall</b>    | <b>27.8</b>        | <b>48.4</b> |             | <b>23.4</b>   | <b>46.6</b> |             |
| Fall 1998             | White Students    | 30.6               |             |             | 22.9          |             |             |
|                       | Students of Color | <u>18.4</u>        |             |             | <u>15.9</u>   |             |             |
|                       | <b>Overall</b>    | <b>28.6</b>        |             |             | <b>22.5</b>   |             |             |

Note: Rates include students who transferred from one University campus to another and graduated (e.g., a student who matriculated at Morris and graduated from Duluth is counted as a Morris graduate). The University also reports graduation rates to a national database (IPEDS); it includes only students who matriculated at and graduated from the same campus; these rates are somewhat lower than those shown above.

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Reporting, University of Minnesota

**Table 4. University of Minnesota graduation rates for first-time, full-time new entering students, by year of matriculation and race, 1992-1998. (continued)**

| Year of Matriculation | Student Category  | Morris Campus |             |             | Crookston Campus |             |             |
|-----------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|
|                       |                   | 4-Year        | 5-Year      | 6-Year      | 4-Year           | 5-Year      | 6-Year      |
| Fall 1992             | White Students    | 45.2          | 57.5        | 63.5        | ---              | ---         | ---         |
|                       | Students of Color | <u>34.4</u>   | <u>48.4</u> | <u>53.1</u> |                  |             |             |
|                       | <b>Overall</b>    | <b>44.0</b>   | <b>56.5</b> | <b>62.4</b> |                  |             |             |
| Fall 1993             | White Students    | 45.0          | 61.6        | 64.4        | 17.0             | 28.0        | 31.0        |
|                       | Students of Color | <u>31.3</u>   | <u>54.7</u> | <u>60.9</u> | ---              | ---         | ---         |
|                       | <b>Overall</b>    | <b>43.5</b>   | <b>60.8</b> | <b>64.0</b> | <b>17.0</b>      | <b>28.0</b> | <b>31.0</b> |
| Fall 1994             | White Students    | 48.9          | 65.1        | 70.2        | 29.7             | 40.7        | 46.6        |
|                       | Students of Color | <u>24.6</u>   | <u>42.6</u> | <u>50.8</u> | <u>0.0</u>       | <u>0.0</u>  | <u>0.0</u>  |
|                       | <b>Overall</b>    | <b>46.1</b>   | <b>62.5</b> | <b>68.0</b> | <b>29.2</b>      | <b>40.0</b> | <b>45.8</b> |
| Fall 1995             | White Students    | 48.6          | 62.4        | 64.4        | 24.4             | 33.9        | 35.4        |
|                       | Students of Color | <u>23.9</u>   | <u>37.3</u> | <u>41.8</u> | <u>14.3</u>      | <u>14.3</u> | <u>14.3</u> |
|                       | <b>Overall</b>    | <b>45.3</b>   | <b>59.0</b> | <b>61.4</b> | <b>23.9</b>      | <b>32.8</b> | <b>34.3</b> |
| Fall 1996             | White Students    | 49.1          | 64.9        | 66.4        | 20.1             | 36.4        | 40.9        |
|                       | Students of Color | <u>22.2</u>   | <u>41.7</u> | <u>43.1</u> | <u>0.0</u>       | <u>0.0</u>  | <u>0.0</u>  |
|                       | <b>Overall</b>    | <b>45.4</b>   | <b>61.7</b> | <b>63.2</b> | <b>19.3</b>      | <b>34.8</b> | <b>39.1</b> |
| Fall 1997             | White Students    | 40.0          | 58.7        |             | 24.3             | 39.5        |             |
|                       | Students of Color | <u>25.4</u>   | <u>35.2</u> |             | <u>14.3</u>      | <u>14.3</u> |             |
|                       | <b>Overall</b>    | <b>37.7</b>   | <b>55.1</b> |             | <b>23.3</b>      | <b>38.4</b> |             |
| Fall 1998             | White Students    | 41.1          |             |             | 26.5             |             |             |
|                       | Students of Color | <u>29.9</u>   |             |             | <u>20.0</u>      |             |             |
|                       | <b>Overall</b>    | <b>39.5</b>   |             |             | <b>26.3</b>      |             |             |

Note: Rates include students who transferred from one University campus to another and graduated (e.g., a student who matriculated at Morris and graduated from Duluth is counted as a Morris graduate). The University also reports graduation rates to a national database (IPEDS); it includes only students who matriculated at and graduated from the same campus; these rates are somewhat lower than those shown above.

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Reporting, University of Minnesota

Graduation rates vary somewhat among racial/ethnic groups. (See Table 5.) Asian/Pacific Islander and Hispanic student rates are somewhat higher, and African American and American Indian student rates are somewhat lower. In all cases, however, rates have generally increased for classes entering between 1992 and 1996.

### Strategies To Improve Graduation Rates

The University's strong concern about and intention to improve its graduation rates are highlighted by the following strategies.

The University believes that its comprehensive strategy to improve the undergraduate experience, with particular attention to the first-year experience (orientation, convocation, freshman seminars) can make a significant contribution to improving graduation rates. The University has made investments over the past four years of over \$9 million to improve the undergraduate academic experience, nearly \$76 million in residence halls, \$3.5 million in new financial aid, and \$25.6 million in systems to support undergraduate student registration, advising, and financial aid

**Table 5. University of Minnesota graduation rates for first-time, full-time new entering students of color by year of matriculation and race/ethnicity, 1992-1998.**

| <u>American Indian</u>  |             |             |             |             |             |             |             | <u>Asian/Pacific Islander</u> |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |
|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <u>Rate</u>             | <u>1992</u> | <u>1993</u> | <u>1994</u> | <u>1995</u> | <u>1996</u> | <u>1997</u> | <u>1998</u> | <u>Rate</u>                   | <u>1992</u> | <u>1993</u> | <u>1994</u> | <u>1995</u> | <u>1996</u> | <u>1997</u> | <u>1998</u> |
|                         | %           | %           | %           | %           | %           | %           | %           |                               | %           | %           | %           | %           | %           | %           | %           |
| <b>4 yr</b>             | 7.3         | 21.5        | 15.6        | 11.6        | 8.1         | 12.8        | 5.4         | <b>4 yr</b>                   | 12.3        | 15.5        | 17.5        | 18.9        | 21.0        | 24.8        | 20.5        |
| <b>5 yr</b>             | 10.9        | 26.2        | 25.0        | 23.3        | 16.2        | 25.6        |             | <b>5 yr</b>                   | 35.0        | 35.6        | 37.4        | 38.4        | 41.8        | 46.9        |             |
| <b>6 yr</b>             | 18.2        | 32.3        | 28.1        | 25.6        | 16.2        |             |             | <b>6 yr</b>                   | 45.2        | 45.7        | 46.5        | 45.9        | 49.7        |             |             |
| <u>African American</u> |             |             |             |             |             |             |             | <u>Chicano Latino</u>         |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| <u>Rate</u>             | <u>1992</u> | <u>1993</u> | <u>1994</u> | <u>1995</u> | <u>1996</u> | <u>1997</u> | <u>1998</u> | <u>Rate</u>                   | <u>1992</u> | <u>1993</u> | <u>1994</u> | <u>1995</u> | <u>1996</u> | <u>1997</u> | <u>1998</u> |
|                         | %           | %           | %           | %           | %           | %           | %           |                               | %           | %           | %           | %           | %           | %           | %           |
| <b>4 yr</b>             | 2.8         | 7.1         | 4.0         | 10.9        | 12.0        | 11.1        | 14.7        | <b>4 yr</b>                   | 10.5        | 15.5        | 11.8        | 19.1        | 14.5        | 26.9        | 21.3        |
| <b>5 yr</b>             | 17.1        | 25.0        | 24.2        | 24.0        | 28.9        | 25.1        |             | <b>5 yr</b>                   | 26.7        | 23.6        | 26.3        | 35.1        | 27.7        | 42.3        |             |
| <b>6 yr</b>             | 26.7        | 29.8        | 31.5        | 31.3        | 35.9        |             |             | <b>6 yr</b>                   | 32.6        | 34.6        | 34.2        | 43.6        | 33.7        |             |             |

distribution. These investments are contributing to steady improvement in retention and graduation of all students.

Broader-scale strategies for Twin Cities undergraduate colleges derive from the recommendations made by the Subcommittee on Graduation and Retention of the Twin Cities Council of Undergraduate Deans. (See *Improving Our Graduation Rates* report cited previously.) The strategies being implemented include:

- Communicating clear and explicit institutional expectations about academic progress. Effective fall 2002, the University's Twin Cities campus restructured tuition to give students a clear financial incentive to be full-time students. The Twin Cities campus also began implementing a 13-credit minimum registration requirement for all new students. The initial response to these changes has been encouraging. Average credit loads are up for all students, new and continuing. The proportion of freshmen registering for fewer than 13 credits dropped from 9 percent to 1.1 percent. The proportion of transfer students who registered for fewer than 13 credits dropped from 35 percent to 14.3 percent.
- Making an institutional commitment to help students stay on track, e.g., full-year registration for freshmen, email reminders about academic progress, and mid-term grade reports;

- Removing institutional barriers and providing incentives for success, e.g., pay more attention to retention in the junior and senior years, find better ways to identify students who may be at risk, and continue to increase grant-based student aid to help reduce students' dependence on work.

## **Section 5: Progress in Increasing Revenue To Support Research**

As one of the country's premier research institutions, and the only one of its kind in the state, the University of Minnesota takes seriously its mission to discover new medical treatments, develop new technologies, and expand the bounds of human knowledge through extensive research programs. Achieving this mission depends directly on the quality of the University's faculty and their ability to compete for external funding that will support their research, scholarly, and other activities.

The funds the University attracts for research come from many different sources. Primarily, faculty, staff, and students compete for research funds from federal agencies like the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation. The University also receives dollars from state and local governments, businesses, and foundations. As competition intensifies for the best researchers and scholars and the funding to support their endeavors, the University is well positioned to continue as a leading research, learning, and outreach institution.

The University has made significant progress in generating external funding to support its research programs. In recent years, this progress has been the result of a broad and diverse range of research across the University. While sponsored funding is a key measure of research activities and quality, there are other significant factors, such as the University libraries, that contribute to and help support a strong research infrastructure.

### **Proposals Submitted**

The dollar value of research proposals submitted provides an early predictive measure of the University's future research activity. During FY 2002, University of Minnesota researchers submitted sponsored program proposals requesting \$1.5 billion, up only 5 percent from the previous year but more than double over the five-year period FY 1997-2002. If the FY 2002 proposals are as competitive as those submitted in recent years, the University should continue to realize significant increases in sponsored program activity.

### **Sponsored Awards**

The level of grant and contract awards is another important measurement and a predictor of the University's capacity to achieve its research mission in the future. In FY 2002, the University received nearly \$526 million in sponsored awards, up 6 percent over FY 2001, and a 53 percent increase over the five-year period FY 1997-2002.

### **Sponsored Expenditures**

Sponsored expenditures, the most consistent measure of external research support, totaled \$443.1 million for FY 2002, up 8 percent from FY 2001, and up nearly 70 percent over the five-year period FY 1997-2002. Expenditures in both FY 1998 and FY 2000 reflect large capital expenditures for equipment and explain a portion of the rapid growth in research expenditures for those years. By

contrast, in FY 2002, the growth is a result of program expansion throughout the University and represents the increasing strength of the University's research programs broadly.

Overall, the federal government provides more than two-thirds of the University's sponsored funds, or \$314 million in FY 2002. (See Table 6.)

- The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, of which the National Institutes of Health is the principal component, continues to be the largest single sponsor of University research programs, accounting for \$208.3 million, or 48 percent of expenditures in FY 2001.
- The second largest sponsor is the National Science Foundation at \$37.4 million.

**Table 6. Proportion of FY 2002 sponsored expenditures, by source**

| Source                           | Percentage of Total Sponsored Expenditures |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Federal agencies total           | 72%  |
| Dept. of Health & Human Services | 48%  |
| National Science Foundation      | 8%   |
| Dept. of Energy                  | 1%   |
| Dept. of Defense                 | 3%   |
| Other federal                    | 12%  |
| Private Foundations and NGOs     | 3%   |
| Business and Industry            | 6%   |
| Misc. Government                 | 7%   |
| State                            | 7%   |

Source: Office of Oversight, Analysis, and Reporting, University of Minnesota

- The State of Minnesota is a close third, sponsoring \$32.6 million in research activities in FY 2002. The combined research expenditures attributed to state and local government agency sources, \$55.9 million in FY 2002, represents a decline of 6 percent from FY 2001, and reflects the tightness of state and local government budgets. However, in the five-year period FY 1997-2002 there was still an increase of 109 percent. This suggests that research faculty and professional staff are becoming increasingly active in initiating research projects that focus on problems and responses relevant to state and local concerns.

### **Technology Commercialization**

University faculty and research staff are increasingly active in disclosing new technologies and negotiating licenses of the University's intellectual property. This process is important as a contribution to the state's economy. It also generates revenue that can be reinvested in future research development. Between FY 1998 and FY 2002, gross revenue from licenses increased by 400 percent, from \$5.3 million to \$26.5 million, largely due to two highly successful pieces of intellectual property.

These dollars have been reinvested in research and technology transfer infrastructure as well as graduate student fellowships.

## **Section 6: Academic Health Center Goals and Outcomes**

In November 1999, the Board of Regents established a special committee to work with the Academic Health Center (AHC) administration and faculty in developing a new AHC strategic vision. The committee met monthly from December 1999 to June 2000. In addition to hearing from AHC faculty, the committee held meetings with legislative and state health leaders, health providers, health community representatives, and others active in health issues. The Board of Regents approved the AHC's strategic vision at its July 2000 meeting and endorsed the AHC's six-year strategic plan at its December 2000 meeting. The plan was presented to and endorsed by the legislative higher education and health and human services committees and served as the basis of the University's funding request for the AHC.

### **Focus Areas**

The Academic Health Center strategic plan has six focus areas:

- Balance the operating budget and stabilize the finances of the Medical School to maintain current enrollments of primary care physicians and specialists;
- Rebuild the Medical School faculty and the AHC's health research capacity;
- Develop interdisciplinary and community-based health professional education;
- Meet the state's health professional work force needs;
- Improve access to AHC research, information, and new technology; and
- Build community support for funding of health professional education and research.

### **AHC Endowments**

The Minnesota Legislature created two state endowments, one in 1999 and one in 2001, to support health professional education programs within the AHC. A portion of the state's tobacco settlement payments funds the endowments. The state originally estimated that these payments would total \$720 million. The AHC receives quarterly payments of its share of the endowments' market value. The state originally estimated the AHC would receive \$13.6 million in FY 2002, \$22.5 million in FY 2003, and \$25.1 million in FY 2004, with the endowments fully funded. The amount of money the AHC actually receives is significantly less, as payouts are subject to the sales and profitability of tobacco companies and the performance of the state's investments in the stock and bond markets.

### **Revised Plans**

As part of its FY2002-2003 biennial legislative request, the University requested \$49.5 million for AHC-related purposes: \$16 million to support the Medical School's core educational programs; \$10.4 million to hire new physician-scientists as part of the rebuilding of the Medical School faculty over six years; \$7.1 million to expand enrollments in nursing, pharmacy, medical technology, and rural dentistry; and \$16 million to support interdisciplinary, community-based education programs. The

AHC has had to significantly revise its financial and programmatic plans in that it will receive only an estimated \$31.1 million from the endowments in the FY 2002-03 biennium. This is due in large part to reduced payments to the state from the tobacco companies and poor performance of the stock and bond markets. Since the endowments were established, their fair market value has declined by \$135 million, and proceeds have fallen short of initial projections by nearly 16 percent.

### **Medical School Core Educational Programs**

Since 1992, the cost of education in the Medical School has exceeded revenues because of reduced reimbursement for patient care, which historically paid for 40 percent of the school's expenses. The AHC used \$7.4 million in FY 2002 and \$9.9 million in FY 2003 from the endowments to maintain current enrollments and stabilize funding for the Medical School's educational programs for primary care physicians and specialists. These funds were used to pay the salaries of faculty, primarily in the clinical departments, for the education work they do. Funds were also used to support graduate student programs and other priority educational programs in the Medical School. To cover the additional shortfall in the Medical School's educational budget, the school has cut expenses, reallocated funds, and increased tuition by 14 percent in FY 2002 and 16 percent in FY 2003.

### **Rebuilding the Medical School Faculty**

Between 1995 and 1999, the Medical School, long one of the nation's top 20 recipients of NIH grants, dropped to 27<sup>th</sup> in grants received. The decline resulted primarily from a loss of faculty. Between 1995 and 1999, the school lost 84 (16 percent) of its tenured/tenured track faculty, resulting in a loss of \$41 million in potential grant funding. The Medical School has developed a six-year plan to rehire faculty (physician-scientists) in eight strategic investment areas. The school has created an investment account that is being funded by reallocations and state endowment funds. All vacant faculty positions revert to the Dean's Office for reassignment and possible funding from the investment account. The school will use \$3 million from the state endowments to hire new faculty in FY 2003 (28 percent of the original plan). This will enable the hiring of 10 to 12 faculty. While some searches began last year, most faculty will not be hired until 2003, one year later than originally planned.

### **Strategic Growth and Investment Areas**

The Medical School, through a joint planning effort of the faculty and administration, has identified and endorsed eight research areas for growth and investment. The areas are not based in specific departments but are interscholastic, fostering ties across departments and with other schools and colleges. The areas, which are forward-looking and build on the school's strengths are: aging; cancer; cardiovascular and pulmonary health; developmental biology, children's, and adolescent health; genetics and genomics; immunology and infectious diseases; neurosciences; and stem cell biology. Using funds from the new state endowment, reallocations, and private gifts, the school plans to hire between 40 and 50 additional new faculty over the next four years in these strategic growth areas.

### **Health Professional Workforce**

Minnesota is experiencing a shortage of health care professionals, particularly in rural areas. As the population ages and requires greater health care, these shortages will grow more acute. The AHC

allocated \$2 million from the state endowments in the FY2002-03 biennium to begin to address these shortages. The funds support expansion of the nursing program in Rochester, the pharmacy program in Duluth, and the rural dental clinic in Hibbing.

### **Nursing Expansion In Rochester**

Minnesota reflects the national shortage of nurses. There are more than 2,900 openings for registered nurses. The School of Nursing established a satellite of its BSN program in Rochester in fall 2002. The program is part of the University of Minnesota – Rochester, and a collaborative effort with Mayo Foundation and MnSCU. The joint effort, when fully operational, will enroll a total of 60 students – 30 in the University’s BSN program, and 30 students in MnSCU programs at Winona and Mankato.

### **Pharmacy Expansion In Duluth**

With over 300 unfilled openings for pharmacists in Minnesota, there is already a critical shortage of these health care professionals. This shortage is predicted to grow as the population ages and we increasingly rely on drugs for chronic health problems related to aging. The College of Pharmacy will expand its enrollment by 50 percent beginning in fall 2003, establishing an expansion on the Duluth campus for 50 students, who will complete three years of the program there.

### **Rural Dentistry**

Rural communities are experiencing a shortage of dentists and dental hygienists. The shortage will become critical statewide as more than 20 percent of the state’s dentists are expected to retire in the next 10 years. The School of Dentistry is establishing a new program designed to recruit and train dental professionals in rural communities. Under the program, the school plans to open several full-service, low-cost dental clinics in rural communities for the training of its students. It opened its first clinic in partnership with MnSCU and Hibbing Community College in January 2002. Start-up and operating funds in FY 2002 and FY 2003 came from the state endowments as well as AHC and school reallocations. Plans for additional clinics are on hold because of a lack of state endowment funds until at least FY 2004.

### **Medical Technology**

Plans to establish a satellite of the University’s highly ranked medical technology program in Rochester, in collaboration with the Mayo Foundation, are on hold because of a lack of state endowment funds until at least FY 2004. A joint AHC-Mayo working group is evaluating options, but implementation cannot proceed until the required funds are in place.

### **Health Care Delivery and the Health Care Workforce**

The AHC is engaged in a number of efforts to rethink the current health system and system of training health care professionals, paraprofessionals, and technicians. We are working with the Department of Health and other state agencies, health care delivery organizations, community and professional organizations, MnSCU, and private colleges. We launched an important initiative, the National

Institute of Health Policy, in partnership with the University of St. Thomas. The institute invited 100 state leaders to think through the changes needed in the health care delivery system, in the health care workforce, and in the training of health care professionals and others over the next 10 years. Three pilot projects were conducted, focusing on team care, a common pre-professional curriculum, and home-based long-term care education.

### **Health Professional Education**

The AHC is updating its education and training programs to meet the rapid advances in health care and ensure our graduates have the skills and knowledge needed by future health practitioners. There is an increased emphasis on prevention and wellness, information technology, genomics, patient safety, enhanced clinical skills, evidence-based medicine, interdisciplinary care, and meeting the needs of the state's changing racial and ethnic communities. More of the AHC's clinical training is being moved into non-hospital settings in communities across the state, including a primary care clinic in the Minneapolis Phillips neighborhood, a geriatric transitional care unit at Walker Methodist, and sites in underserved rural and urban communities. The AHC received a \$1.1 million federal grant, using matching endowment funds, to support training sites in medically underserved communities in northeast and southwest Minnesota.

### **Translational Research Facility (TRF)**

The University requested funds from the legislature in 2002 to build a \$37 million translational research facility to house 33 new clinician-scientists and 200 research support staff from the Medical School and College of Pharmacy. The facility is an integral component of the University's strategic initiative in molecular and cellular biology. It is the key facility component of the six-year plan to rebuild the Medical School faculty as provided in the 2002-2003 biennial budget. The University needs an additional 100,000 square feet of laboratory space just to meet current needs in the health sciences.

The University raised private funds in 2002 to cover one-third of the cost, and the legislature approved state funding for the building, but Gov. Ventura vetoed it. The University will resubmit its request in the 2003 session. Design work is already under way. If state funding is approved, construction will begin in summer 2003 with an expected occupancy of July 2005.

The clinician-scientists housed in the new facility will advance new methods and treatments for improving health in areas such as infectious diseases, AIDS, Alzheimer's, epilepsy, diabetes, cancer, organ transplants, and drug delivery. They will also translate discoveries from the human genome project into new therapies for patients with gene-based diseases or conditions. TRF will provide a collaborative physical environment – a common practice in the private sector and other leading academic research institutions – that promotes creativity and innovation, and which has been shown to shorten development times for new technologies. The 33 new clinician-scientists are expected to generate over \$17 million in additional federal and private research dollars over the next four years, a 15 percent increase for the Medical School and College of Pharmacy.



**Appendix A**  
**Framework for Undergraduate Improvement**  
**Initiatives, Impact, and Goals**

| <b>Academic Initiatives</b>   | <b>Impact on Students</b>  | <b>Goal</b>  |
|---|--|--|
| <p><b>Freshmen Seminars</b><br/> 35 new faculty positions<br/> 20 seminars in 1998-99<br/> 125+ seminars in 2000-01<br/> 130 seminars in 2001-02</p>  | <p>1999 – 400 students (8%)<br/> 2000 – 1,875 students (38%)<br/> 2001 – 1,900 (35%)<br/> 2002 – 2,003 (38%)</p>   | <p>Sufficient freshman seminar capacity to provide all freshmen with a seminar experience</p>          |
| <p><b>Undergraduate Research</b> (to include all University sponsored undergraduate research programs)</p> <p>UROP – 297 faculty systemwide participated in 2001-02</p> <p>Summer 2002 – 163 faculty involved in 8 summer research programs targeted to under-represented students</p>  | <p>For 2001-2002:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">272 Twin Cities students<br/> 9 Crookston students<br/> 18 Morris students<br/> 117 Duluth students</p> <p>Summer programs – 186 TC undergraduates in 2002 from under-represented groups</p>  | <p>UROP – 1,000 students per year</p> <p>Summer programs – 200 under-represented students per year</p> |
| <p><b>Study Abroad</b><br/> Students can select from 252 study abroad programs in about 80 countries.</p> <p>Figures show the numbers of undergraduates studying abroad each year and the percentage of that year's graduating class that they represent. This is how the percentage is calculated each year for institutions across the U.S.</p> | <p><u>UMTC</u>:</p> <p>1997-98 – 779 students (16%)<br/> 1998-99 – 715 students (14%)<br/> 1999-2000 – 988 students (20%)<br/> 2000-01 – 1,065 students (22%)<br/> 2001-02 – 1,056 students (20%)</p> <p><u>UMD</u>:</p> <p>1997-98 – 100 students (9%)<br/> 1998-99 – 105 students (8%)<br/> 1999-2000 – 109 students (9%)<br/> 2000-01 – 160 students (14%)<br/> 2001-02 – 214 students (17%)</p> <p><u>UMM</u>:</p> <p>1997-98 – 103 students (28%)<br/> 1998-99 – 113 students (33%)<br/> 1999-2000 – 88 students (25%)<br/> 2000-01 – 129 students (40%)</p> <p><u>UMC</u> (has just begun sending students abroad):<br/> 2001-02 – 1 student<br/> 2002-03 – 11 students (5%)</p> | <p>50% of graduating students</p>  |
| <p><b>Writing Intensive Courses</b><br/> Students complete four writing-intensive courses during their college careers.</p>   | <p>Required for all students</p>   | <p>There are sufficient course seats for students to fulfill the requirement.</p>                      |
| <p><b>Interdisciplinary Minors</b><br/> Nearly 20, including: Leadership, Information Technology, Design, New Media, Business, Violence Prevention, Youth Studies, Disability Studies, Applied Ethics (UMC), Information Design (UMD), Information Technology</p>   | <p>2001 – 300+ students<br/> 2002 data not yet available</p>   | <p>Add minors in high-demand fields to allow students to expand career opportunities</p>               |

|                              |  |  |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| (UMC), Foreign Studies (UMD) |  |  |
|------------------------------|--|--|

| <b>Student Development and Support</b>  | <b>Impact on Students</b>  | <b>Goal</b>  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>SEAM</b> (Student Excellence in Academics and Multiculturalism)  | 1999 – 235 students in 11 learning communities (CLA, GC)<br>2000 – 200 students in 10 learning communities (CLA, GC)<br>2001 – 182 students in 11 learning communities (CLA, CBS)<br>2002 – 175-180 students in 12 learning communities (CLA, CBS)             | Enhance academic success for students of color; build community; enhance multicultural awareness and involvement |
| <b>Service Learning/Community Service</b>   | 3,250 students in 2001-02 at UMTC  | 4,000 in 2002-03 at UMTC<br>Facilitate intensive learning experience for students                                |
| <b>Convocation</b><br>120+ faculty participate each year at UMTC  | '98, '99, '00, '01, '02<br>4,000 UMTC students participated each year.   | Continue annually – all freshmen   |
| <b>Advising and Student Support Services</b><br>Increased Web advising resources.   | Improved service for all students.   | Improve student satisfaction with advising   |
| <b>Freshman Orientation</b>   | 5,205 students (nearly 100 percent of incoming freshmen) attended in summer 2002.  | Enhance first-year experience for all freshmen   |
| <b>Residential Living/Learning Communities</b><br>Also include new first-year experience halls.<br><br>New houses in 2002: Pre-Health Sciences House (2 houses)<br><br>Residential College redesigned as a First-Year program | 7,126 total capacity for student housing (including residence halls, apartments, and co-ops) in 2002-03 (4.7% increase over 2001-02).<br><br>5,332 total students in residence halls, 2002-03<br><br>1,000 students in 22 living-learning communities in 02-03 | 26 houses planned for fall 2003  |
| <b>Take Your Professor to Lunch</b>   | Approximately 200 students and 35 faculty members in 2001-02   | 1,000 students per year  |