

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA



2010 Report to the Minnesota State Legislature Minnesota Statutes §135A.031 Subd.7 (2007)

**Office of the Senior Vice President
for Academic Affairs and Provost
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota**

February 2010

**2010 Report to the Minnesota State Legislature
Minnesota Statutes §135A.031 Subd.7 (2007)**

**Office of the Senior Vice President
for Academic Affairs and Provost
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota**

February 2010

Contact:

Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost
University of Minnesota
234 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55455
612-625-0051
<http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost>

This publication is available in alternative formats upon request.
Please contact Joseph Shultz, 612-626-6544.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

The University's mission, carried out on multiple campuses and throughout the state, is threefold: research and discovery, teaching and learning, and outreach and public service.

Table of Contents

Cited Minnesota Statutes

Introduction	1
Section 1: Allocation of State Appropriations	3
Section 2: Tuition Rates and Fees	7
Section 3: Graduation Rates	13
Section 4: Undergraduate Enrollment	15
Section 5: University Research	17
Appendix A: Tuition Rates and Required Fees, 10-year History	21

**Cited Minnesota Statutes
for
2010 Report to the Minnesota State Legislature**

85th Legislative Session (2007-08)

Sec. 6, Minnesota Statutes 2006, section 135A.031, subdivision 7, is amended to read:

(b) By February 1 of each even-numbered year, the Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota and the Board of Trustees of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities must submit a report to the chairs of the legislative committees with jurisdiction over higher education policy and finance. The report must describe the following:

(1) how state appropriations made to the system in the previous odd-numbered year were allocated and the methodology used to determine the allocation;

(2) data describing how the institution reallocated resources to advance the priorities set forth in the budget submitted under section 135A.034 and the statewide objectives under section 135A.011. The information must indicate whether instruction and support programs received a reduction in or additional resources. The total amount reallocated must be clearly explained;

(3) the tuition rates and fees established by the governing board in each of the past ten years and comparison data for peer institutions and national averages;

(4) data on the number and proportion of students graduating within four, five, and six years from universities and within three years from colleges as reported in the integrated postsecondary education data system. These data must be provided for each institution by race, ethnicity, and gender. Data and information must be submitted that describe the system's plan and progress toward attaining the goals set forth in the plan to increase the number and proportion of students that graduate within four, five, or six years from a university or within three years from a college;

(5) data on, and the methodology used to measure, the number of students traditionally underrepresented in higher education enrolled at the system's institutions. Data and information must be submitted that describe the system's plan and progress toward attaining the goals set forth in the plan to increase the recruitment, retention, and timely graduation of students traditionally underrepresented in higher education; and

(6) data on the revenue received from all sources to support research or workforce development activities or the system's efforts to license, sell, or otherwise market products, ideas, technology, and related inventions created in whole or in part by the system. Data and information must be submitted that describe the system's plan and progress toward attaining the goals set forth in the plan to increase the revenue received to support research or workforce development activities or revenue received from the licensing, sale, or other marketing and technology transfer activities by the system.

Introduction

“...[The regents shall] make a report... to the Legislature...exhibiting the state and progress of the University...and such other information as they may deem proper, or may from time to time be required of them.”

– University charter, 1851 Territorial Laws, Chapter 3, Section 16

This report to the Minnesota State Legislature addresses the reporting requirements in MN.Stat. §135A.031 Subd.7 (2007), as listed on the previous page. The report is organized into five sections addressing allocation of state appropriations, tuition rates, graduation rates, undergraduate enrollment, and University research.

This report may be supplemented by the University of Minnesota's annual *University Plan, Performance and Accountability Report* (September 2009) which is available at www.academic.umn.edu/accountability. The *University Plan, Performance and Accountability Report* provides further discussion and greater detail of key accountability issues and University strategies and is referenced in several places throughout this report.

History of Accountability

The University has a strong history of leadership in promoting accountability. Since the University of Minnesota's inception more than 150 years ago, citizens, the state legislature, the federal government, the Board of Regents, alumni, students, parents, employers, and many others have recognized the importance of ensuring that the University be accountable for fulfilling its fundamental tripartite mission of teaching, research, and public engagement. The University continues to support and promote accountability initiatives.

The ways in which the University has demonstrated its accountability and its progress in meeting mission-related goals have included numerous required as well as voluntarily produced reports. Several of these reports are described on pages 9 and 10 of the *University Plan, Performance and Accountability Report*.

Section 1: Allocation of State Appropriations

At the University of Minnesota, the state appropriation is allocated annually to major academic units to support their direct and indirect costs of operation. Each unit goes through an annual compact planning and budget development process with the academic and financial leaders of the University in which all strategic goals, proposed initiatives, operating budget issues and revenue and expenditure projections are reviewed, analyzed, and discussed. Specific allocations of the state appropriation to each unit are then based on leadership decisions informed by those discussions.

The State of Minnesota appropriated \$648,974,000 to the University of Minnesota in FY 2009-10 including:

- O & M (Operations and Maintenance) appropriation of \$550,345,000;
- General Fund, State Special appropriation of \$96,472,000; and
- Health Care Access Fund, State Special appropriation of \$2,157,000.

FY09-10 allocations of state appropriations by major academic unit are provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Internal allocation of state appropriations to the University of Minnesota, FY 2009-10.

Unit	O & M Appropriation	General Fund State Special Appropriation	Health Care Access Fund State Special
Twin Cities Campus			
Academic Health Center (AHC)			
College of Pharmacy	\$6,577,617	\$1,444,000	
College of Veterinary Medicine	16,913,073	3,805,516	
Medical School	66,118,879	16,277,760	2,157,000
School of Dentistry	12,591,630	144,000	
School of Nursing	6,396,780	444,000	
School of Public Health	11,511,284	372,564	
Academic Health Center-Shared	48,105,595	6,203,173	
Carlson School of Management	6,549,540	899,681	
College of Biological Sciences	22,127,344	438,037	
College of Continuing Education	12,232,927		
College of Design	8,158,425	345,807	
College of Education and Human Development	24,102,418	998,615	
College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences	31,116,288	26,839,084	
College of Liberal Arts	54,318,131		
Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs	4,921,112	110,455	
Institute of Technology	64,985,324	1,387,000	
Law School	6,143,104		
Athletics	7,783,608		
Crookston Campus	10,658,885		
Duluth Campus	38,296,222	2,946,873	
Morris Campus	19,040,585	280,363	
Rochester Campus	7,290,417	450,000	
University Wide Academic, Research and Outreach			
Agricultural Experiment Station	3,677,138	4,005,622	
Graduate School	850,486	845,377	
Minnesota Extension	8,678,372	18,180,500	
Office of Sr. VP System Academic Admin.	2,974,095	903,573	
Office of Sr. VP Academic Affairs and Provost	8,698,836		
Office of VP Research (Centers/Institutes)	8,674,065		
Scholarly & Cultural Affairs	4,043,476		
Undergraduate Education	3,836,322		
Service and Support Units			
Auxiliary Services (initiatives)	237,813		
Student Affairs	4,313,708		
President's Office	485,253		
Equity and Diversity	1,672,939		
Unallocated by unit at time of budget approval	16,263,309	9,150,000	
Total:	\$550,345,000	\$96,472,000	\$2,157,000

Source: Office of Budget and Finance, University of Minnesota.

Leveraging Other Resources

The FY10 University operating budget approved by the Board of Regents in June, 2009 included a planned \$94.9 million internal reallocation of resources, to partially address the reduction in the state appropriation and

required cost increases, as well as limited new investments. The approved FY10 budget solution framework included the overall incremental resources presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Sources of revenue, University of Minnesota, FY 2009-10.

Revenue Source	Amount
University Reallocations	\$94.9 million
Tuition & University Fee	\$41.0 million
Change in State Appropriation	(\$81.8 million)
Total Incremental Recurring Resources	\$54.1 million
Federal-State Fiscal Stabilization Funds – Nonrecurring	\$89.3 million

Source: Office of Budget and Finance, University of Minnesota

The \$94.9 million of internal reallocation partially supported the loss of state appropriation, investments in the Neurology Department, the Translational Neuroscience initiative, the initiative on Health Informatics, faculty hires in the College of Liberal Arts, the Respiratory Protection Program, the University’s financial aid programs and so forth, as well as other unit specific strategic

initiatives and infrastructure costs in the areas of fringe benefits, utilities, debt service, and technology. Given the magnitude of the reduction in the state appropriation and some growth in infrastructure costs and program investment, each major unit of the University, and therefore instruction and support programs within those units, received fewer resources in FY10 compared to FY09.

Section 2: Tuition Rates and Fees

University policy mandates that “tuition assessments within the University of Minnesota as a public institution must reflect the shared responsibility, benefits, and needs of the state and of the individual student.”

The Board of Regents establishes tuition rates annually and factors in issues of access, choice, retention, progress toward degrees, the competitive environment, applicable state and federal policies and laws, and state appropriations to the University.

The University has taken extraordinary efforts to ensure that all qualified undergraduate students have access to its academic programs regardless of their financial background, and it has committed significant resources to its scholarship programs.

Over the period FY 2001 to FY 2009 University scholarship support for undergraduate students has increased by 155 percent. Since 2005 the University has raised more than \$300 million for its scholarship endowments.

In 2008-09, the University’s undergraduate students received \$78 million in University scholarship support—\$10 million more than the combined federal and state grant total of \$68 million.

The University of Minnesota Promise Scholarship programs provide special support to Minnesota residents.

- The Free Tuition Program will benefit 6,200 students in 2009-10. It guarantees grants and scholarships that fully cover tuition and required fees.
- The Middle Income Scholarship Program will benefit 6,800 students in 2009-10. It provides scholarships of \$500 to \$1,750 to students from families with incomes up to \$100,000.

Undergraduate Student Tuition and Fees:

Table 3 shows the 2009-10 undergraduate resident and non-resident tuition and required fees at the University of Minnesota – Twin Cities and other public Big Ten universities. Twin Cities campus undergraduate resident tuition ranked fifth within this group for 2009-10.

In terms of undergraduate non-resident tuition, the Twin Cities campus ranked tenth among the public Big Ten universities for 2009-10. Undergraduate resident and non-resident tuition and required fees data for the past 10 years is provided in Appendix A.

Table 3. 2009-10 undergraduate resident and non-resident tuition and required fees, University of Minnesota –Twin Cities and public Big Ten universities.

Institution	Rank	Resident	Rank	Non-Resident
Penn State University	1	\$14,416	5	\$25,946
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	2	12,528	3	26,670
University of Michigan	3	12,400	1	36,163
Michigan State University	4	11,383	2	27,781
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities	5	11,293	10	15,293
The Ohio State University	6	8,706	8	22,278
Purdue University	7	8,638	6	25,118
Indiana University	8	8,613	4	26,160
University of Wisconsin - Madison	9	8,314	7	23,063
University of Iowa	10	6,824	9	22,198
Comparative Group Average*	-	\$10,202	-	\$26,153

Source: National Center for Educational Statistics

* Comparative Group Average excludes the University of Minnesota.

Note: Tuition and fees may differ slightly from that reported elsewhere because of differences in reporting rules that require inclusion or exclusion of certain fees.

Table 4 shows the 2009-10 undergraduate resident and non-resident tuition and required fees at the Duluth, Morris, Crookston, and Rochester campuses and comparative institutions. Undergraduate resident tuition on the coordinate campuses ranked above that of comparative institutions for 2009-10.

In terms of undergraduate non-resident tuition, the Duluth campus ranked 15th within the comparative group for 2009-10 while the Rochester, Morris, and Crookston campuses ranked 17th, 19th, and 20th, respectively. Coordinate campus undergraduate resident and non-resident tuition and required fees data for the past 10 years is provided in Appendix A.

Table 4. 2009-10 undergraduate resident and non-resident tuition and required fees, University of Minnesota – Duluth, Morris, Crookston and peer institutions.

Institution	Rank	Resident	Rank	Non-Resident
University of Minnesota - Rochester	1	\$11,350	17	\$11,350
University of Minnesota - Duluth	2	11,038	15	13,038
University of Minnesota - Morris	3	10,715	19	10,715
University of Minnesota - Crookston	4	9,988	20	9,988
Winona State University	5	7,809	16	12,542
University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee	6	7,702	1	17,431
University of Wisconsin – La Crosse	7	7,509	9	14,081
University of Wisconsin - Stout	8	7,506	2	15,566
Bemidji State University	9	7,202	25	7,202
Southwest Minnesota State University	10	6,918	26	6,918
University of Wisconsin - Superior	11	6,736	4	14,309
University of ND - Grand Forks	12	6,727	21	9,457
University of Wisconsin - Eau Claire	13	6,629	5	14,202
University of Wisconsin - Green Bay	14	6,618	6	14,187
Minnesota State University Moorhead	15	6,598	27	6,598
University of Wisconsin - River Falls	16	6,533	7	14,106
University of Wisconsin - Stevens Point	17	6,528	8	14,101
University of Wisconsin - Whitewater	18	6,495	10	14,069
University of South Dakota - Vermillion	19	6,468	23	7,841
University of Wisconsin - Platteville	20	6,456	11	14,029
Minnesota State University - Mankato	21	6,429	3	15,416
North Dakota State University - Fargo	22	6,410	22	9,134
University of Wisconsin - Oshkosh	23	6,349	12	13,922
St. Cloud State University	24	6,330	14	13,081
University of Wisconsin - Parkside	25	6,276	13	13,849
South Dakota State University - Brookings	26	6,155	24	7,528
Metropolitan State University	27	5,628	18	11,173
Comparative Group Average	-	\$6,696	-	\$12,206

Source: National Center for Educational Statistics

* Comparative Group Average excludes University of Minnesota campuses.

Graduate and First-Professional Student Tuition and Fees

Graduate Students: Table 5 shows the 2009-10 resident and non-resident tuition and required fees for graduate students at the University of Minnesota – Twin Cities and other public Big Ten universities.

University of Minnesota graduate student

resident tuition ranked third within this group for 2009-10. In terms of graduate student non-resident tuition, the University ranked 10th among public Big Ten universities for 2009-10. Graduate tuition data for the past 10 years is provided in Appendix A.

Table 5. 2009-10 graduate resident and non-resident tuition and required fees, University of Minnesota – Twin Cities and public Big Ten universities.

Institution	Rank	Resident	Rank	Non-Resident
University of Michigan	1	\$17,475	1	\$35,133
Penn State University	2	16,258	2	28,210
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities	3	13,401	10	20,499
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	4	12,534	4	25,800
Michigan State University	5	11,948	7	23,666
Ohio State University	6	10,708	3	25,948
University of Wisconsin - Madison	7	10,518	6	25,072
Purdue University	8	8,638	5	25,118
Indiana University	9	7,898	9	21,299
University of Iowa	10	7,863	8	21,467
Comparative Group Average	-	\$11, 538	-	\$25,746

Source: National Center for Educational Statistics

* Comparative Group Average excludes the University of Minnesota.

Table 6 shows the 2009-10 resident and non-resident tuition and required fees for graduate students at the University of Minnesota - Duluth and its 23 comparative institutions.

University of Minnesota - Duluth graduate student resident tuition ranked first within the comparative group for 2009-10. In terms of graduate student non-resident tuition, the University ranked second within the comparative group for 2009-10.

Table 6. 2009-10 graduate resident and non-resident tuition and required fees, University of Minnesota – Duluth and peer institutions.

Institution	Rank	Resident	Rank	Non-Resident
University Of Minnesota - Duluth	1	\$13,408	2	\$20,506
University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee	2	9,998	1	23,664
Bemidji State University	3	8,494	22	8,494
University of Wisconsin - Stout	4	8,381	14	13,444
Southwest Minnesota State University	5	8,281	23	8,281
Winona State University	6	8,253	16	11,778
University of Wisconsin - Green Bay	7	7,956	3	18,021
Minnesota State University - Mankato	8	7,950	15	12,568
University of Wisconsin - Superior	9	7,871	4	17,936
University of Wisconsin - Stevens Point	10	7,737	5	17,802
St. Cloud State University	11	7,719	17	11,607
University of Wisconsin - Platteville	12	7,696	6	17,761
University of Wisconsin - La Crosse	13	7,672	7	17,736
University of Wisconsin - River Falls	14	7,660	8	17,725
University of Wisconsin - Eau Claire	15	7,628	9	17,693
University of Wisconsin - Parkside	16	7,618	10	17,683
University of Wisconsin - Oshkosh	17	7,578	11	17,643
Minnesota State University Moorhead	18	7,538	24	7,538
University of Wisconsin - Whitewater	19	7,507	12	17,572
University of North Dakota - Grand Forks	20	7,140	18	10,076
Metropolitan State University	21	6,937	13	13,561
North Dakota State University - Fargo	22	6,805	21	9,726
University of South Dakota - Vermillion	23	6,310	19	10,036
South Dakota State University - Brookings	24	6,059	20	9,785
Comparative Group Average	-	\$7,768	-	\$14,267

Source: National Center for Educational Statistics* Comparative Group Average excludes University of Minnesota campuses.

Section 3: Graduation Rates

As a result of University programs and efforts described on pages 26 through 29 of the *2009 University Plan, Performance, and Accountability Report*, the University is making steady and significant progress in seeing that more of its students complete their college degrees in a timely manner. Table 7 shows the University's graduation goals while Tables 8, 9, and 10 show the four-, five-, and six-year graduation rates for all students, students of color, and male and female

students on the Twin Cities, Duluth, Morris and Crookston campuses.

Further discussion and the significant progress made on the Twin Cities campus is presented on pages 30 through 34 of the *2009 University Plan, Performance, and Accountability Report*. Similar information is presented on pages 107 through 109 for the Duluth campus, pages 125 to 127 for the Morris campus and pages 138 to 140 for the Crookston campus.

Table 7. 2012 4-, 5-, and 6-year graduation goals, University of Minnesota.

Campus	4-year Graduation Goal	5-year Graduation Goal	6-year Graduation Goal
Twin Cities	60%	75%	80%
Duluth	40	60	65
Morris	60	75	80
Crookston	40	50	55

Table 8. 4-, 5-, and 6-year graduation rates, University of Minnesota, (Classes beginning in 2005-2003).

Campus	Fall 2005 Cohort		Fall 2004 Cohort		Fall 2003 Cohort	
	4-year Rate	Number of Students	5-year Rate	Number of Students	6-year Rate	Number of Students
Twin Cities	46.7	2,466	66.2	3,683	68.6	3,540
Duluth	28.5	612	54.9	1,230	57.5	1,528
Morris	50.3	179	68.7	263	66.3	273
Crookston	38.4	61	38.6	66	43.8	78

Source: University of Minnesota 2008 NHS Student Graduation/Retention Report

- Notes:
1. The Rochester campus enrolled its first class of students in 2009-10 and therefore, does not have 4-, 5-, and 6-year graduation rates.
 2. The definitions used to select first-time full-time new entering freshmen cohorts for the Duluth and Crookston campuses are slightly different than those used for federal NCES reporting. In these instances students with small numbers of post high school college level credits are included and students undecided between seeking an associate or bachelor's degree are excluded. NCES compliant numbers for these campuses are generated at the end of the spring semester and will be available in May 2010.

Table 9. 4-, 5-, and 6-year graduation rates for students of color, University of Minnesota, (Classes beginning in 2005-2003).

Campus	Fall 2005 Cohort		Fall 2004 Cohort		Fall 2003 Cohort	
	4-year Rate	Number of Students	5-year Rate	Number of Students	6-year Rate	Number of Students
Twin Cities	29.9	290	49.1	500	58.0	620
Duluth	17.3	18	43.9	61	45.1	65
Morris	32.4	22	57.6	38	48.2	27
Crookston	8.3	#	50.0	#	40.0	#

Source: University of Minnesota 2008 NHS Student Graduation/Retention Report

- Notes: 1. A pound sign (#) denotes any cohort with fewer than five students. In these cases numbers are withheld due to data privacy policies and regulations.
2. The Rochester campus enrolled its first class of students in 2009-10 and therefore, does not have 4-, 5-, and 6-year graduation rates.
3. The definitions used to select first-time full-time new entering freshmen cohorts for the Duluth and Crookston campuses are slightly different than those used for federal NCES reporting. In these instances students with small numbers of post high school college level credits are included and students undecided between seeking an associate or bachelor's degree are excluded. NCES compliant numbers for these campuses are generated at the end of the spring semester and will be available in May 2010.

Table 10. 4-, 5-, and 6-year graduation rates for male and female students, University of Minnesota, (Classes beginning in 2005-2003).

Campus	Fall 2005 Cohort				Fall 2004 Cohort				Fall 2003 Cohort			
	4-year Rate		5-year Rate		4-year Rate		5-year Rate		6-year Rate		6-year Rate	
	Male	Number	Female	Number	Male	Number	Female	Number	Male	Number	Female	Number
Twin Cities	41.9	1,012	50.9	1,451	64.2	1,590	67.8	2083	65.6	1,533	71.2	2,001
Duluth	23.8	261	33.7	346	52.7	564	57.0	664	57.0	624	58.1	630
Morris	45.6	67	54.4	112	68.2	101	69.2	162	63.8	104	67.9	169
Crookston	32.2	29	47.8	32	36.5	35	40.5	30	41.5	44	48.5	32

Source: University of Minnesota 2008 NHS Student Graduation/Retention Report

- Notes: 1. The Rochester campus enrolled its first class of students in 2009-10 and therefore, does not have 4-, 5-, and 6-year graduation rates.
2. The definitions used to select first-time full-time new entering freshmen cohorts for the Duluth and Crookston campuses are slightly different than those used for federal NCES reporting. In these instances students with small numbers of post high school college level credits are included and students undecided between seeking an associate or bachelor's degree are excluded. NCES compliant numbers for these campuses are generated at the end of the spring semester and will be available in May 2010.

Section 4: Undergraduate Enrollment

The University's efforts to strengthen the preparation of prospective students, attract the best students to apply for admission, and ensure affordable access for all admitted students are described on pages 17 through 20 of the *University Plan, Performance, and Accountability Report*.

Tables 11 through 14 show the most recent student enrollment based on racial or ethnic group on each of the University's four

campuses. An analysis of progress made toward enrolling underrepresented students on the Twin Cities campus is presented on pages 23 through 25 of the 2009 *University Plan, Performance, and Accountability Report*. Similar information is provided on pages 106 through 107 for the Duluth campus, pages 124 to 125 for the Morris campus and pages 136 to 138 for the Crookston campus.

Table 11. Number and proportion of students by racial/ethnic group, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, Fall 2009.

	2009 Enrollment	2009 Percent Enrolled
Caucasian	36,413	77.5%
Total Students of Color	8,023	17.1%
African American	2,158	4.6%
American Indian	508	1.1%
Asian/Pacific Islander	4,211	9.0%
Chicano/Hispanic	1,146	2.4%
Not Reported	2,547	5.4%
Total Domestic Students	46,983	100%

	2009 Enrollment	2009 Percent Enrolled
Total Domestic Students	46,983	90.9%
International Students	4,676	9.1%
Total Students	51,659	100%

Table 12. Number and proportion of students by racial/ethnic group, University of Minnesota-Duluth, Fall 2009.

	2009 Enrollment	2009 Percent Enrolled
Caucasian	9,992	87.6%
Total Students of Color	779	6.8%
African American	152	1.3%
American Indian	162	1.4%
Asian/Pacific Islander	346	3.0%
Chicano/Hispanic	119	1.0%
Not Reported	641	5.6%
Total Domestic Students	11,412	100%

	2009 Enrollment	2009 Percent Enrolled
Total Domestic Students	11,412	97.8%
International Students	252	2.2%
Total Students	11,664	100%

Table 13. Number and proportion of students by racial/ethnic group, University of Minnesota-Morris, Fall 2009.

	2009 Enrollment	2009 Percent Enrolled
Caucasian	1,269	77.7%
Total Students of Color	323	19.8%
African American	42	2.6%
American Indian	203	12.4%
Asian/Pacific Islander	51	3.1%
Chicano/Hispanic	27	1.7%
Not Reported	41	2.5%
Total Domestic Students	1,633	100%

	2009 Enrollment	2009 Percent Enrolled
Total Domestic Students	1,633	95.8%
International Students	72	4.2%
Total Students	1,705	100%

Table 14. Number and proportion of students by racial/ethnic group, University of Minnesota-Crookston, Fall 2009.

	2009 Enrollment	2009 Percent Enrolled
Caucasian	1,336	61.9%
Total Students of Color	163	7.6%
African American	72	3.3%
American Indian	24	1.1%
Asian/Pacific Islander	30	1.4%
Chicano/Hispanic	37	1.7%
Not Reported	659	30.5%
Total Domestic Students	1,633	100%

	2009 Enrollment	2009 Percent Enrolled
Total Domestic Students	1,633	94.7%
International Students	121	5.3%
Total Students	1,705	100%

Note: Excludes CHIS (College in the High School Program) students

Table 11. Number and proportion of students by racial/ethnic group, University of Minnesota-Rochester, Fall 2009.

	2009 Enrollment	2009 Percent Enrolled
Caucasian	46	80.7%
Total Students of Color	3	5.3%
African American	1	1.8%
American Indian	0	0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2	3.5%
Chicano/Hispanic	0	0%
Not Reported	8	14.0%
International	0	0%
Total Students	57	100%

Section 5: University Research

The latest data released by the National Science Foundation (NSF), covering research performance for 2008, show that the University of Minnesota posted the largest percentage increase (9.5 percent) in research and development (R&D) expenditures among all institutions listed in the NSF's top-20 ranking list (see Table 15). Research expenditures have increased nearly 30 percent since 2004, giving the University the third-largest growth in research volume among the 12 public institutions included in the top 20, and the fourth largest among the top-20 private and public institutions.

The University maintains its rank as the nation's ninth leading public research university based on the NSF R&D expenditure data. Although there is considerable variation in relative rankings among fields of study

based on citations of scholarly works of the faculty, in virtually all categories the University also ranks among the top-10 public universities. Based on these common, recognized metrics, the University has established a record of performance that identifies it as one of the leading research universities in the country.

A thorough discussion of the investments, strategies, and progress made is presented in the Board of Regents *Annual Research Report*, <http://www.research.umn.edu/stats.html> and on pages 87 through 92 of the *University Plan, Performance, and Accountability Report*. Furthermore, more detailed data regarding the University's and its comparative group institutions' total research expenditures and technology commercialization are presented on pages 93 through 99 of that report.

Table 15. Top 20 Institutions Reporting Largest R&D Expenditures in Science and Engineering

2008 Rank (All)		Institution	2008			2004 - 2008		
			Total \$	Percent Increase	Rank (Publics)	Growth Since 2004	Rank (All)	Rank (Publics)
		All R&D expenditures ^a	\$51,908	5.0%		20.9%		
		Leading 20 institutions	15,363	4.7%		19.2%		
1		Johns Hopkins University ^b	1,681	8.2%		22.3%	8	
2		University of California - San Francisco	885	5.0%	1	21.6%	9	7
3		University of Wisconsin - Madison	882	4.9%	2	15.5%	14	10
4		University of Michigan (all campuses)	876	8.3%	3	13.9%	15	11
5		University of California - Los Angeles	871	5.8%	4	12.7%	17	12
6		University of California - San Diego	842	5.4%	5	18.8%	11	8
7		Duke University	767	-1.9%		47.2%	1	
8		University of Washington	765	1.1%	6	7.1%	19	14
9		University of Pennsylvania	708	9.3%		18.6%	12	
10		Ohio State University (all campuses)	703	-2.4%	7	35.7%	2	1
11		Penn State University (all campuses)	701	7.5%	8	16.8%	13	9
12		Stanford University	688	0.0%		2.5%	20	
13		University of Minnesota (all campuses)	683	9.5%	9	29.9%	4	3
14		MA Institute of Technology	660	7.5%		21.6%	10	
15		Cornell University (all campuses)	654	1.9%		13.5%	16	
16		University of California - Davis	643	7.0%	10	25.6%	7	6
17		University of Pittsburgh	596	6.6%	11	29.0%	5	4
18		University of California - Berkeley	592	7.3%	12	12.6%	18	13
19		University of Florida	584	-1.5%	13	30.6%	3	2
20		Texas A&M University	582	7.0%	14	27.4%	6	5
		All other surveyed institutions	\$34,909	0.4%		25.6%		

^a Excludes R&D performed by university-administered federally funded research and development centers.

^b The Johns Hopkins University includes the Applied Physics Laboratory, total R&D expenditures for which were \$778 in FY 2007, \$845 million in FY 2008.

Source: National Science Foundation

Patenting and Licensing

Despite the state and national recession over the past 18-24 months, the University's overall technology commercialization revenue increased nearly 10 percent, to a total of \$95 million. As shown in Table 16 the number of agreements providing financial returns showed a healthy increase of nine percent in FY2009. Although the significant decline in the number of new licenses issued could be interpreted as a negative indicator, the decrease represents a deliberate decision to focus on high-value

agreements that the University believes will yield better financial results. In the past fiscal year the University increased the number of invention disclosures from faculty and staff by 12 percent. The University's efforts to focus on promising technologies and improved confidence of faculty in the new commercialization operation are yielding positive results as it continues to strengthen the intellectual property pipeline and focus its efforts on the development and marketing of

high-value innovations. As the statistics in Table 16 bear out, the transformation of technology commercialization operation over the past three years is now bearing fruit. In fact, the University is now being sought out by peer institutions as a benchmark for best practices in university technology transfer operations.

University-based technologies have figured prominently in the launch of 11 new companies over the past two years. Recognizing the

importance of establishing a successful entrepreneurial ecosystem in Minnesota, the University has been working with partners in the public and private sector to encourage the State of Minnesota to develop a cohesive, statewide strategy for nurturing and developing biotech and other key industries in the state. Economic development requires an entrepreneurial ecosystem that encourages and supports innovation through creative, forward-thinking public policy that incents and nurtures its development into thriving companies.

Table 16. University of Minnesota Technology Commercialization Data

	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	FY2007	FY2008	FY2009
Disclosures	219	224	251	230	193	217	244
New U.S. Patent Filings	73	82	104	84	51	52	65
New Licenses	58	101	86	85	77	63	44
Start-Ups	3	4	1	3	4	2	1
U.S. Patents Issued	56	43	54	29	44	37	n/a
Current Revenue Generating Agreements	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	281	306
Gross Revenues (million)	\$39.5	\$48.4	\$48.70	\$57.8	\$65.2	\$86.9	\$95.2
Outgoing Material Transfer Agreements	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	67	106

Source: Office for Technology Commercialization

Appendix A: Tuition Rates and Required Fees, 10-year History

Table 17. 1999-2010 undergraduate resident and non-resident tuition and required fees, University of Minnesota – Crookston and University of Minnesota – Morris.

	UM Crookston Undergraduate Resident	UM Crookston Undergraduate Nonresident	UM Morris Undergraduate Resident	UM Morris Undergraduate Nonresident
1999-2000	\$3,600	\$3,600	\$4,778	\$9,540
2000-2001	\$4,060	\$4,060	\$5,567	\$10,599
2001-2002	\$5,626	\$5,626	\$6,142	\$6,142
2002-2003	\$6,098	\$6,098	\$7,154	\$7,154
2003-2004	\$6,780	\$6,780	\$7,990	\$7,990
2004-2005	\$7,607	\$7,607	\$9,056	\$9,056
2005-2006	\$8,097	\$8,097	\$9,721	\$9,721
2006-2007	\$8,568	\$8,568	\$10,312	\$10,312
2007-2008	\$8,822	\$8,822	\$9,331	\$9,331
2008-2009	\$9,381	\$9,381	\$10,006	\$10,006
2009-2010	\$9,988	\$9,988	\$10,715	\$10,715

Source: Office of Institutional Research, University of Minnesota

Table 18. 1999-2010 undergraduate and graduate, resident and non-resident tuition and required fees, University of Minnesota – Duluth.

	Duluth Undergraduate Resident	Duluth Undergraduate Nonresident	Duluth Graduate Resident	Duluth Graduate Nonresident
1999-2000	\$4,599	\$12,369	\$5,409	\$10,269
2000-2001	\$4,818	\$13,015	\$5,673	\$10,800
2001-2002	\$5,421	\$14,459	\$6,364	\$12,017
2002-2003	\$6,259	\$16,517	\$7,476	\$14,033
2003-2004	\$6,968	\$17,332	\$8,368	\$15,467
2004-2005	\$7,934	\$19,039	\$9,397	\$16,496
2005-2006	\$8,512	\$19,619	\$10,103	\$17,203
2006-2007	\$9,042	\$20,150	\$10,739	\$17,837
2007-2008	\$9,606	\$19,232	\$11,640	\$18,738
2008-2009	\$10,279	\$19,905	\$13,408	\$20,506
2009-2010	\$11,038	\$13,038	\$13,408	\$20,506

Source: Office of Institutional Research, University of Minnesota

Table 19. 1999-2010 undergraduate and graduate, resident and non-resident tuition and required fees, University of Minnesota – Twin Cities.

	Twin Cities Undergraduate Resident	Twin Cities Undergraduate Nonresident	Twin Cities Graduate Resident	Twin Cities Graduate Nonresident
1999-2000	\$4,649	\$12,789	\$5,517	\$10,377
2000-2001	\$4,877	\$13,463	\$5,794	\$10,921
2001-2002	\$5,536	\$15,002	\$6,547	\$12,200
2002-2003	\$6,280	\$16,854	\$7,662	\$14,220
2003-2004	\$7,116	\$18,746	\$8,517	\$15,616
2004-2005	\$8,029	\$19,659	\$9,525	\$16,624
2005-2006	\$8,622	\$20,252	\$9,655	\$17,330
2006-2007	\$9,173	\$20,803	\$10,887	\$17,985
2007-2008	\$9,598	\$21,228	\$11,388	\$18,486
2008-2009	\$10,634	\$14,634	\$12,603	\$19,701
2009-2010	\$11,293	\$15,293	\$13,401	\$20,499

Source: Office of Institutional Research, University of Minnesota