Committee members present: Mary Ellen Becker, Chair, Amir Arbisser, David Neil, Sue Erickson Nieland, Jenny Rokes, President John Forsyth (ex officio)

Call to Order, Introductory Comments

Regent Becker called the meeting to order at 3:45 p.m.

Regent Becker reported the IBSSS Task Force was making good progress. The Task Force has asked for permission to move the report with recommendations from the March Board meeting to May or June.

EDU 1. Approval of Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION</th>
<th>Regent Nieland moved to accept the previous minutes, dated September 14, 2004. Regent Rokes seconded the motion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDU 2. Graduation and Retention Rates Report

Comments from Dr. Gonzalez, Assistant Director, Academic Affairs

Dr. Gonzalez said that the report has been streamlined to be more focused on a few key items. However, all the tables the Committee has seen in the past that are not included in the report are available on the Board of Regents' web site.

Dr. Gonzalez said one new feature of the report is the inclusion of the non-persistence study results. In addition, using data from the National Student Clearing House, the report indicates that approximately 65% of the first-time full-time freshman students in Fall 2002 who did not return the next year transferred to another institution.

There was an increase in the one year retention rate for the three institutions. The average for the three is 82%, which compares to the national average of 73%.
The six-year graduation rates at the University of Iowa and Iowa State University are at an all time high. The average for the three institutions is 65% and compares to the NCAA Division I average of 60% and the national average for public four year universities of 55%.

An item in the docket memo highlights strategies that each of the Universities have instituted regarding retention.

- The University of Iowa has continued to focus on the four year graduation plan. In addition, the university has implemented a program called College Transition, which is a first-year experience course to help students become acclimated to the University.

- Iowa State University’s first-year retention data for students participating in learning communities are higher than for the general population. In addition, ISU has instituted academic assistance programs, such as supplemental instruction, to help students succeed, especially in the science courses.

- One of the initiatives at the University of Northern Iowa is their Plan of Study. UNI was selected as one of 12 campuses to serve in a study of best practices leading to high retention and graduation rates, which are significantly higher than their peers.

Regent Nieland referred to the graduation rates differences between institutions. Dr. Gonzalez said that one factor that affects graduation rates is the selectivity of institutions in terms of the numbers and types of students they admit. For instance, the University of Michigan is classified as a highly selective institution. President Geoffroy further stated that there is a general correlation of ACT scores with six-year graduation rates.

Regent Becker added that ACT scores relate to retention and are also associated with the number of high level courses the students have taken in high school. Hopefully, if there are changes through the system to help support the students, those numbers will be raised higher than they are now.

Regent Neil said he liked the new report format because it generates conversation to develop policies. The appendices were helpful. Regent Becker said that there might be some unintended questions if admission standards were changed such as limiting opportunities for some students who, not due to their own fault, have potential but haven’t been guided very well in terms of what to take.

Regent Neil asked for information about national best practices. Which ones have the Regent universities adopted? In order to maximize scarce resources, it is in the best interests of the Regent enterprise to achieve the highest graduation rates possible. Regent Neil said the goal should be to figure out what is in the best interest of that student. Regent Rokes said there is significant variation at the high school level. The cutoff GPA at one high school might be significantly different from the cutoff GPA at another school.

After extensive discussion of the report, Regent Becker asked if each institution would speak about two things from the discussion. One, as students are being admitted, how do they adjust for the large school, like West High and Iowa City, where the upper half may actually have higher scores on ACT, than another school. Secondly, are there some things between the Board Office and the institutions that the Universities can provide that would help the Board with policy direction. The Board doesn’t want to limit opportunity for students; they also don’t want students to be expending a lot of funds and not being able to make it at the institutions. There are dual responsibilities for supporting students once they get in, and are the right students attending.
Comments of President Geoffroy, Iowa State University

President Geoffroy said that if a student is in the top half of their high school graduating class in Iowa, and have met the minimum core expectations, regardless of grade point average, they are accepted.

Regent Becker asked if individuals would be eliminated if they were not in the top half, but had a high enough ACT. President Geoffroy said that ISU has a sliding scale. If students are not in the top half, ISU looks at the class rank, and the ACT score before deciding. He said he’d be very careful about considering a proposal to raise the admissions requirements above that 50%. That works in Iowa because of the generally high quality of the K-12 system. There are a lot of students that come to Iowa State University who do extremely well, who are close to that 50% cutoff. It’s a combination of work ethic, maturing, etc. At Iowa State, they wouldn’t want to see the University diminish the opportunity for education for those students. They are very pleased with the way it works currently.

Comments of President Koob, University of Northern Iowa

President Koob said that admission of the top 50% seems to work quite well. Every year, UNI plots the success of students by GPA and high school rank. There are qualified students that finish below the 50th percentile that are admitted by a formula similar to what President Geoffroy described, that succeed better than those that fall right at the 50th percentile. He said that the second case supporting President Geoffroy’s comments on the quality of high schools is a comparison within the peer group for UN. California State University, Fresno’s graduation rate is 46%. They only admit from the top 1/3rd of the California graduating classes. Yet, while their selectivity is much higher than the University of Northern Iowa’s, UNI’s graduation far exceeds theirs.

President Koob said he came from an institution where they admitted the top 12% right in the middle of the UC system and the students at UNI, admitting the top 50, performed better on the average than the other students. That’s a direct reflection of the quality of Iowa high schools. Anything that we use for comparisons nationally has to take into account the quality of the education Iowa is receiving pre-college.

Comments of Associate Provost Lopes, University of Iowa

The University of Iowa also uses a sliding scale to make assessments of students who do less well than the top ½ in their high school class. In the data available on the web site, there are breakdowns by graduation rates by high school rank and ACT scores. Those show very clearly that students who are in the lower levels of both kinds of thresholds, have a much harder time graduating. The six-year graduation rates for those groups are down in the 50s. There’s no doubt that with a broader range of students admitted, they are admitting some that will bring the graduation rate down.

Comments of Provost Hogan, University of Iowa

Provost Hogan said he would like to have a discussion about the admission requirements. He would favor giving institutions a little more flexibility when it comes to the requirements, to get a better match. That would be good for the students, would improve retention, graduation and it would be good for the institution. It would also be good for the resources that are available to the institution and the Regent’s system. This could be a complicated issue, take a long discussion and would involve more than the Regents’ institutions. It would have to involve how the community college system is being utilized. As students enter community college, even if they had a 22 or 23 ACT score and they take the right course that first year and transfer, they’ll graduate at a very successful rate.
Regent Becker said the Committee should think about partnering with Iowa high schools to help their students be more ready, rather than just changing the bar. She said there are data that show more students graduate if they begin in a four year college. The community colleges have said that some students never intend to go through four years, which makes it hard to measure.

President Geoffroy said the ACT just released a comprehensive study of what works in student retention for multiple kinds of institutions. Regent Becker suggested that we consider referring this to the Council of Provosts to bring a proposal to the Education and Student Affairs Committee and request a practical time line for that report to the Education Committee. Obviously, there is a lot of interest in this topic.

Regent Neil said that the group can look at the best practices studies to determine which ones were being done, which ones could reasonably be done and which ones wouldn’t be done for whatever reason.

EDU 3. 2 + 2 Council Report

Comments from Dr. Gonzalez, Assistant Director, Academic Affairs

Dr. Gonzalez made brief comments on the 2+2 Council. It was created in December, 2001 by the Board of Regents Priority Study Group. Its purpose was to enhance articulation agreements between the Regent Universities and Iowa community colleges and to encourage the development of new agreements, especially for place-bound students.

In the last year, the Council addressed three objectives. The first objective was the development of a gateway web site. That team was led by Dr. Guy Aylward, Vice President of Instruction at Hawkeye Community College. The second objective was to study the future role of the Council. That effort was led by Dr. Chris Russell, Vice President of Instruction at Iowa Valley Community College. The third objective was to investigate the development of a program of study at the Regent universities for community college students who had completed an Associate of Applied Science program. That effort was headed by Dr. Ann Zalenski from the University of Iowa.

Dr. Gonzalez gave a brief demonstration of the gateway web site. The purpose of this web site is to enhance information available to students interested in transferring. The University of Iowa is the host for the web site. This web site is designed for students transferring from a public community college in Iowa to a Regent university.

Comments of Associate Provost Lola Lopes, University of Iowa, Co-Chair for 2+2 Council

Associate Provost Lopes talked about a new program that will be offered to students who graduate from community colleges with an Associate of Applied Science degree (AAS). While there is an articulation process for graduates of an AA degree who transfer to a Regent university for a bachelor’s degree, students who graduate with a technical degree, such as an AAS, and who want to obtain a four year degree after they’re out in the work force haven’t been able to articulate into a four year program.

The Council tried to build something that would be parallel to the Bachelor of Liberal Studies degree. That is a distance program for individuals wanting to complete a four year degree who are place-bound. They developed something that is aimed at students who have an AAS degree and wish to obtain a four year degree through this education. The program is called the Bachelor of Applied Studies. The program will require that an individual must have worked at least three years to be admitted into the program.
If the program is approved by the Board, it will be offered by the University of Iowa. It will be available completely by distance and will allow students who have the two year technical degree to complete a bachelor’s degree by taking courses from a variety of areas. Basically, they will need to take courses in three different study areas. Students will be able to take courses on the ICN or on the web; they can also do GIS or take some courses at colleges that may be closeby. It’s a very flexible program and it will serve this population very effectively, just as the Bachelor of Liberal Studies does. Regent Neil asked why there was a requirement to work for three years. Associate Provost Lopes said this program was designed for a group of mature students.

Regent Neil asked what kind of interaction the Council had with the business community regarding the BAS program and if the business community saw value in the program. Dr. Gonzalez said that the community colleges have strong letters of endorsement from both the community college presidents and chief academic officers. The push for this program came from the community colleges, because they felt their students did not have a continuation pathway.

Comments of Kim Linduska, Executive Vice President of Instruction at DMACC, Co-Chair for 2+2 Council

Dr. Linduska talked about the transfer web site. She said the process of transfer for community college students is really easier than the perception of the process of transfer. It’s frightening for some community college students to leave their local community college and go to one of the big Regent schools. The earlier discussion on preparing students is very relevant. Community colleges are seeing more and more students coming to the community college first and then transferring for a variety of reasons, cost being one reason. Even though the existing process is good, she said they need to work harder to make it better, because when you lose students, you do lose them for good. The community colleges can take those students and put them in smaller classes, nurture them and give them back, so that everybody wins.

Dr. Linduska commented on the Bachelor of Applied Studies degree. It has been something the community colleges have been interested in for a long time. They prepare students very well in computer programming, business administration, accounting and other areas. They don’t have the background in English and humanities and some of the liberal arts studies. Graduates go to the workplace and do a very fine job working next to the bachelor degree colleagues and understand very quickly that they cannot move up in a company without a bachelor’s degree.

Regent Becker asked if the Council had thought about marketing strategies for those people that are out in the field now. How does the Council plan on rolling out the information? Dr. Linduska said they don’t have a marketing plan yet. At this point, they have sent the proposal forward to ISU and UNI to get their initial reactions. Then it will need to come to the Committee for full approval. They do know this program will need to be marketed through radio spots, through newspaper ads, and through networks of employers.

Regent Neil said he liked the close working relationship between the community colleges and the Regents. He thought they needed to go farther down that road for the public to understand the full value of public education and public higher education. He encouraged the Committee as they go forward to reach out to the business communities so there is a better understanding of what they expect.

Regent Newlin asked if the 2+2 Council would continue to function. Regent Becker said there was more analysis to be done, in particular on the internal procedures that go through the Board Office. She said the Board Office is going to look at some recommendations in terms of future collaborative efforts and how that might look, perhaps differently than the current structure, to keep allowing this
good collaboration and help the students more forward. Regent Forsyth said he thought this is really exciting and the good collaboration and said that was what Regent Newlin was suggesting.

Regent Becker asked Carol Bradley, Acting Director, Academic Affairs, to talk about that the future of the 2+2 Council. Carol said everyone agrees this has been excellent work and that the 2+2 Council has made great strides. The question is that there are several sub-committees that seem to be working in somewhat related areas. The 2+2 Council, the Regents Committee on Educational Relations, the Liaison Advisory Committee on Transfer Students. The notion was that the Board Office should take one more look at all of those subcommittees and see that there isn’t unnecessary duplication and that people are in the right spots to get the job done.

President Forsyth said process improvement is great, especially if you could take three groups and make them one. Regent Becker said she thought that was the intent, to work to try and find efficiencies and be respectful of peoples’ time. President Forsythe said they would want to enhance relationships and would want to improve the student experience and outcomes. If that can be done with one group instead of three groups, that’s good. From a policy perspective, he feels the group is excited about this and wants to encourage it.

Regent Becker said they appreciated the presentation of the recommendations. They sound great and will try and quickly move the Regents’ process in terms of that degree, it sounds like all the background work has been done.

**EDU 4. Fall 2004 Enrollment Report**

*Comments from Dr. Gonzalez, Assistant Director, Academic Affairs*

Dr. Gonzalez wanted to comment on three items in the Enrollment Report. In addition to the fact that it has been streamlined, the tables for the report are on the Board’s web site.

One of the characteristics in the report is the number of new freshman. This year the new freshmen represent approximately 18% of the total undergraduate enrollment. However, this is the third consecutive year of a decrease in the number of new freshmen.

In terms of diversity, there has been an increase in the number of racial and ethnic minority students this year. That pattern has existed for approximately ten years. The largest increase occurred at the University of Iowa.

The enrollment are projected to decrease over the next 10 years. Obviously 10 year enrollment projections are subject to change, but they are projected to decrease by approximately 2300 students, which amounts to a 3% decrease.

Dr. Gonzalez noted that recently the Council of Provosts approved a change in the calculation of FTEs. Currently, one FTE equals 15.5 credit hours. RCER proposed a change to the Provosts from 15.5 to 15.0 credit hours. Beginning with next year’s report, the FTE calculation will be based on a divisor of 15.
EDU 5. For Referral to ICEC and Board Office

A. Catalog Changes – ISU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION</th>
<th>Regent Neil moved that the revisions be forwarded to the ICEC for review and recommendations. Regent Rokes seconded the motion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Name Change for Department of Chemical Engineering – ISU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION</th>
<th>Regent Neil moved that the following proposal be forwarded to the ICEC for review: That the name of the Department of Chemical Engineering at Iowa State University be changed to the Department of Chemical and Biological Engineering. Regent Nieland seconded the motion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was discussion about the sequence of referring items to the ICEC and Board Office for review before they are brought to the Education and Student Affairs Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION</th>
<th>Regent Neil moved that information be reviewed by ICEC first and then come back to the Education and Student Affairs Committee for review. Regent Nieland seconded the motion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regent Becker asked Provost Hogan if there had been any changes in the previous reports since the they have already been seen by the Committee. Dr. Hogan said there hadn’t been any.

C. Post Audit Reports

- Ph.D. Health and Human Performance – ISU
- M.S. and Ph.D. Bioinformatics and Computational Biology - ISU

Using the existing procedure, the post audit reports were referred to the ICEC and Board Office for review.

EDU 6. Reports from ICEC and Board Office

A. Post Audit Reports

- Graduate Program in Translational Biomedicine – SUI
- Master of Computer Science – SUI
- Ph.D. in Second Language Acquisition – SUI
B. Academic Program Requests

- B.S. and M.S. Diet and Exercises – ISU
- M.S. Degree Program in Enterprise Computing - ISU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION</th>
<th>Regent Neil made a motion that reports from Item 6A. and 6B be approved and referred to the Board for approval. Regent Rokes seconded the motion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regent Forsyth suggested that, in the future, the reports include a comparison of current performance with projected performance.

EDU 7. Faculty Activities Report Update

Comments from Dr. Gonzalez, Assistant Director, Academic Affairs

Dr. Gonzalez reported that the Faculty Activities Report would be presented in May. At the last meeting, the Committee asked the Board Office and the institutions to look at the process for putting together a Faculty Activities Report, because the Committee wants the report to be continued.

A planning team of Board Office and institutional representatives looked at possibilities for a restructured report, including the Delaware study, portfolio analysis, and case studies. Ultimately, the team looked at some of the things that had been done at other institutions and found a process that had been used by the Board of Regents in Arizona that included a series of questions revolving around faculty activities. The team focused the proposed report on those questions.

A proposal was made by the team for the Committee to approve the format for Faculty Activities Report. The team also suggested it could be a biennial report, because the trend data have shown there is not a lot of change. After 2005, the following report would be in 2007.

Regent Becker clarified that they wanted the Committee to approve the new format, so they can move forward and have it prepared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION</th>
<th>Regent Neil made a motion to approve the new format for the Faculty Activities Report. Regent Nieland seconded the motion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDU 8. College Combination: College of Family and Consumer Sciences and College of Education - ISU

Comments from President Geoffroy, Iowa State University

President Geoffroy introduced Pam White, the Interim Dean of the College of Family and Consumer Sciences and Gary Thomas, the Interim Dean for the College of Education. He said both were closely associated in this endeavor.

The docket book provides a summary of the proposal for combining the Colleges of Education and Family and Consumer Sciences into a single new college.
Discussions about this organizational change began about one year ago. In February 2004, Provost Allen appointed a planning committee to begin working out the details and investigating the feasibility of combining the two colleges. The committees worked very cooperatively with a great spirit of collegiality over the last nine months. Various work groups were appointed to work on different portions of the plan, involving students, faculty, staff, and alumni in some cases. They held many open forums and received input from a number of different groups. The plan was finalized in October, 2004. The plan was then placed before the faculty of the two colleges for advisory voting and the faculties voted 79% to endorse the plan and send it forward.

At the same time, one of the key work groups spent considerable time thinking about the name of the new college. They began work last May and started by putting together a long list of possibilities. They held open forums and various straw ballots and eventually narrowed the list to a shorter list of four names that seemed to be most favorable. They put those four names to broad based straw vote and took the top two of those names, which were Human Sciences and Education, Family and Consumer Sciences and asked the faculty of the two colleges to vote on those two names at the same time they were voting on the plan to combine the colleges. The faculty voted 60% in favor of the name Human Sciences and 37% for Education, Family and Consumer Sciences. The planning committee recommended proceeding with the name College of Human Sciences.

President Geoffroy said he accepted the proposal and forwarded it to the faculty senate for review and advice in accordance with the University’s policy on academic reorganization. The faculty senate had an extensive debate on the proposal. It was clear from the discussion there was very strong support for the combination, but very mixed opinions on the proposed name for the college. The final vote of the full senate was 34-33 in favor of the entire proposal with the name Human Sciences.

Along the way, the senate convened into a committee of the whole, to take a sense of their thinking and they broke the issue into two parts. The senate and the committee as a whole voted 60-8 in favor of the combination, an overwhelming majority. The vote on the name was mixed, but negative, 37-31. They came back together, considered the whole thing together and voted 33-33 and the President of the Senate had to cast the deciding vote.

According the University’s policy on academic reorganization, the senate vote is advisory to the President. After considerable reflection and consultation this past week with the leadership of the senate, with the two deans, with the provost office staff and reviewing this large binder that the naming committee put together, detailing their work over the last six months, President Geoffroy said he decided to accept the full proposal and recommend that the Board approve the proposal to combine the Colleges of Education and Family Consumer Sciences into a single new college, that would be named the College of Human Sciences.

President Geoffroy said the two colleges worked extremely hard over the last nine months to put this proposal together. There is a real spirit of moving forward and cooperating that has been formed as a result of this effort. The faculty in the two colleges voted this name as their preferred name; it’s what they wanted. In the end, President Geoffroy said he decided to support the faculty and the two colleges. President Geoffroy recommended that the Board approve the name College of Human Sciences.

Comments of Gary Thomas, Interim Dean for the College of Education, Iowa State University

Dr. Thomas said the choice of names was somewhat limited and he and Dr. White believe that Human Sciences is a very forward-looking name, that it captures what the six departments in this college are about. In fact, three of those six departments have “Human” in their title and those are the only three departments at the University with “Human” in their title. He said the name is becoming
increasingly recognized on a national level. Some people question whether education is appropriately described there or not, but he believes it is, that in fact the approach one takes in education is a scientific study of children and adults. They do a systematic approach in trying to understand those children and adults and provide education. He said they do think they fit under that title.

Comments of Pam White, Interim Dean for the College of Family and Consumer Sciences, Iowa State University.

Dr. White said the term “Human Sciences” is defined by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC). This particular organization is the larger organization that Iowa State University belongs to as a land-grant university. They define the “Human Sciences” unit as having most all of the units present in this to-be-combined college.

When trying to rename a college, it is important that the name reflect the timing when a unit is developed or when it underwent change. For example, if you take Family and Consumer Science, it actually began many years ago as a domestic science program. Then it was a home economics program. Then it was a family consumer science program. Now, Human Science is a name that has been evolving to describe units that will be similar to this one.

Human Sciences is a very powerful way to describe the disciplines that are in the program and that reflect the fact that both FCS and education have evolved over time to include more depth in their disciplines. This new college will be the principal college on campus to address world issues of increasing importance, such as quality of life and preparation for children for a dynamic future. The college will bring together many faculty and staff with expertise in those areas and will improve the quality of life for individuals, families, the community and the school. All that is encompassed in that name, Human Sciences. The name is visionary, it’s futuristic, it’s inclusive, it’s unifying, it’s fresh, it’s short and it’s memorable.

Comments from Provost Allen, Iowa State University

Provost Allen wanted to add that the alumni of the two colleges are passionate about their schools, their education and their departments. He feels that’s very positive and that they do care about what is going on.

He said he also has the trust and faith in the faculty, staff, and students at Iowa State for the way they managed this difficult process. Starting about a year ago, they had some tough issues. As they worked through the issues, people started seeing how they could work together to make this happen, to build something bigger out of two pieces than what could be done individually.

He said it was very important to pick good leadership when you do something of this magnitude. This outcome is in alignment with the mission of the university and will make these two colleges stronger.

Regent Becker commended all the individuals involved with the process. There was a lot of input from alumni, faculty and students and the Board appreciates the passion they bring to it. The Board looked at it very carefully to make sure they were coming up with the direction that was appropriate.

Regent Nieland said she believes in the strength of diversity and wished the college luck. She said the group convinced her that the name is a best practice.

Regent Neil complimented everyone involved in showing sensitivity for everybody’s feelings. This was not an easy decision, there was a lot of emotion involved. He wished the college luck.
Regent Neil made a motion to approve the combining the College of Education and the College of Family and Consumer Sciences into a single college named the College of Human Sciences. Regent Nieland seconded the motion.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

EDU 9. Professional Development Assignments Request

*Comments by Tony Girardi, Assistant Director, Academic Affairs*

At the college level, the Provosts signed off on the requests, and they have been reviewed at the Board Office and they are recommended for approval.

Regent Neil made a motion to approve the Professional Development Assignments. Regent Rokes seconded the motion.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

EDU 10. Accreditation Reports

- *Greenlee School of Journalism and Communication*
- *Bachelor of Fine Arts in Interior Design*

*Comments from Provost Allen, Iowa State University*

Provost Allen reported that both of the above programs underwent accreditation review, had self-studies prepared, had campus visits and both were very successful in that process. He said they were very pleased they both passed the test.

Regent Becker said several meetings ago, the Committee requested that the focus of the accreditation reports be on things that impact students. She said it seemed these two were.

Provost Allen said the one on Interior Design had very carefully looked at what students needed to be successful once they earned their degrees. He thought it was the case in both schools.
EDU 11. Lakeside Laboratory

Comments of Dr. Barak, Senior Consultant

Dr. Barak said that last spring they reported to the Board that the Lakeside Lab Coordinating Committee, which is comprised of the three provosts, himself and a member of the Lakeside community, had entered into an agreement with the State Extension Service to develop a business plan for Lakeside Lab. The idea was to get the lab into the position of more self-sufficiency in terms of the finances and makes some programmatic changes, such as year-round programming and things that needed to be done.

That plan has now been completed and the Board has a copy. The plan has been approved by the Lakeside Lab Coordinating Committee and is ready to go forward. He said they are looking forward to three years of tremendous progress in Lakeside Lab, both in terms of the program and finances.

Also, they have in mind that in three years, they would reassess the situation and see where they stand, see if they achieved the goals they set out and may be back to the Board to discuss further plans.

The Lakeside Lab Coordinating Committee has engaged the services of two individuals on an interim basis to fill the Director of Operations and Outreach position, which is part time and the Director of Academics and Research position, which is also part time. Cory Peterson and Bonnie Bowen were both present at the meeting. These two individuals will be working out the time line and plan.

Ms. Peterson said the contents of the plan were before the Committee. They have a plan about hiring staff to run the lab. They will do that between now and June 30. On June 30, it will operate for three years. At the end of the second year, they will do a review to determine whether they met their objects and go forward from there.

Regent Becker said she understood the hiring of the people, which is one part of the plan. She was not sure she understood how, for example, the partnerships, the financial and in-kind support for grantees, local community and new partnership is going to be worked on. How the support for maintenance for aging buildings and grounds is going to be worked on. How the year-round non-academic programming is going to be done. That's what she meant about a more detailed, “who's going to do what, when”.

Mr. Peterson said they have a staff of individuals who do those works. They’ve talked with the friends of Lakeside Lab on their responsibilities. The two things that are different are that the friends of the Lakeside Lab agreed to raise an endowment for the lab. They also will have a substantial educational program which will occupy the lab in the off-summer months. That will be run by the Extension and a person that has the capacity to that. They have people in the plan hired to do the work that will change the lab’s function from what it is right now to what it is in the future.

Regent Becker said she’d like to see an interim report before the end of three years.

Provost Allen said that page 21 shows more details on how it would be operated.

Regent Becker said to wait three years to see how things are going seems too long. When you’ve got a goal out three years, it’s nice to have some intermediate steps that have measures and then can report back to the Board part way through.
Dr. Barak said he has agreed to provide to the Coordinating Committee quarterly reports that would say where they are relative to their objectives. Then there would be an annual report. He said they could provide the Board a copy of the annual report, which is essentially keeping track of the progress in meeting the objectives of the plan.

Regent Becker said that would be acceptable. Regent Neil said he thought it was an excellent idea. Dr. Barak said they would be happy to provide that report. Regent Becker said they didn't need anything extensive, just their benchmarks and where they were relative to that. Dr. Barak said that was the same report that the Lakeside Lab Coordinating Committee asked them for.

Regent Becker adjourned the meeting at 8:45 a.m.