# University of Minnesota



# 2012 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 2012

# 2012 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 2012

#### 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 2012 Report to the Minnesota State Legislature

## 85<sup>th</sup> 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 2011) 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 page 5 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 during which strategic goals, proposed initiatives, operating budget issues and revenue and expenditure projections are reviewed, analyzed, and discussed. Informed by those discussions, University leadership then determines specific amounts of the state appropriation to be allocated to each unit.

The State of Minnesota appropriated \$569,751,000 to the University of Minnesota in FY 2011-12 including:

- O & M (Operations and Maintenance) appropriation of \$483,881,000;
- General Fund, State Special appropriation of \$83,713,000; and
- Health Care Access Fund, State Special appropriation of \$2,157,000.

FY 2011-12 allocations of state appropriations to major academic unit are provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Internal allocation of state appropriations to the University of Minnesota, FY 2011-12.

Twin Cities Campus Academic Health Center (AHC) College of Pharmacy College of Veterinary Medicine Medical School	O & M Appropriation \$4,229,336 15,437,477 63,077,182	General Fund State Special Appropriation \$1,444,000	Health Care Access Fund State Special
Twin Cities Campus Academic Health Center (AHC) College of Pharmacy College of Veterinary Medicine	\$4,229,336 15,437,477	Appropriation	
Academic Health Center (AHC) College of Pharmacy College of Veterinary Medicine	15,437,477	\$1,444,000	
College of Pharmacy College of Veterinary Medicine	15,437,477	\$1,444,000	
College of Veterinary Medicine	15,437,477	\$1,444,000	
Medical School	63,077,182	3,360,325	
		15,513,664	2,157,000
School of Dentistry	12,591,630	144,000	
School of Nursing	4,798,283	444,000	
School of Public Health	7,152,517	340,743	
Academic Health Center-Shared	45,902,533	6,634,373	
Carlson School of Management	3,268,416	681,526	
College of Biological Sciences	20,112,154	359,801	
College of Continuing Education	5,082,696		
College of Design	7,058,555	284,044	
College of Education and Human Development	14,606,055	820,257	
College of Food, Agricultural and Natural	30,636,635	22,047,347	
Resource Sciences			
College of Liberal Arts	40,657,335		
College of Science and Engineering	53,340,831	1,140,000	
Humphrey School of Public Affairs	4,419,209	91,942	
Law School	3,488,858	·	
Athletics	6,812,167		
Crookston Campus	8,286,292		
Duluth Campus	26,992,647	2,452,946	
Morris Campus	17,974,726		
Rochester Campus	6,828,925	450,000	
University Wide Academic, Research and Outreach			
Agricultural Experiment Station	3,508,520	3,290,199	
Minnesota Extension	10,990,271	14,933,373	
Office of Sr. VP System Academic Admin.	2,151,470	985,497	
Office of Sr. VP Academic Affairs and Provost	7,524,805	,	
Office of VP Research (Centers/Institutes)	10,031,998	703,683	
Scholarly & Cultural Affairs	4,470,928	,,	
Undergraduate Education	2,337,328		
Service and Support Units			
Auxiliary Services (initiatives)	306,802		
Student Affairs	2,225,957		
President's Office	391,365		
Equity and Diversity	1,590,730		
Unallocated by unit at time of budget approval	36,774,644	7,491,000	
Total:	\$483,881,000	\$83,713,000	
			\$2,157,000

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

# **Leveraging Other Resources**

The FY 2011-12 University operating budget approved by the Board of Regents in June, 2011, prior to knowledge of a final state

appropriation for the 2011-2013 biennium, included the overall projected incremental resources presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Sources of revenue, University of Minnesota, FY 2011-12.

Revenue Source	Amount
University Reallocations/Productivity Gains Tuition Change in State Appropriation	\$63.7 million \$44.6 million (\$70.8 million)
Total Incremental Recurring Resources	\$37.5 million

Source: Office of Budget and Finance, University of Minnesota

The planned University reductions to unit operating budgets, combined with productivity enhancements in those same units, were necessary to partially address the projected reduction in the state appropriation, required cost increases, and limited new investments. The approved budget included investments in such areas as graduate student programming and support, targeted faculty hires in the sciences, biomedical health informatics, scholarships and mental health services for students, in addition to the required infrastructure cost increases for fringe benefits, debt service and technology. To implement these investments and address the significant projected reduction in state appropriation, the support units and the academic units realized an average reallocation of 5 percent and 2 percent respectively.

The final state appropriation for FY 2011-12 was not yet determined at the time the Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota was asked to approve the annual budget. Therefore, a budget was approved and implemented based on the projections in Table 2 above, with contingency plans for differing levels of appropriation. Subsequent to that approval, the University received its FY 2011-12 appropriation with \$25 million more than previously anticipated. Per the contingency plans, the reallocations and productivity gains described above were implemented as planned. Approximately one-third of the additional funds were allocated to recurring initiatives in FY 2011-12, with the remaining two-thirds held to address budget needs in FY 2012-13.

## **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 in doing so, 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 2000-01 to FY 2010-11 University scholarship support for undergraduate students has increased by 255 percent. From 2004 through June 2011, the University raised \$342 million of gift commitments in support of its students.

In 2010-11, the University's undergraduate students received \$92 million in University scholarship support<sup>1</sup>–\$77 million of the combined federal and state grant total of \$120 million.

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

- The Promise Program benefited 7,520 lower income students in 2010-11. It guaranteed grants and scholarships that fully cover tuition and required fees.
- Program benefited 6,774 students in 2010-11. It provided 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 2010-11 undergraduate resident and non-resident tuition and required fees at the University of Minnesota – Twin Cities and its comparison group institutions. Twin Cities campus undergraduate resident tuition ranked third highest within this group for 2010-11.

In terms of undergraduate non-resident tuition, the Twin Cities campus ranked eleventh among the comparison group institutions for 2010-11. Undergraduate resident and non-resident tuition and required fees data for the past 10 years is provided in Appendix A.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>University Scholarships include scholarships such as UPromise, Minnesota Resident, Wisconsin Reciprocity, Aid from Admissions, Aid from Minnesota Medical Foundation, Aid from the University of Minnesota Foundation, Multicultural Excellence Program (MEP), College/Departmental Aid and Athletic Scholarships. It also includes Private Grants such as outside scholarships, Wallin Scholarship, Scholarship America, etc.

Table 3. 2010-11 undergraduate resident and non-resident tuition and required fees, University of Minnesota –Twin Cities and comparison group universities.

Institution	Rank	Resident	Rank	Non-Resident
Penn State University	1	\$15,250	7	\$27,114
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	2	13,713	5	28,840
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities	3	12,203	11	16,503
University of Michigan-Ann Arbor	4	11,837	1	36,001
University of California-Berkeley	5	10,940	2	33,819
University of California-Los Angeles	6	10,781	3	33,660
The Ohio State University	7	9,420	10	23,604
University of Texas-Austin	8	9,418	4	31,218
University of Wisconsin-Madison	9	8,983	9	24,233
University of Washington-Seattle	10	8,701	8	25,329
University of Florida-Gainesville	11	5,044	6	27,321
Comparative Group Average*	-	\$10,409	-	\$29,114

Source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System

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.

Tables 4, 5, and 6 show the 2010-11 undergraduate resident and non-resident tuition and required fees at the Duluth, Morris, and Crookston campuses along with respective comparison group institutions. Undergraduate resident tuition at the Duluth campus ranked 12<sup>th</sup> among its comparison group institutions while the Morris campus ranked 11<sup>th</sup> and the Crookston campus ranked 4<sup>th</sup>.

In terms of undergraduate non-resident tuition, the Duluth campus ranked 8<sup>th</sup> within the comparative group for 2010-11. The Morris campus ranked 14<sup>th</sup> and the Crookston campus ranked 8<sup>th</sup>. Undergraduate resident and non-resident tuition and required fees at the Rochester campus was \$12,102 in 2010-11. Coordinate campus undergraduate resident and non-resident tuition and required fees data for the past 10 years is provided in Appendix A.

Table 4. 2010-11 undergraduate resident and non-resident tuition and required fees, University of Minnesota – Duluth and comparison group universities.

Institution	Rank	Resident	Rank	Non-Resident
Villanova University	1	\$39,665	1	\$39,655
Marquette University	2	30,462	2	30,462
Oakland University	3	11,808	14	13,808
University of Central Florida	4	10,385	5	20,424
University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth	5	9,716	3	22,455
University of Colorado-Denver	6	8,799	7	19,549
University of Michigan-Dearborn	7	8,516	15	11,437
University of Nevada-Las Vegas	8	8,151	9	17,880
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	9	7,518	12	14,862
Old Dominion University	10	7,214	6	20,126
University of North Carolina-Charlotte	11	6,214	10	16,966
University Of Minnesota-Duluth	12	\$5,688	8	\$18,978
Wright State University-Main Campus	13	5,138	11	16,185
Florida Atlantic University	14	5,021	4	20,500
Cleveland State University	15	3,835	13	14,505
Comparative Group Average*	=	\$11,601	-	\$19,916

Source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System

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.

<sup>\*</sup> Comparative Group Average excludes the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities

<sup>\*</sup> Comparative Group Average excludes the University of Minnesota-Duluth

Table 5. 2010-11 undergraduate resident and non-resident tuition and required fees, University of Minnesota – Morris and comparison group universities.

Institution	Rank	Resident	Rank	Non-Resident
Carleton College	1	\$41,304	1	\$41,304
Macalester College	2	40,046	2	40,046
St. Olaf College	3	36,800	3	36,800
Gustavus Adolphus College	4	33,500	4	33,500
College of Saint Benedict	5	32,246	5	32,246
Saint Johns University	6	31,576	6	31,576
Hamline University	7	30,503	7	30,503
Concordia College at Moorhead	8	27,160	8	27,160
St. Mary's College of Maryland	9	13,630	9	25,023
Ramapo College of New Jersey	10	11,874	10	19,679
University of Minnesota-Morris	11	11,532	14	11,532
University of Maine at Farmington	12	9,022	12	17,758
University of Mary Washington	13	7,922	11	19,650
University of North Carolina at Asheville	14	4,729	13	17,501
Comparative Group Average*	=	\$24,639	-	\$28,673

Source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System

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 6. 2010-11 undergraduate resident and non-resident tuition and required fees, University of Minnesota – Crookston and comparison group universities.

Institution	Rank	Resident	Rank	Non-Resident
Delaware Valley College	1	\$29,284	1	\$29,284
University of Pittsburgh-Johnstown	2	\$12,078	2	\$21,878
University of Minnesota-Morris	3	\$11,532	7	\$11,532
University of Minnesota-Crookston	4	\$10,623	8	\$10,623
University of Maine at Farmington	5	\$9,022	3	\$17,758
University of Wisconsin-Stout	6	\$8,099	4	\$15,845
Bemidji State University	7	\$7,497	10	\$7,497
University of Wisconsin-River Falls	8	\$6,894	5	\$14,467
Dakota State University	9	\$6,455	9	\$7,952
Northern State University	10	\$6,351	6	\$12,867
Comparative Group Average*	_	\$10,801	-	\$15,453

Source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System

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.

<sup>\*</sup> Comparative Group Average excludes the University of Minnesota-Morris

<sup>\*</sup> Comparative Group Average excludes the University of Minnesota-Crookston

#### **Graduate and First-Professional Student Tuition and Fees**

**Graduate Students:** Table 7 shows the 2010-11 resident and non-resident tuition and required fees for graduate students at the University of Minnesota – Twin Cities and comparison group institutions.

Twin Cities campus graduate student resident tuition ranked forth within this group for 2010-11. In terms of graduate student non-resident tuition, the Twin Cities ranked 10<sup>th</sup> among public comparison group institutions.

Graduate tuition data for the past 10 years is provided in Appendix A.

Table 7. 2010-11 graduate resident and non-resident tuition and required fees, University of Minnesota – Twin Cities and comparison group universities.

Institution	Rank	Resident	Rank	Non-Resident
University of Michigan-Ann Arbor	1	\$17,973	1	\$36,133
Penn State University	2	17,202	2	29,480
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	3	14,909	4	27,313
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities	4	14,344	10	21,442
University of Washington-Seattle	5	11,449	9	24,789
Ohio State University-Columbus	6	11,298	5	27,228
University of Wisconsin - Madison	7	10,937	8	25,104
University of Florida-Gainesville	8	10,915	3	28,310
University of California-Berkeley	9	10,880	6	25,982
University of California-Los Angeles	10	10,600	7	25,702
University of Texas-Austin	11	10,154	11	19,316
Comparative Group Average	-	\$12,632	-	\$26,936

Source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System

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 8 shows the 2010-11 resident and non-resident tuition and required fees for graduate students at the Duluth campus and its 14 comparative institutions.

University of Minnesota - Duluth graduate student resident tuition ranked third within the comparative group for 2010-11. In terms of graduate student non-resident tuition, the University ranked forth within the comparative group for 2010-11.

<sup>\*</sup> Comparative Group Average excludes the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities

Table 8. 2010-11 graduate resident and non-resident tuition and required fees, University of Minnesota – Duluth and comparison group institutions.

Institution	Rank	Resident	Rank	Non-Resident
Marquette University	1	\$16,290	13	\$16,290
Villanova University	2	14,576	15	14,576
University of Minnesota-Duluth	3	14,370	4	21,468
Oakland University	4	12,972	3	22,374
University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth	5	11,517	6	20,420
Wright State University-Main Campus	6	10,965	5	20,748
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	7	10,447	2	23,734
University of Michigan-Dearborn	8	9,229	9	17,394
Cleveland State University	9	8,497	14	16,070
University of Colorado Denver	10	8,330	7	19,988
University of Central Florida	11	7,882	1	26,907
Old Dominion University	12	6,682	11	16,492
Florida Atlantic University	13	5,759	10	16,675
University of North Carolina at Charlotte	14	5,558	12	16,391
University of Nevada-Las Vegas	15	5,145	8	18,435
Comparative Group Average*	-	\$9,561	=	\$19,035

Source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System

\* Comparative Group Average excludes the University of Minnesota-Duluth

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.

#### **Section 3: Graduation Rates**

As a result of University programs and efforts described on pages 20 through 32 of the 2011 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 9 shows the University's graduation goals while Tables 10, 11, and 12 show the four-, five-, and six-year graduation rates for all students, students of color, and male and female

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

Further discussion and the significant progress made on the Twin Cities campus is presented on pages 32 through 36 of the 2011 University Plan, Performance, and Accountability Report. Similar information is presented on pages 93 through 97 for the Duluth campus, pages 106 to 112 for the Morris campus and pages 122 to 126 for the Crookston campus.

Table 9. 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 10. 4-, 5-, and 6-year graduation rates, University of Minnesota (Classes beginning in 2005-2007).

	Fall 2007 Cohort		Fall 2006 Cohort		Fall 20	005 Cohort
Campus	4-year Rate	Number of Students	5-year Rate	Number of Students	6-year Rate	Number of Students
<b>Twin Cities</b>	54.0	2,841	69.2	3,751	70.5	3,720
Duluth	32.6	726	54.4	1,255	60.3	1,290
Morris	51.7	185	61.8	233	67.1	237
Crookston	33.5	69	51.3	97	52.2	83

Source: University of Minnesota 2011 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.

<sup>2.</sup> 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 2012.

Table 11. 4-, 5-, and 6-year graduation rates for students of color, University of Minnesota (Classes beginning in 2005-2007).

	Fall 20	007 Cohort	Fall 20	006 Cohort	Fall 2005 Cohort	
Campus	4-year	Number of	5-year	Number of	6-year	Number of
_	Rate	Students	Rate	Students	Rate	Students
Twin Cities	38.9	409	55.4	604	53.5	518
Duluth	24.0	35	39.0	46	46.1	47
Morris	32.4	22	49.4	39	48.5	33
Crookston	9.5	#	42.9	6	16.7	#

Source: University of Minnesota 2011 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 2012.

Table 12. 4-, 5-, and 6-year graduation rates for male and female students, University of Minnesota (Classes beginning in 2005-2007).

~		Fall 200		rt		Fall 200		rt		Fall 200		rt
Campus		4-yea	ır Rate			5-yea	ır Rate			6-yea	ır Rate	
	Male	Number	Female	Number	Male	Number	Female	Number	Male	Number	Female	Number
<b>Twin Cities</b>	50.4	1,175	56.9	1,666	68.7	1,675	69.7	2,062	69.1	1,669	71.8	2,045
Duluth	24.5	272	40.7	452	52.0	618	57.1	628	59.8	655	60.7	623
Morris	43.1	63	58.0	119	52.2	84	69.5	148	67.8	99	67.0	138
Crookston	27.7	33	41.9	36	52.6	51	50.6	45	47.8	43	58.2	39

Source: University of Minnesota 2011 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 2012.

# **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 16 through 20 of the *University Plan, Performance, and Accountability Report*.

Tables 13 through 17 show the most recent student enrollment based on racial or ethnic group on each of the University's five campuses. An analysis of progress made toward enrolling underrepresented students on the Twin Cities campus is presented on pages 23 through 28 of the 2011 *University Plan*, *Performance*, *and Accountability Report*. Similar information is provided on pages 93 through 97 for the Duluth campus, pages 106 to 112 for the Morris campus and pages 122 to 126 for the Crookston campus.

Table 13. Number and proportion of students by racial/ethnic group, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, Fall 2011.

1 till 2011.						
	2011	2009				
	Enrollment	Percent Enrolled				
Caucasian	35,922	76.5%				
Total Students of Color	8,272	17.6%				
African American	2,100	4.5%				
American Indian	575	1.2%				
Asian/Pacific Islander	4,255	9.1%				
Chicano/Hispanic	1,236	2.6%				
Hawaiian	106	0.2%				
Not Reported	2,734	5.8%				
<b>Total Domestic Students</b>	46,928	100%				

	2011	2011
	Enrollment	Percent Enrolled
Total Domestic Students	46,928	89.3%
International Students	5,629	10.7%
<b>Total Students</b>	52,557	100%

Table 14. Number and proportion of students by racial/ethnic group, University of Minnesota-Duluth, Fall 2011.

	2011	2011
	Enrollment	Percent Enrolled
Caucasian	10,030	87.0%
Total Students of Color	967	8.4%
African American	206	1.8%
American Indian	196	1.7%
Asian/Pacific Islander	383	3.3%
Chicano/Hispanic	160	1.4%
Hawaiian	22	0.2%
Not Reported	527	4.6%
<b>Total Domestic Students</b>	11,524	100%

	2011	2011
	Enrollment	Percent Enrolled
Total Domestic Students	11,524	97.6%
International Students	282	2.4%
Total Students	11,806	100%

Table 15. Number and proportion of students by racial/ethnic group, University of Minnesota-Morris, Fall 2011.

Tubic feet flamber and pro	P	, <sub>10</sub>
	2011	2011
	Enrollment	Percent Enrolled
Caucasian	1,348	76.2%
Total Students of Color	388	21.9%
African American	39	2.2%
American Indian	257	14.5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	57	3.2%
Chicano/Hispanic	34	1.9%
Hawaiian	1	0.1%
Not Reported	32	1.8%
<b>Total Domestic Students</b>	1,768	100%

	2011	2011
	Enrollment	Percent Enrolled
Total Domestic Students	1,768	91.5%
International Students	164	8.5%
<b>Total Students</b>	1,932	100%

Table 16. Number and proportion of students by racial/ethnic group, University of Minnesota-Crookston, Fall 2011.

	2011	2011
	Enrollment	Percent Enrolled
Caucasian	1,633	65.4%
Total Students of Color	219	8.8%
African American	86	3.4%
American Indian	40	1.6%
Asian/Pacific Islander	54	2.2%
Chicano/Hispanic	36	1.4%
Hawaiian	3	0.1%
Not Reported	645	25.8%
<b>Total Domestic Students</b>	2,497	100%

	2011	2011
	Enrollment	Percent Enrolled
Total Domestic Students	2,497	94.1%
International Students	156	5.9%
<b>Total Students</b>	2,653	100%

Note: Includes dual enrollment high school students

Table 17. Number and proportion of students by racial/ethnic group, University of Minnesota-Rochester, Fall 2011.

	2011	2011
	Enrollment	Percent Enrolled
Caucasian	216	79.7%
Total Students of Color	47	17.3%
African American	22	8.1%
American Indian	2	0.7%
Asian/Pacific Islander	15	5.5%
Chicano/Hispanic	8	3.0%
Hawaiian	0	0.0%
Not Reported	8	3.0%
<b>Total Domestic Students</b>	271	100%

	2011	2011
	Enrollment	Percent Enrolled
Total Domestic Students	271	99.3%
International Students	2	0.7%
<b>Total Students</b>	273	100%

# **Section 5: University Research**

In 2010 the University not only retained its position among the leading public research universities in the country, it also improved its standings among this esteemed cohort.

According to the 2009 national R&D (research and development) expenditures last published by the National Science Foundation, the University ranked 10th among the nation's top public and private research universities (Table 18). The University's R&D expenditure total of \$741 million represents an impressive increase of 8.5 percent over the 2008 total. This growth in volume improved the University's ranking among its public research peers from 9th to 8th, continuing an impressive climb in the rankings from a 10th place position among public universities as recently as 2005. This improvement reflects a 41 percent increase in total R&D expenditures since 2004, the third-largest growth rate among the top 20 universities in the country and the second-largest among public universities. Over this same time period, total R&D expenditures at all U.S. universities increased 21 percent while expenditures at the

top 20 universities increased 19 percent on average, signifying that the University significantly outperformed its peers on a percentage basis during this interval.

Faculty and staff mounted strong responses to new funding opportunities associated with the America Recovery and Reinvestment Act (AARA). Since AARA was announced in 2009, faculty and staff have submitted 962 applications for funding and have been successful in securing 330 awards. These awards have provided over \$194 million to support research at the University, much of which will establish key research facilities, initiatives, and programs that will provide important competitive advantages for University researchers in the years ahead.

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 53 through 59 of the *University Plan*, *Performance*, and Accountability Report.

Table 18. Top 20 Institutions Reporting Largest R&D Expenditures in Science and Engineering

		2004		2009		Percent	Percent
2009 Rank	Institution	Total	Rank (Publics)	Total	Rank (Publics)	Change 2008-09	Change 2004-09
1	Johns Hopkins University	\$1,681		\$1,856		10%	35%
2	University of Michigan (all campuses)	\$876	3	\$1,007	1	15%	31%
3	University of Wisconsin - Madison	\$882	2	\$952	2	8%	25%
4	University of California - San Francisco	\$885	1	\$948	3	7%	30%
5	University of California - Los Angeles	\$871	4	\$890	4	2%	15%
6	University of California - San Diego	\$842	5	\$879	5	4%	24%
7	Duke University	\$767		\$805		5%	55%
8	University of Washington	\$765	6	\$778	6	2%	9%
9	Penn State University (all campuses)	\$701	8	\$753	7	7%	26%
10	University of Minnesota (all campuses)	\$683	9	\$741	8	9%	41%
11	MA Institute of Technology	\$660		\$736		12%	36%
12	University of Pennsylvania	\$708		\$727		3%	22%
13	Ohio State University (all campuses)	\$703	7	\$716	9	2%	38%
14	Stanford University	\$688		\$704		2%	5%
15	University of California - Davis	\$643	10	\$682	10	6%	33%
16	Cornell University (all campuses)	\$654		\$671		3%	17%
17	University of California - Berkeley	\$592	11	\$652	11	10%	13%
18	University of Colorado	\$536	13	\$648	12	21%	34%
19	University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	\$525	14	\$646	13	23%	55%
20	Texas A&M University	\$583	12	\$636	14	9%	39%

Source: National Science Foundation, 2010

#### **Patenting and Licensing**

The University realized increases in all but one of the key metrics used to track the performance of its technology transfer, and launched eight startup companies — the most in the University's history.

Despite a decline in gross revenue to \$83.8 million, the Office for Technology
Commercialization reported increases in several key metrics that are used to track the performance of the University's technology.
As shown below in Table 19 the number of invention disclosures from faculty increased 5 percent, an important indicator of a robust intellectual property pipeline. Thanks to a rigorous, industry-based stage-gate evaluation process, only disclosures that are judged to have significant potential are selected for protection and further development.

While the number of innovations selected for patent filings was essentially unchanged from last year, the value of the current patent portfolio continues to grow. The number of new license agreements rebounded significantly over last year, increasing more than 50 percent, and the number of current revenue-generating agreements increased by 30 percent.

In FY 2009-10 University-based technologies were at the core of eight startup companies, the most since 2000. Technology commercialization revenue has been reinvested to support the University's core mission, fellowships, faculty development, research programs, and infrastructure.

Table 19. University of Minnesota Technology Commercialization Data

FY2006 FY2007 FY2008 FY2009 FY2010 Disclosures 230 193 217 244 255 New U.S. Patent Filings 84 51 52 65 66 **New Licenses** 85 77 63 44 67 Start-Ups 3 4 2 3 8 **U.S. Patents Issued** 29 44 37 n/a n/a **Current Revenue Generating** n/an/a 281 306 399 Agreements **Gross Revenues (million)** \$57.8 \$65.2 \$86.9 \$95.2 \$83.8 Non-Glaxo Revenues (million) \$6.8 \$8.5 \$7.9 \$8.7 \$8.6 **Outgoing Material Transfer** 106 n/a n/a 67 171 Agreements

Source: Office of the Vice President for Research

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

Table 17. 1999-2011 undergraduate resident and non-resident tuition and required fees, University of Minnesota – Crookston and University of Minnesota – Morris.

	Crookston	Crookston	Morris	Morris	Rochester	Rochester
	Campus	Campus	Campus	Campus	Campus	Campus
	Undergraduate	Undergraduate	Undergraduate	Undergraduate	Undergraduate	Undergraduate
	Resident	Nonresident	Resident	Nonresident	Resident	Nonresident
1999-2000	\$3,854	\$3,854	\$5,311	\$10,074		
2000-2001	4,060	4,060	5,567	10,599		
2001-2002	5,626	5,626	6,142	11,690		
2002-2003	6,098	6,098	7,154	13,535		
2003-2004	5,780	5,780	7,991	7,991		
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	8,821	8,821	9,331	9,331		
2008-2009	9,381	9,381	10,006	10,006		
2009-2010	9,988	9,988	10,715	10,715	\$11,350	\$11,350
2010-2011	10,623	10,623	11,532	11,532	12,102	12,102

Source: Office of Institutional Research, University of Minnesota

Table 18. 1999-2011 undergraduate and graduate, resident and non-resident tuition and required fees, University of Minnesota – Duluth.

	Duluth	Duluth	Duluth Graduate	Duluth Graduate
	Undergraduate Resident	Undergraduate Nonresident	Resident	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	7,050	19,412	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	9,188	18,814	11,228	18,326
2008-2009	10,430	12,430	12,606	19,704
2009-2010	11,193	13,193	13,535	20,633
2010-2011	11,808	13,808	14,370	21,468

Source: Office of Institutional Research, University of Minnesota

Table 19. 1999-2011 undergraduate and graduate, resident and non-resident tuition and required fees, University of Minnesota – Twin Cities.

	Twin Cities	Twin Cities	Twin Cities	Twin Cities
	Undergraduate	Undergraduate	Graduate	Graduate
	Resident	Nonresident	Resident	Nonresident
1999-2000	\$4,648	\$12,789	\$5,517	\$10,377
2000-2001	4,878	13,464	5,795	10,922
2001-2002	5,536	15,002	6,547	12,200
2002-2003	6,280	16,853	7,662	14,219
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	10,230	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	13,495	20,593
2010-2011	12,203	16,503	14,344	21,442

Source: Office of Institutional Research, University of Minnesota