

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well
University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Consultative Committee

Campus Governance

10-28-2011

Consultative minutes 10/28/2011

Consultative Committee

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/consult>

Recommended Citation

Consultative Committee, "Consultative minutes 10/28/2011" (2011). *Consultative Committee*. 7.
<http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/consult/7>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Consultative Committee by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

Consultative Committee
Prairie Lounge
October 28, 2011
9:00 am – 10:00 am

Committee members present: Co-chairs Jen Zych Herrmann and Nic McPhee, Brook Miller, Jim Barbour, Bonnie Tipcke, Molly Donovan, Naomi Wente, LeAnn Dean, Manjari Govada,

New member started: Dennis Stewart

Committee members absent: Nancy Helsper

Guest: Dean Finzel

1) Previous meeting minutes approved, 9-0-1 (yea/nea/abstentions)

2) Discussion with Dean Finzel

A. The Center for Small Towns (CST) director vacancy needs to be filled

- Dean advised that it would be staffed by a faculty member with a course release of some amount, perhaps 2 courses worth, but could be modified based on the needs of the candidate and discipline.
- Currently CST is self-directed, with David Fluegel serving as the day-to-day operations manager.
- Q: Has there always been a faculty director? A: No. Tom McRoberts was not a faculty member and directed several areas. Dean Finzel, prior to his appointment as Dean served as the interim director of the CST. This was the first faculty appointment and took place after CST was reorganized.
- Dean Finzel noted that he believed that the appointment of a faculty member would be beneficial: 1) to maintain a connection to the faculty and, 2) cost considerations would make it difficult to replace this vacancy with a full-time director.
- Dean Finzel said that David Fluegel would be eligible to apply for the director position.
- Dean explained that CST has a 20% external sales target (\$50-60k)
- Dean explained that some community outreach or some subject expertise would be helpful, and that this person needs some ability to oversee external contracts.
- Dean explained he thought this should be an ongoing director position and not subject to a limited term.

B. The ACE director position vacancy needs to be filled

- It is currently staffed by Paula O'Loughlin. She has asked to no longer continue in this role, with her term concluding at the end of the year.
- Dean explained that he thought this position should be 3-4 year term.

- And he further explained he thought that it was good to have turnover to bring in new ideas and perspectives into this office.

C. Process for filling vacancies was discussed

- Dean prefers to look internally and keep the pool small, but does not want to appoint people.
- Proposal discussed for identifying candidates: Dean would submit an email asking interested candidates to contact him (and perhaps this may also include a nomination process).
- Proposal discussed for hiring candidates: Dean would consult with CC/or subset of CC members about the candidates identified. It was noted that it would be advisable to also include members of the affected areas to participate in the selection of the candidate/s.

D. Program Review process was discussed

- 5 reviews are in process: Art History, History, English, Sociology and Physics
- Issues with the process were discussed, including difficulties of appointing review committees.
- To-date, each program being reviewed would have a review committee appointed and staffed with 3 or so people, some of whom had a vested interest in the program.
- It was noted that the appointment process may be improved with earlier notification and longer timetables for review teams to complete their work.
- Dean reviewed an alternative procedure: 1) select 5-6 people to serve on a review committee, 2) with 2 people from assessment committee, 3) 2 people from curriculum committee, and 4) 2 people from "at large," but ideally with some interest in the program.
- It was also suggested that other areas under the VCAA/Dean, like library staff could be involved.
- Based on this proposal, the review committee would develop their own process of evaluation, but they would ideally complete all of the reviews for a given year, so the process would maintain consistency
- Dean noted the existing review process has slowed down and is behind schedule. He is thinking that the list of programs to be reviewed would be re-examined in August with Division Chairs and a new list of which program to be reviewed would be identified
- The modified proposal would could: 1) be on an 8-year cycle instead of 4 years, 2) when the review was complete the review would be presented to the curriculum committee and would become part of the minutes, 3) this structure would allow for a follow-up every 4 years to see if improvements or modifications suggested during the review were being implemented.
- More discussion about the process: 1) Dean provides data to program for their internal review, 2) each program conducts their own review, 3) the program review committee then does their work, 4) the program then meets with the Dean and D.C., 5) the results are presented to the curriculum committee
- Dean highlighted the intent of these reviews is developmental and from his perspective is not connected to the Resource Reallocation Review process also starting on campus.
- Some discussion focused on how we might ensure that people reviewing programs have some knowledge about the programs, or whether the process could function well without

necessarily having subject expertise, which is why it was suggested that the original review process had reviewers that were allied with the field they were reviewing.

- There was some discussion about the role student have played and could play in the process. No specific role was identified.
- Some questions were asked about: 1) whether programs are expected to get feedback from past graduates about the evaluated program's effectiveness, and 2) whether programs had to provide some external comparison information.
- A comment was made that the data provided to program committees should be more contextualized, and would provide more nuanced notes about the data to help programs interpret better.

E. General education review

- Dean noted the general education review process was started in the Divisions.
- The accreditation people have asked us to undertake this process.
- Student forums are being organized by student Ian Patterson.
- Dean hopes for some convergence in the discussions, and that the discussions taking place may "funnel" into a few items that we can focus on.

Respectfully submitted,

Troy Goodnough