

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

## University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

---

Membership Committee

Campus Governance

---

9-26-2012

### Membership minutes 09/26/2012

Membership Committee

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/member>

---

#### Recommended Citation

Membership Committee, "Membership minutes 09/26/2012" (2012). *Membership Committee*. 18.  
<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/member/18>

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 Membership Committee by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact [skulann@morris.umn.edu](mailto:skulann@morris.umn.edu).

Membership Committee Meeting  
September 26, 2012

Present: Matt Zaske, Julia Dabbs, Judy Kuechle, Zak Forde, Kristin Lamberty, Dillon McBrady, Troy Goodnough, Roger Rose, Jodi Sperr

Guest: Jacqueline Johnson

Chancellor Johnson thanked Zak for reminding her of the duties and responsibilities as stated in the new Constitution. Today she would like to focus on the RAR process and how this committee can help think about names to serve on the three groups. As a reminder, the RAR process has involved three groups: academic programs; student support programs; and administrative units. Jon Anderson oversees all three areas. The three groups have established procedures/ guidelines and have most recently developed a rubric. This campus has engaged in a process that is pretty unusual – typically this kind of review is only done on academic programs. Because we decided to look at everything, that carries its own complications. She imagines there will be three evaluation groups with some continuity with the group that already exists so some of their expertise would continue. The evaluation team, in multiples of three, would be brought together to do the work in a short period of time and they would apply the rubrics. She imagines an ubergroup that would look for consistency and would have the ability to integrate priority and ranking. She acknowledges this is a complicated process and envisions selecting one or two people from each group to be on the ubergroup. She has already discussed with the Planning Committee, the Finance Committee, and the Consultative Committee.

The hope is to complete the evaluation phase during the month of October. There will be a window of opportunity for people to be able to respond to the various programs that have been reviewed. The third phase is called the implementation phase – once rubrics are applied and programs are prioritized – 4-6 people will make recommendations on what to do next. This phase could be dicey.

Questions/concerns from committee members include:

- will there be carry over from the evaluation group to the implementation group?
- what is the timeline?
- are current members of RAR willing to continue or suggest names?
- how will students be involved?

Chancellor Johnson responded to all of the questions and noted that the link to the website will give information about the timeline and process. She wondered if she should solicit volunteers, perhaps a combination of volunteers and those who have been recommended. The hope is to have all of the information before the budget meeting in the Twin Cities in March. Although our students are more than capable, the implementation phase could be a burden for students and the outcome could have a huge responsibility. Again, this is not a capability issue just her

sense of what is right in terms of authority and decision-making. Zak added that in principle, our governance structure has the vision that faculty, staff and students are all equal players and this allows students to be in leadership capacities. Kristin noted that students have a different type of skin in the game and will not be impacted in the same way. Roger suggested that a student be a voting member of anything involving student related activities; for academic decisions, the student could serve as an ex-officio member. Dillon said students are taking this seriously and have been trying to think of ways to be involved and believes Roger's idea is a good one.

Based on the conversation with this committee, Chancellor Johnson recapped the layout of the next two phases:

- issue of continuity over three phases
- sense of constituency expertise role in evaluation phase
- role of students in these phases
- solicitation/invitation/or some combination regarding the implantation group and who would chair it

Zak said the committee might specifically talk about the evaluation phase and will submit names to the Chancellor Johnson. He would like to invite her back after fall break to talk about administrative reviews.

Zak also mentioned that we are still trying to find a faculty member to serve on AFRC.