

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Membership Committee

Campus Governance

11-20-2012

Membership minutes 11/20/2012

Membership Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Membership Committee, "Membership minutes 11/20/2012" (2012). *Membership Committee*. 16.
<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/member/16>

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.

Membership Committee Meeting
November 20, 2012

Present: Matt Zaske, Julia Dabbs, Jodi Speer, Zak Forde, Kristin Lamberty, Dillon
McBrady, Roger Rose

Zak distributed a draft of a letter (see below) to Chancellor Johnson from MCSA regarding the recommendation of students role in phase three of the RAR process. Dillon added that the concept has been approved by MCSA and students want some sort of power in the RAR process.

Zak read an email message he received from Chancellor Johnson. At this point, she has invited twenty-six people to participate in the evaluation phase of the RAR process and twenty-four accepted. Many of the individuals recommended by the Membership Committee are on the list.

Academic programs: Tammy Berberi; Roland Guyotte; Pete Wyckoff; Gary Donovan; Jane Kill; Jim Hall; Holly Gruntner

Student support programs: Mary Elizabeth Bezanson; Jim Cotter; Chad Braegelmann; Ryan Schamp; Dave Swenson; Jayne Blodgett; Mieka Hoffman; Zac Van Cleve

Administrative programs: Solomon Gashaw; Dan Magner; Brenda Boever; Mike Cihak; LeAnn Dean; Roger Wareham; Judy Kuechle; Evan Vogel

He also shared some of her thoughts regarding the implementation team.

Kristin said she was worried about the "voting" language in the MCSA recommendation that will be submitted to Chancellor Johnson because she doesn't know if the group will actually be voting. Julia added that for consistency and if it has worked so far, it could say that students should have an active voice in the process. Roger asked if the students were asking the committee to weigh in on the recommendation. Zak is looking for a formal stamp of approval with or without caveats. Roger would recommend that Jon Anderson serve as ex-officio for technical/clarity purposes. Zak will recommend that in addition to the five people she listed, the committee recommends that there be student involvement. Zak will work with Dillon for student names that will be sent to Chancellor Johnson. The committee also agreed to let those who have enthusiasm continue on to the next phase.

Zak also mentioned that Ray Schultz is on leave for the spring semester so he will need to be replaced on the Consultative Committee.

Dear Chancellor Johnson,

The recent developments involving the third stage of the resource allocation review have led MCSA to deem it necessary to clarify our stance on student involvement in phase three. We believe that it is essential to the RAR process that students be fully involved. Students on our campus and throughout the University of Minnesota are dedicated to their institution, their education, and the education of all their peers (present and future). We recognize that student membership on a committee such as this might be unprecedented, we feel that due to the exceptional nature of our student body, any student selected to the committee would not only perform as expected, but would naturally excel. In addition we would like to add that students in such prestigious positions is not unheard of on the University level. It is a pretty safe bet that the student-at-large member of the Board of Regents would have to make more difficult decisions, and face more criticism than any student on this committee, yet that position remains popular and serves an important role in the university's function as a whole.

All though we understand concerns about the proper role of students on campus, and about negative ramifications to the individual students, the positive contributions that student members can contribute the process far outweighs any consequences. Without student members, the phase three committee would have to speculate on the thoughts of the student body well beyond levels it should be comfortable with. Voting student members would allow our students to have a fair and balanced voice in the process.

MCSA has several ideas about student membership to phase three. While all of them are slightly different, they all revolve around the same principle: students having a vote in the decision making process. We feel that non-voting student members or a student "sounding board" would not provide the process of an accurate representation of the beliefs of the student body. Instead we suggest several alternatives: First, the simplest solution is having a student as a voting member of the group. This option most effectively combats the problem of putting

students in a tenuous position with staff and faculty on campus, especially if the student is an older one, closer to graduation. Second, we could have several student representatives on the committee, which share one vote (ultimately controlled by the majority of the students). This would increase the representativeness of the group, without disproportionately increasing their voting ability. We would be open to suggestions from your office, however ultimately we would like to see a legitimate student vote on the third phase of the RAR process.

We understand that you are weighing a lot of options, so we appreciate you taking the time to listen to us.

Thank you so much for your time and consideration.