

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Consultative Committee

Campus Governance

11-6-2012

Consultative minutes 11/06/2012

Consultative Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Consultative Committee, "Consultative minutes 11/06/2012" (2012). *Consultative Committee*. 24.
<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/consult/24>

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

Nov. 6, 2012

Guest: Chancellor Johnson

Brook Miller, LeAnn Dean, Nancy Helsper, Heather Waye, Jim Barbour, Chad Braegelman, Joey Daniewicz , Zach Van Cleve, Bonnie Tipcke,

Absent: Jim Hall, Ray Schultz, Molly Donovan

Resource Allocation Review

A little bit behind schedule but still on track for budget planning. We'll get final budget instructions in January; budget is due in March.

RAR scores are problematic in that most may be "above average." RAR team leaders from phase 1 met with Gwen Rudney, who worked with them through a rubric and scoring practice. Out of that, they suggested some simplification of dimensions; revised form of rubric for academic programs. Hilda and Sandy will work to revise the rubric for Student Support; Peh will work on the Administrative rubric.

Jon Anderson has devoted herculean effort to RAR over the last few months. He has taken all the data from the forms to an output that a committee could read. He has finished Student Support programs, next doing Admin programs.

They will roll this out in phases, starting with academic programs. Three groups are being formed, each to work on one of the three types of programs; then an "über group" will look at all for consistency. Individuals will work alone in reviewing reports and then score and bring to group for discussion.

A list of potential evaluators has been produced by the Membership Committee, but Chancellor Johnson is troubled that there is only one USA nominee - the rest are P&A, faculty, and students. There should be more balance.

This process differs from other universities'. We are still discovering the process. It must be as inclusive as possible. If we're successful we should write a book, article, etc.

Discussion:

Bonnie: In the case of only 1 USA, were there not volunteers from USA? Chancellor Johnson did not think this was intentional.

Brook: Do you see the teams being skewed towards the category being evaluated?

Chancellor: For academic programs, all team members but one are faculty. Student Support is not skewed towards staff — that group is also majority faculty. The administrative group has some faculty.

Heather: How many programs per group?

Chancellor: Over 30 academic; 60 student support; and 60 admin programs each; total of 150 reviews. There will be 6 people for each review group (academic, administrative, student support). One or two people will review each program.

Brook: As the scoring happens, will they have their conversation first based on criterion 1, go through all programs, then criterion 2, etc?

Chancellor: They have shrunk the number of criteria, simplifying the rubric. A decision making tree was added to help scorers, but there remain elements of subjectivity. Reviewers will practice and compare scores. The groups will try to quantify things where they can, taking some guesswork out and making the scoring more consistent.

Brook: About the feedback period: units can see what they submitted, but Jon said the program can't see how they were ranked.

Chancellor: I don't know exactly what he was thinking, but I wonder if it wouldn't be OK for units to see how they were scored. Is it essential? Programs needing further review might find it most helpful. There would be no rescoring. Programs are entitled to helpful feedback. It is still unknown how this will work. The final committee could be made aware of some omissions or problems.

Brook: Timeframe: Jon had mentioned 2-3 weeks to do scoring and then 1-2 weeks for units to absorb, read programs. Programs will want as much time as possible to react.

Chancellor: If we roll out two categories (academic and student support), the week of Nov. 12th, we could get done with those two evaluation phases by the end of semester so they could respond over break. Then do final process in early spring semester.

Bonnie: I'm concerned about how hard it would be for someone not involved in initial phase to jump in now and do scoring.

Chancellor: If the rubric is good, anyone should be able to apply it and get a reasonable score.

Bonnie: Another concern would be that people evaluating would be criticized for not being fully aware of program characteristics.

Chancellor: Rubrics mix qualitative and quantitative indices. The majority of evaluators will be from that area.

LeAnn: Would weighting for admin programs and student support programs change in edits?

Chancellor: No, weighting of those programs will remain in place.

Brook: Moving from phase 2 to phase 3... Will implementation folks receive a ranked list along with scores from phase 2 committees, along with information from feedback period and then will they relook at rankings and scores?

Chancellor: I don't expect there will be a 1-150 ranking. Envisions more groupings, like categories of 1) needing more resources, 2) resources now appropriate and 3) may not need more or same resource levels. There may be recommendations that say: "more study needed." The process will still include campus governance and the Regents have final say.

Probably not be narrow budget decisions on any program; rather, the recommendation might be that program x needs more support. The Implementation team will make broad recommendations to the Chancellor and chairs of Planning and Finance Committees. If there is disagreement, it is ultimately the Chancellor's responsibility to submit a balanced budget and make fiscal determinations.

We already know that we're going to be asked to cut again by central administration—maybe 5% or over \$300,000. We have not always allocated funding reasonably. We need to stop using contingency funds to plug holes. I have no prior ideas of particular programs.

Brook: If we have additional thoughts, may be forward them to you and Jon next week?

Chancellor: Yes. I particularly appreciate your questions and also student input when I visited MCSA. I am concerned about people on implementation committees and negative reactions they may personally receive; it could be an especially difficult position for students. But, we take student input seriously at UMM. Maybe the role for students could be "side by side" reviewers?

Bonnie: Staffing is part of the resource review process, right?

Chancellor: Yes, staffing is being considered as well. I appreciate all the time that people have invested in this process --- with no course release or compensation. I hope we all will have vision.

Brook: next week discuss RAR and approve minutes.

Respectfully submitted by Jim Barbour