

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

Planning Committee

Campus Governance

2-4-2015

Planning minutes 02/04/2015

Planning Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Planning Committee, "Planning minutes 02/04/2015" (2015). *Planning Committee*. 65.
<http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/plan/65>

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 Planning Committee by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

4 February 2015

Present: Jon Anderson, Michael Eble, Jim Hall, Seung-Ho Joo, Jana Koehler, Sarah Mattson, Brook Miller, Lowell Rasmussen, Gwen Rudney, Jordan Wentz

Absent: Taylor Barker, Sandy Kill

Chair Jon Anderson called the meeting to order at 1:04 pm.

Motion and second to move agenda items 4 and 5 to earlier in the agenda to accommodate Lowell Rasmussen, who will leave the meeting early. Motion passed unanimously.

Jon Anderson announces that our Strategic Planning document has been forwarded to the Chancellor per her request. Also, the document was sent to the Steering Committee. It is a likely informational item at next Campus Assembly.

Discussion: Are we pressing our students to graduate in four to six years?

- MN Dept of Education graduation rates are published for all institutions in MN.
- There is high variation in risk of failure to graduate related to student background.
- Macalester has a very high graduation rate, but shows up as “moderate” in the rankings because most of its students are at low risk for failure to graduate. So, Macalester is doing what is expected for the students they have.
- In deriving a student’s graduation risk, some criteria are student-related and some are institutional.
- UMM looks good. Why? What are our strengths? We do very well with first-generation college students and with our substantial number of Native American students. These may be among the reasons for our score.
- We must look at both 4 and 6-year graduation rates. The University System does not consider student risks – they treat us the same as Twin Cities Campus.
- In recruiting prospective students, we have parents asking about the likelihood of success at UMM. We need a good message.
- How do our graduation numbers look for students that have transferred from UMM to other institutions? The data include all IPEDS data but do not include students who transfer into or out of UMM.
- Is this information sufficiently valuable that we want to increase our understanding of the model and its inputs/outputs? What’s the real value?
- MHEC were at a meeting of the MN Senate Education Committee. They have substantial influence on legislators.
- Some level of intensive investigation would be worth our time. There is a consensus of the committee to proceed.
- These data show why UMM is unique among the University System institutions. UMM needs to get this message to the University System level. President Kaler speaks of “data-driven results.” Well, here it is.

- With the data we could also study retention. Is it worth the expense? It is agreed to put this question on a future agenda.

Committee business: What are our priorities for the remainder of the semester?

- Organizational structure: Fully within our purview.
- Sightlines study of cost and efficiency will soon be available for FY 12, 13, and 14. President Kaler will be here in April, so it'll be done by then.
- Review of the Institutional Data Book. But should we get started before the new Institutional Data person is in place? Yes, we probably could go ahead.
- Fund Development
- Sustainability of old Mall buildings? Will go to Kaler and Pfitzenreuter. If no success on HEAPR charges, we will offer to use 20% of our HEAPR and trade it for equivalent R&R.
- Native American Tuition discussion. This came out of the discussions on the 2100 student enrollment target. The committee would benefit from a meeting with Sandy Olson-Loy.

The Planning Committee has just this noon received from Chancellor Johnson a late draft of the position description for the new position of Director of Institutional Research.

- This position will report directly to the Chancellor.
- The description is much as we expected from the Chancellor's meeting with us a few weeks ago.
- What, exactly, is meant by "lead"? Will the incumbent decide what to study and what not to study? Is this "leading the vision"?
- Why report to the Chancellor rather than a VC? In any case, it appears that this person will not be part of the inner circle of VCs and senior managers.
- The incumbent should figure out how to get together all the data routinely produced by this campus in a quick and easy way.
- This committee desires clarification of what "Reports to the Chancellor" really means in practice.
- Will the new person be designing metrics or leading the decision-making while not being responsible for the Initiative?
- Is it healthy to have another position reporting to the Chancellor? Search firms have noted our very weird organizational structure.
- So, should we (the Planning Committee) study our organizational structure? Compare to peer institutions?
- There is concern that the new position must represent all of the campus.

Concerns about the proposed change in personnel upon Lowell Rasmussen's retirement

- Concerns about the operation of Admissions with the coleader model. What is the evaluation plan? How will we know it's successful? How will the subunit respond to changing environments?
- The new VC was not an open hire. Why? Is there someone else on campus with these skills?

- We like Bryan's move and support him, but we are uncomfortable with Admissions. Can Bryan be effective in this situation? To whom could Admissions report?
- And another concern: Bryan moving into Facilities Management. Couldn't second line people manage FM better?

Meeting adjourned at 2:05 pm.