

9-8-2010

Consultative minutes 09/08/2010

Consultative Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Consultative Committee, "Consultative minutes 09/08/2010" (2010). *Consultative Committee*. 112.
<http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/consult/112>

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.

Minutes of the Consultative Committee

September 8, 2010

Imholte Hall 218

Present: Jim Barbour, Nancy Carpenter, Brad Deane, Zak Forde, Nic McPhee, Paula O'Loughlin, Mark Privratsky, Sharon van Eps, Naomi Wentz, Jen Zych Herrmann

Meeting with the Committee: Cheryl Contant, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Dean

Meeting was called to order at 8:05 am by co-chair Paula O'Laughlin.

Faculty Salary Plan

This is an important issue on campus and it is time to address it in an analytical way. Without a sound analysis and a plan that outlines the costs and how it would implement, there will be no action in addressing low faculty salaries. To begin to address this issue, we will need to answer several critical questions: What is the appropriate comparison group for our faculty salaries (by institution type, by discipline, etc.)? Not one data set includes all the data we would need. CUPA and AAUP provide data by different categories, but neither is perfect. Perhaps we should go with AAUP data for the Morris 14? A clear faculty salary plan is needed, and must be guided by clear priorities. We should also examine salaries internally.

Reaching our goal means planning that to reach level x , we need $\$A$, for level y we need $\$B$, and so on. Then a strategy must be devised to get there. We must also identify resources available from off campus (central admin), and we need to get in the queue now to get any available funds in time to implement the plan.

The How and the Who - The Dean will be raising this issue with the Faculty Affairs Committee, to whom data will be forwarded. CRPC will also be informed. The likely routing of the process is FAC to CRPC to Campus Assembly.

The Dean indicated that she is providing assistance and working on the Faculty Salary study. The Chancellor is involved in analyzing P&A salaries and bargaining unit salaries.

Review of General Education

Background: The last review of Gen Ed was in 1989. We now have Student Learning Outcomes – now we need to link our general education program, major degree programs, and student activities to our learning outcomes. But, this is a catalog year and Curriculum Committee is booked up with catalog work and ancillary issues. There was a request and agreement to organize a small task force to identify options for a **major** revision of

GenEd. The task force will identify what is unique and distinctive about UMM and tie that to the general education curriculum. They will also look for other models at other universities and/or liberal arts colleges that might inspire us. The task force will bring forward the results of their research to the Curriculum Committee late this semester. Then the Curriculum Committee will take over.

Goal: New GenEd program defined by the end of Spring Semester. AY 2011-2012 will be devoted to devising implementation plans. In Fall 2012, we roll out the new GenEd program. This is a very ambitious timetable, that may not be achievable, but worth trying. Divisions, staff, students are to be linked into this process with Curriculum Committee.

General discussion: Connect with the Assessment Committee. How do we measure outcomes in the student learning outcomes? We need to know what about our current Gen Ed works and what's broken. We currently survey graduating seniors. There are significant differences across the general education categories in what students assess their need for that knowledge is.

Our mission has evolved since 1989, as have our students and our niche. We should be open to a significant change in GenEd programs, rather than just tweaking GenEd. It was also suggested to remember College Writing as an important part of the process. Also, consider the transition problems of having some students on Plan A and others on Plan B. Another suggested that we need more rigor in requiring what a course does to meet a particular GenEd requirement.

Next Issue for Discussion

No notes were taken on this discussion because of confidentiality concerns.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:07 am.

Respectfully submitted by Jim Barbour