

11-16-2010

## Consultative minutes 11/16/2010

Consultative Committee

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Consultative Committee, "Consultative minutes 11/16/2010" (2010). *Consultative Committee*. 104.  
<http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/consult/104>

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](mailto:skulann@morris.umn.edu).

## **Consultative Committee Minutes**

**Tuesday, November 16, 2010**

*Present: Paula O'Loughlin, Naomi Wentz, Mark Privatsky, Nic McPhee, Jen Zych Herrmann, Brad Deane, Nick Bergantine, Laura Thielke, Sharon Van Eps*

*Guest: Dean Cheryl Contant*

The meeting was called to order by co-chair Paula O'Loughlin.

Dean Contant began the meeting with an update on program reviews. The first round of reviews is almost completed. She hoped to have them finished by spring semester but is not too optimistic that will happen. The disciplines reviewed in the first round were the Honors Program, Chemistry, Psychology and CMR. Some are finished with their reports, others have been submitted to their discipline for review, and some have been submitted to the Division Chair for discussion. There are four other disciplines scheduled to be reviewed yet this year. The self-studies produced are due to the Dean by the beginning of spring semester. She will then form review committees who will work through a plan of action for any suggested changes. The timing is difficult with the budgets cuts but this is seen as a way to improve programs.

All disciplines and programs know when their review will be done so are encouraged to begin working on the information as time permits.

When the report is done, the Division Chair and disciplines meet to discuss the outcomes. An abbreviated report will then be given to the Curriculum Committee. The Dean's Office will house the review committee information. It was suggested that it would be nice to have some kind of visible outcome and to have the outcomes made public.

The Dean then updated the committee on the confidential matter she discussed at her last visit to the committee.

Next, the Dean updated the committee on the position of the Assistant Dean. The position was set up as a two-year position to be reviewed at the end of the second year. To date there have been two meetings with the Assistant Dean to discuss the position. The position as it is now configured requires a very diverse skill set. It is not likely that any other one person could do all aspects of the current job well. The issue remains that the Dean needs to review all aspects of the job to determine the possibility of splitting the position into two areas: academic and office

management. This, of course, assumes that the position will continue. The current model is probably not the model she will move forward with. She is looking at alternatives.

It was suggested that if the CARE office is to grow, there needs to be more of a team approach to the oversight and functions of the office. Being co-located is essential for this to happen. The Dean hopes to restore some personnel back into these offices in the future. The committee suggested that all programs composing the CARE office need to have something measurable to work towards. Ownership needs to be given back to each of the offices. This is critical to making the office work as a unit.

The timetable for the transition for the Assistant Dean position was discussed. The Dean would like to figure out the alternatives by Thanksgiving and come back to the committee in December to discuss her thoughts on the position. She welcomes suggestions from the committee on how to structure the position. Some of her thoughts to date are:

- Student academic issues – have the Scholastic Committee take over this piece;
- First Year Experience – develop a model for the coming year but it will continue to be a work in progress. The curricular part of the experience is in place, but the rest of the experience has not yet been formulated.

Some suggestions from the committee were:

- Position needs to be empowered to make decisions on their own;
- Make the 'uber' advisor and academic components of the position into a separate position

The Assistant Dean position as it is now was a quick fix to a series of problems. There needs to be a way to help the position as well as others to do things better, i.e. managing office and chairing committees. If faculty are to be used in managing offices, training needs to be available for them (and others) to learn how to run an office as this is not their area of expertise.

It was again suggested that there needs to be an assessment of the re-organization efforts with benchmarks for the offices to work towards.

The meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon Van Eps

