

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Consultative Committee

Campus Governance

1-28-2015

Consultative minutes 01/28/2015

Consultative Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Consultative Committee, "Consultative minutes 01/28/2015" (2015). *Consultative Committee*. 121.
<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/consult/121>

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
January 28, 2015
Prairie Lounge
9:30 am

Present: Rita Bolluyt, Jean Rohloff, Leslie Meek, LeAnn Dean, Michelle Page, Nancy Helsper, Jayne Blodgett, Julie Eckerle, Sam Daniewicz, Megan Jacobson

Absent: Allison Wolf, Lisa Harris

Guest: Bart Finzel

Minutes from Jan. 21 approved

Dean Finzel's visit

FYE pilot project (YOUR CALL – You, Resources, Careers and Liberal Learning)

- The program is moving forward with funding approved by the Finance Committee and with the approval of the Vice Chancellor's group.
- The program design was influenced by information gathered from the FYE Disappearing Task Force report.
- The pilot program is scheduled to start in the Fall 2015 and will create a "lab" course associated with 5 IC courses. Using the IC course is for ease of organization, and the additional meeting times will be included in registration materials, so students are clearly aware of the relationship. Faculty associated with the sessions will only be asked to remind students of the session and meet with the mentors occasionally for updates.
- The students enrolled in the IC course with a lab will meet with 2 peer mentors, probably in the evening, with 5-7 meetings designed to help students acclimate to Morris and learn about how to navigate campus as well as make them aware of the resources and programs available to them (e.g. how to read a syllabus, where to go for counseling, stress and time management, etc.) If they attend all of the sessions they will receive a \$350 stipend.
- A second round of sessions will focus more on individual work related to career goals, but will still involve the student mentors. This area is still being developed. It would also award a \$350 stipend if all sessions/work are completed.
- Each set of sessions will have a coordinator who will design the specific sessions for the program. The coordinator for the first part of the program will be part of the Office of Academic Success. Since the IC lab development is only 50% time, the hope is to create a description that will also include 50% time working for OAS. The second session will also have a coordinator at 50% time working in the Career Center with the hope that additional work will be assigned in the Career Center.
- If rolled-out to all students, the monetary reward would be associated with merit scholarships, so they would know \$700 would be contingent on completion of the program.
- The Morris College Success Program has been doing some of this programming, so we will look for what is working well and how to think about timing.
- If the program expanded to all IC classes, it might influence other on-campus activities (e.g. Mental Health Awareness Week) because the students would be getting information in lab that might be happening in all-campus events.
- Other ideas for the First Year Experience are being rolled into Title III and compact for programs in sophomore and junior and senior years. Very preliminary.

Questions/Comments

1. How about faculty who cover this type of material? Many do not cover those topics because they aren't comfortable with the material or don't want to grade "lab" materials. Faculty would want to connect with mentors to see what is covered and adjust class time as needed.
2. Will peer mentors be trained? Yes.
3. Is this program linked to changes in advising? No.
4. How to determine if the pilot is successful? Look at student demographics to see what differences there are. There is also talk of creating a follow-up survey from Noel-Levitz to see differences between registration and the end of the first year.
5. Entry is based solely on IC enrollment? Yes.
6. Classes will be identified ahead of time? Yes.
7. What about the second semester? The individualized work will start in the fall but can't finish until second semester and reward would be available then.
8. Timing needs to consider community council times, etc.
9. Peer mentors will they be trained and paid? Yes, to both.
10. What about making the IC class 3 credits with 1 credit for the "lab" instead of the financial reward? Pros: students get credit and that motivation; Cons: There is some question as to whether or not the faculty would embrace it, based on concerns about rewarding credit for non-academic work.

Higher Learning Commission quality initiative program

Nothing new from last year; the next Dean will need to focus on that next year

Advising

- There are changes coming to advising in that freshman advisors will be assigned based on students enrolled in his/her 1000-level classes.
- Students will not be allowed to declare a major at summer registration. They could indicate an interest and would wait to declare a major until the end of the first semester.
- Advising is working on identifying how that will work.
- The Master Advisor program will continue and perhaps play a bigger role because of the new method.
- How will this affect work? For term-faculty, if you advise you are given a 20-credit load and if you don't advise you get 24-credit load. The hope is this change will equalize the advising work load (e.g. languages may not have as many majors but there are lots of first year students, so may increase the number of advisees in that area).
- Could not declaring a major affect registration? Advising will think about how to adjust registration since it is currently assigned by major. Students will be allowed to declare an interest, so assignment could be made based on that.
- One of the reasons for adjusting when students declare a major is that many students feel like they have failed if they decide to change their major after the first semester/year.
- New faculty teaching intro courses will not advise.

Summer Session Salaries

- There is some concern about declining salaries for faculty teaching summer session.
- Summer session is self-sustaining, so this can cause some limitations.
- After Continuing Education closed there were fewer offerings with the thought they would have larger enrollments; however, that didn't happen.
- Faculty are given a choice as to how they would like to be paid. They are either paid by the number of students enrolled, so a small class could mean smaller pay. The other option is to say the course won't be taught unless the minimum (8) number of students enroll.

- There has also been a decline in internship pay for summer supervision. This is in relationship to how much Directed Studies were being paid, so that was leveled out by placing a cap on summer salaries for internships. It was noted that this policy may need to be reviewed for the internship coordinators in certain disciplines because internship supervision is part of the job.

Course Evaluation – Online vs. Print

- It is possible to move to online evaluations, and there has been talk at the all-U level about moving to this method. However, the number of participants usually decreases with online evaluations.
- Could completion of evaluations be tied to receiving your grades? That's an option, although it doesn't seem ideal to punish students for not completing a voluntary evaluation.
- Is there IT support for it? Most likely, but there would need to be more discussion.
- Could you do it electronically with clickers? Done at other places, but it can cause other organizational/logistical issues
- Electronic could allow for faculty to see and Chairs review at the same time, which would mean faculty could have access to them earlier.
- From a governance standpoint, who should be involved? SCEP/Scholastic would be a place to start
- Consultative will pass along to Scholastic Committee and Tisha Turk, our SCEP rep.

Respectfully submitted,
Jayne Blodgett