

3-10-2016

Consultative minutes 03/10/2016

Consultative Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Consultative Committee, "Consultative minutes 03/10/2016" (2016). *Consultative Committee*. 141.
<http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/consult/141>

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 Agenda/Minutes

Meeting date: 03/10/2016
Meeting location: Moccasin Flower
Time: 4 p.m.
Note taker: Michelle Page

Members present:

<input type="checkbox"/> Kelly Asche	<input type="checkbox"/> Brenda Boever	<input type="checkbox"/> Rita Bolluyt
<input type="checkbox"/> Rachel Brockamp	<input type="checkbox"/> Julie Eckerle	<input type="checkbox"/> Lisa Harris
<input type="checkbox"/> Megan Jacobson	<input type="checkbox"/> Jane Kill	<input type="checkbox"/> Lori Kurpiers
<input type="checkbox"/> Michelle Page	<input type="checkbox"/> Ted Pappenfus	<input type="checkbox"/> Elsie Wilson

Minutes

Reminder that the Consultative Committee is invited to lunch with Chancellor candidates; also please attend open meetings as much as you are available. Some members interpreted the invitation as for chairs/leaders only. Jane will confirm with Peh (search committee chair) that the whole committee is invited.

Discussion (& approval) of minutes from last three meetings:

Feb. 18, minutes by Elsie

Feb. 28, minutes by Kelly

March 3, minutes by Ted

Follow-up on meeting with Bart and Jacquie: comments on the proposals? One member felt the proposal was a "done deal" and they did not want our feedback, just to report what was happening to us. Various member comments:

Good to focus on retention and discuss it with a variety of committees

Would it be more helpful to give the retention monies to the offices who support students? So many offices are understaffed and feel they can't adequately support students. Perhaps it would be more effective to support existing, core programs and offices rather than adding new programs.

There seemed to be little consultation on the retention plan and offices who work with students face to face were not consulted.

One member does not understand why CC was considered a good forum for sharing the plan—why not share for information in campus assembly? CC is for consultation and this was a report with no indication of how the committee should follow up.

A member was disheartened that it appeared suggestions and questions were not being recorded

At some point there should be communication about how this all connects to the budget and finances; all of the topics (retention, budget shortfalls, etc.) should be connected. It seems that the focus is on directing even more students to units that are already overburdened—has support for these offices been considered? We haven't collected the right data—we are trying to fix things that may not need fixing.

Messages appear contradictory—we are keeping faculty advising but also doing more with professional/focused supports. Are we trying to have our cake and eat it too? Are either the rhetoric or actions contradictory or will all the components work together?

Shared governance means having input and working together on shared goals. If goals, needs, opportunities were communicated, we could all work together. How are we collecting and using data?

Got the impression that there are a lot of variables involved in retention and why students leave and a few were chosen as the focus for UMM's proposal to the system

Are these initiatives what students really want? You have a danger of creating redundant positions and yet none can really help you because none have all the needed resources. There is a danger of students being overwhelmed and confused by options.

Morris College Success Program—certain faculty were trained to work with students in the program. This made more sense than what is being proposed now (in the opinion of one member).

One member questioned whether the data is even wanted—a lot of data has been collected and is ignored in the decision-making process. It feels defeating. When staff are not utilized effectively or valued for what they can offer, it is frustrating and morale decreases. What can we say or do? One member is wondering how to voice our concerns, how we can change things.

The chair often sends a message to guests after a meeting. The chair can pass on questions about what data we have and how it is used, when will a comprehensive presentation be given about the current grants and who is being served and what roles everyone is playing in them, etc.

When attending open meetings for chancellor candidates we can make it clear that we wonder about the direction we will be headed.

One member asked, What information do we want about the grants? Response: Who is involved, how the work of each of us is affected, what students are served, how are things funded (what pots of money does each program come from?) There's a lot going on and people might be more excited about if it were explained and if we knew if these fit into some sort of strategy or if we were just trying things out to see what works. We need to know how we (campus members) fit in if we are to support the work well.

Why is it that we have new staff positions and yet many staff feel overworked and overwhelmed? [it was clarified that grant funded positions must be created

exactly according to the grant and they aren't permanent; members recognized that but also emphasized that more support in our service units is needed and the lack of communication about grant-funded positions creates misperceptions; the work of the grant programs needs to be evaluated and what we learn from these programs needs to be communicated so that the valuable parts of the programs can continue]

Follow-up discussion of Constitution Review Committee proposal considered last week

It seemed that the primary proposal was about the Chancellor and it needs to be decided if the rating system should be extended to vice chancellors. Perhaps the chancellor and one VC could be rated every year and the VCs would be rotated? Another member recommends starting with the chancellor and seeing how that goes. Perhaps there could be another amendment down the road that includes VCs if that becomes desirable. We don't want to obligate future committees to work they didn't sign on for.

One member asked if the process had been discussed at last week's meeting. There had been discussion about the methodology but no conclusive decision. The committee's interpretation is that at this point the constitution review committee just wanted to see if we would affirm a constitutional amendment and would take on the task; details of procedure would not go into the constitution and would be decided later.

The chancellor embodies the administrative team so presumably feedback would be indicative of perceptions about the entire administration and the chancellor could share and act on that feedback as needed.

Jayne Blodgett had sent information about other institutions that have a chancellor review committee—do we really want to create a new committee?

Planning for remaining semester's work, possibly via subcommittees. Julie brainstormed a list of topics that might be undertaken during the rest of semester:

Communication with the constitution review committee; it would be helpful to have a point person. Lori could help with the constitution review.

- o HFA key card reader—Lisa Harris would have a good answer to this but the problem is multifaceted. Ted can help with this issue and be part of the conversation.
- o Work conditions and retention of faculty of color—hard to do much with this complex issue this spring; make it a priority for beginning of next year
- o Retention of students and budget; is there a place for us to consult on this big issue? It feels like many people have questions about this. A good first step is to give the administration our questions and then perhaps this could form the backbone of a general presentation to the campus. Our questions might represent the main concerns and then they could branch out as additional questions or concerns arise. CC could encourage Bart and Jacquie to present on this issue; we could send an email to campus indicated we had met with them and brought them some questions and to be prepared for this conversation. Also, Sandy's office is involved in many of the grants so she should be part of the conversation. This does not have to be a negative thing—there are many exciting things happening and these can/should be communicated.

- Follow-up related to governance (report that was given in Campus Assembly)
- Discipline coordinator survey—parsing the data, how to make sense of it; Kelly is willing to help with this. So far there are about 20 responses.