

4-7-2016

Consultative minutes 04/07/2016

Consultative Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Consultative Committee, "Consultative minutes 04/07/2016" (2016). *Consultative Committee*. 142.
<http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/consult/142>

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: 04/07/2016
Meeting location: Moccasin Flower
Time: 4 p.m.
Note taker: Julie Eckerle

Members present:

Kelly Asche Brenda Boever Rita Bolluyt
 Rachel Brockamp Julie Eckerle Lisa Harris
 no Megan Jacobson Jane Kill Lori Kurpiers
 Michelle Page Ted Pappenfus Elsie Wilson

Agenda (**AND MINUTES**)

- Discussion & approval of minutes from March 10 meeting (attached -- *thanks Michelle!*)
MINUTES WERE APPROVED.
- Announcement re: OIT discussion
JULIE SHARED AN EMAIL INVITATION FROM MATT SENGER TO PARTICIPATE IN A CONVERSATION ON TECHNOLOGY NEEDS AT THE U OF MN. THE DISCUSSION RE: UMM NEEDS WILL BE SPONSORED BY THE OFFICE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (OIT) AND HELD MONDAY, APRIL 18 FROM 1-2 P.M. IN HFA 45. JULIE IS NOT SURE IF INDIVIDUALS SHOULD RSVP, BUT ANY MEMBERS ABLE TO ATTEND CAN CONTACT MATT DIRECTLY IF THEY WISH. JULIE WILL DEFINITELY ATTEND, IN HER CAPACITY AS CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR.
- Remaining Business for **LAST 3 MEETINGS**: Discussion, Plans, & Goals:
JULIE SUGGESTED THAT THE MEETING BE DEVOTED TO FOLLOW-UP ON SEVERAL ISSUES AS WELL AS MAKING PLANS FOR HOW/IF THE ISSUES CAN BE RESOLVED BY THE END OF THE SEMESTER.
 - Search Committee Diversity (Megan)
JULIE EXPLAINED THAT MEGAN HAD RAISED A CONCERN ABOUT SEARCH COMMITTEE DIVERSITY VIA EMAIL SINCE THE LAST MEETING. SINCE MEGAN

COULD NOT BE AT THIS MEETING, JULIE SUGGESTS POSTPONING THIS ISSUE UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING (APRIL 14), WHEN MEGAN CAN EXPLAIN DIRECTLY TO THE REST OF THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS, AS WELL AS LEAD THE DISCUSSION AS NECESSARY.

○ Summer Term Contract Concern (Julie)

JULIE EXPLAINED THAT A FACULTY MEMBER HAS REACHED OUT TO CONSULTATIVE WITH A CONCERN ABOUT THIS YEAR'S SUMMER TERM CONTRACT, WHICH CONTAINS A STATEMENT HIGHLIGHTED IN GREEN THAT THE FACULTY MEMBER DOES NOT REMEMBER SEEING ON PAST YEARS' CONTRACTS. THE STATEMENT READS: "SUMMER SESSION COURSES MUST MEET THE TOTAL PER-CREDIT WORKLOAD EXPECTATIONS HELD FOR COURSES SCHEDULED FOR AN ENTIRE SEMESTER. AS PER UNIVERSITY POLICY, ONE CREDIT EQUALS 42-45 HOURS OF WORK PER SESSION (INCLUDING BOTH IN-CLASS AND OUT-OF-CLASS ACTIVITIES)." BECAUSE THIS SEEMS TO BE A NEW ADDITION TO THE CONTRACT, AND BECAUSE THE FACULTY MEMBER IS ONE OF A RELATIVELY SMALL NUMBER WHO TEACH IN THE SUMMER, THE FACULTY MEMBER FELT SINGLED OUT BY THIS COMMENT AND ASKED CONSULTATIVE TO LOOK INTO IT. SO JULIE GOT A COPY OF THE CONTRACT AND SHARED IT WITH THE COMMITTEE.

MEMBERS POINTED OUT THAT THE HIGHLIGHTED STATEMENT ARTICULATES FAMILIAR UMM POLICY AND THAT CONCERNS HAVE BEEN RAISED IN THE PAST ABOUT INCONSISTENT WORKLOADS DURING SUMMER TERM. PERHAPS, IT WAS SUGGESTED, THIS IS JUST A REMINDER? EVEN SO, MEMBERS AGREED THAT A CONTRACT IS NOT THE BEST PLACE FOR SUCH A STATEMENT/REMINDER AND THAT THE GREEN HIGHLIGHTING IN PARTICULAR SEEMS A BIT MUCH (BOTH "OBNOXIOUS AND UNNECESSARY," TO USE ONE COMMITTEE MEMBER'S WORDS).

IT WAS SUGGESTED THAT JULIE CONTACT GWEN RUDNEY (SUMMER TERM DIVISION CHAIR) DIRECTLY TO ASK A FEW QUESTIONS (IS THIS STATEMENT NEW THIS YEAR? IF SO, WHY HAS IT BEEN INCLUDED?) AND TO SUGGEST THAT THERE MAY BE A BETTER PLACE FOR THIS STATEMENT THAN A CONTRACT.

JULIE WILL REPORT BACK TO THE COMMITTEE AFTER HEARING FROM GWEN FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION SO THAT SHE CAN GET BACK TO THE CONCERNED FACULTY MEMBER BEFORE THE END OF THE TERM.

○ HFA Card Reader: Please review information Lisa has shared (she has consulted with Jen Lund) & review the issue as described below (Lisa & Ted are our point-persons on this issue)

LISA CONTEXTUALIZED THE EMAIL MESSAGE FROM JEN LUND THAT SHE HAD FORWARDED TO CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN THE LAST FEW WEEKS. SHE EXPLAINED THAT JEN'S MESSAGE WAS AN ATTEMPT TO SET THE RECORD

STRAIGHT, SINCE SHE SOMEWHAT FREQUENTLY GETS QUESTIONS AND/OR HAS TO ADDRESS MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT THE CARD READERS ACROSS CAMPUS. LISA ADDED THAT, BASED ON THE RECENT SECURITY AUDIT, CARD READERS ARE THE WAY TO GO. THERE ARE CURRENTLY TOO MANY KEYS CIRCULATING, AND IT REQUIRES A LOT OF WORK, TIME, AND MONEY TO GET ALL OF THOSE KEYS BACK OR TO RE-KEY WHEN AN EMPLOYEE LEAVES.

TED EXPLAINED THAT SCIENCE HAS A VERY OLD SYSTEM THAT WORKS SOMETIMES BUT SOMETIMES DOES NOT AND THAT THERE IS CURRENTLY A PROPOSAL TO UPDATE THAT SYSTEM AND TO MAKE THE ENTIRE BUILDING KEYCARD ACCESSIBLE. THIS HAS RAISED THREE CONCERNS FOR FACULTY IN SCI/MATH: (1) IF A KEYCARD DOES NOT WORK AND THUS LIMITS ACCESS TO A LAB, POTENTIALLY IN A DANGEROUS OR EMERGENCY SITUATION; (2) PRIVACY CONCERNS RE: COLLECTION OF DATA VIA KEYCARD SYSTEM; AND (3) POTENTIAL FOR INNOCENT INDIVIDUALS TO BE BLAMED IF THERE WERE A THEFT.

LISA VERIFIED THAT DATA IS INDEED COLLECTED VIA THE KEYCARD SYSTEM BUT THAT IT IS USUALLY ONLY ACCESSED WHEN SOMETHING HAS GONE WRONG. TED SAID THAT PEH IS CURRENTLY IN CONVERSATION WITH JEN LUND, BRYAN HERRMANN, AND OTHERS, SO THAT HE THINKS THE SCI/MATH CONCERNS ARE BEING ADDRESSED.

THUS, CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS AGREED THAT WE HAVE DONE WHAT WE CAN TO INVESTIGATE THIS ISSUE AND THAT JEN LUND HAS ADDRESSED THE CONCERNS RAISED BY A FACULTY MEMBER EARLIER THIS TERM TO OUR SATISFACTION. JULIE WILL FORWARD THE EMAIL MESSAGE FROM JEN LUND TO THAT FACULTY MEMBER AND MAKE SURE THAT HE/SHE IS ALSO SATISFIED.

- Annual Rating of the Chancellor: Please review the issue as described below (Lori is our point-person on this issue)

JULIE SHARED WITH THE REST OF THE COMMITTEE THE AMENDED CONSTITUTION LANGUAGE DRAFTED BY THE CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE AFTER MEETING WITH US ABOUT ADDING AN ANNUAL CHANCELLOR RATING TO THE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHARGE. MEMBERS RAISED CONCERNS ABOUT THE PHRASE "AND THE COMMITTEE WILL MEET WITH THE CHANCELLOR TO DISCUSS THE FORWARDED RESULTS," IN PART BECAUSE IT SEEMS TOO PRESCRIPTIVE. OTHER COMMITTEE MEMBERS SUGGESTED THAT IT MIGHT WASTE TIME, ESPECIALLY IF THE RESULTS WERE STRAIGHTFORWARD AND POSITIVE. THERE WAS A BRIEF DISCUSSION OF THE GOAL OF THE PROPOSED RATING, WHICH A COMMITTEE MEMBER NEATLY SUMMARIZED AS (1) PROVIDING THE CHANCELLOR WITH FEEDBACK; (2) MAKING SURE THAT THE CAMPUS COMMITTEE FEELS THAT IT HAS A VOICE AND THAT IT IS HEARD; AND (3) PROVIDING PRESIDENT KALER--AS THE CHANCELLOR'S SUPERVISOR--WITH THE INFORMATION. IN

THE END, THE COMMITTEE AGREED TO RECOMMEND TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE THAT THE PHRASE IDENTIFIED ABOVE BE REMOVED FROM THE AMENDED LANGUAGE. LORI AGREED TO CONVEY THAT MESSAGE TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE.

- Discipline Coordinator Survey: Please review the issue as described below (Julie & Kelley are our point-persons on this issue)

JULIE UPDATED THE COMMITTEE RE: PROGRESS ON THE DISCIPLINE COORDINATOR SURVEY AS FOLLOWS: KELLY HAS CREATED AN ELECTRONIC SURVEY, AND ABOUT 45 SURVEYS WERE RECEIVED. THIS SEEMS, IN JULIE'S OPINION, A VERY GOOD RESPONSE RATE, ESPECIALLY CONSIDERING THE FACT THAT AT LEAST ONE DISCIPLINE (MUSIC) SUBMITTED ONLY ONE SURVEY ON BEHALF OF ALL FACULTY AND THAT AT LEAST ONE PERSON WHO COORDINATES MORE THAN ONE DISCIPLINE SUBMITTED ONLY ONE SURVEY (LIKELY THERE WERE OTHERS WHO DID THE SAME). UNFORTUNATELY, JULIE HAS NOT BEEN ABLE TO ENTER THE RESULTS IN THE SURVEY TOOL YET, AND IT IS UNLIKELY THAT WE WILL BE ABLE TO MAKE A FULL REPORT ON THE DATA AT THE CAMPUS ASSEMBLY THIS SEMESTER. EVEN SO, JULIE IS COMMITTED TO PROVIDING--AT THE VERY LEAST--AN EMAIL UPDATE WITH SURVEY RESULTS BEFORE THE END OF THE ACADEMIC YEAR. THEN THE NEXT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CAN DECIDE HOW/IF TO PROCEED ON ACTION BASED ON THE SURVEY AND POTENTIALLY TAKE THE ISSUE TO THE CAMPUS ASSEMBLY.

- Campus Governance Follow-up (Julie)

JULIE PROPOSED THAT SHE MAKE A BRIEF ANNOUNCEMENT AT THE NEXT CAMPUS ASSEMBLY BY WAY OF FOLLOW-UP ON THE REPORT AT THE FEBRUARY MEETING. ESSENTIALLY, SHE WILL SAY THAT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE HAS FORWARDED ALL OF ITS RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES AND/OR INDIVIDUALS AND THAT CONSULTATIVE FEELS IT HAS DONE WHAT IT CAN DO ON THIS ISSUE; IN OTHER WORDS, THE COMMITTEE IS LETTING OTHERS DO THE PROBLEM-SOLVING AND FOLLOW-UP, SINCE WE ARE PRIMARILY A CONSULTATIVE ENTITY AND SINCE WE UNDERSTOOD OUR JOB TO BE ASSESSING CAMPUS PERCEPTIONS, REPORTING ON THOSE PERCEPTIONS, AND SUGGESTING A WAY TO MOVE FORWARD. SECONDLY, JULIE WILL EXPLAIN THAT THE RESULTS OF THE DISCIPLINE COORDINATOR SURVEY ARE BEING PROCESSED AND WILL BE SHARED WITH THE CAMPUS COMMUNITY VIA EMAIL, SINCE THERE WILL BE NO TIME FOR A CAMPUS ASSEMBLY REPORT THIS ACADEMIC YEAR (SEE ABOVE DISCUSSION RE: THE DISCIPLINE COORDINATOR SURVEY).

JULIE ALSO NOTED THAT MANY OF THE INDIVIDUALS/COMMITTEE CHAIRS TO WHOM SHE HAS FORWARDED THE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS HAVE RESPONDED BY ASKING HOW CONSULTATIVE WANTS THEM TO RESOLVE THE ISSUE. JULIE HAS EMPHASIZED, IN RETURN, THAT

CONSULTATIVE REALLY DOESN'T HAVE THE ANSWERS OR CONCRETE SOLUTIONS AND THAT CONSULTATIVE FEELS IT'S TIME AND APPROPRIATE TO PASS THE ISSUE TO OTHERS; SHE CONFIRMED WITH ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS THAT THIS IS INDEED THE RIGHT MESSAGE TO BE SENDING. ALL WERE IN AGREEMENT.

- MICHELLE RAISED A QUESTION NEAR THE END OF THE MEETING: WHETHER WE SHOULD CONSIDER APPLYING FOR AN MSAF TO ASSIST WITH CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE WORK (MUCH AS GENDER, WOMEN, AND SEXUALITY STUDIES--GWSS--HAS AN MSAF STUDENT EVERY YEAR TO SUPPORT THE DISCIPLINE), ESPECIALLY SINCE IT IS UNLIKELY WE WILL GET SUPPORT STAFF FOR OUR COMMITTEE ANY TIME SOON AND THE COMMITTEE CHAIR HAS A LOT OF DETAILS TO HANDLE BEHIND THE SCENES (ESPECIALLY WHEN THERE IS DATA COLLECTION AS THERE WAS THIS YEAR). A BRIEF DISCUSSION ENSUED. FIRST, JULIE ASKED IF IT WOULD BE A PROBLEM TO GIVE STUDENTS ACCESS TO PRIVATE AND/OR CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION, BUT SEVERAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS PROVIDED EXAMPLES FROM ACROSS CAMPUS IN WHICH STUDENTS HAVE SUCH ACCESS AND IT IS NO PROBLEM AS LONG AS THERE IS PROPER TRAINING, ETC. OF COURSE, WE ALSO ALREADY HAVE STUDENT MEMBERS ON OUR COMMITTEE, AND ACCESS TO PRIVATE/CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION HAS NOT BEEN A PROBLEM BEFORE. SECOND, TED ASKED IF THE STUDENT WOULD TAKE MINUTES, AND MICHELLE RESPONDED THAT SHE THOUGHT THE STUDENT WOULD. THIRD, RITA ASKED HOW MANY HOURS OF WORK THE POSITION COULD OFFER, SINCE MANY MSAF STUDENTS DO 8 HOURS/WEEK; ALL AGREED THAT WE COULD ASK FOR A SMALLER NUMBER OF HOURS. FINALLY, A MEMBER WONDERED IF THE DEADLINE HAD ALREADY PASSED, BUT IT HAS NOT.

MICHELLE AND JANE AGREED TO LOOK INTO THE ISSUE SO THAT WE CAN--IDEALLY--SUBMIT A PROPOSAL THIS YEAR. WE ALSO AGREE THAT WE WOULD ASK FOR A 3-4 HOUR/WEEK COMMITMENT.

MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 5 P.M.

Agenda Documents & Notes

HFA Card Reader:

The concerns: Several faculty experienced HFA key card reader malfunctions before this semester began, and the proposed solution for future problems was (according to the faculty member who called Julie) to call ahead to security before coming to the building. Clearly, this is not a sustainable model. Also, the faculty member voiced concern about there being no local control for this issue, since the operation of the card readers runs through the TC. Finally, there was concern about the lack of (or ineffective) communication about key card access and key card problems here at UMM. Since other buildings are also considering key card readers, there is a lot to think about! Question: will it be necessary to go to Bryan H. with this?

Jen Lund's Message to Consultative (shared by Lisa via email):

"I will start with a little background on university card access. About ten years ago the university system began allocating funds for safety on campus. A majority of the funds were to be used for security cameras and university card access to buildings. Key control as you know has many major security issues. Card readers are much more efficient because of the ease of deactivating a card if someone loses it opposed to re-keying the building and also the capability of locking the building down in an emergency situation. We began using card readers in Imholte Hall about ten years ago. The Welcome Center has been using card readers for approximately five years and the residence halls for four and a half years. Tom Ladner (ORL) is responsible for residence hall student access and Sandy Kopel (Campus Police) is responsible for faculty and staff. Supervisors need to be reminded that when hiring new staff or students who need building access that they need to register their university card numbers with Campus Police in order to have them activated. They also need to let us know if they get a new card because the numbers change. We would like to see the cards or have a copy of it. When they come to pick up office keys they should bring their university card.

Tom Ladner had this to say about the Office of Residential Life: "ORL has been using card access for residence hall exterior entrances since the Fall of 2011. Some in the office were very concerned at the time about having to coordinate access control through the Twin Cities, but most of these concerns turned out to be unfounded. DPS / Central Security has been very responsive to our needs. I believe our residents and residential staff have found card access to be a great convenience. There are rare cases (approximately 2 - 3 per semester out of 900+ active residents) the system seems to randomly drop a resident, and the typical resolution is to have them get a new card. There are another 2 - 3 cases each semester where a card is physically damaged in such a way that it no longer works. Again, the resolution is to get a replacement card. I find it much easier to monitor and resolve access control issues related to our card access doors than our keyed access doors."

We have had some maintenance issues with two or three of the doors since we put card access in. Facilities Management has staff knowledgeable in fixing issues we might encounter with card access. As you all know we also can have maintenance issues with mechanical locks as well.

I am aware of two faculty members in HFA who experienced issues with their cards during break. No one else reported any problems to us. I am aware of several faculty members who have had problems with their keys to their offices or building this semester. The solution of calling Campus Police to respond if you are having issues with your card or key is always given. If we don't know, we can't help. Calling ahead was given as a second solution, as well as if it is 50 below windchill, drive up to the door and tell us you will be parked outside for a few minutes. We have very few complaints from

the Social Science Division about card entry. The Welcome Center has many volunteers who have limited access and we do not have complaints about access. They do call us if they experience problems. I sent a message to supervisors of the areas using card access asking for input and only received positive comments.

The Science Building has been operating on a independent card access program for about 16 years. It is obsolete. If you want more information about that please let me know. It is nothing like the University system of card access. Right now Campus Police staff sometimes spends hours a day working on the programming in our office and in the building. We take the door hardware apart and use a netbook to program the doors every time access is changed. This is not sustainable because it is breaking down more frequently than we have the time or funds to manage. This also involves the time of Facilities Management.

Please contact me if you have any other questions.”

Annual Rating of Chancellor:

The issue: The Constitution Review Committee has already drafted the Constitutional amendment about this, and **I will share that with you at our next meeting.** Perhaps--if time this semester--Lori can lead a discussion on the details of the actual survey/ranking tool. It would be nice for next year's committee to have something in place when the academic term starts.

Discipline Coordinator Survey:

Kelly has created an electronic version of the survey, so the next step is to enter, compile, and analyze the data. I received roughly 45 surveys, which seems a pretty good return rate, in my opinion, especially since some disciplines made the decision to submit one survey on behalf of the discipline and all its potential coordinators.

Campus Governance Follow-up:

Perhaps an update at next Assembly?