

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Planning Committee

Campus Governance

9-11-2012

Planning minutes 09/11/2012

Planning Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Planning Committee, "Planning minutes 09/11/2012" (2012). *Planning Committee*. 22.
<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/plan/22>

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 Planning Committee by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

Planning Committee
September 11, 2012
Prairie Lounge, Student Center

Present: Jim Barbour, Michael Eble, Julie Eckerle, Jim Hall, Arne Kildegaard, Margaret Kuchenreuther, Sarah Mattson, Lowell Rasmussen, James Rook, Gwen Rudney (for Leslie Meeks), Jordan Wentz

Guest: Jacqueline Johnson, Chancellor

Agenda

Organization and agenda for the fall

Discussion with Chancellor Johnson about Resource Allocation Review (RAR)

Committee members began the meeting by introducing themselves.

1. Need to change meeting day.

After a short discussion it was decided to change meeting days/times for Fall Semester 2012 to accommodate more schedules. The committee will now meet Wednesdays at 8:00 a.m.

The committee was reminded:

- the Committee's charge (as stated in the Constitution...*The Planning Committee develops, reviews, and recommends policies and plans with long range implications for the development of the campus. The committee considers matters relating to institutional mission, organizational structure, marketing, fund development, energy policy, and the development and maintenance of physical facilities.*) But in short this committee needs to think about the short and long range situations at UMM from every angle. The Finance Committee is the other half and both committees need to keep connected. The Planning Committee is expected to think about space, monetary resources etc. There are areas which overlap with the Finance Committee, thus the need to communicate back and forth with them. Michael Korth is this year's chair of the Finance Committee. It is hoped the committees won't meet the same day or week which will make communications easier.
- the need to finish things from last spring. The Committee needs to finish its recommendation for UMM's peer comparison group. It is hoped to be completed by October. There is a meeting scheduled for the analysis people from FCC on Oct 25th.
- the Committee needs to make a recommendation on the right target enrollment for UMM. Data has been collected, but hasn't been put together to define the answer and make a recommendation.
- for this year Lowell is asking the committee to look at HEAPR and Capital Planning. Margaret will meet with both Lowell and Bart to get specific direction for immediate, short term and long items.

2. Resource Allocation Review (RAR) presented by Chancellor Johnson

- Before addressing the RAR, Chancellor Johnson talked about the FCC time table. It is good to have the October 25 deadline on our horizon. Peter Radcliffe and Daniel Jones-White did a good job gathering and presenting the information and the result is an important issue as it will be used in many ways. For example the accountability report which goes to the Regents this week and holds all kinds of comparative information. Right now it is using the Morris 14 for everything from salary data to retention data and so on etc. These comparison groups are an important part of the conversation.

- Reviewing the strategic plan is an important exercise. This is something the Committee should revisit on a regular basis. Jacquie feels we have made some progress. However, there are still a number of things we have put aside, or don't feel are necessary anymore. Jacquie has made a "cheat sheet" which she will share with Margaret and then it can be brought back to the committee and decisions regarding some items may just need to be let go from the strategic plan. The enrollment question has been an on-going concern. The current plan calls for UMM having 2100 student by the year 2013, This figure however didn't differentiate between full time, part time, degree seeking, non-degree seeking students. Other considerations are the space limitations, what is the right size of faculty in relationship to a particular number of students? The strategic plan is available for anyone to view.

- Chancellor Johnson is hoping to receive feedback from this Committee with clear vision in regards to UMM going in the right direction in regards to the relatively new committee structure. When UMM started the resource allocation media process task force, it was a joint effort that existed between the CRPC Chair, who at the time was Bart Finzel, and Chancellor Johnson. Deciding as how UMM could realign the highest priority group out of the Blue Ribbon Task Force. This group was formed and is now overseen by Jon Anderson and also has three sub groups (academic, administrative and scholastic) and about to complete the first phase assignment. It has many scrambling (Peh Ng is in charge of holding Chancellor Johnson to task and completing this in a timely manner). Jacquie needs to write a narrative from her office. This is almost done thus completing first phase. The phase consisted of gathering data and scrutinizing that data and programs, writing the narrative and mission center, making sense of that. It also consists of developing criteria rubric which will be used to try and evaluate, and ultimately prioritize programs. As we move into the second phase (sometimes referred to as the evaluation phase) it is hoped to get a sense from this group on how we would constitute that evaluation group. It is hoped both of these phases would be completed by the end of this semester. Then the third phase which would be yet another group beginning Spring Semester. After discussing the first 2 groups, Jacquie would like our opinion as how going forward this committee stays connected and grounded to the process through its role in Campus governance. Thinking about the evaluation phase Chancellor Johnson's vision tends to think of it in multiples of 3s (three categories, academic program [programs that directly support student learning], administrative units [Chancellor's Office, Business Office etc.], and Student Support. The thought is to would have people applying the rubrics to the material in each of the groups. Chancellor Johnson's vision is to have a group of 4-5 people working on the academic programs, similarly a group working on the student support, and then a group working on administrative programs. Jon suggests we have an "uber" group which would involve 1-2 people from the sub-groups overseeing the whole, looking for things such as continuity. Questions come to mind in regards to the structure for each group: should the academic group be open only faculty, student support programs consist of student affairs staff, and should the administrative units be only comprised of

administrators? Then these lead to other questions: what is the continuity we want to achieve between the groups that are working now, should some of those people continue on to the evaluation phase or should it be an entirely new group of people? Then again as we move to the implementation phase, it has been envisioned a smaller group of people would be looking at the programs. This information will have been “scored” and prioritized. And then would they make recommendations about the allocation of resources to the Chancellor and the chairs of the Planning and Finance Committees how are we going to work this back into the governance. Jacquie would like to know our visions as how we move forward and within the next month when we will be getting active.

- ME** One issue was brought up in the Humanities Coordinators meeting...how were the people selected and how do they score? The term “scoring” seems to scare people. What is a “3,” “4,” or “5”, how are people *trained* to interpret what is written and interpret the data which will give it a score? This was a concern of Mary Elizabeth Bezanson. How does one reach continuity between everyone in the group? Who has been *trained* to decipher scores?
- JJ** The intention is to have training. This also came up in the Consultative Committee meeting where I also had this conversation. Brook raised the concern, which was a little bit different concern, but related to this one. How do you migrate from qualitative dimensions to a numeric score that is another aspect of this. How does one preserve those qualitative things that don’t necessarily translate well to the numeric score. There will be some training for the people applying the rubrics. But it would be appreciated if everyone takes time to view the rubrics themselves. There will be some attention paid to the question of interrater reliability. I believe that is what Mary Elizabeth is asking. How do we ensure that the three Chancellor Johnson assigns are the same three that “you” assign and how do we the checks as we work our way through this process. We will have to pay attention and do some cross checking as well. Chancellor Johnson admits that she has not done extensive work with rubrics. However she did work with them to some extent as part of an exercise as part of an assessment of student learning outcomes. It is possible to move from a descriptive narrative category to the assignment of a number. It has to happen in a context of conversation between the people who are doing the scoring. If you have given a “1” to a program and someone else a “5” on a 5 point scale, obviously there is something wrong. That and the pre phases of this as we look at how the rubrics apply should give us enlightenment as to whether this is going to work or not.
- GR** I feel you have answered it very well. Just as we assign a grade to a narrative piece, that is the score. The idea is to have the scoring the same on that document. We did decide to match it, not compare programs, but judge it on the criteria. People are trainable. When people are doing the massive scorings often they will do comparable scoring. And if they are within one point different score that is acceptable. However if it is further apart than that, it may require re-scoring.
- LR** After the evaluation process takes place, I think there is a time line that I am concerned about from the stand point that our next budget submission for FY 13. Our compact budget presentations are due the end February or first of March which means we have to have a pretty good idea of our budget process in place by that time. We also have been told to assume there will be NO new State money coming. That might change revenues. However if there are salary increases, that will be the re-allocation target. We will find ourselves reallocating of current budget dollars. And that is why this RAR process weighs heavily on

that decision. The more information we have on that evaluation process would help facilitate budget decisions and would be extremely useful.

- JJ** (Question raised by Brooke from the Consultative Committee) Have we established a target for this process? For instance how many dollars we want to reallocate. We did have this discussion when we began this process. And when we were all reading the book, discovered it gives a good straight forward description of how this works, in particular to the academic programs. One section of the book talks about how this procedure has been done in different places. Some schools start out with a dollar figure. We decided not to do that. But rather do something way broader than what anyone has tried before. The budget model that is going to the Regents this week has a reallocation target of 5%. Also, the directive we are likely to get is we will be told where to reallocate that. Currently I think they feel it is to come from administrative costs. However it is important to get this done and have the campus' input as to where the resources go is very valuable.
- SM** It would be helpful if one person from each group could sit on the committee this would help with continuity. The spreadsheets are full of detail and the amount of input from each group might be lost if not represented properly.
- JJ** The sense of continuity keeps coming up and is important. It might also be important to have new ideas to bring a fresh outlook.
- MK** One thing that came up, is if the divisions should elect representatives to the committee vs. appointed as some may perceive appointed with prejudice. If no lab scientist were on the committee the extra cost benefit could be lost, as science is an expensive area. Each division has its own peculiarities along the same lines. These costs need to remain a viable issue. It is crucial to have persons on board who know and understand these issues, especially on the academic review.
- ME** The Humanities Division is concerned that if you offer up to one discipline another would be knocked down. I am saying this just so it is heard.
- JE** There is enough "fear" in the divisions that there is tension felt all across campus.
- JJ** There is a group that worked together to develop the rubrics process and another group that works together to apply the rubrics. And there is yet another smaller group working to decide how these things come out, what we don't understand. So for example, if the group evaluated my office and the group decided priority wise a score of 109 out of 110. Then is there a chance to discover if something had been missed. There would be the option of pointing that out. However in terms of academics programs, if people are afraid their area is going to be eliminated. This is not the way it happens. There is a process in place that goes through our campus assembly all the way up through the Regents, not only for program creation but also program elimination. Nothing like that will happen out of this process. However how do we comprise these groups? However if there is a way for constituents to elect, name, appoint, whatever way they choose people they want to have an active part would be a great idea
- AK** Currently the Membership Committee appoints people to the different committees. What worries me about the process of electing people to things is then they view themselves as

having constituents and they almost fight to protect their “home turf.” And yet the Membership Committee could be asked to come up with a reasonable slate of persons that could be assigned to these areas.

- JJ** It is the Membership Committee that needs to weigh in on this. It reinforces the impact of names given. But one question needs asking, should it only be faculty members who evaluate academic programs and student affairs personnel who evaluate student support programs and administrative personnel who evaluate administrative programs. This would be a good way to do it, or a mix of some ratio might also work as long as expertise in each area was represented.
- MK** I put together the Environmental Studies report and found it the most frustrating things I have done. Part of that is because Environmental Studies has a 1.25 FTE and yet has 15 faculty and all these programs, I wasn't sure what to write. I kind of wonder if someone on the committee needs to have a very interdisciplinary vent. There are more and more areas of “studies” that are hard to fit into the rubric the way it was constituted. I wonder if there is there someone who could be in that regard.
- JJ** It also has been suggested to have predominant faculty in the academic area etc. but there are those that feel only experts should be on the committee, not having exclusive ownership; not only faculty but predominately faculty in the academic area. Membership Committee is the closest in terms of its purview as to who to populate these groups. But then how does the implementation group constitute itself?
- MK** Maybe people who are not in academics have sense on other realms of UMM, or is there another way that would make sense?
- SM** It is good to have the experts evaluating. However the way things are done here at UMM and who we are, maybe need to have members be of other areas.
- JJ** Is there any opinion on the role of students on either the evaluation or implementation phases?
- MK** One concern is that students who tend to be involved are mostly from Social Science.
- JR** I don't feel that is true at least for this year.
- GR** The strength of student involvement is the current pulse of what is happening on campus and the issue that makes it hard for students when it comes to other things is that it has to look not only to the future, but also the past. Student involvement is good, but that is what makes it difficult. The “uber” group is where the big picture needs to come from.
- JJ** The “uber” group's purpose in the evaluation phase is to pay attention to the inter rated reliability not necessarily to have the Big Picture. I think what Gwen is talking about is the implementation phase. So now we have a list of programs and for instance if mine is 109 out of 110, now what? What are the recommendations...I think that is the Big Picture. I would like to get back to the student role? I think the students can be well involved in the evaluation piece of it. But I really worry about their being involved in the implementation phase where

there are recommendations being made about resources. It is not because I don't think students can't do it, aren't smart enough or have a forward enough perspective to do it. I worry about the responsibility we put on the students. I don't think it is appropriate. I don't want to sound condescending.

- AK** As for the "uber" group how much reworking would the implementation group have to do? Are you envisioning this as an appellate process, the appellate courts and rules, and procedures followed, and finding fact? It is scary. But the number of questions is really supposed to narrow the higher up you go, making the executive decision easier.
- JJ** In terms of what I envision, I don't see the implementation group arguing whether a 5 is a 5. But rather I see the argument being about the role of programs has been correctly understood. And we need to remember there is the opportunity for restating and/or explaining why this program is really important. And that the implementation team would be making recommendations of the allocation of resources. We are only making a judgment of this in the process. I see it as making a judgment about value. And correct placement in some prioritization.
- GR** As the program or report is the scored, when does that program get a chance to answer questions? As the fact that it has happened this year, there are programs which have gone through the review. Their reports were privileged. Which is being scored, the report or the program? I am saying that something was not explained well enough as you received a lower score. Or was there something missing in the report, there was a problem with that report.
- MK** The limit of words (100 words) makes the communication of importance and explain what these people and program do is difficult at best. Did you pick the correct term used in the 100 word explanation to convey the gravity of the situation.
- SM** I have a question about organizational structure roles. We have Vice Chancellors and Division Chairs and a lot of reports. Does this group play a role somewhere in this process? They could review the report and see right away that for example this isn't what Sarah meant. She missed this piece. Then they could go back and relate this piece of information. Is this what we are talking about? Is there a role for that group to take on a responsibility for the continuity, clarity and communication we are talking about?
- JJ** That is one of the questions on my mind, especially in terms with the Implementation team. What is the right balance between the administrative voice, roles and responsibilities and the non-administrative that means we do have shared governance which means there are the administrative roles and responsibilities and then there are the governance, committees etc. So the sharing of that demonstrates us working together. And I think that is really important particularly in this implementation phase, with a group that is making the recommendations. And maybe the answer to your question is the implementation phase the recommendation is to whom? Is it the Division Chairs, is it to the Vice Chancellors and what opportunity do those two administrative groups have to weigh in to clarify all of this?
- SM** I am worried about what if the 100 words didn't clearly explain the jist of the program? Who has that consistently through the division path? Is there a Division Chair who can say this is

changing the course of things. Maybe we need to bring these people together and discuss and re-submit this. Where is the life guard?

Margaret reminded everyone to mark all Wednesdays at 8:00 AM for the Planning Committee.