University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Consultative Committee   Campus Governance

10-9-2012

Consultative minutes 10/09/2012

Consultative Committee

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

Consultative Committee Minutes 10/9/12
Ray Schultz, Note Taker
Present: Co-chairs Brook Miller and LeAnn Dean, Jim Barbour, Chad Braegelmann,
Joey Daniewicz, Jim Hall, Nancy Helsper, Ray Schultz, Zach Van Cleve, Heather Waye

The 10/2/12 minutes were approved with minor changes, which Leann said she would
make before posting.

I. Gen Ed Task Force/Subcommittee

The committee discussed process issues with regard to the Gen-Ed Task Force. Brook
reviewed some strategies previously discussed which included:
Individual Disciplines Looking at Themselves;
Looking at Other Institutional Models;
Consulting Division Chairs (who had attended a Gen-Ed workshop;
Staff Support;
Possibility of Outside Consultants;

The Dean has already asked the Curriculum and Assessment Committees to start
mapping out a process. Brook asked the question of Consultative if we have any more
formal recommendations to offer the Dean for this process. The committee then engaged
in an extended discussion of recommendations, primarily revolving around Mary Allen's
"Assessing General Education." At the conclusion of the discussion Brook indicated that
he would type up these recommendations and forward to the Dean after the committee
had the opportunity to comment on his memo.

Highlights of the discussion included:
- Discussion of determining whether UMM has already accomplished some of the
  assessment steps recommended in Allen's study (p16 and ff.), including "buying
  into" gen ed; Nancy noted that we already have developed general objectives of
  gen ed areas.

- Discussion of student feedback and issues of retention with regard to gen ed; Zach
  indicated that student forums on this isse in the past had not always been well
  attended;

- There was discussion as to the timing of engaging in the different strategies such
  as comparisons and conversations within the institution : should on e happen
  before the other or might they be simultaneous?

- Chad brought up the issue of gen ed area: do we lack in certain areas?

- LeAnn brought up Allen's talk of "mission statement" for gen ed and does UMM
  have an articulated one.   Nancy cited the catalog and that the General Education
  introduction had been written by Bettina Blake a number of years ago. She
  expressed the suggestion that this be something to be looked at.

- There was discussion of Learning Outcomes. LeAnn asked if Information and Technology Literacy was included or integrated into gen-ed

- Nancy asked: What does Consultative bring to the discussion that Curriculum and Assessment do not. Is it our job to help determine if gen-ed work or if the syste is broken? Can the Registrar get info out of APAS to see how students are meeting gen-eds. (Or might this be something that has to be farmed out to the TC?)

- Brook cited the DEEP Project in Allen (p 105-106) and also to Allen p25 ("Greater Expectations") and questioned whether the committees should look at this to aid in their study. LeAnn also indicated that she has some other articles on DEEP on E-Reserve.

- Zach said that another student forum in the future might/should be possible.

II. Wellness Plan

There had been concern brought to the committee about the placement of the Wellness Program's Bike program equipment and the timing of the Commuter Program starting later in the fall semester and not taking advantage of the nicer weather.

The committee then moved to a more general discussion of dissatisfaction or frustration with the Wellness Program, either from personal experience or comments from colleagues.

Some areas covered included:

- General sense of user friendliness, finding correct info, need for changing password
- The fact that Angie Berlinger is the UMM contact person for this program and cannot access many parts of this system (one member asked if she had had training to advise)
- Promptness in being credited with points
- The fact that the website is a "maze of links
- Confusion over name and connection with the RFC

There was also discussion over the relative benefits of the program's "Health Coaching" by phone option, with some questioning the return on the investment in terms of time and energy and some seeing value in its reinforcing common sense approaches to health.

The committee agreed that we invite Sarah Mattson and Angie Berlinger to an upcoming meeting to share these concerns with them and question them further if needed.

III. RAR

There was discussion focused on concerns about accuracy of the data/numbers generated for some disciplines in the RAR process or whether the data will fully tell the story of some disciplines' profiles. A member wondered whether this concern will be effectively conveyed to the Phase 2 RAR members. It was determined that the process of recruiting/appointing Phase 2 panel members was currently underway. The current general timeline for RAR was discussed as being targeted approximately around Thanksgiving for Phase 2 and the new year for Phase 3.

There were also concerns expressed about the submission process itself: one member recounted problems with the forms (difficult to save accurately, difficult to do tables properly, etc.). A member expressed concern that it may be difficult for a discipline/unit to respond to any ranking without a having an accurate record.

Brook asked the question: where in the processdoes a feedback mechanism kick in?

Other questions and comments for concern:
- Is there someone in charge to acknowledge receipt of completed forms?
- The rubric for ranking programs: how does quantity/quality fit in? The evaluator's subjectivity?
- Is there a process for checking errors or inaccuracies? Nancy H remarked that her office should know of these.

As a result of this discussion, the committee agreed that Brook would draft a memo to Jacquie Johnson and Jon Anderson in order to ask for answers/clarification to some of these concerns.

IV. CC Website
In the final few minutes of the meeting, a draft of the website was shown. The committee chairs would be listed as the contacts. Nancy suggested that we include the area each member is from.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 11: 00 a.m.
Submitted by,

Ray Schultz