University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Consultative Committee   Campus Governance

1-17-2013

Consultative minutes 01/17/2013

Consultative Committee

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

Consultative Committee

January 17, 2013

Present: Brook Miller, LeAnn Dean, Nancy Helsper, Heather Waye, Jim Barbour, Chad Braegelman, Zach Van Cleve, Bonnie Tipcke, Jim Hall, Molly Donovan

Absent: Ray Schultz, Joey Daniewicz

Approved minutes of 27 November 2012 meeting.

Cochairs announced that an email was sent to the campus community inviting input, questions, and issues that may be addressed by the Consultative Committee.

Other Agenda items:
- LeAnn has been working on the text for the Consultative web site that describes the process the committee follows in addressing concerns.
- RAR phase 3
- Jim Hall: audit of Finances and IT offices; vice-chancellors will likely review report in February – Consultative will discuss the report in 28 February meeting

LeAnn discusses the Process Document:
- Confidentiality
- Sounding board
- Investigations, e.g., personnel issues
- Our activities may affect both units and individuals
- We should provide feedback to the originator of any issue
- Make suggestions and recommendations
- Follow up later with affected parties

Brook reviews RAR process so far:
- Über Team reconciling first 2 steps
- Next Tuesday, Process/Implementation team will meet
- 4-category framework:
    - I. Recommended for enhancement
    - II. Status quo
    - III. Recommended for reduction of resources
    - IV. Recommended for elimination
- There are no targets, no specific distribution required.
- RAR ultimately emerge from the Blue Ribbon panel

RAR Feedback from the Consultative Committee:

Identified 3 programs whose submissions "fell out" and have not been scored (Institutional Research, Business Office, Registrar's Office). How many fell out altogether?

The division of the process into Programs makes budget numbers very murky. There needs to be a bottom line understanding of what was each Unit's budget so there could be some understanding of how it has changed—i.e., what it was 5 years ago versus now. The forms' constraints on breaking down total budgets may lead to erroneous judgments.

A significant component of the efficiency, productivity, and potential of programs has to do with current personnel rather than structure and/or "achievable demand."

This may lead to at least two misattribution scenarios:

1. a program with highly efficient, productive personnel may be operating "above its level" in terms of productivity, but might return to less impressive levels if and when personnel turn over;

2. a program with inefficient, unproductive personnel may make a program look unproductive and inefficient, leading to an underestimation of potential for growth and/or potential for improved efficiency (with different personnel)

Interpretations of scoring data. There are significant variations in the possible interpretation of *any* rubric data. For example a low score in quality could indicate a need for significant investment (call this "reading a"). However, a low score in quality could indicate a need to disinvest (call this "reading b"). Of course, one could make this argument about *any* scoring. However, with a lack of pre-designated quality metrics or targets (or metrics or targets for any other categories), interpreting scores is a shaky proposition. At every turn, with every score, one must choose a "reading a" or "reading b" outcome. One might expect significant variations based upon personal factors. Therefore, a successful negotiation of interpreting rubric scores in a fair, consensus driven way would entail a far more robust "Phase III" effort than is currently scheduled. Even in this event, one could not guarantee or expect consensus.

The Phase III group is operating in the absence of information about *fungibility*. Some programs involve monies that could not be repurposed; others have monies that could not be repurposed without significant institutional reorganization entailing additional costs.

The way data was submitted (including the low word counts) discouraged reporters from providing a full picture of their programs.

Future meeting topics:
- RAR redux
- Committee charge document
- Lowell Rasmussen re budgets, capital improvements

The next meeting will be 31 January with Chancellor Johnson
Committee members are asked to send questions for Jacquie and any additional thoughts on RAR.

Jim Barbour