

10-12-2015

Campus Assembly minutes 10/12/2015

Campus Assembly

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/camp_assembly

Recommended Citation

Campus Assembly, "Campus Assembly minutes 10/12/2015" (2015). *Campus Assembly*. 33.
http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/camp_assembly/33

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

Campus Assembly Meeting
October 12, 2015

I. Chancellor's Remarks.

Chancellor Johnson gave the following remarks: "In case you wondered ... this is my last first campus assembly of the year.

And speaking of lasts but more importantly firsts ... some of you are here for the first time, and we have carved out a little time in the agenda for some reflections on what this is and why it matters.

We've had a busy start to the school year, where we welcomed more than 400 new first year students; over one hundred transfer students. However, our numbers are down slightly overall, and we will continue to explore reasons why: variables influencing this are likely the trend toward students bringing in more credits as new high school students so they should be able to graduate sooner than four years; a larger graduating class last spring—I guess if you graduate you can't return—but also some of the challenges we are experiencing in retaining students. Our retention rate, measured fall to fall for the cohort of new high school students, was at 76% this fall, down from last fall when we were at 79% and down from several years ago when we were at 86%. This is a trend that can't continue. There's lots of fodder here to fuel interesting research projects and of course action plans. And we haven't been idle in thinking about and acting on this.

You perhaps know that in the past six months we have applied for three federal grants to support student success here and we have been successful in two of the three—we've been awarded a federal TRIO student support services grant and a federal Native American Serving Non-Tribal Institutions grant under the federal Title III program. Each to be distributed over the course of the next five years and each in excess of \$1 million. Congratulations go to many people including Sandy Olson-Loy, Hilda Ladner, Jennifer Zych Herrmann, Bart Finzel, Kristin Kearns, former UMM faculty member who now assists us with grants, and many others. Thank them when you see them. In addition, for the third year in a row, we have been awarded funds from the Great Lakes Guaranty Program, this time to support students and local employers in the development of new, regional internships. I know that other offices and individual faculty members have also won grants in recent months, so not wanting to slight anyone, but rather wanted to call out some of these grants that will have application issues that concern us all.

The Regents met last week and if you can't make it to the Twin Cities for the monthly meetings, it is interesting to observe them in action—you can stream the Friday morning meeting. They heard about cost drivers for the university: personnel accounting for some 60% of expenditures; and increased allocations for student aid also going up over the course of the past several years. They approved the six-year capital plan which includes some dollars for HEAPR as well as dollars for each of the campuses to renovate spaces that improve the student experience. They also heard about system activities and priorities related to enrollment management and student aid, and had a work session on this topic.

The Engagement Study is out, now in its third year, and I do encourage all of you who are employees to participate. Our participation rate last year was 70%, up over the preceding year when we were at 56%, up over the overall U of MN response rate of 64%. We have learned some interesting things in these past two years, and we have taken some steps to act on that which we have learned: we continue to celebrate as a group our attention to students and the clarity of our mission. And we also know from those first surveys that we have on-going opportunities to improve development and leadership opportunities for faculty and staff, and to continue our efforts in relation to faculty salaries. We have also used many venues for communication of the information we glean from this survey, including meetings of the admin committee, division chairs, division meetings, AFSCME labor management committee, on-line access for all to the results, and the Faculty and P&A Affairs committee has also been active in exploring further the results of these surveys.

As I know you know, it's been an awfully busy fall: we dedicated our new EcoStation; we welcomed as our distinguished scholar in the liberal arts Gary Nabhan; Peter Sagal; lecture series; fall athletics; and homecoming, which includes alumni activities—concert and football and soccer. I know we weren't as lucky in soccer (or rugby) as we had hoped but if you haven't heard about the homecoming football game, you should really ask—44/43, down to the wire. They are off to a fresh start with a new coach, a great team and loyal fans.

President Kaler plans to visit this area and our campus on November 2 and 3—look for more details soon. This is the season for visitors—from IT to the offices of Equity and Diversity—they worry about getting here before the snow flies."

II. For Information. History of Campus Assembly by Michael Korth read by Jon Anderson.

Shared governance systems are common to colleges and university across the United States. Such systems provide a structure for organizing and managing how certain aspects of the work of the institution are shared among various members of the institution. This is often contrasted with the command-and-control structure of the traditional corporate model.

Shared governance is appropriate at colleges and universities because deep expertise and profession-based authority is widely distributed across the institution and is not merely concentrated in a few individuals who are the designated deciders.

The American Association of University Professors, in their Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities says, "The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others. The relationship calls for adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort."

The AAUP statement goes on to presume little to no student involvement in spite of having the word "students" in the first sentence just quoted. In fact it leans toward a faculty senate model of governance.

UMM chose, about forty-five years ago, to have a more inclusive shared governance system, one that includes much more student and staff involvement than is typical. This broader involvement is manifest in the membership of Campus Assembly itself as well as of the committees of the assembly.

After describing a bit of the administrative structure at UMM, the UMM Constitution says: "The Campus Assembly is recognized by the University Senate as the official campus policy-making and legislative body. The powers and responsibilities include the following:

- A. "To establish appropriate policies, procedures, and regulations governing the campus and to act on all issues that materially affect the campus as a whole. Areas included are institutional mission, organizational structure, allocation of resources, budget, curriculum, academic support services, faculty development, honors, functions, admissions, retention, graduation, study abroad, student services, athletics, student activities, awards, financial aid, student behavior, and campus events. "

The areas of responsibility of Campus Assembly form a lengthy list. Fortunately, committees carry out much of the work of the assembly. The areas of responsibility just mentioned are distributed to various committees. Those committees will bring items requiring Campus Assembly approval or items of general interest back to the assembly. We have a lot of committees and periodically we grouse about having too many but when we talk about eliminating any, we hesitate to do so because we do not wish to give up that voice.

So here we are. As a Campus Assembly, we bring together a great wealth of expertise and experience. UMM's shared governance structure gives us an opportunity to be fully engaged in striving together to ensure the continuing success of our campus.

For more of an actual history of the Campus Assembly, I recommend Roland Guyotte's detailed article on the subject. It can be found on the Campus Assembly webpage.

III. For Action. From the Steering Committee. Minutes from 4/27/15 Campus Assembly meeting approved as presented. Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

IV. Old Business.

A. For Information. Update from Constitution Review Task Force.

Jen Goodnough reported that the Constitution Review Task Force reviewed suggestions submitted and made the following three categories for further consideration.

- I. Spring 2015 – minor corrections/revisions – approved by Campus Assembly last spring
- II. Fall 2015 – more substantial changes (in no particular order)

- Disability Services or Academic Services as ex office on ASSC? or other committees?
- Faculty and P&A Affairs – elected instead of appointed? (old system), P/A clearly defined here?
- Faculty Development – more faculty (75%), less student and staff?
- Voting: create flexibility not exact procedure/rules; move entirely online; consult with Membership; how critical is extra nominee; how critical is successive elections?
- Assessment – does it need P/A rep?
- Non-tenure/tenure track faculty as well as P&A responsibility on committee; responsibility/expectations of CA members to serve on committees; can we clarify definition of CA membership section; this is part of a larger discussion (III); Faculty & P&A Affairs – specific about non-tenure track faculty.
- Committee chairs – any need more definition?
- Committees not covered (Queer Issues, Dining Services, subcommittees in general) – how many other committees are out there and what is their relationship, if any, to campus governance?
- Too big to be nimble – are some committees too large? Too many committees? Especially related to the service expectations issue.
- Are there conflicts w/USA (contract, tradition, practice, perception) with committee membership?
- How well matched are committee charges and activities? Tasked to Steering to check but is it being implemented? (e.g. Functions and Awards for award ceremonies and commencement?)

III. Recommendations for further action beyond just Constitutional review

Discipline Coordinators – not defined in constitution, workload and authority varies widely

Division Chairs – what happens when it's more than one person?

Common meeting time

Service – culture vs requirements – the academy cannot run on guilt

The Steering Committee will discuss how this list becomes available to the campus. The next step is to invite people to serve on the adhoc committee to begin reviewing the list of suggestions.

V. New Business.

A. For Action. From the Membership Committee. Election of faculty member to the Steering Committee was moved to the next Campus Assembly meeting.

B. For Action. From the Membership Committee. 2015-16 committee replacements serving on core and other standing committees. Approved by unanimous voice vote.

Jane Kill replaces Rebecca Webb on Consultative Committee

Denise Odello replaces Rachel Johnson and Wes Flinn (both on SSL Sp 2016) on Assessment of Student Learning

Siobhan Bremer replaces Gary Wahl on Assessment of Student Learning

Tracey Anderson replaces Jim Cotter on Curriculum Committee

Jennifer Deane replaces Mark Collier on Curriculum Committee
Kellie Meehlhause replaces Pilar Eble on Curriculum Committee
Oscar Baldelomar replaces Julie Eckerle on Planning Committee

C. Other new business.

1. Update on the WELL.

Bart Finzel gave a brief update on the Work, Engagement, and Liberal Learning initiative or what we've been calling the "WELL" (once called "Your Call", and the "Wall"). At this point, the WELL is more vision than program, although we have begun to pilot a few elements to determine if taking it, or some aspects of it, to scale makes sense.

The WELL program is motivated by a growing body of evidence indicating that our students come to us unusually uncertain about their futures. In a survey they take at new student registration, students indicate they have an unusually low level of career closure—a scale inversely related to student persistence that measures the degree to which a student has defined a career goal and has committed to it. It is apparent that our students, upon entry, often do not see the connection between the liberal learning we provide and their future careers, leaving them feeling adrift, unengaged, and more likely to transfer or even drop out. To address this problem, we have identified a series of inter-related ideas—the WELL—to better connect liberal education to a student's future career aspirations.

The WELL umbrella includes three different components:

- I. First, there are programs targeted at entering students: a 7-8 week peer mentored program and career pathways programming.
- II. Second, there is an effort to better leverage what we are already doing by making on-campus employment opportunities more impactful.
- III. Third, we are working to increase the opportunities for students to engage in impactful work both on and off campus to demonstrate the efficacy of the skills associated with a degree from a liberal arts college.

Over the last several years, elements of this initiative have been discussed with the Consultative Committee, the Finance Committee, and the Planning Committee, even though the name has changed and program elements have evolved over time. We have also been seeking funding for the program from various sources and many members of this body have been involved in these efforts. Of course, each funding source has their own particular expectations and timeline and have complicated planning.

Where are we at? At this point, we are piloting the peer mentored program. The pilot involves 67 students registered in 5 IC sections. Students are given a financial incentive to meet with 2 peer mentors in groups of 12-13 weekly on Monday nights to discuss things like the expectations UMM has for students, the academic calendar, social adjustment, getting connected to campus resources, academic success planning, and working with their adviser. About 40 of the 67 eligible students are actively engaged in the program to date. These sessions end in early November—just as first year students will need to see their advisers for spring registration.

Upon completion of the peer mentored program, in November and December, participating students will be asked to engage in a pilot of a career pathways program. Students will begin by taking an interest inventory and discussing the results with one of our career professionals. In the spring, the program will continue with students taking Strength Quest, completing the on-line program "Pathways to Professionalism; undertaking resume writing workshops, and the like.

In addition to piloting the programming for first year students, in last spring's call for proposals for Morris Student Administrative Fellows (MSAFs), we added the expectation that supervisors of MSAF students engage them in a work reflection exercise. The program is simple, but has the potential to add value to what we are already doing. We will ask MSAF supervisors to engage their student employees in a work reflection by asking them a series of simple questions: How does the job relate to a student's academic work? To our

stated learning outcomes? and how does the academic work they are pursuing assist them on the job? As has been the case at other institutions that have done this, we think this will enable our students to better understand and articulate the skills they have honed and gained as a result of their work.

Finally, we have made some progress in increasing the number of opportunities that students will have to engage in impactful work. This year, we nearly doubled the funding for MSAF positions, employing 54 students in roles as TAs, lab assistants, and videographers. We have also received two large institutional grants that will increase employment opportunities for students on campus over the next several years, particularly opportunities for first year students and opportunities for 3rd and 4th year students to serve as peer mentors. Lastly, we have recently received funding from the Great Lakes Foundation to facilitate the creation of roughly 60 paid, off-campus internship opportunities for juniors and seniors with financial need in each of the next three years. In all of these cases, we trust these work opportunities will give students much needed experience while improving the quality of life on-campus and in the region while also demonstrating the power and value of the education we provide.

We will be assessing each of these pilot programs to see if they do in fact lead more students to have confidence in their choice to be at Morris and demonstrate to new students the opportunities available to them. We also intend to continue to look for outside funding before we make any permanent commitment to using UMM dollars to fund them going forward.

VI. Campus Committee Reports.

Kristin Lamberty, chair Assessment of Student Learning, shared a diagram of the assessment workflow that the ASLC is trying to support on our campus.

The campus approved Campus Student Learning Outcomes (CSLOs) March 3, 2010. The initial request for programs and disciplines to explicitly create Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs) went out in Spring 2014 with the suggestion that it would be a good plan for disciplines and programs to include their PSLOs in their catalog descriptions due that fall.

In fall of 2014, programs were asked to submit their 3-year **assessment plans**. The plan template includes a place for programs to **indicate which CSLOs might map to the courses or student work** they are planning to assess.

From the plans, programs move on to **actually carry out assessment**. The assessment of student learning might include direct measures (such as rubrics from the MN VALUE Project), indirect measures (such as evaluations by peers or self-report surveys), or a combination of both direct and indirect measures. The goal is to **gather data about student learning** related to one or more PSLOs.

The Assessment of Student Learning Committee (ASLC), meanwhile, looks at the plans to get an idea of what assessment is happening. Where there is overlap with CSLOs, the committee may request that some professors participate in gathering data to help us assess how well students are achieving the CSLOs. There is also a **curriculum map** that allows disciplines and programs to indicate what courses might include introduction, reinforcement, or mastery of various CSLOs. These **mappings** are being gathered by the ASLC to support sampling across campus for assessing our CSLOs and to help us see, as well, where there might be some CSLOs that are not currently being introduced, reinforced, or mastered (and therefore, assessed) in many courses. If there are gaps, the mappings will help us identify those.

The ASLC suggests that disciplines and programs consider the results of their assessment of student learning. Based on results (based on the assessment of student learning), disciplines could consider what changes might better support their PSLOs. These changes, if any are suggested by the data gathered, should help with the **catalog revision** process. The data can provide some rationale or support for programs to change (or to stay the same). If part of the catalog revision includes updating PSLOs, that is a good time to

consider how those PSLOs might be assessed and include that in the plans. In general, when making catalog revisions, it makes sense to **consider how to determine the impact of the catalog revisions on students' achievement of the PSLOs.**

Nancy Carpenter, co-chair of the Membership Committee, reported that the committee made a call for nominations for the Chancellor Search Committee. Those names were shared with the Consultative Committee and division chairs. The President's Office has acknowledged the receipt of those names.

Chlene Anderson, reporting for the Faculty and P&A Affairs Committee, noted that the committee has met once so far this semester. This year they intend to review the salary survey and the implementation and interpretation of SRTs. If anyone has comments or suggestions, please direct them to Gordon McIntosh (chair) or any other member of the committee.

VII. All University Reports.

Jen Goodnough, UMM's rep on the Senate Committee for Educational Policy (SCEP), reported that two policies that have reviewed are about to enter the 30 day review period: first day of class attendance policy and make up for legitimate absences. Go to policy.umn.edu to comment on those or contact Jen.

Peh Ng, UMM's rep on Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA), reported that the policy about faculty development leaves is no longer in the hands of SCFA but it is now in the Office of the Provost who will consult with deans, vice presidents and the budget office.

There is a rule that the ratio of adjunct faculty vs regular faculty should not exceed more than 25%. It is not clear how this could affect our campus or how they do the headcount.

Nancy Carpenter, UMM's rep to the Senate Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT), reported that the Formal Communities of Practice (fCOP) hopes to pilot a process to review and receive input on emerging academic technologies. The working groups will identify the top 3-5 priorities. There is a kick-off this Friday, October 16 from 8:00-10:30 am in the McNamara Alumni Center.

VIII. Announcements.

None

IX. Adjournment.

Adjourned at 5:50 pm.