

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

## University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

---

Campus Assembly

Campus Governance

---

10-31-2017

### Campus Assembly minutes 10/31/2017

Campus Assembly

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/camp\\_assembly](https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/camp_assembly)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Campus Assembly, "Campus Assembly minutes 10/31/2017" (2017). *Campus Assembly*. 42.  
[https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/camp\\_assembly/42](https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/camp_assembly/42)

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](mailto:skulann@morris.umn.edu).

Campus Assembly Minutes  
October 31, 2017

I. **Chancellor's Remarks.**

“It’s been a busy fall semester, and it is not over yet. I would like to highlight a couple of things that are ongoing and upcoming for your information and attention.

I want to remind those of you faculty and staff who have not yet completed the employee engagement survey that it is open through this Friday, November 3<sup>rd</sup>. Feedback from the survey will, in addition to other purposes, serve as a data point for us during the visioning and planning processes in the spring and next fall.

Beginning on Monday, University of Minnesota internal auditors will be here for two weeks completing an every-five-years audit of our campus. There will be a second, short survey associated with that process that will take place after the employee engagement survey closes – from November 6-20. I know that having two surveys back to back is confusing, but I hope you’ll also participate in the audit survey. I’ll be sending out a reminder later this week. And for those of you really into auditing, or who want to learn more about what the internal auditors do, there will be an open information session on November 6<sup>th</sup> from 3:30-4:30 in this room.

Later in this meeting we will have dedicated parts of the meeting devoted to the HLC processes and the readings and conversations components of the strategic visioning and planning processes. More on both of these topics later.

In early December, I will be hosting a Community Forum focused on budget issues. As you know, our enrollment came in short of where we had projected it to be. As a result and because of longer standing concerns that need to be addressed, we will need to make adjustments to our expenditures for this biennium in order to balance our budgets for this year and next. To date I have held two budget planning meetings with the vice chancellor group, division chairs, and chairs of the steering, finance, and planning committees. Bryan Herrmann and Melissa Wroblewski have also consulted with the finance committee. We are working with the suggestions that have surfaced from these consultations, as well as additional ideas arising from other offices on campus, and we are putting together plans to deal with the shortfalls. By the December meeting I expect to be able to provide some outlines of a plan for FY 18 and FY 19.

Finally, Happy Halloween! I hope we will have an expeditious meeting this afternoon so that you can all go home, get in your costumes, bundle up, and spend a spooky, fun-filled evening with your kids and/or all of the neighbors’ children.”

II. **For Action.** From the Steering Committee. Minutes from 9/25/17 Campus Assembly meeting were approved as presented. **Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.**

III. **For Information.** History of Campus Assembly.

Roland Guyotte gave the following remarks about the history of Campus Assembly:

“In 2017, UMM’s Campus Assembly is its most visible evidence of shared community governance. It is not an elected Senate, as, for example the University of Minnesota has, but rather an inclusive body of more than two hundred members—faculty, p & a staff, bargaining unit/civil service workers, and students—at a university of fewer than 2000 students. And, to a remarkable extent, it has been so for almost all of UMM’s almost sixty-year history.

A brief look at the history of UMM’s Campus Assembly illustrates the growth and change of campus governance since its early days during the 1960s. During the campus’s first decade UMM had an Assembly that had no student

or civil service representation. Yet the Assembly gathered frequently, sometimes every week, in town meeting fashion to discuss the campus mission and make decisions on a wide range of matters. A substantial revision of the Constitution took place during the 1969-1970 academic year when a small task force, after nineteen meetings, presented a draft to the campus in May 1970. After considering alternative forms of organization, the proposal called for an Assembly consisting of faculty members working more than one-third time, student members at a ratio of 1:100 (in 2017, 1:90), and civil service members including all directors and two civil servants elected at large. This approach continued through subsequent revisions, notably the change in 1982 incorporating "academic professionals." This latter decision set the course for enlarging the body to its current size.

The Campus Assembly is authorized by the University Senate "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, admission, retention, graduation, study abroad, student services, athletics, student activities, awards, financial aid, student behavior, and campus events." An exception is the voting of students' degrees or academic awards, which is reserved to the faculty.

Much of the Assembly's work is done by its committees, whose composition and charges are prescribed in the Constitution and By-Laws. While the Assembly may delegate its powers to its committees or to other bodies, most items of general interest return to the Assembly for final review. As it has evolved in recent years, the Assembly meets as a whole several times a year, but its committees may meet considerably more often. An elected Steering Committee sets Assembly agendas and an elected Membership Committee, both of these a product of a 2005 constitutional revision, proposes committee memberships for Assembly approval. A third elected body, the Consultative Committee "serves as a campus sounding board" prior to bringing matters before the Steering Committee or for those "who wish to express or review concerns outside the scope of campus governance" or to "receive recommendations concerning follow-up with appropriate campus offices or programs." These committees include faculty, p & a, civil service and students who are elected by their constituencies. There are also seven Core Standing Committees and five Other Standing Committees.

This fall the Assembly has taken action by electronic vote, itself an innovation only two years old, on a proposal by the Scholastic Committee to establish policy for students transferring back and forth from U of M campuses (Multi-I) and in response to an ad hoc proposal to change Assembly meeting days from late afternoons to a midday hour on Tuesdays and Thursdays."

IV. **For Information**. From the Parliamentarian. Parliamentary Procedure on Voting.

Tim Lindberg, Parliamentarian, walked through the Parliamentary Procedure on Voting document attached to these minutes.

Summary of comments:

- Except for changes to the constitution or by-laws, all votes can take place during a Campus Assembly meeting.
- Motions can be brought "For Information" if they are either ONLY for information (i.e. no vote needs to take place at any time) OR if the entity which brought forward that motion seeks information from the Assembly body before offering the motion for a vote at a later date. This allows that entity to revise the motion as necessary before a vote.
- Motions do not need to be brought "For Information" first before being brought "For Action."
- Electronic Voting is not required for ANY votes, but is useful for elections and changes to the constitution or by-laws.
- ONLY changes to the constitution and by-laws have a requirement for the length of time voting must be open (14 days).

V. **For Discussion and Action**. From the Functions & Awards Committee. UMM's policy on naming parts of buildings.

Elena Machkasova, Chair of Functions & Awards, reported that the current UMM policy was adopted in 2003. It specifies a lengthy public process for naming parts of building for philanthropic contributions that involves a recommendation by External Relations/Funds Development Office (now Office of Advancement/Development Office), an approval by the Functions and Awards Committee, and then approval by the Campus Assembly.

In 2010 UMN Board of Regents adopted an All-U policy (Amended in 2015): <https://regents.umn.edu/sites/regents.umn.edu/files/policies/Namings.pdf>  
This policy requires forming a naming committee by the UMN President and protects confidentiality of potential donors until the Board of Regents approves the naming.

The proposal brought to the assembly changes the part of UMM Policy related to naming significant university assets (such as parts of buildings) to follow the Regents' policy. It also states that UMM Chancellor will consult with the University President to include representation from the Morris Campus on any naming committee for any UMM building.

The proposed change accomplishes two goals:

- It makes UMM policy consistent with the All-UMN policy in relation to philanthropic naming,
- It makes the naming process more appealing to potential donors due to a more streamlined procedure and protection of donors' confidentiality.

Jen Goodnough asked for clarification on the definition of what the University considers a substantial portion of a building. Elena believes a lecture hall would be substantial, a small room would not. Susan Schmidgall added that the policy calls for philanthropy based on square footage. Wes Flinn, UMM's rep to the All Honors Committee, said people should feel free to contact him if they have recommendations.

#### **Motion to approve proposed language passes by voice vote with two abstentions.**

VI. **For Information.** From the Steering Committee. Results from Multi-I and Community Hour vote.

Nic McPhee, Chair of Steering, announced the results of the two recent votes:

**Community Hour:** 70.4% of eligible electors voted.

Yes: 104 (83.2%)

No: 21 (16.8%)

Abstain: 8 (6.0%)

**Multi-Institutional Enrollment:** 66.7% of eligible electors voted.

Yes: 103 (97.2%)

No 3 (2.8%)

Abstain: 20 (15.9%)

Steering Committee will be working with the Registrar's Office to see how the committee can support the transition to the community hour.

VII. **For Information.** Summaries of Readings and Conversations.

Canvas site: <https://canvas.umn.edu/courses/26265>

Michelle Behr encouraged the campus community to attend the conversations because it will be helpful to inform ourselves so when we talk about our future we're coming from a place of knowledge. The readings and minutes are posted on the Canvas page.

#### **Conversation One: the Larger Context**

Wednesday, October 4, 2017 3:30 PM

Facilitators: Sarah Buchanan, Sarah Mattson, Tiernan Lenius

Notetaker: Michelle Page

## Attendance

Approximately 55 people in attendance; approximately 75% staff, approximately 15%-20% faculty, <10 students (4-5 individuals)

The Chancellor had articulated Principles for the conversations. The conversations should be:

- “evidence-based” that is, conversations should make reference to, or derive from, readings, data and other evidence-based credible sources.
- It should be “inclusive” of all voices so that we are sure that we have considered the range of available perspectives.
- The conversations must be “congenial” or respectful and
- “focused on what our questions ought to be – not yet on consensus or solutions” and finally,
- they are a “first step in a cumulative conversation; a piece of a larger, more existential conversation” – brainstorming, or points of discussion for future deliberations, if you will.

## Discussion question:

Review of issues from the Rudger and Peterson article - the constellation of issues–

- enrollment declines;
- access and cost conversations;
- concerns about the value of college, and particularly colleges’ roles with respect to careers and employment;
- declining state support;
- campus climate and the role of universities as conveners of free speech – presents a complicated backdrop within which we conduct our core business. How might we elevate our mission and our campus values within this conversation?
- What might it take for Morris to cut through the Gordian Knot that public higher education finds itself grappling with?

## Take-Aways and Areas of Seeming Consensus:

- Our mission should not change--we embrace the liberal arts nature of our institution as well as the accessibility provided by being public.
- We need evidence of value for money, positive student outcomes, etc. to support the narratives that we tell through all of our recruiting materials and activities.
- We should consider how to create and re-create programs that are appealing to prospective students and families, but always with a liberal arts lens, always focusing on the liberal arts nature of said programs
- Resources are an issue.

## Areas of Seeming Disagreement:

- What kind and how much program revision to do
- Should there be a more unified approach to certain conversations--tagline, jobs vs. careers, etc.

## Unanswered Questions:

- What are the state and national data/demographics and how does UMM fit into those? What are the implications for us as an institution?
- What are some high priority academic programs that we can “repackage” easily with few new resources?
- How can we disrupt the cycle? Insufficient resources leads to insufficient student support leads to lower retention/enrollment leads to even more insufficient resources.

Summary of this event is available on line.

---

Thursday, October 19, 11:00 AM  
Facilitators: Tim Lindberg, Angie Stangl, Tiernan Lenius  
Notetaker: Tammy Berberi

### Attendance

Approximately 28 people in attendance; approximately 60% staff, approximately 20% faculty, 20% approximately students

### Summary of Discussion:

There are external pressures upon UMM from the accountability and accreditation movement. While we need to react to these pressures, we also need to be proactive about communicating the value of an education here (and liberal arts more generally). There was discussion of how measures/rankings are things some parents look at when considering schools with their college bound students.

The accountability measures do not generally reflect the importance that institutions like UMM hold in U.S. society. The question was raised – where is the voice of higher education within the accountability movement. This pointed out that it is not only a matter of joining conversations about metrics but also about translating the value of a liberal arts education to these things that are readable by parents, local & nation governments, etc.

Throughout the conversation, it was acknowledged that the accountability movement is politically motivated. Even so, we do need to have an answer for it.

### Unanswered Questions

How are individual offices on campus affected by the demands of the accountability and accreditation movement? More broadly, how might these new demands produce differential impacts on parts of the UMM campus?

In what ways can we, as members of the UMM community, balance the external pressures of the accountability movement with our own internal values to ensure that UMM remains both competitive and true to its mission?

What aspects of the accountability movement are permanent or long-lasting pressures that we must deal with and what aspects might be more short-term or politically motivated, but with limited long-term impact?

---

### **Conversation Three: Tomorrow's Student**

Monday, October 30, 2017 4:00 PM  
Facilitators: Siobhan Bremer, Kellie Meehlhouse, Tiernan Lenius  
Notetaker: Viktor Berberi

### Attendance

Over 60 faculty, staff and students

The readings for this discussion included the article "Demography as Destiny: Policy Considerations in Enrollment Management," which describes the challenges faced by higher education to provide a quality education in light of diminishing financial resources and diversely prepared students. Added to this challenge are different learning styles and an ever-growing dependence on technology, as outlined in the second reading, "Students of the Future." With these trends and issues in mind, the conversation was asked to consider how UMM in particular could respond.

A major topic of discussion was student retention and attracting a shifting demographic of students to UMM. While the university prides itself on its diversity, some argued that we needed to focus on being inclusive as well. Once first-gen, racial minority, and other underrepresented students are enrolled, adequate resources need to be available to serve their needs. The same is true for supporting faculty and staff. Additionally, UMM needs to continue to challenge the notion of educational "worth" by focusing curriculum on making the world better as well as connecting students with recent alumni.

Another challenge is mental health, which was identified as a major reason why UMM students drop out. It was generally agreed that students are stressed out for a number of reasons, such as trying to finish their course requirements as quickly as possible and not being able to make connections with fellow classmates. One student referred to Morris as a "mental health desert" because counselor availability is limited. One solution is to partner with community organizations, especially in terms of transportation and specialist access. Others proposed building spaces for and practices of self-care into curriculum, especially in IC and first-year courses.

If you weren't able to make this discussion and would like to add your thoughts, please visit the Canvas page.

VIII. **For Information.** HLC update.

Melissa Bert, who is coordinating all of the HLC work, gave the following report:

**Quality Initiative Teams** [report due spring-summer 2019]

**Assessment of Retention Initiatives**

- Co-leads: Melissa Bert & Barry McQuarrie
- Team: Barbara Burke, Devon Johnson, Hilda Ladner, Jessica Porwoll, Gwen Rudney, Student TBD

**Student Mental Health and Wellbeing**

- Co-leads: Sandy Olson-Loy & Jeanne Williamson
- Team: Tammy Berberi, Colter Combellick, Matthew Hoekstra, Bridgett Karels, David Israels-Swenson, Student TBD

**High Impact Practices in the First Year**

- Co-leads: Sylke Boyd & Jennifer Deane
- Team: DeLores Allison, Cindy Boe, Simon Franco, Jess Larson, Argie Manolis, Christina Montañez, Tricia Rohloff, Student TBD

**Assurance Argument Teams** [assurance argument due spring-summer 2019]

**Criterion 1: Mission**

- Lead: Gwen Rudney
- Team: Kerri Barnstable, Wes Flinn, Margaret Kuchenreuther, Troy Ostby, Melissa Vangsness

**Criterion 2: Integrity**

- Lead: Michael Korth
- Team: Nancy Helsper, Windy Roberts, Roger Rose, Kim Schultz, Laura Thielke

**Criterion 3: Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources & Support**

- Lead: Tracy Otten
- Team: Jana Koehler, Kellie Meehlhause, Engin Sungur, Melissa Wroblewski

**Criterion 4: Teaching and Learning: Evaluation & Improvement**

- Lead: Stacey Parker Aronson
- Team: Troy Goodnough, Judy Korn, Ray Lagasse, Bibhu Panda, Heather Waye

**Criterion 5: Planning and Effectiveness**

- Lead: Peh Ng
- Team: Laura Burks, Bryan Herrmann, Denise Odello, T.J. Ross, Dennis Stewart

**Assessment Report** [due March 2018]

- Lead: Rebecca Dean
- Assessment of Student Learning Committee: Viktor Berberi, Nancy Helsper, Rachel Johnson, Kristin Lamberty, Cristina Ortiz, Tricia Rohloff, Nadezhda Sotirova, Sheila Windingstad, Sara Carmen, Sam Rosemark

IX. **Campus Committee Reports.**

None.

X. **All University Reports.**

Peh Ng, faculty rep on the Senate Committee for Faculty Affairs, reported that at the October meeting, Vice President Kathy Brown talked about the unionization for service employees on the Twin Cities campus and that this has been tabled because the faculty union issue is temporarily on hold.

Kristin Lamberty, UMM's rep on the University Learning Technology Advisors Committee, reported they have been talking about electronic meeting resources. We currently have WebEx and Google. Please let her know if you need something in a web platform because we'll have visitors here in December where we can give our input and try things out.

Michelle Behr congratulated those who worked on the McNair Grant.

Heather Peters, UMM's representative on Disability Issues, reported that we are putting together a focus group to talk about the mental and physical health parity issues in rural Minnesota.

XI. **Announcements.**

None.

XII. **Adjournment.**

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 pm.

## **Parliamentary Procedure on Voting**

Robert's Rules and the Constitution and By-Laws of the University of Minnesota – Morris  
October 2017

### WHAT ROBERT'S RULES SAY<sup>1</sup>:

- All items before a parliamentary body are considered “motions” and as such they have self-contained instructions. UMM has a tradition of noting that items are either “For Information” or “For Action” but these are NOT required by Robert's Rules. Since they are informal standing rules of Campus Assembly, however, we should continue to use such terminology unless instructed not to by a majority vote of Campus Assembly.
- “A resolution or a long or complicated motion should be prepared in advance of the meeting, if possible, and should be put into writing before it is offered.” (33)
- Under the section regarding voting by mail (which most closely resembles our use of electronic voting outside of a Campus Assembly meeting) it states that these are “generally reserved for important issues, such as an amendment to the bylaws or an election of officers – on which a full vote of the membership is desirable even though only a small fraction of the members normally attend meetings.” (424)

### WHAT THE CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS SAY:

#### General Outline

- ONLY members of Campus Assembly may vote on any business in front of Campus Assembly. (Art IV, Section 1, Paragraph E)
- Quorum for meetings is a simple majority of membership of the Assembly. (Art IV, Section 6)
- Campus Assembly has responsibility “To establish appropriate policies, procedures, and regulations governing the campus and to act on all issues that materially affect the campus as a whole.” (Art IV, Section 2, Paragraph A)

#### Electronic Voting

- The Constitution does NOT require electronic voting at all. It simply allows for electronic voting to be done, by no longer specifying it must be done at a Campus Assembly meeting. This change was introduced to allow for flexibility in voting.
- Only bylaw and constitutional changes have a requirement for how long voting must remain open

#### Amending Constitution or By-Laws (Art X)

- Proposed amendment MUST “first be presented for discussion at a meeting of the Campus Assembly.” Then, along with minor modifications, it must be distributed for voting to all assembly members at least two weeks prior to vote. This is then considered a “discussion and waiting period”. Changes to Constitution must be by 2/3rds majority of all votes cast (By-Laws only required simple majority). Voting must be open 14 calendar days.

#### Elections: Steering, Membership, and Consultative Committees, and for Parliamentarian.

- Membership is elected by constituencies.

---

<sup>1</sup> Page numbers listed are from 11<sup>th</sup> Edition.

- The Vice-Chair of Steering and the Parliamentarian are voted on by all members of Campus Assembly
- All other members of Steering and Consultative are elected by constituencies.
- The process for voting for Steering and Consultative is as follows: Vice-Chair of Steering; other faculty/P&A on Steering; faculty/P&A on Consultative; parliamentarian (students and USA complete their own elections separately).

#### SUMMARY

- Except for changes to the constitution or by-laws, all votes can take place during a Campus Assembly meeting
- Motions can be brought “For Information” if they are either ONLY for information (i.e. no vote needs to take place at any time) OR if the entity which brought forward that motion seeks information from the Assembly body before offering the motion for a vote at a later date. This allows that entity to revise the motion as necessary before a vote
- Motions do not need to be brought “For Information” first before being brought “For Action”
- Electronic Voting is not required for ANY votes, but is useful for elections and changes to the constitution or by-laws
- ONLY changes to the constitution and by-laws have a requirement for the length of time voting must be open (14 days)

# UMM POLICY ON NAMING PARTS OF BUILDINGS

Submitted by the Functions & Award Committee to the Campus Assembly and approved on January 29, 2003

Revised by the Functions & Award Committee October 19, 2017  
(Revisions are for Philanthropic Naming Only)

Naming buildings is covered by all university policy, but naming parts of buildings is regulated by the University of Minnesota, Morris (UMM) policy below.

## UMM POLICY ON NAMING PARTS OF BUILDINGS

Parts of University buildings may be named to honor one or more individuals. Living or deceased individuals associated with the University who retired or left the service of the University may be recognized on the basis of their philanthropic activities toward UMM. Deceased individuals may additionally be recognized for extraordinary achievements, contributions, or service to UMM. Separate names may be given to rooms, laboratories, lecture halls, or auditoriums within a building.

### Procedures for Naming Parts of Building in Recognition of Extraordinary Achievements, Contributions, or Service

Recommendations should be initiated by a division or administrative unit, and submitted to the Functions and Awards Committee (F&A). Recommendation sent to and approved by F&A will be submitted to the Chancellor and, finally, to the Campus Assembly for approval.

### Procedures for Naming Parts of Building in Recognition of Philanthropy

~~The Office of External Relations/Fund Development will prepare guidelines to ensure consistency between contribution levels and opportunities to recognize donor generosity through the naming of part of a building. These guidelines will be submitted by the Office of External Relations/Fund Development to F&A for information and coordination prior to any public announcement or publication of the naming opportunities. For gifts that qualify, recommendations should be initiated by The Office of External Relations/Fund Development, and submitted to the Functions and Awards Committee (F&A). Recommendations sent to and approved by F&A will be submitted to the Chancellor and, finally, to the Campus Assembly for approval.~~

*The University of Minnesota, Morris will follow existing University of Minnesota Regents and University of Minnesota Foundation Policy in regards to Philanthropic naming of significant university assets. When articulated in University of Minnesota Regents Policy Section V Subd 2 and a naming committee is constituted, the Chancellor will consult with the University of Minnesota President to include representation from the Morris Campus on any such committee.*

### Forwarding of Recommendations

The format for recommending *honorary consideration* of the naming of parts of building to F&A shall be as follows:

**Nominee** -- see requirements noted above.

**Nominator**-- must be an alumnus or a current member of the faculty or staff. **[Board of Regents policy requires that no disclosure is to be made to the nominee, or persons other than those writing supporting letters, until a decision is forthcoming.]**

**Nomination Summary**-- 50 words or less.

**Reasons for Nomination (including a description of the space under consideration)** -- single page, 12-point type.

**Letter from Nominator**-- should focus, from personal knowledge, on the extraordinary achievements, contributions, or service of the nominee or the philanthropic activities that justify the nomination.

**Supporting Letters** -- at least 2, not more than 4, focusing on the above criteria.

**Maximum Length of Dossier** -- not more than 12 pages.

**Number of Copies** -- 7 of each item; collated, stapled, and clipped (no binders or folders).

**Date of Submission** -- at least 6 months before the naming is to take place. Later submission will be considered, but without any guarantee of timely decision.

**Submit to** -- the Functions and Awards Committee.

**Note:** Persons writing letters of nomination should know that such letters will be legally available to the nominee upon request, even to an unsuccessful candidate who becomes aware of the nomination. Nominators should also make sure that writers of supporting letters are aware that their letters, too, will be available on request.

An honorary nomination approved by F&A will be submitted to the Chancellor and, finally, to the Campus Assembly for approval. The Chancellor may reject the nomination. The Campus Assembly requires a positive two third majority vote of all eligible members to approve the nomination.

Procedures for the naming of parts of buildings will be reviewed periodically by the F&A in consultation with the Chancellor and the Office of Advancement/Development Office.

Once part of a building of UMM is approved, the following should be notified in writing by F&A:

- Office of Advancement/Development Office
- Plant Services Office