

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

## University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

---

Planning Committee

Campus Governance

---

10-6-2014

### Planning minutes 10/06/2014

Planning Committee

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

---

#### Recommended Citation

Planning Committee, "Planning minutes 10/06/2014" (2014). *Planning Committee*. 58.  
<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/plan/58>

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

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Monday, 6 October 2014

**Present:** Jon Anderson, Michael Eble, Brook Miller, Sandy Kill, Taylor Barker, Jordan Wente, Gwen Rudney, Jim Hall, and guest Colleen Miller

**Absent:** Jana Koehler, Lowell Rasmussen, Sarah Mattson, Seung-Ho Joo

Jon Anderson called the meeting to order at 3:32 pm.

The minutes of the 22 September meeting were approved by voice vote.

Chair Jon Anderson introduced the meeting's topic of discussion: the UM-Twin Cities Strategic Plan (Draft). He also referred to Provost Hanson's presentation to the campus assembly. He then invited questions, remarks, and concerns from the committee.

Discussion followed:

- Concern regarding Certificates. Is the U moving toward competency-based learning? Refers to page 39 in the draft plan, and pages 44-45. How serious about this is TC?
- JAnderson asks Gwen Rudney to recap the retreat that they both had attended.
- GRudney: The certificate idea appeared to be applied to undergraduates. There was also mention of a program to offer a tuition-free course to students within 5 years of their graduation.
- JAnderson: This extra course would be part of the degree program, intended to continue the graduate's engagement with their discipline and with the U. Its intent is that the grads would build relationships with the campus. There were Working Groups assigned to the various sections of the plan. These groups must have been fairly committed to these ideas to get them into the document. There is a serious next step to implementation. It is not clear that the certificate idea would ever go forward. Which parts of the draft plan will get implemented is quite unpredictable, seemingly random.
- This conversation has come up in other committees. This could be a big deal to the Education Div.
- Reference on p. 46 to developing new undergrad minors. What effect might this have on established interdisciplinary majors? Defunding of these humanistic majors? How likely is this to go forward?
- This idea may come from the adversarial climate caused by competition for tuition dollars on the TC Campus. Many opportunities for disciplines to work together are squandered because of these battles over who gets the tuition money.

- The emphasis on undergraduate education is cause for concern, since these initiatives in the TC may siphon money away from the other campuses.
- Postgraduate programs are like purgatory for art graduates. They wait there until they find a slot in grad school. Is it wise to focus on this interstitial area when it might divert resources from undergraduate and graduate programs?
- There have been questions as to the possibility of a new or updated Plan for UMM. The Chancellor has stated that she is not ready for such a large undertaking any time soon. But the campus community would like to have some updated news on planning issues. Perhaps some focused document from the PC? No major undertaking, but there is a desire for some current guidance from the PC. There was a great effort by last year's PC to go through the 2006 Plan and make judgments on what has been accomplished, what we need to work on, and what we need to abandon. This could be a good starting point to begin our review. Does the PC want to take on a modest effort?
- Yes, we should.
- We spent most of last year working on this. We could go through it and mark off what we've accomplished and highlight those items that we need to work on.
- Were there things that we really need that were left out of this plan? Should/could we address them now?
- Are we getting any pressure from the TC to update our Plan or to try to align it with theirs?
- There are good reasons to say yes and good reasons to say no to trying to align our plan with the TC plan. We should have that discussion, but there has been no real signal from TC either way.
- We can claim victory on the Green Campus/Green Energy. It is part of our campus culture and part of our mission.
- We should stay our course and do what we need to do; but we need to show that we fit somehow into the TC plan or we may lose funding.
- TC plan was approved by the Regents. So, is it a system plan? We need to tie ourselves to some things, at least.
- What's the product of this proposed effort?
- How do we use any planning document?
- Do we have to get Regents' approval?
- There was communication with Robert Jones re 2006 document. No one remembers having seen any further communication regarding official approval or other action taken.

- I'm sure our plan was presented to the Regents
- Current directions to Support Units imply alignment with TC.
- Ideas for a new document or list? Follow alignment model? Pick several goals and objectives where we are favorably aligned to the TC wind flow.
- Not a bad idea – not starting from scratch, but still our plan
- If we look at our goals and strengths, we could align, but also show our strengths...
- How do we “align” in a constructive way?
- TC doesn't have to take up the whole boat.
- Four themes and five vision statements. Can we categorize our plans within this format?
- Such as in their Summary?
- The TC Summary includes a Table showing 4 general themes and 5 vision statements. Can we fit our document into this framework?
- Good idea. How do we integrate the current issues? What are our curricular challenges? We continue to deal with Faculty and P&A salaries. What are the challenges that we need to ameliorate?
- Implementation: What are the next steps? What is TC doing about implementation? What is required of us?
- TC is trying to cobble together teams to do implementation. We were invited to participate in these implementation groups, but we saw no reason or benefit since this is a TC project.
- This is important work and we need to do it. We can use the framework as an analysis tool. What are the numbers now?
- Last year we covered much of that.
- But we will not be “dynamic and engaged” with a 2006 Strategic Plan.
- GR and JH, can you comment and explain more on what you're proposing?
- Four Themes, Five Vision Statements: can we take our plan and align anything with themes and/or vision statements? We may have additional columns that are the results of our uniqueness. And what is different about us?

- Make index of last year's document. Do we need to proceed point by point?
- JW and JH agree to meet tomorrow.
- Like working on both efforts simultaneously.
- Perhaps we can list highlights for the Regents? Keep other stuff for internal use.
- We want to be on the lookout for difficult questions, such as: How do we align with “urban location” or “really big research projects”? Do we emphasize UMM's rural location and its strengths?
- In many cases, we can follow the TC; there are other cases when we should just run in the opposite direction.
- The idea of place is a big issue. We're not just “Rural”.
- If the Money is flowing to “urban”, we need to keep our programs, such as internships, that make us unique.
- In Education, student teachers go to lots of places and get diverse experiences. We do better than TC in this area.
- List of Grand Challenges?
- Page 26 of the draft Strategic Plan document. There is a 15 item list of Big Challenges.

JA: Other business? JA and JH will send out assignments. Next week: HEAPR. No meeting over Fall Break. On 27 October, Capital request (Lowell). We will meet on 3 November if needed. We have some time crunch.

Group: What are we poised to do?

Meeting Adjourned at 4:33 pm.