

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well
University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Campus Resources and Planning Committee
(Inactive)

Campus Governance

2-11-2009

Campus Resources and Planning minutes 02/11/ 2009

Campus Resources and Planning Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Campus Resources and Planning Committee, "Campus Resources and Planning minutes 02/11/2009" (2009). *Campus Resources and Planning Committee (Inactive)*. 21.
<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/crpc/21>

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 Resources and Planning Committee (Inactive) by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

Campus Resources and Planning Committee

February 11, 2009

Present: Shannon Juhnke, LeAnn Dean, Jennifer Rothchild, Pete Wyckoff, Sara Haugen, Dave Swenson, Heather Peters, Ray Schultz, Bryan Herrmann, Kathy Julik-Heine, Escillia Allen, Sarah Mattson, Karen Cusey, Zak Forde

Guests: Tom Mahoney

Pete reminded the committee that next week we will talk about the Master Plan. He has started a Moodle thread where committee members can download a pdf file of the plan. It will also be on reserve at the Briggs Library.

UMM recovered facilities and administrative costs policy

Tom Mahoney reported that the current University of Minnesota policy returns 100% of recovered Facilities and Administrative costs (formerly IDC/ICR) to the coordinate campus that generated the F&A. 2.5% of the UMM recovered amount is reserved for the library, leaving 97.5% to support sponsored projects related activities as UMM as follows:

- A. Support of the Grants Development Office
 1. Support for one student intern position
 2. Office operations and travel including professional development travel
 3. Maintenance of a reserve equal to one year's allocation
- B. Any remaining funds will be available at the Dean's discretion with the following priorities:
 1. Reimbursement to units for communications and supply costs directly related to awards that generated F&A
 2. Matching money for proposals/awards that generate F&A
 3. Incentive funds to encourage development of proposals for existing funding
 4. Faculty professional development (travel, software, publications charges, etc.)

Pete asked if there are potential future revenue streams for UMM. Tom responded that the biggest opportunity right now would be for stimulus funds although we need to keep in mind that we would be competing with every other institution in the country. Pete asked about the current staffing in the office and about implications if staffing was raised to four or cut to two. Tom said due to a misuse of funds in the Twin Cities, the entire system was revamped for compliance. Subsequently, he spends most of his time on compliance related activities. If the office were cut to two, there would be less support for proposal preparation, deadlines, etc. If more funding was available, he would like to see direct support for faculty to prepare proposals as opposed to another staff person helping to support a nebulous system. He also believes its important to remember that we should chase dollars that support the mission not just because they are available.

Mission statement

Pete explained why the mission statement was back on the agenda of CRPC. After discussed at Assembly last fall, there was a lot of push back on the proposal submitted. Pete told the Executive Committee he was not willing to devote more time revisiting the mission statement so the EC took a crack at it. CRPC has been asked to consider the latest draft from the EC.

Sara wondered if there was a sentence or two of the longer version that could be used and wondered how often the statement is reviewed. From a student perspective, Zak believes a simple sentence could convey the general idea. Pete said he is not convinced that in the end we can come up with a statement that is distinctive enough. Bryan believes a statement should be inspiring or exciting and suggested that perhaps we need a vision statement to follow a mission statement. Heather asked if the statement is helpful from the Admissions standpoint. Bryan responded that it doesn't carry enough to market us and doesn't separate us from other small liberal arts college.

Motion: (Juhnke/Schultz): we find this draft acceptable but encourage periodic review of the statement going forward

Vote: Motion passed (12-0-1)