

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Steering Committee

Campus Governance

2-11-2020

Steering minutes 02/11/2020

Steering Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Steering Committee, "Steering minutes 02/11/2020" (2020). *Steering Committee*. 62.
<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/steering/62>

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

Steering Committee Meeting
Tuesday, February 11, 2020
Student Activities Conference Room, Student Center

Minutes from 1.28.20 approved as presented.

Campus Assembly Follow-up: Thoughts on modified use of microphones?

Ted reported that he has not received any feedback and wondering if other committee members had received comments. Steering agreed to continue the pilot program of roving microphones until the end of the academic year.

From Planning: "Renaming" Request for Campus Assembly Approval

The following message was received from James Wojtaszek, Chair of Planning:

*In the absence of the former Functions and Awards Committee, and in the interest of moving this change forward in a timely fashion, the UMM Planning Committee supports the creation of the **Clifford J. Benson Center for Community Partnerships**, which will be comprised of the Office of Community Engagement, Center for Small Towns, and Office of Sustainability. We ask the Campus Assembly to approve this renaming.*

LeAnn wondered if the people involved have been informed and if they approve. Michelle responded yes to both. Given recent naming problems on the Twin Cities campus, Jenn wondered if someone has looked into whether or not this naming may cause a problem.

Ted will inform James that he should plan on presenting this at the next Campus Assembly meeting.

Campus Assembly Follow-up and Next Steps: Recommendations from Ad Hoc Committee on Committee Reallocations.

Ted proposed walking through and finalizing the recommendations if Steering agrees with the recommendation.

Assessment of Student Learning

Recommendation: Amend the Curriculum Committee membership to include Assessment Facilitator as an ex-officio.

Academic Support Services

With respect to the Tech Fee recommendation under the Academic Support Services Committee (ASSC), Ted proposes a shared governance model similar to that approved by ASSC previously and endorsed by the Dean at the time. The proposed group would have a majority of students

as voting members and have the following general structure: 4 faculty; 7 students; 1 USA member; 1 P&A member; ex officio members (IT, Library, Facilities management representatives). This overall structure was agreed upon by ASSC and MCSA in April 2009.

To support this point, Ted read the following brief history of Tech Fee and rationale for moving to a shared governance structure.

Tech Fee Discussion Items

- 1996-97: Approved by Campus Assembly with oversight by Academic Support Services Committee
- Approved by the Board of Regents in 1997 with the following statement:

Investments will be identified via a proposal process (open for all members of the campus community) which will be reviewed by the Academic Support Services Committee.

- Fall of 2007, concerns were raised by Division Chairs that technology on campus was not being funded properly and that Tech-Fee funding decisions made by MCSA were inappropriate
- Given its authority over Tech Fee, ASSC began investigating Fall 2008
- After much work and consultation with all levels of shared governance, ASSC and MSCA agreed on a general format for a Tech Fee Group to oversee all aspects of Tech Fee
- The new group was scheduled to begin work in Fall 2010, but MCSA changed their minds, complained to the Chancellor and the Chancellor sided with MCSA (Ted went on sabbatical in fall 2010 and was not part of the conversations to implement the new Tech Fee group)
- Jumping ahead to Feb 2019: MCSA Representative Josh Westfield sends an email to campus with a call for applications in the Tech Fee. Hidden in the communication was the fact that IT was allocated 75% of the funds over an 8-year proposal submitted by IT. Campus groups would now be competing for 25% of the funds.
- I expressed my concerns to Josh about the allocations to IT; several members of the campus community communicated directly to me with their concerns as well.
- Now to Feb 2020: MCSA representative Maddie Happ sends out the annual request for Tech Fee. Despite the fact that MCSA had a year to review their guidelines which had been questioned by the campus community, identical guidelines as the previous year were sent to campus.
- As a follow-up to Maddie's email, Ted reached out to her asking for a list of previous allocations and award amounts in advance of a Chemistry Discipline discussion on Tech Fee. Maddie's response: "I have not seen or heard a list of previous allocations..." and further "I do not have access to previous allocations"
- It's concerning that the person leading Tech Fee has zero knowledge of what has been awarded previously

Concerns with the Recommendations to have MCSA and IT oversee Tech Fee

1. Revisions to previous guidelines provide a disadvantage to students: Student groups on campus are now competing for less funds from Tech Fee. For example, students used to compete for a pool of about \$200k, now the pool is about \$50k.

2. There is a conflict of interest in the current model proposed by the Ad Hoc committee. The recommendation gives consultation and planning for Tech Fee to MCSA and campus technology experts. Presumably, the “campus technology experts” would be from IT. Why would members of IT plan to remove their current 75% allocation of Tech Fee funds?

In addition, there are fundamental problems with the 8 year plan proposed by IT.

*One item Ted will mention: If you look at the 8 year plan approved by MCSA, there is no mention of the support of technology in art studios, recital halls, theaters, rehearsal halls, and laboratory spaces. This shows a lack of consultation with the people on campus who actually use our teaching and learning spaces

3. The shared governance model for the oversight of Tech Fee that has been approved by the Campus Assembly, Board of Regents, and former Academic Support Services Committee is not being recognized.

4. MCSA’s decision to allocate 75% of Tech fee to IT was not appropriate. Nowhere in the guidelines previously established by MSCA could groups on campus request funds outside of the normal funding cycle. If MCSA wished to make changes to Tech Fee, they should have followed the proper channels within our shared governance structure. I know of no funding stream within the University of MN where (a) rules are changed for a particular group; and (b) 75% of available funds are distributed to said group.

Prior to the meeting, Ted communicated with you a proposal for a shared governance model to oversee Tech Fee. This is largely based on a model previously agreed upon by ASSC and MCSA in 2009. Ted thinks this is a good starting point for our discussion.

After Ted read the above statement, Sam said he does not think it makes sense to talk about the tech fee related to the recommendations from the ad hoc committee reallocations. Ted believes it’s important to look at the history of tech fee. Ted’s concern is that student groups no longer have access to the same funding. Tim asked when ASSC gave this up? LeAnn responded that the committee didn’t—decisions were reported to ASSC but there was no discussion during an ASSC meeting about the change. ASSC used to play a much larger role. Tim asked why ASSC would take back the process if they never gave it up. If tech fee was already out of ASSC oversight, when it did shift completely to MCSA? And, if this is true, then we have been violating Roberts Rules of Order for many years. Jenn noted that a previous chancellor had overruled ASSC and MCSA several times. Michelle added that tech fee is the only source of funding for technology on this campus. Part of the logic behind the 75/25% allocation is to ensure that faculty, labs and offices were able to have a regular cycle of replacement for their equipment. With respect to the overruling, ultimately it’s the chancellor’s responsibility and not a governance body.

Tim understood that this was a student fee created for new ways to get innovative technology on campus because UMM did not have a sustaining model. LeAnn said this was folded in as an academic fee. Jenn read the Board of Regents policy. Sam noted that tech fee is unique to UMM and has become this way for a reason. Students do not want to control everything or take anything away from ASSC. The 75/25 split was talked about in MCSA forum. MCSA also talked to Bill Zimmerman and Bryan Herrmann. It’s more efficient for IT to plan and allocate if

there's a guaranteed amount and shouldn't be looked at negatively. Sam said he could not speak to the history of the 2009 memo but in terms of how funds are managed, he's heard nothing but good things and thinks the way MCSA is handling this is fine. Jenn said things might be fine at the moment. The fee has been around for a long time and has looked differently so what's the reason for the change? We should look at how we've strayed from the original approval from the Board of Regents. It seems there's a lot of angst from where it began and we need to understand how that came to be. This is a fraught topic with strong opinions and varied recollections. Sam added that IT encourages staff, faculty students to go through them for computer purchases and this makes more sense so they can strategically plan for new computers. He would argue this is the strongest shared campus governance we that we have on campus. Dave would like to see distribution from previous years for further discussions.

Faculty Development

Functions and Awards

International Programs

Multi-Ethnic Experience

Becomes Diversity and Equity Committee.

Adjourned at 12:40 pm