

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Planning Committee

Campus Governance

3-31-2015

Planning minutes 03/31/2015

Planning Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Planning Committee, "Planning minutes 03/31/2015" (2015). *Planning Committee*. 76.
<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/plan/76>

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.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

31 March 2015

NOTE: The staff recorder was not present at this meeting. The following notes are from an audio recording of the meeting.

Announcements: Sandy Olson-Loy could not be here to today because of a scheduling conflict.

Documents re Organizational Structure (prepared by Jon Anderson) for the Committee's review.
Documents were presented on screen during discussion.

- Is UMM's organizational structure normal or abnormal? There is lots of diversity in organization structures among institutions similar to ours. There is no discernable pattern.
- Jim Hall explains that his staff will look through web sites for old document versions. How can we adapt to this reality?
- About the idea of more formal administrative activity by Faculty: Was there a consensus?
 - Committee agrees that there had not been enough discussion.
 - Discussion among committee members. It is agreed that Jon Anderson should go forward with these documents to the next level, i.e. Campus Assembly
 - Q: Should we add another box to the structure? A: The addition of administration is very unlikely.
 - Consensus: Rather than identifying actions, we will frame them as existing/open questions.
 - Submit questions to Chancellor and Dean? A: The Chancellor is booked for 21 April
 - So, we should hold this until we have talked to administration. We will try to get this done before the end of the semester.
 - Another question to answer: Would additional administration enhance efficiency and/or bring in more money than is spent on the position?

Other Business before the Committee:

- Follow-up on topics with Mike Cihak. Also note that Mike sent the Committee a thank you note.
- Questions about changes in the Chancellor's Strategic Initiative?
- Electricity monitoring in buildings. Students want to study electricity use v generation. Is there a potential to forecast and schedule? What information can we get from our existing meters?

Q: Which topic do we want to discuss now? A: Instructional and Media Technologies.

- Mike's mission statement did not include service to the wider community. This needs clarification.
- What is the allocation of resources between internal and external services?
- Asking for help: the Help Desk. Many times it's just mundane stuff. Everyone in the office should know the Top 10 things that they get calls about. There are not enough people to have specialists. This would leave Ramsey more time to deal with major issues.
- The help desk has improved dramatically over the past 3 to 5 years.
- At this time of year, Studio Art, for example, might need equipment for up to 3-4 weeks. IMT is not set up for long term usage of equipment.
- There is only one FTE. Is more help needed?

- Customer support by the service units: we do annual unit reports, but do not do client surveys. Facilities Management and Food Services do them now, but others do not. FM performance results go to Sightlines. Sodexo has sophisticated methods for student feedback. For many units, if client surveys are required, managers might balk at the increased work load, but we need to know how well we are meeting the needs of the community. How is Service Now working for IMT?
 - Q: Do such surveys actually get done? A: The response rate is about one-fourth to one-third.
- IMT should develop a full Mission Statement.
- Is this a future Planning Committee topic? Should we extend it to campus-wide general strategy?
 - Mike Cihak will appreciate our timely feedback.
 - We could bring it up with the Chancellor and/or Dean. The Dean has refreshment cycles for Academic Program Reviews. He may have additional ideas.
- Do we want to revisit services in depth? Yes. “How do we know what we’re doing?”

Other topics?

Chancellor’s Document: WELL (Work Engaged in Liberal Learning)

- Secure funding for WELL?
- We have always given merit scholarships. Data indicate that a work opportunity (stipend or hourly) is better for many students.
- Three types of institutional financial aid: Merit, Stipends, Work Programs
- It appears that stipends have a bigger impact on retention than do merit scholarships.
- Can we improve the performance of our Financial Aid programs to improve retention and/or graduation rates?
 - Work gives students more feeling of belonging. There is an increase in retention rates for those students on stipends.
 - Merit is cash to the student; Stipend has specific expectations attached; Work is simple hourly pay.
- Previously, our Financial Aid has been almost all merit, but that is starting to change because is must.
 - We increase merit by \$200k per year to keep up with the market.
 - We started funding stipends over merit last year.
 - Stipends such as MAP and MSAF tie the student’s works experience to their academic goals.
 - Programs for new students? We need a program into which students can self-select.
 - WELL stipends could be off campus.
- Redistributing resources among the three FA types?
- The WELL proposal puts in 1 FTE for documentation of student effort.
- Noel-Levitts data indicate that a high percentage of incoming students know they want to be here, but don’t know what they’re going to do here.
- Q: What is the difference in effect of merit v stipend? A: Merit gets ‘em here; stipends keep ‘em here.

Meeting adjourned.