

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

## University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

---

Consultative Committee

Campus Governance

---

2-2-2011

### Consultative minutes 02/02/2011

Consultative Committee

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

---

#### Recommended Citation

Consultative Committee, "Consultative minutes 02/02/2011" (2011). *Consultative Committee*. 102.  
<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/consult/102>

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 Consultative 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).

Consultative Committee

February 2, 2011

Present: Mark Privratsky, Nic McPhee, Naomi Wente, Jennifer Zych Herrmann, Paula O'Loughlin, Manjari Govada, Sharon VanEps, Nick Bergantine, Nancy Carpenter, Jim Barbour, Jane Kill, Brad Deane

Met with Chancellor Johnson:

- Blue Ribbon Committee review, talked about previous reviews to committee
  - ranked resource allocation as highest priority
  - resource allocation group will have one leader, divided into three different sub-groups

-Q: Will group membership be voluntary?

-A: No, specific individuals will be selected and recommendations would be welcome.

-Q: You mention that the Resource Allocation committee will make recommendations based on certain indicators. What specific indicators will be used and how?

-A: Quantitative indicators are the main focus as they are needed to help focus where we will allocate resources. We need to look at industry standards, and look at how other institutions set priorities.

-Q: Are industry standards the same as output indicators?

-A: Both are looked at, but if industry standards are not looked at, we will look at similar institutions to get a feel for staff and resource allocation. Looking at resource allocation is a long term process, not fast moving.

-Q: Is this topic confidential?

-A: Resource allocation is not a secret, emails have been sent and people know about the cuts going on. Our goal is to tell the truth and show urgency without creating panic.

-Q: We have already went through a round of extensive cuts a few years back. How will the recommendations of this committee inform future process?

-A: Any possible actions will be thought over and decisions will be made in light of our strategic plan. It is hard to look at cuts until surplus and costs have been assessed.

-Q: Is the review board looking at previous cuts and will we be nibbling away via small cuts like in the past, or are we looking at larger cuts?

-A: There is not a clear goal and we must look at past cuts and new cuts. Multiple phases of cuts are needed, big and small.

-Q: Is there a timeline for the process?

-A: Yes, indicators should be done by the end of summer. Allocation and prioritization needs to be done by next March.

-Q: Is there unnecessary tension between an entrepreneurial system and the schools mission? We can have growth within the liberal arts system.

-A: The answer is not cutting liberal arts, entrepreneurialism and the liberal arts do work together. We simply need to relook at what is liberal arts and liberal learning. As a land grant institution we have to continue to look for outreach opportunities. We should look at using our campus facilities more extensively when classes are not in session.

Submitted by Nick Bergantine