

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Steering Committee

Campus Governance

2-22-2022

Steering minutes 02/22/2022

Steering Committee

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

Steering Committee Minutes
Tuesday, February 22, 2022
(Members connected remotely via Zoom)

Present: Ed Brands, Jon Anderson, Cal Mergendahl, Tim Linberg, Janet Ericksen, David Israels-Swenson, Rebecca Dean, Jasmine Dailey, Kari Adams, Dylan Young.

Ed called the meeting to order at 11:40 am

All referenced documents are housed in the Shared TeamDrive for Steering Committee.

1. Minute taker: David Israels-Swenson
2. Announcements - None
3. Approve DRAFT [minutes](#) of Steering Committee (2.8.2022)
 - a. There is confusion about which Board of Regents Meeting was being referred to in section B. It was clarified that this is the March Board meeting and the minutes were updated. Dave moved to approve the minutes, Janet seconded. The motion was approved.
4. Determine what process to follow for voting on [Education building naming proposal](#)
 - a. Ed has put together the above memo mapping out the process for the assembly. It was agreed that this would work and that this would clearly document the campus support for the renaming as it moves to the central process.
 - b. There was some discussion about whether the suspension of the rules should be done in the assembly meeting or a part of the electronic voting process. The current policy for naming parts of buildings requires a $\frac{2}{3}$ vote of all campus assembly members, which is challenging to meet and the last time this happened we followed this same process.
 - c. Planning was working off of a draft policy that had been created several years ago but it was determined that it had never been brought forward to the full assembly for a vote. The Steering committee will encourage Planning to update this policy and bring it forward for approval this year.
5. Set [Agenda](#) for 3.1.2022 Campus Assembly meeting
 - a. There was some concern that perhaps this agenda was a bit light.
 - i. A suggestion was made that perhaps there could be an update on campus assessment efforts.
 - ii. An update on the boarding school historical work was suggested, but the Acting Chancellor reported that there was not much new information to report, but that the campus would appreciate an update regardless. This item was added to the agenda.

- iii. A suggestion was made that perhaps there is a need for a presentation on student satisfaction about the different modalities of course delivery. It was unclear what data actually exists at this time. Concerns were also raised about how many “in person” classes are actually meeting in person.
 - iv. It was suggested that some of the committees may be encouraged to give some updates on what they are working on so that the assembly has some sense of what might be coming up at future meetings. The Steering Chair will reach out to some of the committee chairs to see who could provide a report.
 - b. There was a question raised as to whether the proposal coming from the Curriculum Committee would be controversial. No one seemed to believe that any of the proposals would elicit significant discussion.
 - c. A suggestion was made to communicate more clearly that the Assembly meeting will be held over Zoom as there was some confusion at the last meeting. There was discussion about if Assembly would return to a hybrid modality or stay on Zoom. Dave moved that future assembly meetings for the remainder of Spring 2022 be held over Zoom. Rebecca seconded. The motion passed.
6. New/other business?
- a. The Acting Chancellor asked if there were issues that should be addressed in her opening remarks.
 - i. It was suggested that the expected tuition increase be addressed and perhaps some broader budget planning assumptions.
 - ii. A suggestion was made to touch on the proposed planning for commencement.
 - iii. An update on new hires and approved searches was suggested.
 - iv. A question was posed as to whether an update on our relationship with Crookston was needed.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:27 pm.