

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Planning Committee

Campus Governance

4-6-2016

Planning minutes 04/06/2016

Planning Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Planning Committee, "Planning minutes 04/06/2016" (2016). *Planning Committee*. 86.
<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/plan/86>

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.

To:	Planning Committee:	Oscar Baldelomar, Brook Miller, Seung-Ho Joo, Sandy Kill, Jana Koehler, Mike Cihak, Helen Juarez, Austin Tipper, Rachel Evangelisto, Bryan Herrmann (ex-officio), Gwen Rudney (ex-officio), Matt Senger, Melissa Bert, Alison Campbell (West -(secretary)
	Present:	Oscar Baldelomar, Brook Miller, Seung-Ho Joo, Sandy Kill, Jana Koehler, Gwen Rudney (ex-officio), Matt Senger (ex-officio), Melissa Bert, Bryan Herrmann, Alison Campbell (West)-secretary
From:	Engin Sungur, Chair	
Subject:	Meeting Agenda	
	Date:	April 6, 2016 (Wednesday)
	Start:	2:30pm
	End:	3:30pm
	Place:	Imholte Hall 115

THE AGENDA

1. Approval of March 9 and March 30, 2016 Minutes (*Attached to the email, 5 min.*).
 - *Action: Approval of the minutes – yes for both*
2. *Reactions to:*
 - *City Water Treatment Plan-Implications for Campus*
 - Process is already underway so we don't have much of a say.
 - *Chancellor Search- How the Planning Committee will work with the new Chancellor?*
 - We could wait for the new Chancellor to make suggestions before we move forward which is a reaction and not being proactive or use the suggested approach and move forward on our own
 - *Approach to Strategic Planning*
 - Create a living document
 - Included an introduction part of the history, create a culture of strategic thinking
 - Proposal on a time table for spring
 - Identify units
 - Adding data to template - This template will be sent to committees and ask for their suggestions
 - Once completed we will send back to the units and administration for approval
 - All parts are integrated
 - Bryan said the strategic plan is at the point where we need to do a major refresh – not sure if the suggested approach should be done in the first year's cycle. We need to think 10 years out but do something operational that we can do within the next 3-5 years.
 - We need to relook at the evaluation order - we don't want to redo every component every year – agree with reassessing each year but we don't want to worry about coming up with new ideas
 - Engin said it will be more like an assessment to see if it is working or not
 - Gwen said the Finance Committee is able to say what we do but the Planning Committee is still struggling with that
 - Strategic planning processing does belong in the Planning Committee
 - With something as important as this – in the stages proposed where is are committees intersection with administration? – if we want to take an active shared governance we can't just do it here alone, we need to have the leadership involved
 - Need to figure out a way to be more clear on how we will be including administration because it will give us more power as a functioning committee and as a faculty and staff

- May need to create a different layer that is more clear – meet with administration and our own bosses and see what their goals and key components are
 - Identify units and committees – who needs to be involved in this? Clarification of roles – we could send out an email at the beginning of the year saying “these are the components we want to look at and these are the committees we think are involved in key ways, if you think you are too than please let us know”
 - Engin said the components are already existing from the strategic plan we have. We will send the components related to the different units
- Engin said the units he mentioned include the administration because they are their own unit
 - He thinks we will let the administration know what we are planning later and not include them from the start – wants to notify them of the relevant parts
 - Doesn’t want to give ownership to the administrations – wants the planning committee to have ownership
 - Gwen disagrees and thinks it is a tactical error not to include them – collaboration is important for this project
- Seung-Ho said last year when Jon was chair we found some difference between other institutions and reported them to administration but they didn’t acknowledge them. We need better communication
 - Issue is, when do we start this? – Inclination is to start after the new Chancellor comes so we don’t waste time
 - Committee needs to seek instruction from the VC and Chancellor more regularly so they know what we are working on
 - Admires Engin for working so hard on the strategic plan process
 - We should focus on the planning part roles not so much on assessment
 - What distinguishes us from other public arts institutions? We need to try to make UMM unique
- Engin said everything we do should be integrated so it works smoothly – Emphasis that this is only an assessment – no its not because it generates new ideas and objectives – will be an information database
 - This will be a strong document because we are working with different units
 - He thinks that we should work from the bottom to the top not top to bottom
- Jana said we should go back to the constitution and the planning committees responsibilities which are develop, review, and recommend policies and plans that helps the campus. This statement could mean different things to each of us – there is no guidance on what we should be doing
- Sandy asked do we need to develop long term goals and then assess them and implement them or do we assess and come up with goals after? – we have to start somewhere.
 - In the library we just did our own strategic plan which took months to do and learned that some goals we made were not good – Feel in planning we have to start a plan before we can assess anything – confused and feel we are doing it backwards
 - We all have our own goal and we need to listen to what administration wants
 - Feels we can start on setting some goals before the new Chancellor comes because we know what this institution needs and have been here a long time
 - Engin said we will start assessing what the existing strategic plan has
- Some think we were going to start fresh with the strategic plan because it is so outdated
 - The strategic plan never expires
- Bryan said he worked closely on creating the one from 2006 and it worked really well to have a shared goal from the beginning – we have an opportunity with a new Chancellor coming in the fall to have some good conversations about how to start this
 - Likes the component about including the different committees
- Seems like we are always trying to map things from what the Twin Cities does

- Brook talked about conversations from Campus Assembly
 - Faculty believe that it would be helpful to know what is working and not working in the shared governance from a Senior Leaders standpoint
 - Administration needs proposals to gain global support – can't just force things on people
 - We already get facetime with Bryan and Melissa so we should utilize it
 - Concerned about initiatives that didn't feel were properly brought through the process. Want to make sure there is collaboration.
 - We should be the keepers of the strategic plan (convenience) – we should know it really well
 - Need for clearer motions/dimensions on how to proceed
 - Lowell last year had us think about facilities priorities – where we are as a group?
- Engin said he has heard “do we really need your Planning Committee”
 - What is the value that is being given in our existing administration? – are they just trying to keep us busy?
 - We need to start from the bottom up
 - Gwen said we don't want to be in opposition of administration – we have key players already on this committee – would like an addition added to the process. Thinks the cycle is a great start though
 - Thinks we can be ready to present a road map to the new Chancellor
 - Know in the Strategic Plan we have to build in an evaluation cycle, need to coordinate with the administration
 - Engin asked where do you want administration to intersect in the process and what roles are they going to have?
 - Bryan agrees to lay the road map – Say in the fall we are going to start a Strategic Plan initiative and line up meetings to bring ideas together
 - CRPC always ended up talking about money – that is why we separated the two communities
- Bryan mentioned that Jacquie presented to the Board of Regents on the Strategic Plan on March 31st – It was very last minute. She talked about what we currently have and what we have completed. She will be sending the PowerPoint with the information she talked about.