University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Planning Committee   Campus Governance

1-23-2024

Planning minutes 01/23/2024

Planning Committee

Planning Committee Meeting Minutes: January 23, 2024:

Present: Mark Collier, Roger Rose, Elliot James, Nizhoni Marks, Laura Thielke, Emma Kloos, Bryan Herrmann, Arne Kildegaard, Bill Zimmerman

Review/Discussion of [Draft Document:](#)

Subcommittee (Collier, Rose, Kildegaard) worked on a rough document (linked above) responding to the call from the Chancellor for Planning Committee to help guide program continuation conversations. The purpose of this meeting is to gather feedback from the full committee, talk through the current framework, and establish a plan for the final version of the document.

Section I: Trying to work out what question is being asked. What are we being asked to do?

Peh's question: What to do about disciplines that fall below the threshold – how to help them continue? Laid out options 1-9 (Part II).

Part III: Odello's understand is that administrators are looking for process solutions rather than substantive solutions. So far, we've been more substantive.

Next meeting: Invited new VP for distributed learning – one of the items for suggested action (Part II, #5, pg. 5) was to arrange for faculty in low enrolled courses to teach online for other campuses. See what this person thinks about our situation and how we can outreach to other campuses. Example of existing fix – moving Morris summer course offerings to be as visible as other campuses summer courses in online search tools.

Division chairs need to work with faculty and the Dean to come up with solutions. Each discipline needs to figure out what works best for them. Maybe this could be a working document – people could add to it as they come up with ideas for doing things.

Prologue:

There has been serious contraction in the faculty without contraction in the programs. Expansion of programs, contraction of faculty. We come up with new majors/programs and as we do it, we're thinking – this is to maintain and address existing student interest and make us more attractive in the marketplace where we're competing with small liberal arts institutions. Double edged sword – as we're doing that, we are cannibalizing existing programs on campus. Does it draw students from outside UMM to UMM or does it take students who would have been taking Humanities and put them in Social Science, for example. Trying to maintain viability by extending ourselves in ways that are hard/time consuming. The consequence is that we're taking enrollment from other classes that exist.

This guidance from Planning is meant to be a menu that a Dean can think about. "I want all disciplines to look at this question". Where are you now? Do you have what you need now? What do you need to stay viable/sustainable.

This process may be an issue for small disciplines (1 or 2 people) that just went through 5 year review. Too much work for disciplines understaffed who have already done this thinking. Need something much more targeted or following more of a normal process. Maybe build something into a 5 year review that incorporates these questions. Does that solve the Chancellor's request to the Dean – how are you evaluating who is sustainable and viable. pg 22-23

The question Planning Committee is tasked to help answer is: what leads to an evaluation of a program? Step 1: review major enrollments. Step 2: In discussion with Discipline Coordinators, Division Chair, and Chancellor, pick metrics and review.

We're not recommending any one path, we are just saying this is a menu. The options the disciplines have include those listed in Part II: looking at courses, major requirements, fill courses in from TC, evaluation of service courses for other majors, etc. Part of 5 year review but you are going to have situations (retirements, attrition) that make it happen faster.

The committee agreed to build off prologue, these are the options (Part II), it looks like these are some of the things that are going on. Some programs review in 5 years, some programs face retirement – forced rethinking - and do internal evaluations considering the above options OR OTHERS. It's been a bit ad hoc. The catalyst for review may be a decision by a division chair. In addition to mentioning prior solutions, we can mention options/possibilities that have never actually been explored. Possibly explore a couple examples under each option but make it clear that it's not an extensive list and the disciplines are the experts in their own area.

Begin with prologue – here's what we've been doing. Follow with a survey of things that disciplines have done. Generic categories. Keep or let go of part with processes. Possibly add to list of options some meetings with admissions or other experts who have a sense of what students are wanting. Perhaps a campus conversation would be a good avenue for low enrolled disciplines to explore.

There are several processes we've seen historically, some are more formal than others. This is what we've seen.

The group discussed incentives like a small stipend to redesign a program during the summer. This would help for folks to see the process as supportive instead of onerous. $1000 to have conversations with someone in the profession/useful experts (i.e., American Political Science Association – external counseling). Paying for expertise.

Respectfully Submitted:

Emma Kloos