

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Planning Committee

Campus Governance

4-16-2024

Planning minutes 04/16/2024

Planning Committee

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

Planning Committee
April 16, 2024 11:40 a.m.
Zoom and Welcome Center 122

Members Present: Mark Collier (chair), Roger Rose, Elliot James, Stephen Crabtree, Emma Kloos, Laura Thielke, Arne Kildegaard (Division Chair – non-voting), Bryan Herrmann (non-voting), Bill Zimmerman (non-voting), Nizhoni Marks

Absent: Bethanie Belisle

Attending: Dean Peh Ng

I. Minutes for 3/5 meeting – reviewed & approved.

II. Chair Update on Further Steps after this Meeting: discussion of reaching out to Steering Comm (Denise Odello); open question over whether should go just to faculty or full campus-assembly for discussion.

-- Immediate step for Today's Meeting: Planning Committee needs to approve

-- Discussion for Process after that. Chair suggested that providing basic information to campus assembly with invitation to review it. Discussed by others

-- Arne: Noted that document should go to Division Chairs for review.

III. Discussion of Document:

Initial Comments: Chair noted that final revisions to document completed recently.

-- Committee members agree with providing shorter list of options to Chancellor/administration. One member suggests adding an abstract or overview and page numbers, even possibly table of contents. Others agree with those additions.

-- Chairs summarizes challenges creating document, the view for cutting down number of options, and idea the sub-group working on document reached rough consensus of core options.

-- Chair noted that further conversation with VP of Distributive Learning can take place on Thursday (3/18).

-- General Discussion of Document

-- Brian: concerned with "existential threat" terminology.

-- Member remarks that process resembles adaptive/reactive approach that has guided decisions thus far, not a campus informed direction. At several points, faculty and chair comment on need for institutional approach for the future, that acknowledges resource constraints.

-- Discussion of concept of “combinations of majors”: Members noted there should be a process for guiding small majors facing challenges. Chair emphasizes the difficulties of guiding majors/disciplines more specifically.

-- Committee considers adding comment to document Abstract/Summary that adds committee’s view need of framing of approaches needed from administration to help guide view of options. -- Chair likewise emphasizes guidance needed to assist small, challenged majors.

-- Committee notes and discusses whether Division Chairs can add more guidance. Later noted process of prioritizing is laid out by Division Chairs and that some majors used to have combined forms and committee discuss whether Division Chairs have enough guidance. Member notes the need for more coordinated effort and plan for going forward. Example: Geology could use more guidance beyond “good luck”. Comm members also notes that without new hires, only solution is for some majors is “consolidation”.

Some committee members note that old, combined program structures from long ago may not be helpful today. Those don’t answer “combine with which” other major?

-- Committee member notes that new Dean may have to say “let’s consolidate”, and make unpopular choices and these are priorities, but should be framed in terms of what the future holds for specific majors or areas... Goal to reduce uncertainty for challenged majors.

-- Committee emphasized importance of more conversations how to reimagine UMM as smaller institution. Maybe new Dean will need to make tough choices, but new Dean has advantage of new perspective. Chair notes that some assurance of future enrollments is needed to do some on this planning.

NOTE: Dean joins meeting & Chair reviews document and esp. options outlined. Emphasis of laying out minimal options and need for next Dean’s input to have a more specific plan. This may entailed having process for developing guidance for restructuring.

-- Dean’s Feedback: notes Chancellor wanted feedback on process and more guidelines. Suggested process for streamlining majors wanted.

-- Committee emphasizes framing of expectations from New Dean. New strategy does not need to be “top-down” but needs buy-in through active engagement with campus and stakeholders.

Chair emphasizes not wanting to tie hands of new Dean. Need suggested tactics push to disciplines to plan, a central solution based on general vision of principles.

-- Dean notes that Chancellor wanted some set of principles for consideration and that from other public meeting the campus has rough sense of future.

--Chair notes committee was not in a position to determine specific principles. If basic options recommended are not sufficient, then need further guidance. Planning just offering broad set of suggestions, not specific options based on visions. It noted does not have marketing research for guidance beyond general options.

--Chair concludes that campus faculty need larger guidance on what kind of "college" we want to be.

Committee thanks Dean for participating. Dean comments on sharing the document with Chancellor once approved.

Committee moves to Vote on Document: Motion to approve proposal succeeds, 6-0-0 in favor.