

2-7-2018

Consultative minutes 02/07/2018

Consultative Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Consultative Committee, "Consultative minutes 02/07/2018" (2018). *Consultative Committee*. 162.
<http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/consult/162>

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.

Consultative Committee
Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, Feb. 7, 2018
8 a.m. Prairie Lounge

Members present: Sarah Buchanan, Michael Cihak, Ann DuHamel, Nancy Helsper, Tiernan Lenius, Janel Mendoza, Michelle Page, Noah Pilugin, Angela Stangl, Jeri Squier, Roger Wareham
Guests: Heather Peters-Stefanek and Adrienne Conley

I.Meeting called to order at 8:02 a.m.

II.Approval of minutes from January 24 and 31 meetings

- a. There was a move to approve January 24 minutes as submitted; the motion was approved unanimously.
- b. There was a discussion regarding consistent content and format of minutes; it was determined that since there is not clerical support for this committee the member taking the minutes will determine format.
- c. Approval of January 31, 2018 minutes was tabled to the next meeting.

III.Exit Interview Information / Discussion with Human Resources Director Sarah Mattson

- a. The committee didn't get to Exit Interview discussion with Sarah Mattson due to other items of discussion at the Jan. 31 meeting. A member feels we still need to follow up with HR regarding exit interviews being more proactive. Some members want more information on one of the reason that was given for employees leaving – that regarding demands of the job being too big. Questions include: How many said it? When? Is it a trend that has broader implications for campus? Should we look at data over the long term? The committee believes someone should be collecting data and analyzing it. HR should have written procedures (if they don't) regarding exit interview process and it should be articulated to all supervisors and employees and followed consistently. Data should be tracked and analyzed – what are longer terms trends and how can they inform best practices? The committee discussed whether or not it should request Sarah come back or should there be a subgroup or a memo following up? Everyone agreed that we would like to know what is currently being done. It was proposed that the committee would send a follow up e-mail to Sarah and then ask her to return to the committee in fall. Angie and Sarah will draft an e-mail and send to S. Mattson for response and possibly invite her back this semester.
- b. The committee will address at a later meeting the other HR items that were discussed at the Jan. 31 meeting

IV. Concerns regarding UMM's ticket purchasing software

- a. Concerns have been brought to the committee that the per ticket cost of the ticketing system managed by Student Activities has been raised from 50 cents per ticket to \$1.00 a ticket. Some of the academic disciplines and student groups are quite concerned the burden of this and how it will impact programs, particularly those in the arts. Consultative Committee needs to collect more information and will determine at a future meeting how it would like to follow up on this issue. Subcommittee may be formed to work on ticketing issue; although it has been taken to student affairs committee.

V. Possible future items for discussion

- a. Branding and Marketing (perhaps invite the new Communications person, Randy Sands?)

VI. Discussion with Heather Peters-Stefanek and Adrienne Conley regarding the Commission on Women/Women's, Gender, Equity Advisory Council proposal to replace the Commission on Women's committee appointment with an Equity and Diversity Advocate appointment.

- a. Peters-Stefanek, chair of the Commission on Women provided an overview of the proposal and the issues surrounding it. Three years ago the 25% staff position was not replaced when the person in the position retired. Kerri Barnstuble was able to handle many of the responsibilities when she had her former position but was no longer able to do so when she assumed her current position. Since that time the commission has struggled to handle the duties of the position, particularly fulfilling the ex officio role the director played on numerous campus governance committees. Commission representatives have talk with the chancellor about refilling the position but it seems as if the current budget climate could not sustain reinstating the position. The commission then explored how to off-load some of the programmatic pieces since they are currently not fulfilling all responsibilities broadly, particularly that of committee representation. The proposal in discussion (see attached) was developed and commission members met with the chair of the Membership Committee as well as the full committee to discuss how to roll out the proposal and to make more systematic. It is envisioned that training for the advocates would take place each fall. Membership Committee suggested the proposal be discussed with Consultative Committee as well.
- b. Discussion of the proposal took place. A committee member expressed that they were not in favor of the proposal and concerned that the Commission board had not gotten endorsement of full Commission on Women membership since not all women employees have not had opportunity to weigh in on the proposal. It was reminded that the UMM Commission on Women committee is an advisory committee that does programming for all women on campus – much like similar committees on the other U of M campuses. Duluth has vital committee Commission for Women. Crookston has a Women's commission and TC has Women's Center – their website actually lists 40 reasons why need to still have one. There should be an opportunity for all UMM Commission constituents to weigh in on this proposal and other options should be considered. Another member observed that the proposal was not necessarily

- removing Women's viewpoint but was roughly making sure there is an equity advocate on all committees. It is clear to the Commission board that the Commission currently cannot do everything it used to, including overseeing the lactation room, child care, etc. It is a size/capacity issue. Initiatives that are important to women are being eroded because not enough people are stepping up.
- c. The proposal and the conversation brought up many issues including; the changing role and focus of the Commission on Women; a need to understand the work that has historically been done by the Commission as well as the history of the Commission itself; a discussion of the advocacy role of Commission coordinator and how that is maintained; the need for a constitutional change if the proposal is to be enacted; the need to more institutionalize many of the needs currently be handled by a volunteer board; that both the Commission on Women and Gender Women and Sexuality Studies areas are unstaffed at UMM in an era of misogyny; what are the administration's priorities regarding these issues; and if the proposal were approved how would we ensure that UMM faculty/staff – including civil service and bargaining unit staff -- would be able to meet qualifications.
 - d. Peters-Stefanek and Conley were invited to come to a future meeting to provide updates and to continue the conversation

VII. Meeting adjourned at 8:59 a.m.

Note taker: Roger Wareham