

12-9-1985

Campus Assembly minutes 12/09/1985

Campus Assembly

University of Minnesota, Morris
Campus Assembly Meeting
9 December 1985

The campus assembly met on Monday, December 9, 1985, at 4 p.m. in the science auditorium.

In the absence of the Chair, Vice Chair Ernie Kemble conducted the meeting.

The minutes of the October 14, 1985, assembly meeting were approved.

The dean spoke to the curricular items on the agenda. She explained that these courses are generally offered away from campus and are aimed at those working with pre-school age children who need certification in this area. The curricular proposals, Ed 1067 and Ed 1069, in continuing education were approved.

The next item on the agenda was a discussion of the chancellor's draft response to the "Commitment to Focus" (CTF) document. With no objection from assembly members, the remainder of the meeting was recorded. Kemble encouraged members to either write or call the chancellor with their comments if they felt their concerns were not adequately covered in the minutes or on tape.

Blake introduced the item for the chancellor. Imholte had asked her to cover the following four points:

- where we are in the process (1)
- what we need to accomplish at this meeting (2)
- points about the document itself (3)
- importance of what we are doing (4)

1. The CTF document came from Keller before he was president and is the central document to All-University planning, a part of the Cycle IV process. Imholte appointed a task force in April of 1985, with a double charge of looking at the GER and looking at the major. The task force work began in April and continued through the summer, including such things as:

- day-long retreat
- consultation with Jerry Gaff, authority on improving liberal learning
- visits with people from other campuses
- interviews with UMM faculty, staff, and students

The task force was given a deadline of November 1, 1985, to report to the chancellor. A report was submitted on 11/1 which stressed a two-stage process. The report submitted is a goals statement, not a curricular recommendation. The second stage will be a proposal for curricular change.

The Executive Committee will meet on 12/10 to consider whether or not to broaden the task force, and if so, by what method. Meanwhile the task force is continuing with its work.

2. The Executive Committee has brought this item to the assembly for information, not action. The discussion here is a part of the consultative process. Imholte wanted the fact stressed that there are two separate reports. The first is the New Directions Task Force report which is an internal document still in the process of revision (Imholte has requested that the task force report to him by mid December on any changes it wishes to recommend in the document). The second report, and the one that is up for discussion at this meeting, is Imholte's draft response to the CTF document.
3. In his document, Imholte is trying to counter concern expressed about the task force statement being too negative. In trying to give a more positive emphasis, he would welcome suggestions for improvement, i.e., perhaps adding or changing some of the examples. Whatever the campus does in response to the CTF statement, additional funding will be required.
4. Every two or three years, units get to report to the regents, but this time, there is an opportunity for folks to focus more fully on UMM--a chance for UMM to beat its own drum. Timing is important in curricular change. One consultant felt that things were moving too fast for curricular change. This is one reason the task force chose to present the report as it did. Over the next few months is perhaps the best chance, and maybe the only chance, to get financial support. At this time, it is not recommending specific courses, but a direction. It is important to put something forward.

The response was now open for discussion. Spring began by saying that on page 4, third from last paragraph, it describes two positions. He didn't feel that people would fit comfortably into either one of them. He said the paragraph did not describe where he stood, and that he had not talked to anyone who had not stressed change. He also did not feel the next paragraph adequately reflected the position the task force had taken in its report.

Uehling called attention to the quote from the CTF document in IV on page 4. He said that some of the stipulations listed on pages 5 & 6 might be consistent with CTF, but others were not. He also noted C on page 6 as being in the singular, whereas the CTF statement talked about multi-discipline courses. He was afraid some regents might point that out.

Dawn Braithwaite remarked on the use of the word "skills" in Goals 2 & 3 on page 5. She thought it should be more than developing skills; perhaps "ability" or "competence" would be a better word to use.

Purdy indicated that he had a problem with Goals 2 & 3. He thought it was meaningless to separate the two. If one develops creative thinking skills, one has to be able to show it by writing or speaking.

Elifoglu said he would prefer using "observation" instead of "perception," because it better implies objectivity. He also wondered about the use of "computation" in C on page 5. He wondered if it shouldn't be "quantitative analysis" instead.

Charles Braithwaite said that in A on page 6, "speaking" should be included as well as "writing."

Purdy wondered how the scientists felt about the phrase, "introduce the complexities of the natural world" at the end of Goal 1 on page 5. He said if there were no objections by the scientists, he would not pursue it.

Farrell called attention to the phrases preceded by dashes on page 6, and said he wished there were other ways to state the last two phrases. Paulson suggested using "facilitate" instead of "permit" in the second to last phrase. Farrell also objected to the next to last sentence of the paragraph on the middle of page 6, "The basic plan for UMM is, as it has been from the start, to build the finest undergraduate college we can by creating an environment intensively organized for learning." He said this was the effort of every college. Does it need to be said, or said in this way?

Guyotte spoke on behalf of calling attention to UMM's attractive, clean campus. He said UMM should be spoken of in a way which distinguishes itself from other campuses. The residential, liberal arts character of UMM needs to be highlighted, and if UMM is going to be asking for additional funding, then it may wish to highlight certain other characteristics.

Olson suggested that more might be said in the way of comparing UMM to other colleges. He said one characteristic which distinguishes UMM is its student-faculty ratio. He also commented on the reference to a clean and healthy campus. He said in some instances, the resources we have are not sufficient to accomplish this. He cited problems with the hoods in the Science & Math building.

Peterson spoke about the fact that G on page 3 just spoke of one funding possibility. He also said that the first statement on page 6 was too brief. He suggested it needed something more for clarification.

Gremmels agreed with Olson's statement about comparing UMM with other liberal arts colleges. He said he would be interested in a comparison of the numbers of traditional majors to see where UMM fits. He went on to say that the quality of our graduates should be measured with other institutions.

Elifoglu expressed concern over the allocation of internal funds. If courses are added, something will have to be sacrificed.

Nellis said that in the profile of students, there is no reference to the growing number of non-traditional students and the importance of UMM to the community around it.

Uehling commented on the summary. He thought the first paragraph was fine, but then the document seemed to die. He suggested appending a strong sentence to the end of the first paragraph, perhaps something like, "By focusing now on the general education requirement, UMM continues its historical commitment to improvement," and then eliminating the rest of the second paragraph.

Kissock asked if this would be a lead document to help UMM get resources in future years. He said if the sense of this document was in opening a door such as that, it does not do the job. He said the document shows UMM in a positive light now and would not raise the question of needed resources. Blake said that the document alone would not do that. May thought it was intentional that the document was not that obvious about the need for additional resources--they [regents] should reach that conclusion without our being so obvious.

Spring said it would be a mistake to alter the document as Kissock suggested. The CTF is not a budgetary report and will not alter the 1987-89 biennial request. It would be more politic to let that be an assumption between our administration and the central administration, and not put it into this document. Blake agreed, but said the comments would be helpful.

Klinger thought the document was promising to do certain things which cannot be done without additional funding. He referred to page 5, C. If the prospect of promises of this kind is even raised, then the document should state that it is conditional on more funding. Purdy pointed out that the solution is in the first sentence of C. Klinger indicated that that solution was unacceptable to him.

Ahern agreed with Spring's statement and said that it was consistent with the timetable. He said that the campus should be in a position by spring quarter to say what additional resources are needed.

Paulson said that the issue of resources might be solved by inserting a sentence in the summary concerning the next process, including the need for resources in that step.

McCannon said that the document ignores an important characteristic of UMM--that it is part of a major land grant institution with a mission of public service. He said the document did not refer to the huge contributions UMM has made in this area.

Thielke questioned the part of the CTF document which said that UMM should become a small liberal arts college rather than a small College of Liberal Arts. She didn't think UMM had ever been a small College of Liberal Arts, and therefore, that part of the focus document should be addressed.

Hart thought Thielke's concern was worth considering. He said the response points out some unique things UMM has done and the above criticism of the CTF document is legitimate. It might be good to challenge the statement about UMM being a miniature CLA. Spring supported the idea, pointing out that UMM has scientists; CLA does not.

With no further comments on Imholte's draft response, the assembly adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Submitted by Pat Tanner