

2-6-1984

Campus Assembly minutes 02/06/1984

Campus Assembly

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/camp_assembly

Recommended Citation

Campus Assembly, "Campus Assembly minutes 02/06/1984" (1984). *Campus Assembly*. 254.
https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/camp_assembly/254

This Article 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 Campus Assembly by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

✓ EB

University of Minnesota, Morris
Campus Assembly Minutes
February 6, 1984

The Campus Assembly met at 4 p.m. on February 6, 1984, in the Science Auditorium. A roll call at 4:10 p.m. showed a quorum to be present.

Questions arose about reopening discussion on the Mission Statement. Imholte commented that it was the judgment of the Executive Committee to continue on with the discussion of the Planning Assumptions from the previous meeting. When discussion is completed on the rest of the document, the assembly will return to the Mission Statement, and to other portions of the document if needed.

A question also arose as to why the approved amendment from the January 23 meeting was not included in the January 30 document. Imholte explained that the Executive Committee felt it was inappropriate to do so because the January 30 document was the product of the Morris Campus Resources and Planning Committee and not necessarily what had been amended in the assembly.

Frenier read Fred Peterson's proposed amendment to A Two-Biennia Plan and said the committee accepted it as an editorial change. The amended paragraph will now read:

I.B.4. (third paragraph) (p. 15)

Increased emphasis on maximum use of time allotted for research and creative work in the arts and, where feasible, increase involvement of students in research and creative work in the arts.

Frenier read the Mission of the Campus as amended at the previous meeting and also read the corrections by the Morris Campus Resources and Planning Committee to I.B.1. and I.B.2. of The Two-Biennia Plan.

I.B.1. (first paragraph) (p. 13) should read:

[The academic administration (central and divisional), in consultation with Student Activities and the Counseling Service, will revise fundamentally the orientation and advising programs.] The first step in a sound advising program must be the timely procurement and dissemination to advisers of complete information about prospective students. This should include, for example, the following types of data:

I.B.2. (p. 14) should read:

The Provost will appoint a faculty/staff/student task force to improve the quality of cultural and recreational programming on campus and thus address the sense of isolation academically able and prepared students experience during their undergraduate careers. Such an effort will require the coordination of many separate efforts and resource sources, including, but not limited to, discipline and divisional programs, Student Activity programs, and Housing programs. (Appoint 15-September-1984, Report 1-January-1985).

Discussion turned to the Planning Assumptions section of the document and the written amendments to it.

1. Kissock amendment to II.A. (p. 1)

Kissock proposed that II.A. be amended to make it consistent with the change in the Mission Statement. He proposed the following rephrasing of the statement:

Our primary commitment lies in providing, maintaining, and strengthening our liberal arts programs in the broad areas of science and mathematics, the humanities, and the social sciences; teacher education; and preprofessional programs.

The amendment was seconded. Spring stated that he didn't think consistency was an adequate criteria for change. UMM was created as a liberal arts college of the University of Minnesota with teacher education being added later. He saw no reason why it was inconsistent to emphasize that the primary purpose of UMM is liberal arts.

Frenier commented that she chose to come here because UMM was a liberal arts institution. She said there are many rumors that UMM is a two-year college and if we stress that we prepare students to go elsewhere we just add fuel to the fire. Guyotte concurred with Frenier.

Granger suggested that the whole phrase having to do with teacher education and preprofessional programs be eliminated. He said that we don't do special things for preprofessional programs, they are simply liberal arts courses. Hart felt that we should clearly identify what our primary function is. He thought that we did provide teacher education and preprofessional programs within the liberal arts context, and felt that the stronger we are in liberal arts, the better able we are to provide the other two.

Carver agreed with Granger, but felt that the preprofessional programs should be looked at differently than teacher education. Because Education is one of our divisions, it should be left in the statement, but preprofessional programs should be taken out.

The Kissock amendment to II.A. failed with 23 in favor, 34 opposed, and 4 abstentions.

2. Kissock amendment to II.B.1. (p. 2)

Kissock proposed adding "and areas of the U.S." to the last sentence of II.B.1.

Spring mentioned that the present wording is as recommended by the student services people. He said that it was to be assumed that ordinary attention be given to other groups. He also felt that the change would not be in agreement with our recruiting efforts. Granger thought that the addition would broaden our objectives regarding recruiting and weaken the special mention of the other groups.

The Kissock amendment to II.B.1. failed.

3. Civil Service amendment to add a II.B.5. (p. 3)

There was a recommendation from the Civil Service Executive Committee to eliminate the last paragraph of B.4. and add the following paragraph as B.5:

Support Staff. In striving to achieve a reputation as one of the best undergraduate liberal arts colleges in Minnesota, we need a staff of qualified, highly-trained and dedicated professionals in the support services. Highest priority should be given to recruitment, development, and retention of staff. An able and committed staff is essential to our institutional health and to maintenance of academic programs and retention of students.

Spring commented tht the planning committee had used the term "highest" very carefully throughout the document. "Highest" priority is given to teaching effectiveness. Programs and issues are more important than groups of people.

Eidem said she accepted the above comments and wondered if it would require a written amendment to use the second paragraph of B.4. as a new B.5 entitled "Support Staff." Imholte indicated that a written amendment would be necessary.

The Civil Service amendment to add a II.B.5. was withdrawn.

4. Kissock amendment to II.C. (p. 4)

Kissock's amendment to delete the bracketed words (those) and (that are feasible) from lines 11 and 12 of II.C. was withdrawn after an explanation of what was meant by feasible. He may submit another amendment substituting another term for "feasible."

Kissock amendment to II.C. withdrawn.

5. Civil Service amendment to III.C. (p. 8)

There was an amendment from the Civil Service Executive Committee to change the heading for III. C. under Goals and Objectives from "Student Personnel Services" to "Services for Students."

Civil Service amendment to III.C. passed.

6. Civil Service amendment to III.D. (p. 10)

There was a proposed amendment from the Civil Service Executive Committee to change the III.D. heading under Goals and Objectives from "Campus Services" to "Support Services." This would be consistent with the heading for II.B.4.

The Civil Service amendment to III.D. passed.

7. Civil Service amendment to add III.D.5. (p. 10)

The Civil Service Executive Committee proposed the following amendment as III.D.5. under Goals and Objectives:

To encourage professional contributions and enhance staff development in the areas of service, job performance, management and planning, and technical support.

The Civil Service amendment to add III.D.5. passed.

8. Kissock amendment to I.A.2. of A Two-Biennia Plan. (p. 12)

Kissock's amendment to add "and nation" between "state" and "where" on line 7 of I.A.2. was withdrawn.

9. Granger amendment to I.A.2. of A Two-Biennia Plan. (p. 12)

Granger proposed the following amendment to replace the present I.A.2.

To supplement our current recruiting efforts, the Director of Admissions, in consultation with the Assistant Provost, the Academic Dean, and the Scholastic Committee, will devise a plan designed to broaden the base of the population of potential prospective students interested in residential liberal arts education. Aimed at reaching a broader population of students with interests and abilities compatible with the curricular offerings, the plan should outline strategies for strengthening the recruiting activity among metropolitan, out-of-state, and local non-traditional populations. It should identify the resources necessary to broaden the recruiting base and should consider, in addition to the Admissions staff, methods of increasing the participation of faculty, staff, and alumni where appropriate in the recruiting process.

Frenier explained that the planning committee feels that the system as it is now does not work and that the population in the seven-county metropolitan area is expanding and we need to give priority to that area. Granger pointed out that the amendment does not overlook the seven-county area. He said that the present wording removes the responsibility for planning and implementation from the Director of Admissions who has more expertise in this area.

Spring stated that the planning committee felt the responsibility should lie with the senior administrative officers on the campus. He also thought that our out-of-state recruiting was governed by the central administration. Lopez agreed with Granger that the primary responsibility should be with the Director of Admissions. Granger explained that the rules on out-of-state recruiting are imposed largely by us and not the central administration. He felt that we needed to develop a plan that will broaden our base of students interested in liberal arts education. Togeas agreed with Granger's statement about responsibility belonging to the Director of Admissions and also felt it would be wrong to give such priority to the seven-county area. He would prefer not to suggest that the seven-county area is the way to go.

Guyotte spoke against the amendment and thought we should assert our state-wide mission.

Lammers in speaking against the amendment, did not agree with the rationale for not competing with institutions in the metropolitan area.

Thielke favored the amendment and spoke highly of our admissions effort indicating that we should not take planning efforts away from where we are successful. Carver agreed that primary responsibility should stay with the professional in admissions.

The Granger amendment to I.A.2. of A Two-Biennia Plan carried with 35 in favor, 14 against, and 6 abstentions.

10. Granger amendment to I.B.1. of A Two-Biennia Plan. (p. 13)

Granger proposed the following amendment as a replacement for I.B.1. and I.B.2.

The academic administration (central and divisional), in consultation with Student Activities and the Counseling Service, will revise fundamentally the orientation and advising programs. The revised advising program must recognize that not all faculty make good advisers and that it is essential to recognize, in both the allotment of faculty responsibilities and in the reward system, those who do. The delivery of new student information and curricular materials essential to proper advising during orientation and registration sessions should be improved; the orientation program should insure that new students are given much more individual time with the best qualified faculty advisers to plan their first year's course work and fall registration. The program should be equally appropriate to traditional and nontraditional students (1-January-1985).

Spring pointed out that the correction passed out by Frenier at the start of the meeting takes care of part of the problem. Granger agreed but said that it doesn't change as many of the objections as he wants. He said that the planning committee goes into more detail and implementation strategy than he would like. Frenier indicated that the committee wanted to say something specific. Spring agreed with Frenier that there was a need for specificity. He indicated that the committee was of the opinion that our greatest failure in retaining students comes from inadequate advising, and he cited an example.

Lopez spoke against the amendment as being too general to see any improvement in the present system.

Olson favored the amendment. He sympathized with the problems of having inadequate information to advise wisely, but didn't believe that getting that specific would solve all the problems. Farrell spoke in favor of specificity and cited problems now existing in the advising system.

Straw wondered what effect it would have on our recruitment if we refused to let students take part in the summer registration programs

unless we had all their pertinent data. Granger indicated that this could be done, but restated his opinion that the kind of specificity the document calls for will not solve the examples of bad advising cited during this discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m. without a vote being taken on the last mendment.

Submitted by Pat Tanner