

4-2-2019

## Campus Assembly minutes 04/02/2019

Campus Assembly

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/camp\\_assembly](https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/camp_assembly)

---

### Recommended Citation

Campus Assembly, "Campus Assembly minutes 04/02/2019" (2019). *Campus Assembly*. 257.  
[https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/camp\\_assembly/257](https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/camp_assembly/257)

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 Campus Assembly by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact [skulann@morris.umn.edu](mailto:skulann@morris.umn.edu).

Campus Assembly Meeting  
April 2, 2019  
Science Auditorium

Campus Assembly was called to order at 11:41 am.

**I. Chancellor's Remarks.**

“Good morning, and happy April! This is always an extraordinarily busy, but hopeful, time of year, as the snows melt and the days grow longer. This morning I want to provide you with updates on several things.

**FY 19 Budget**

In December I provided an overview of our condition for this fiscal year (FY19). As you'll recall, this year's tuition revenues are short of our projections from last year, leading to a gap of about \$250,000. As I noted in December, we plan to balance the budget by June 30 with vacancy savings accrued over the course of the year. That continues to be our strategy for this year's balanced budget.

**FY 20 Budget**

In mid-March, Morris made our Budget Compact presentation on the Twin Cities campus to propose our FY20 budget. We still do not know the results of that process – and likely will not until at least May and even more likely, June – but the budget process this year is a little more complicated than usual because of two large unknowns:

(1) the Governor's biennial budget recommendation – even after the increase in his revised budget – does not fully fund the University of Minnesota request. The University asked for an \$87 increase for the biennium and the governor's recommendation now sits at \$51m. [The House (with a DFL majority) recommends a greater higher education funding allocation than the governor while the Senate (with a Republican majority) recommends lower funding for higher education]; and

(2) it is not entirely clear who the sitting regents will be when the University system's budget is approved in June. The latter is important because the regents must approve both tuition levels and pay increments as part of the budget approval process.

If you remember from December, our main cost drivers for next year's budget include one-time reductions that we have made this year, a tuition shortfall, and a fringe and compensation increase. To help to meet these expenses, we proposed recurring savings of \$900,000 in salary and fringe, a 1% tuition increase, and some one-time monies from carry-forwards and contingencies. As of today, we are close to making our \$900,000 target, and have identified the needed carry-forward and contingency funds.

We have modeled our budget based on the original instructions from the budget office with respect to tuition increases and salary and fringe increases as I reported to you in December.

However, it now seems possible that we will be asked to increase tuition by 1.5% -- a higher percentage than we had budgeted, and that the salary increases will be lower than we anticipated earlier in the year - now closer to 2-2.25%.

Finally, a reminder that the strategic planning outcomes will ultimately inform budget priorities and decisions going forward. It is important that we continue to make progress to develop our priorities through the visioning and planning process. And it is to an update on that that I now want to turn...

### **Strategic Visioning and Planning**

Campus Assembly endorsed our vision and eight aspirational statements in early November. In December, four task forces with representation from campus governance; students, faculty and staff; and connections to some of the related constituencies were charged to further develop four of the aspirational statements.

Three high level themes central to the vision statement were reflected in the work that each taskforce completed and transcended all of them. These will continue to underpin our planning work ahead:

- Shared vision and common purpose: building the model 21st century public liberal arts college
- Invested institutional collaboration attentive to inclusion (fostering capacity with respect to community, culture, climate, governance)
- Ensuring a sustainable and stable University community (recruitment, retention, and persistence among all groups)

Draft reports from the task forces were completed in February. Those of you who took the time to look at the drafts could see that there were many, many good and thoughtful ideas generated. During March, the campus community was asked to provide feedback to help us to define and focus on priorities so that we can develop immediate plans around a manageable set of objectives. Over 100 responses were gathered in person at an open forum or through the online survey. Taskforces were provided with all of the results and comments and have been meeting to incorporate the community's feedback into their recommendations. I expect to receive their revised reports within the next week. Specifically, each group has been asked to reexamine their draft recommendations in light of the feedback, prioritize actions, propose timelines, identify appropriate consultations as we move to put plans into action, and suggest teams responsible for ensuring that implementation is successful. I expect to bring the updated recommendations from the four taskforces to Campus Assembly at our next meeting for endorsement.

A post-script note: Even as we move to begin to take action on recommendations emerging from this group of four aspirational statements, we will work again in the fall to repeat this process for the additional four aspirational statements having to do with scholarship, sustainability, accessibility, and our role as an educational center and within the University of Minnesota.

## **Amendment Group 4 and Community Hour**

At the last Campus Assembly, I referenced documentation concerning Amendment 4 to the Constitution that was included in your Assembly packet as Steering had planned to bring this group of proposed Constitutional changes to Assembly for discussion today. Between the last Assembly meeting and this one, Steering has met with members of the taskforce that proposed Amendment 4, as well as the chair of Steering at the time this group of Amendments was last discussed. Steering continues to work through this proposed amendment and hopes to bring forward this amendment group at the April 30 meeting.

Steering also has not forgotten the feedback it has received on the community hour. The committee will continue to consider the suggestions that it has received and work on possible tweaks to our current model.

Finally, tomorrow, April 3, is Support the U Day at the state capitol in St. Paul. We always have a robust group of representatives from Morris to share their stories with state legislators. I encourage all who are able to participate in this event to tell your Morris stories."

Mary Elizabeth Bezanson requested that the lights in the front of the science auditorium be adjusted to enable the group to see the speaker as well as hear her.

**II. For Action. From the Steering Committee.** Minutes from the March 5, 2019 Campus Assembly meeting approved as presented by unanimous voice vote.

**III. For Action. From the Functions & Awards Committee. Scholar of the College nominations.** Committee Chair Elena Machkasova presented the list of students recommended for this honor. There was an additional name not published in the Campus Assembly agenda and the list was amended to include Maija Kittleson Wilker.

Margaret Kuchenreuther made a comment on the unevenness of the student descriptions and that some were overly vague and others very specific. Elena responded that the committee really appreciates the nominations and the work that goes into them. The form includes sample nominations and templates. Sometimes it becomes necessary for the committee to ask for clarification. She also asked that any minor corrections be sent to either Jenna Ray or herself. With the reminder that only faculty are allowed to vote, there was a unanimous voice vote in favor of accepting all the nominations.

**IV. For Information. From the Assessment of Student learning Committee.** Campus Student Learning Outcomes models. Rachel Johnson and Kristin Lamberty represented the ASL Committee and presented the proposed SLO models. They invited all to examine the new model suggestions and forward suggestions and opinions to the committee (Rebecca Dean) by April 5<sup>th</sup>. The committee will then read through the suggestions, find common themes and synthesize them before forwarding them to the Curriculum Committee, who will decide what will be brought forward to Campus Assembly at the April 30<sup>th</sup> meeting. Rachel and Kristin presented two models currently under consideration. The first model is mission-based and includes main themes of Scholar, Environmental Steward, Global Citizen and Community

Contributor. The second model centers around the verbs of create, communicate, appreciate, evaluate and participate. They then opened the discussions for questions and comments.

Peh Ng asked if the current Student Learning Outcomes are still an option. The response was that Assessment would like a different model because of the challenges in applying the current SLOs in accreditation and other situations. Peh responded that there are aspects of the new models that would also be difficult to assess.

Sara Lam wondered about how the process of identifying SLO's related to General Education. Rachel replied that Assessment has thought about how the current Gen Ed requirements would fit in as well as possible new general education approaches. However, the current SLOs don't necessarily fit in with our gen eds. All this would be discussed in Curriculum Committee.

Arne Kildegaard commented that these new models may be more difficult to assess than you might think. We might be led to conclusions that we are failing more than we realize. Is the supposition that outcomes are something we are required and committed to doing? Kristin replied that the first model may be misunderstood. It is based on profiles on student learning. She drew an analogy on the white board, based on two axis or a kite imagery. What students learn and do at UMM will bolster their later success. It is a developmental process where we're ensuring that there are opportunities for these outcomes. Arne suggested that if these outcomes are optional, many students wouldn't accomplish them. Rachel indicated they weren't optional. They constitute a toolkit, enhancing and building a student's profile. Arne opined that a mission statement is aspiration, but learning outcomes shouldn't be. We shouldn't lock ourselves into a major future initiative, but should be strategic. Rachel commented that HLC indicates that SLO's should be driven by a college's mission.

Mary Elizabeth Bezanson shared her view that, in reference to the global citizen model that includes references to culture, a student can have cultural enhancement without travelling very far. And being culturally aware does not make a person a global citizen. Rachel responded that some feedback had indicated we should simply include the word "citizen" without the adjective of "global."

Viktor Berberi outlined the distinction that SLO's are not a checklist to be accomplished, like general education. We want to avoid making too strong a connection between SLO's and General Education. We need to think holistically. General Education requirements are opportunities for exploring different avenues and can also be aspirational.

Julie Eckerle expressed two concerns: our current mission statement doesn't match up with our general education requirements (which need a major overhaul) and our two big current initiatives (general education and retention) are particular challenges with the students we attract. First generation students are an example. In her WLA class, students couldn't articulate what it meant to be a global citizen for example. Rachel responded that the Assessment Committee had paid close attention to strategic planning activities.

Sarah Buchanan urged UMM to encourage the "global" aspect of citizenship. For example, we need to work more on foreign language skills and encourage true communication across cultures. This still needs to be included in General Education requirements.

Sandy Olson-Loy said that her hope for SLO's is that they are descriptive of what students really do and how we think about liberal arts college experiences. Skills are learned both through curricular and co-curricular activities, through leadership experiences as well as intercultural competence. Rachel commented that our current SLO's don't address co-curricular contributions to a great degree.

Peter Dolan posed the question again as to whether SLO's are directed for everyone or simply as opportunities for those who wish to take advantage of them. Kristin responded that we should help students build capacity, that everything they're doing enhances their toolkit of skills and approaches. They are not simply a box to be checked.

#### **V. Announcements.**

The 2018-19 MCSA President (Andrew Brichacek) and Vice President (Sierra Brown) thanked the assembly for all the cooperation in the past year and the incoming MCSA President (Sam Rosemark) and Vice President (Josh Westfield) introduced themselves and pledged continuing efforts for working together, wellness, sustainability and a sense of community.

#### **VI. Campus Committee Reports.**

Elena Machkasova, on behalf of the Functions and Awards Committee, alerted the body to a campus naming initiative that will be presented to the Campus Assembly at the end of April. They would welcome feedback to that proposal.

#### **VII. All University Reports.**

None

**Question:** Mary Elizabeth Bezanson asked if there were official changes to the block M. The Chancellor replied she wasn't aware of any changes. Kari Adams responded that changes to the painting on the swimming pool are related to the fact that the double M is prohibited by the U of M system.

#### **VIII. Adjournment.**

The Chancellor adjourned the meeting at 12:32 pm.

Respectfully submitted by LeAnn Dean