

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

## University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

---

Campus Assembly

Campus Governance

---

4-14-1997

### Campus Assembly minutes 04/14/1997

Campus Assembly

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

---

The Campus Assembly met on Monday, April 14, 1997 at 4 pm in the Science Auditorium.

I. Chancellor David Johnson reviewed plans for upcoming visitors to campus. Regent Bob Bergland will be visiting Morris on May 6, 1997. Bergland served as Secretary of Agriculture during the Carter administration. On October 6 Mark and Judy Yudof will visit UMM.

Johnson then announced his intention to resign effective June 30, 1998. He is pleased that the timing of his announcement will permit President-elect Yudof to appoint his successor. Johnson will not be claiming his tenured position in sociology but looks forward to supporting UMM and the university at large. His priorities for his remaining 14 months at UMM will include the Morris Science Project and the Morris Junior Year program.

II. The minutes of the February 3, 1997 Campus Assembly meeting were approved as distributed.

III. The Assembly reviewed the proposal for committee reduction. Mercedes Ballou wondered how the workload created by a cessation of adjunct committees would be met by their parent committees, such as the Curriculum Committee. Bert Ahern reminded her that the cessation could be temporary. Ballou then asked who would appoint membership to any resurrected adjunct committees. Ahern explained that constitutional procedures would be followed depending on whether a parent committee recommended creating a subcommittee or reinstating an adjunct committee.

Andy Lopez asked about the Consultative Committee and David Johnson explained that it would continue in its current form. Sam Schuman raised the possibility that the Assembly should discuss what needs doing before discussing how to do it and wondered whether starting from scratch might not be more productive than cutting and reinstating. Margaret Kuchenreuther asked how committee assignments would be handled under the proposal so that faculty might be able to gauge their workload. She acknowledged that the high level of activity among adjunct committees might suggest they are not as superfluous as might be thought and wondered how workload can be reduced while maintaining involvement. Johnson explained that the Executive Committee, which appointments Assembly ("Big 5") committee membership in the spring, would meet again in the fall to appoint adjunct committees as necessary.

Fred Farrell asked for clarification about any difference between this proposal and the constitutional procedure for reviewing adjunct committees biennially. Johnson explained that the by-law process asks Assembly committees to determine what adjunct committees should be discontinued...the proposal requires them to determine which ones should continue. John Bowers added that the proposal addresses the mandate from the Consultative Committee by permitting the Assembly committees to evaluate their necessity.

Nat Hart worried that committees overburdened by the cessation of adjunct committees will inappropriately prioritize their expanding workloads. He wondered if instead the activities of the adjunct committees couldn't be absorbed into a new standing committee. Tinisha Davis supported this point, noting the disproportionately large number of adjunct committees functioning under the umbrella of the Curriculum Committee.

Johnson asked the Assembly for feedback on the section of the proposal addressing the size of search committees. Mary Elizabeth Bezanson expressed concern that workload will not be diminished for women or faculty of color if diversity on search committees is to be maintained.

Michael O'Reilly complimented the proposal's structure in addressing responsibilities but worried that it focused inappropriately on reducing committees rather than committee work. Ahern reminded the Assembly that the proposal seeks to decrease the workload while asserting the need for responsibility and focus on policy rather than administration.

Eric Klinger worried that the proposal might simply result in adding administrative workload to a smaller number of committee participants. He offered as an example the number of possibly-redundant steps a curriculum proposal must go through ( review by discipline, division, Curriculum Committee, Assembly, and possibly General Education Committee).

Bart Finzel suggested that the proposed restructuring would result in a type of prioritizing that would responsibly reduce workload. Discussion ended with Elizabeth Blake and Bert Ahern stressing the importance of committee work focusing on policy, not administrative implementation.

IV. Bert Ahern and Engin Sungur updated the Assembly on the Task Force for Assessment of Student Learning (which becomes the fifth Assembly committee effective fall 1997) prior to consideration of their proposed plan. Gwen Rudney replaces Carol Marxen and Jason Kohler replaces Eric Bauer. The group has reviewed the version of the plan circulated in November. All major disciplines have received a server concerning plans for assessment. Minor modifications have been made to the previous plan and discipline addendums have been added. Roland Guyotte asked whether semester curriculum would be covered by the proposal before the Assembly and was that it would. Dimitra Gianulli asked whether the plan would have to be reflected in individual course syllabi and Ahern explained that it should be reflected at the program level. Michael O'Reilly asked whether external evaluations of disciplines will continue. Ahern responded that such reviews were not a Task Force issue but would not be in conflict with the plan and would fall under the purview of the Dean's Office. Sam Schuman noted that the TFASL plan is concerned with student learning while external evaluations, which he anticipates will continue, look at all elements of a program.

The assembly approved the proposal by vocal vote.

V. The following items from the Curriculum Committee passed by vocal vote:

- ArtH 3600 - add E2, E6, E8 (general ed)
- Ed 1014, Beg. Sign Lang. II - add P6, E7 (general ed)
- Ed 1042, Int. Sign Lang. II - add E7 (general ed)
- Music Form B - teacher prep changes (regular)
- Spch 1100H - change of quarter (regular)
- Geology UC summer course - move to regular, change credits, add E9 (regular)
- IS 1220 - move to Psy 1401 (regular)

There was no further business and the Assembly adjourned at 5:25 pm.

Rebecca Webb

University of Minnesota, Morris  
Campus Assembly Minutes  
April 28, 1997

The Campus Assembly met on Monday, April 28, 1997 at 4 pm in the Science Auditorium. Bert Ahern, Vice-Chair of the Executive Committee, chaired the meeting in David Johnson's absence. Jack Imholte served as Parliamentarian.

I. Roger McCannon announced plans for a campus-wide flood clean-up response effort. The Cougar bus will carry up to 45 volunteers to Breckenridge on May 1 and 8. Public health nursing will provide free tetanus shots on campus on Wednesday, April 30. Staff may take up to sixteen hours of work time for volunteer efforts; student and faculty should work out their class commitments in order to participate.

II. Bert Ahern reviewed the process by which material for the May 12, 1997 Assembly meeting will be distributed. The General Education/Common Experience proposal will be emailed to the campus. All proposed amendments must be submitted in writing by noon on Friday, May 2. The Executive Committee will compile the material and distribute a hard copy agenda shortly thereafter. Elections will also be on the May 12 agenda.

III. As the Assembly moved on to consideration of the slate of candidates for Scholars of the College, Ahern reminded the Assembly that only faculty are eligible to vote on this item. Nat Hart expressed appreciation for the information provided on the candidates and Bert Ahern thanked Arden Granger for compiling it. He also shared Mimi Frenier's concern that only 25% of the candidates are female despite UMM having a student body that is over 50% female. Elizabeth Blake added that some disciplines seem more active in nominating their students than others and encouraged all disciplines to rigorously consider candidates. Ford Brown wondered whether the disproportionate representations were a trend or only prevalent this year. The slate of the following candidates passed by vocal vote: Joel Anderson, Andy Bobst, Chad Dolly, Lisa Hollermann, Ryan James, Robert Kess, Jason Kohler, Megan Mahn, Karl Manske, Kelly Murphy, Kristopher Nelson, Kristian Roth, Jessica Schomberg, Randall Smith, Keith Vertanen, Craig Wilcox.

IV. The Assembly reviewed the amended committee reduction proposal which has been reduced to four items. Ahern stressed that committees are for making policy, not overseeing implementation, and need to keep their agenda meaningful.

Ferolyn Angell, identifying her alignment with the Disability Services user group concept, asked who decides which Assembly (Big 5) committee a user group reports to and what that committee's involvement with a user group would be. Ahern explained that the Executive Committee would determine reporting routes if the user group were a governance group.

Tap Payne expressed concern about folding the Ford Grant Committee into the Curriculum Committee via an International Programs link when the funding from the Ford Foundation was granted based on specific personnel. Ahern stressed that the Executive Committee's concern is for groups forming when others already exist to do that work and administration (of a grant) shouldn't be confused with governance.

Payne proposed an amendment to remove the Ford Grant Committee (FGC) from item B and was seconded by Eric Klinger. Discussion followed.

Klinger suggested that the committees mentioned in item B are administrative committees and are more appropriately tied to administrative offices than to Assembly committees. Payne mentioned the different staffing ratios of the FGC and the International Programs Committee

(IPC) and suggested that the higher percentage of faculty on the FGC was appropriate, making folding into the IPC a disadvantage.

Bart Finzel suggested that the language of the proposal was broader and therefore more flexible than was being perceived and stressed the need to make accountable those "hidden" committees who are functioning autonomously of the Assembly. Jeff Ratliff-Crain asked whether the item B committees would simply become subcommittees of Assembly committees. Finzel replied that the proposal sought accountability, not control. Ahern again stressed that faculty shouldn't be doing administrative work but policy shouldn't by-pass the Assembly. Margaret Kuchenreuther noted that the proposal does use the word "eliminated" and the FGC should not be eliminated. Jennifred Nellis suggested that the FGC become a subcommittee of the IPC and Eric Klinger asked why bother eliminating a committee at all if it would just continue as a subcommittee. Cathleen Brannen added that the FGC cannot be eliminated if the grant is to continue. Tom Johnson moved the question and the amendment to remove the FGC from item B passed by vocal vote.

Eric Klinger then moved to eliminate item B from the proposal and refer it back to the Executive Committee. Fred Farrell seconded the motion, which passed by vocal vote. Discussion of the rest of the proposal followed.

Farrell asked about the purpose of item A, expressing a concern for limiting the flow of information among smaller disciplines (given the confidentiality of search material). Bryan Vickstrom expressed concern about the possibility of students being underrepresented. Loren Gustafson pointed out that the item recommends smaller search committees but does not require downsizing. Klinger requested a friendly amendment of the words "as a guideline" after "we recommend" and was not opposed by any members of the Executive Committee.

Ferolyn Angell asked why item D suggested that the Executive Committee review new committees. Bert Ahern answered that it would permit tracking of workload. Nellis added that it would permit the Executive Committee to prevent the creation of redundant new committees. Ahern added that the Executive Committee only staffs constitutional committees.

Concerning item C discussing user groups, Greg Thorson expressed concern that the process being proposed would lead to a loss of specialization. Jeff Ratliff-Crain added that it led to accountability but did not necessary lead to reduction.


The vocal vote led to a request for a division of the house. The proposal passed as amended by a vote of 44 ayes, 17 nays and 9 abstentions.

There was no further business and the Assembly adjourned at 5:30 pm.

Rebecca Webb

University of Minnesota, Morris  
Morris, Minnesota 56267

April 25, 1997

MEMOTO: Dave Johnson, Chair, Executive Committee  
FROM: Sam Schuman, Chair, Curriculum Committee   
SUBJECT: Items Approved by the Curriculum Committee

Please find attached items approved by the Curriculum Committee which should be placed on the agenda for the next meeting of the Campus Assembly. These are action items. Included is detailed course information. A summary of the votes cast by members of the Curriculum Committee (12 voting, 4 non-voting) is presented below:

Agenda Item Description	Meeting Date	Vote (For-Against-Abstentions)
<i>GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM</i>		
<b>GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS (GER) for the Semester System: Category framework and course requirements</b>	4/16/97	(5-2-0)
<u>Limit of one GER category per course</u>	4/16/97	(4-2-0)
<b>COMMON EXPERIENCE for the Semester System</b>	4/23/97	(5-1-0)

Note: although the above three items were voted upon separately by the Curriculum Committee, we bring the complete General Education program to the Assembly as a whole and unified proposal.

nm  
att.