

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

## University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

---

Campus Assembly

Campus Governance

---

2-13-1984

### Campus Assembly minutes 02/13/1984

Campus Assembly

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

---

Dettina  
v EB

University of Minnesota, Morris  
Campus Assmby Minutes  
February 13, 1984

The Campus Assembly met at 4 p.m. on February 13, 1984, in the Science Auditorium. A quorum was present and the meeting commenced.

Provost Imholte announced that discussion would continue on the planning document.

1. Granger amendment as a replacement for I.B.1. of A Two-Biennia Plan  
(p. 13)

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 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).

Wojciechowski spoke in favor of the amendment as a better way to address the concerns people have on advising and orientation. He said that he agrees with the intent of I.B.1. as shown in the document, but feels it is too restricting. As the coordinator of summer orientation and advising he indicated a high degree of overall satisfaction in the program and said that he was previously unaware of the problem indicated. He felt that the amendment would give them the latitude to make necessary changes.

Spring reiterated that the primary concern is the retention of students and felt that the document as it is suggests a necessary standardization of procedures.

The Granger amendment to be used as a replacement for I.B.1 of A Two-Biennia Plan carried with 44 in favor 24 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

2. Granger amendment to I.B.3 (p. 14).

The Academic Dean, in consultation with support service staff, will plan and begin implementation of a campus academic assistance program appropriate for well-prepared and educationally disadvantaged students. Such a program should address the needs of admissible students; it is not intended to encourage the enrollment of underprepared students or relaxation of the selective admission policy of the college. The plan should include identification of the resources necessary for long-term implementation and be coordinated with existing academic assistance efforts in the disciplines and elsewhere.

Granger said that the amendment from the student services directors was simply another way of stating the objectives in a manner that seemed less narrow and in keeping with activities already underway. He thought B.3. as stated in the document gave the impression of narrowness and elitism, and he felt the assembly should not endorse the rhetoric of it.

Spring stated that the planning committee was unanimously opposed to the amendment and said he hoped to hear from them. Togeas said that Spring's statement did reflect the committee's attitude on the item and that he liked the rhetoric of it. Lammers seconded Togeas' comments. A student member spoke against the amendment and indicated that what came out of the committee was more structured.

Granger amendment to I.B.3. failed with 15 in favor, 47 against and 7 abstentions.

3. Granger amendment to add the following as B.5. to replace I.B.2. of A Two-Biennia Plan (p. 14).

The Provost, in consultation with the Student Services Committee, will appoint a faculty/staff/student task force to evaluate, coordinate, and improve the quality of the college's cultural and recreational programs, activities, and opportunities. Such an effort should include evaluation and assessment of the range, quality, and scheduling of events. It should include but not be limited to Student Activities, the Union Board, Residential Life, intramural, and discipline co-curricular programming. (Appoint 15-September-1984; report 1-March-1985.)

Spring announced that a significant number of the planning committee voted not to agree to the amendment. Members of the committee, including one student member, were concerned about the "sense of isolation." Hart opposed the amendment because it included the phrase, "The Provost, in consultation with the Student Services Committee...." He objected to consultation with only one group and said that if consultation is to occur, it must include all groups. He also objected to the addition of the phrase on "evaluation and assessment." He said that evaluation is important, but has to be made in terms of goals, and that the goals of co-curricular programs are different than the goals of student activities.

Wojciechowski thought perhaps Hart was confusing the Student Services Committee with the student service directors, but Hart replied that there are many programs within each division for which the Student Services Committee has no responsibility.

Granger said he didn't think the "sense of isolation" statement belonged in the planning document. Students spoke both in favor of and against having the "isolation" statement in the document.

Granger amendment to add B.5. as a replacement for I.B.2. of A Two-Biennia Plan failed by voice vote.

4. Kissock amendment to substitute "area" for "bailiwick" in the last Paragraph of I.B.4. (p. 14) was accepted by the committee.
5. Henjum amendment to change I.C. Curricular Program, Sections C.1., C.2., C.3., and C.4 (p. 15 & 16).

C. Curricular Program

- C.1. The Morris Campus Resources and Planning Committee will develop a plan, which it will submit to the Curriculum Committee, the Administration and the Assembly, that will provide guidelines for making curricular program decisions. Discipline categories will be developed as follows:
  - C.1.a. Those which could be reduced in size without adversely affecting the quality of the programs.
  - C.1.b. Those which should be augmented in order to improve the quality of and access to the programs.
  - C.1.c. Those which could be dismantled due to changing student interest or campus priorities.
  - C.1.d. Disciplines which, if added, would strengthen the curriculum.
- C.2. Prime considerations for adding, changing or deleting curricular programs would include feasibility, programmatic integrity, emerging or diminishing interests by the students and the appropriateness of the program on a liberal arts campus. Other high quality liberal arts campuses would be used as points of reference for determining programmatic appropriateness.
- C.3. Proposals for changing the UMM curriculum will be prepared for the assembly by the Divisions, Dean, and Curriculum Committee. The guidelines listed in "C.2." above will serve as criteria for making these decisions.
- C.4. Before action by the Curriculum Committee, any major new curricular program proposals will be submitted to the Morris Campus Resources and Planning Committee for the purpose of judging the resource feasibility of such proposals. When the proposal goes to the Assembly, the issues of resource feasibility, programmatic integrity, emerging or diminishing interests by the students and the appropriateness of the program on a liberal arts campus will be presented.

Henjum explained that the above format addressed the broad issue of deleting, changing, or adding courses and programs to the UMM curriculum. He felt the original wording was too limited. It merely specified making distinctions among our academic disciplines according to the substantive nature of their liberal arts content. It did not

provide a plan for making programmatic decisions across the campus. He explained that he substituted the phrase, "develop a plan" instead of "set up a process" in C.1., because he felt it was more straightforward. He also incorporated the Curriculum Committee into the process along with the assembly and the administration, and placed the subcategories under C.1. instead of C.2.

Frenier explained that the planning committee used the phrase, "set up a process" in response to the concern expressed last spring that faculty were not adequately consulted.

Spring thought there was confusion in Henjum's proposal. He said that what the planning committee was proposing in C.1. and 2 were not curricular changes. They were asking for a process to 1) make distinctions among our academic disciplines according to the substantive nature of their liberal arts content, and 2) to comment upon present faculty resource distribution on campus.

Kissock noted that the planning committee had gone ahead and set up subcommittees to look into C.1. and 2 and those committees are already making recommendations. He felt that this was "product" not "process."

Guyotte said that what was going on now was in response to a request by the provost for input into the March 1 document he must submit to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Farrell felt there was confusion between the roles of the Curriculum Committee and the Resources and Planning Committee in the establishment of curriculum.

Spring stressed again that any curricular changes would go through the channels already in place. He pointed out that the assembly by passing the amended C.1., would be involving the Resources and Planning Committee in curricular program decisions that only the Curriculum Committee should be allowed to make.

Questions arose concerning the subcommittees already meeting in regard to C.1. and 2. Guyotte explained that the planning committee in response to a request by the provost had appointed two subcommittees, following the models of C.1. and 2., and instructed them to begin work as they might do if the planning committee document were adopted.

Thielke didn't think the planning committee could decide on feasibility without knowing the types of planning going on in the Curriculum Committee. She said there needed to be dialogue between the two committees before coming to the assembly.

Underwood commented that the issue of centrality to the liberal arts is in everyone's minds when they think about resource allocation. He favored the proposal from the planning committee and the assembly.

Henjum amendment to change I.C. Curricular Program, Sections C.1., C.2., C.3., and C. 4. failed by voice vote.

6. Kissock amendment to remove I.C.1. and line 6 of I.C.2. from A Two-Biennia Plan (p. 15).

Kissock proposed to remove the following from the document:

I.C.1.

The Morris Campus Resources and Planning Committee will set up a process by which it can submit to the Assembly and the Administration a descriptive schematic outline of our curriculum. That outline will make distinctions among our academic disciplines according to the substantive nature of their liberal arts content. (1-May-1984)

He also proposed removing the phrase, "together with the results of C.1. above," from line 6 of C.2. He felt that the whole idea of making distinctions among disciplines would be divisive.

Straw also felt that the statement regarding liberal arts would cause divisiveness, because everyone has a different definition of liberal arts.

Hinds said that he was disturbed by the course of the conversation and stated that if we as a campus cannot define what is our central mission, then we have failed. He thought perhaps fears would be allayed if Guyotte again explained what is already being done.

Guyotte explained that the subcommittee had focused on three things: 1) historical evolution of UMM curriculum, 2) curriculum of other liberal arts colleges, and 3) one of the items in the "Proposed Criteria for Retrenchment and Reallocation" - centrality.

Wojciechowski wondered how C.1. addressed the problems of recruitment and retention. Spring replied that one of the most important parts about college is the curricular programs for prospective students, and both recruitment and retention are, in part, determined by our curricular programs.

Kissock amendment to remove I.C.1. and line 6 of I.C.1. from A Two-Biennia Plan failed with 27 in favor, 34 against, and 5 abstentions.

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Submitted by Pat Tanner