

10-27-2011

Campus Assembly minutes 10/27/2011

Campus Assembly

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

Recommended Citation

Campus Assembly, "Campus Assembly minutes 10/27/2011" (2011). *Campus Assembly*. 8.
http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/camp_assembly/8

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.

Campus Assembly Minutes
October 27, 2011

I. Chancellor's Remarks.

Chancellor Johnson gave the following remarks, "I would like to read a portion of a letter I received from Robert Jones, Kathleen O'Brien and Richard Pfitzenreuter stating that we have authorization to proceed with design of the Green Prairie Residence Hall." (Applause.) "The opening of a new residence hall on the UM-Morris campus is an agreed upon priority for the University of Minnesota, given enrollment increases and improved financial performance on the Morris campus over the past few years. This memorandum authorizes ongoing design work towards that objective, with the goal that the Green Prairie residence hall will be open for students in the fall of 2013. This still requires final approval from the Board of regents in May with ground breaking soon after. Special thanks and acknowledgement of the work of Sandy Olson-Loy, Lowell Rasmussen, Henry Fulda and T.J. Ross.

If you haven't had a chance to walk by the north side of campus, there is a project to beautify the area of campus between Camden and Imholte, that has looked like a gravel pit. Pavers are being installed now with a plan to add garden spaces to the front of Camden and tables/potted plants for gathering. This won't be finished until spring and has been the product of a number of campus individuals who work in facilities and grounds led by Rick Reimers, Mike Hoffman, Mic Rose and Robert Thompson. This is one of the things I love about this campus – ideas and innovations come from everywhere.

Thanks to those who attended yesterday's workshops, one on sexual harassment and nepotism policies and one on hiring for a diverse and inclusive campus. Thanks to Sarah Mattson for organizing and arranging this opportunity. About 20 people attended the workshop led by Kim Hewitt, director of the Twin Cities EEO office and her colleague Michael O'Day. The two policies – sexual harassment and nepotism – are changing somewhat, so this moment of change presents a good opportunity to provide some training whose purpose is twofold: To create a culture in which all individuals have the opportunity to flourish and succeed. Second, to insure that all of us who are employees of the University of Minnesota are aware of Regents policies by which we are bound, are aware of our legal and ethical responsibilities in relation to sexual harassment and nepotism, and that we are all aware of our rights in relation to these issues.

What's next? Sarah Mattson and Hilda Ladner are working with me to provide additional opportunities for faculty and staff to participate in similar sessions, with the expectation that 100% of UMM employees will have taken part by the end of June. Specifically I have asked Hilda and Sarah to craft a plan that will provide multiple avenues for participation and education – from group meetings like the one yesterday, to individualized sessions available electronically to group sessions available through Webinars. The goal is to have that plan shaped by December 2 which workshops/training ready to go spring semester, so stay tuned.

Finally, I want to spend a few minutes talking about some of the measures that matter to our success as a campus and that have also been in the spotlight this fall, as they are every fall, the spotlight that shines upon us from the University of Minnesota Board of Regents. I'm talking about graduation rates and retention. Graduation rates are measured (nationally) by considering only those NHS students who enter in any given fall semester, and who then comprise a 'cohort' that is followed for four, five and six years. These data are reported to a federal database and made available now to prospective students and their families. U of MN alters these data a bit and provides graduation rates that follow students through the U system – so while the national database only looks at those students who have graduated from our institution in four years, the system shows all university graduation rates. What percentage of the 378 entering freshmen of fall 2006 graduated in spring 2010? 49.2%, less than half. That compares to UMTC

@50.2%, Duluth @ 30.4 and Crookston @ 37.6. UMM's 5 year graduation rates for the 2005 cohort are 64.3% and six year graduation rates for the 2004 cohort are 71.8%, with goals of 75% and 80% respectively.

By University of Minnesota standards we are doing fairly well, better than Crookston and Duluth. We always used to be better than the Twin Cities but that has changed and is changing. St. Olaf four-year graduation rates are 82.1; 85.4 and 86.1 for five and six year.

Another data point under the spotlight is our retention rate, which is typically presented is fall to fall, first year students. UMM's most recent data for NHS entering fall 2008 – 85.5% returned in fall 2009; for NHS entering fall 2009 – 81.4% returned fall 2010; for NHS entering fall 2010 – 82.8% returned this fall.

Why do students leave here? Why do they stay? Maybe they weren't qualified to begin with? The data, measured by ACT scores, does not bear that out. From the fall 2004 cohort, ½ of the students who left UMM entered UMM with an ACT composite score of 24 or higher; 9% who left had an ACT composite score of a 28.

Why am I talking about this? Because these data matter. Because we care about educating students. Because we believe in them when we admit them and we want them to stay and graduate in four years. Because we want to be successful in retaining students as we are in recruiting students. Because prospective students and their families are increasingly sophisticated as they "shop" schools. And because the Regents and the legislature and the president of the University are paying attention to this.

We are doing a good job and we can do better. We will continue to gather these data, report them, and examine them to determine appropriate intervention strategies and to determine where to best place resources.

These data are available to all of you in various places – the University's Accountability Report and in our own institutional data book. You will be called on in your various capacities to help me, Jennifer Zych, Bart Finzel, Sandy Olson-Loy and the division chairs better understand as we develop strategies to move us forward toward improvement. Thanks to Jen Zych for providing the information."

Parliamentarian Dave Swenson read from Roberts Rules of Order regarding action items. "A motion made by direction of a board or duly appointed committee of the assembly requires no second from the floor (provided the subordinate group is composed of more than one person), since the motion's introduction has been directed by a majority vote within the board or committee and is therefore desired by at least two assembly members or elected or appointed persons to whose opinion the assembly is presumed to give weight regarding the board's or committee's concerns." *Roberts Rules of Order, Newly Revised 10th Edition; 2000; Robert III, Evans, Honemann and Balch; page 35, lines 1-10.*

II. For Action. From the Steering Committee. Minutes from 9/20/11 Campus Assembly meeting approved as presented.

III. For Action. From the Membership Committee. Dennis Stewart elected as faculty representative to Consultative Committee.

IV. For Action. From the Morris Campus Student Association. First-year student representatives serving on core and other standing committees approved as presented.

Assessment of Student Learning: Natasha Myhal
Planning: Jordan Wentz
Scholastic: Allison Wolf
Student Affairs: Pengxue Thao

V. For Action. From the Curriculum Committee. The following Humanities course change approved as presented.

Revised Course:

Lang 1062—Reading in the American University (change from 1 to 2 credits)

Rationale: The course was provisionally approved as a 1 credit course that was too narrowly focused and could not effectively cover and reinforce some of the most essential reading skills. Changing it to 2 credits will provide students with a broader range of skills work to be more successful in the heavy reading load they encounter at the University level in a second language.

VI. For Information/discussion. Report from the Resource Allocation Review Task Force.

Jon Anderson, Chair of the Resource Allocation Review Task Force, presented the following:

Criteria List:

1. History, development, and expectations of the program
2. External demand for the program
3. Internal demand for the program
4. Quality of program inputs and processes
5. Quality of program outcomes
6. Size, scope, and productivity of the program
7. Revenue and other resources generated
8. Costs and other expenses associated with the program
9. Impact, justification, and overall essentiality of the program
10. Opportunity analysis of the program

Criterion 1 – History, Development, and Expectations of the Program

Academic Programs:

What is the History of the program?

What is the program's Connection to the university mission

What is the Program's own statements of mission?

Student Service Programs:

Why was the program established?

How has the program evolved over the years?

How central is the program's purpose to the UMM mission, vision, and core values?

How congruent is the program with current university expectations?

Administrative Programs:

Why was the program established and how has it evolved over the years?

What are its administrative antecedents?

Are there constraints under which the office is governed? (Explain briefly.)

Criterion 2 – External Demand for the Program

Academic Programs:

What are the past academic trends over time regarding program needs?

What are the present external needs, as found by the Bureau of Labor Statistics employment trends over time?

What are the future needs projections regarding graduates in next 5 years ?

Student Service Programs: (this may or may not apply)

What is the current/future external demand for the program?

In what ways is the program interdependent on other programs?

What would the impact be on other programs if this was altered or discontinued?

What external indicators are there to show the need for the program, and how do you accurately measure these

indicators?

Administrative Programs:

Who are the external clients?

What external indicators are there to show the need for the program, and how do you accurately measure these indicators?

Criterion 3 – Internal Demand for the Program

Academic Programs:

What is the program's history of credit hours offered by term ?

In what ways does the program create linkages – wherein a course is offered as a requirement for other programs ?

What are the numbers of majors and minors (5 years) ?

What are other forms of current (and future) demands?

Student Service Programs:

What is the current/future demand for the program?

In what ways is the program interdependent on, or does it serve, other programs?

What would the impact be on other programs if this was altered or discontinued?

Administrative Programs:

Who are the internal clients?

In what ways is the program interdependent on programs, and what would the impact be on other programs if this was altered or discontinued?

Criterion 4 – Quality of Program Inputs and Processes

Academic Programs:

Does the program have accreditation, if relevant?

Has the program received external awards/ recognition of programs & people ?

What is the education level of program providers ?

Student Service Programs:

(How do you determine standards for practice in your area? – campus/regional/national standards/benchmarks/policies)

Process - Is the current delivery mode of the program effective in meeting the needs of its students?

Inputs - What is the number of full-time, part-time, and student staff associated with this program?

What are the qualifications of full-time and part-time staff?

Speak to the quality/adequacy of equipment, facilities, technology, and other resources associated with this program.

Administrative Programs:

Identify any benchmarks or standards with which your programs must be in compliance?

Identify the certification or specialized skills that staff members in your program are required to have?

Is there additional infrastructure (technology, equipment, facilities, etc.) that your program need to improve functionality?

Criterion 5 – Quality of Program Outcomes

Academic Programs:

What are the relevant measures of student satisfaction in teaching/ learning ?

What are the measures of faculty creative work and research output/ quality ?

What are the measures of faculty service ?

Student Service Programs:

What is the quality of program outcomes?

What examples of exemplary performance has the program produced?

What evidence exists of congruence between intended and actual UMM Learning Outcomes

http://www.morris.umn.edu/committees/Curriculum/Learning_Outcomes_Approved.pdf?

Administrative Programs:

What would you consider to be exemplary performance in your program?

Are there best practices recommended for your program and how would you measure them?

Criterion 6 – Size, Scope, and Productivity of the Program

Academic Programs:

What is the program's 5-year enrollment history ?

What is the program's 5-year enrollment growth or decline ?

What is the program's enrollment by course & section for the past 5-years (and % occupancy) ?

What are the factors affecting growth patterns ?

Student Service Programs:

This criterion looks at numbers of students and clients being served.

Has this program been growing, declining or remaining stable?

Please provide a history of the last five years.

What factors may have contributed to increasing or decreasing participation?

Administrative Programs :

Please provide hard numbers that are associated with your program? (For instance: numbers of students and clients being served, number of staff members (FTE), number of student workers, etc.)

Criterion 7 – Revenue and Other Resources Generated

Academic Programs:

What are the grants received by the program and its people ?

What is the value of the earmarked gifts to the program ?

What is the value of the collected fees and ticket sales, income from special programs, study abroad, summer school & programs ?

Student Service Programs:

(enrollment, fees, grants, fundraising, rent, sales, etc.)

What is the net revenue generated by program customers?

What other sources of revenue are generated by the program?

What other resources are generated by the program?

Administrative Programs:

Identify the revenue and other resources generated. For instance, enrollments, cross-subsidies between programs, research grants, fundraising, equipment grants, other current sources, and potential revenues yet untapped. Also consider external relationships that provide benefits: university-corporate liaisons, economic development relationships, and joint ventures.

Criterion 8 – Costs and Other Expenses Associated with the Program

Academic Programs:

What is the budget for operation ?

What is the library support costs ?

What are the salary expenses ?

Student Service Programs:

What are the relevant costs (both direct and indirect) associated with the program?

Are there demonstrable efficiencies associated with the program, relative to other programs?

Administrative Programs:

Identify all relevant costs and other expenses associated with your program.

Are the current resources allocated to the program sufficient for it to meet the office's current needs, goals, and objectives, and for it to properly serve the campus? (Briefly explain.)

Criterion 9 – Impact, Justification, and Overall Essentiality of the Program

Academic Programs:

What kinds of qualitative statements about the program's value to the campus can be made ?

What additional information about the program can be relevant ?

Student Service Programs:

What impact has the program had, or promises to have?

(for example -What are the benefits to the institution of offering this program?

How is this program related to the success of other programs?)

Administrative Programs:

What impact has the program had and what are the benefits to the institution?

Criterion 10 – Opportunity Analysis of the Program

Academic Programs:

What are the types of changes planned for growth, constraints stopping growth ?

What are the types of within campus alliances planned for the future ?

What are the types of collaborations with the community/ stakeholders ?

Student Service Programs:

What changes are anticipated for this program in the future?

How could this program be revised in order to enhance or strengthen it?

What is the future outlook of the program?

What additional information could be helpful to the review process?

How has the current budget environment impacted your area's ability to provide exceptional services?

If your program were given additional resources, where would you invest?

What would be the outcome of that investment?

Are there other sources of funding or potential revenues yet untapped that could be invested?

Administrative Programs:

What external environmental factors affect the program and what opportunities are created?

Is the program maximizing its ability/potential to collaborate/work with other campus units with similar goals/mission? (Briefly explain.)

How would a change in program format be beneficial, such as new uses of technology?

Questions/concerns from assembly members:

Jenny Nellis wondered what we are planning to do with the data/analysis and asked if we are doing this for the purpose of improving programs; cutting programs; giving programs more money; less money?

Jon responded the final decisions will not be made by the analysis group but will help guide the decision-makers. He sees the purpose as holistic – we want to improve the health of the campus. Chancellor

Johnson added that because the state will probably not increase its appropriations, we need to take a look at what we're doing and where we're using our resources. If you listen to comments by the Regents and President Kaler, the words "efficiency and effectiveness" are used over and over again.

Tammy Berberi asked how this process compares with ongoing cyclical reviews. Bart Finzel said some of the data could be used for ongoing reviews but they are really two separate processes.

Jim Cotter wondered about standardization of the data collection and suggested that we keep an eye on the outcomes from other schools and keep an entrepreneurial eye to what we're doing.

Jon Anderson encouraged everyone to use the discussion boards.

VII. Campus Committee Reports.

Faculty and P&A Affairs Committee

James Wojtaszek said the committee is in the process of revising the salary report to include last year's data. We have chosen to take on the issue of workload after the issue was suggested by multiple people.

This issue includes class load, release time, advising loads, leaves, and support. We will also include issues related to P and A positions that are not faculty lines.

VIII. All University Reports.

Peh Ng said a proposal will be coming to SCEP related to ratings of student teaching. Very few instructors currently authorize the release of questions. The Vice Provost is proposing to publish and maintain a list of ratings. If there are any questions, please contact Peh.

James Wojtaszek reported there is some discussion on SCFA regarding outside perceptions of accountability and how professors are using their time and resources at the university. Evaluation results would rank professors productivity. This is still in the preliminary stage; however, if you have ideas how we should be involved, please contact James.

IX. Old Business.

none

X. New Business.

Hazen Fairbanks said Students Today, Leaders Forever will be hosting a wheelchair-a-thon next week to raise awareness of the lack of handicap accessibility at UMM. Students will be asking for donations.

Adjourned at 6:00 pm