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I. Chancellor’s Remarks.

Chancellor Johnson gave the following remarks, “We are off to a great start with a terrific group of new students who add value and energy to the community; plus new faculty and staff. Add good weather and it’s a formula for a successful launch. Where else can you find a campus that not only hosts a farmer’s market on its mall but that welcomes a cow and several sheep.

We have slightly exceeded our “budgeted” numbers for enrollment and that is always VERY good news. Our residence halls occupancy numbers are the highest they ever been—now I can say more than fifty per cent of our students live on campus. We are at capacity and that’s also very good news.

Our faculty scholarly work and research and artistic production continues and will be celebrated mid semester, and the intellectual climate of the campus and the community is enriched by any of a number of fall lectures, including the Driggs, the Barber and the Lee. In addition, this coming week Nobel Prize winner Peter Agre, distinguished visiting professor for the liberal arts will visit campus with a variety of events on Monday and Tuesday. This position made possible by Bettina Blake, who served as chief academic officer during Jack Imholte’s chancellorship and who continues to reside in Boston and support us from a distance. Agre is a longtime member of the Johns Hopkins School of Medicine faculty. In 2003 he shared the Nobel Prize in Chemistry for discovery of the aquaporins.

Speaking of Boston, next Thursday UMM will be honored there at the annual summit of the ACUPCC. We will receive the ACUPCC and Second Nature Campus Climate Award—the only liberal arts college in the country to be so honored. Troy Goodnough and Lowell Rasmussen will be there to accept the award.

Next week is homecoming and I’m hoping for wins in the many sports that will be played next week both on and off campus. Football—it’s our turn I think—and volleyball at home, and men’s and women’s soccer away. Several of the Regents will be visiting us as well on Friday and Saturday, with a chance to meet students, faculty, staff, judge decorating in the residence halls, and the many alumni who will be on campus for our Morris campus connect event and with our distinguished alumni and cougar hall of fame combined banquets.

I will end my remarks with some comments about the University of Minnesota’s engagement survey. Last year was the first year the U employed this survey. This provides us with an opportunity to see how people feel about the work they do here, and about the work environment. The results of the survey have been discussed in a number of places including at vice chancellor’s meetings, in staff meetings in those areas with enough responses to warrant area or unit specific results and I think at consultative committee. I had asked that we identify two or three strengths and two or three challenges as we move forward into this academic year. My informal statement about this having listened to feedback from various groups is that I can say (1) both faculty and staff take great pride that we do (2) we see ourselves as student centered and (3) we perceive that we provide quality in the educational and support services we provide. We continue to be challenged by (1) salaries that we perceive as lower than they should be—you’ll note that we are addressing the faculty salary issue, have been for the past three years and are committed to continuing to address that for two more years; and (2) we continue to need to cultivate a culture of appreciation—people work hard here and don’t always feel appreciated for the work that they do; and (3) we need to provide more professional development opportunities for both faculty and staff. The new engagement survey will go live on October 1st so please watch for it and participate in it.

Upcoming in this campus assembly is an appearance by U of MN Provost Karen Hansen as we look at our own strategic planning efforts over the course of the past 8 years and consider how we might fit into the new plan emerging from the Twin Cities campus.”

II. For Information. History of Campus Assembly by Michael Korth.

“Shared governance systems are common to colleges and university across the United States. Such systems provide a structure for organizing and managing how certain aspects of the work of the institution are
shared among various members of the institution. This is often contrasted with the command-and-control structure of the traditional corporate model.

Shared governance is appropriate at colleges and universities because deep expertise and profession-based authority is widely distributed across the institution and is not merely concentrated in a few individuals who are the designated deciders.

The American Association of University Professors, in their Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities says, “The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others. The relationship calls for adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort.”

The AAUP statement goes on to presume little to no student involvement in spite of having the word “students” in the first sentence just quoted. In fact it leans toward a faculty senate model of governance.

UMM chose, about forty-five years ago, to have a more inclusive shared governance system, one that includes much more student and staff involvement than is typical. This broader involvement is manifest in the membership of Campus Assembly itself as well as of the committees of the assembly.

After describing a bit of the administrative structure at UMM, the UMM Constitution says: “The Campus Assembly is recognized by the University Senate as the official campus policy-making and legislative body. The powers and responsibilities include the following:

A. “To establish appropriate policies, procedures, and regulations governing the campus and to act on all issues that materially affect the campus as a whole. Areas included are institutional mission, organizational structure, allocation of resources, budget, curriculum, academic support services, faculty development, honors, functions, admissions, retention, graduation, study abroad, student services, athletics, student activities, awards, financial aid, student behavior, and campus events.”

The areas of responsibility of Campus Assembly form a lengthy list. Fortunately, committees carry out much of the work of the assembly. The areas of responsibility just mentioned are distributed to various committees. Those committees will bring items requiring Campus Assembly approval or items of general interest back to the assembly. We have a lot of committees and periodically we grouse about having too many but when we talk about eliminating any, we hesitate to do so because we do not wish to give up that voice.

So here we are. As a Campus Assembly, we bring together a great wealth of expertise and experience. UMM’s shared governance structure gives us an opportunity to be fully engaged in striving together to ensure the continuing success of our campus.

For more of an actual history of the Campus Assembly, I recommend Roland Guyotte’s detailed article on the subject. It can be found on the Campus Assembly webpage.”

III. For Action. From the Steering Committee. Minutes from 4/29/14 Campus Assembly meeting approved as presented. Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

IV. Old Business.

None.

V. New Business.

A. For Action. From the Membership Committee. Leslie Meek was elected to the Consultative Committee.

B. For Information. From the Planning Committee. Executive Summary of the UMM Strategic Plan by Jon Anderson.
Background
● UMM produced a strategic plan in 2006.
● In AY13-14, the Planning Committee evaluated UMM’s progress towards the aspirations enumerated in the 2006 plan.
● The secondary goal was to issue recommendations regarding future commitments to the goals unattained.
● Full report available under “minutes” in Planning Committee webpage.

Strategic Plan Overview
● Teaching and Outreach: Broad integration of liberal learning outcomes and integration of green initiatives and multicultural perspectives into the curriculum.
● Viability & Sustainability: Increase scholarship funds and non-traditional revenue sources, and secure full funding for the Native American Student Tuition Waiver.
● Student Initiatives: Develop a cohesive, year-long First Year Experience, create the Academic Center for Enrichment, and strengthen student academic support.
● Faculty & Staff Initiatives: Provide comparable and competitive salaries for faculty and staff and secure additional funds to support faculty scholarship and creative activity.
● Visibility: Develop a brand identity for the campus and implement a campus-wide integrated marketing plan to enhance our national and international recruitment.
● Capital Plan: Update the Campus Master Plan to align with strategic initiatives of visibility.

Specific Examples
Goal: Update and modernize residential life facilities
Goal: Locate external units in the Welcome Center
Goal: Renovate and modernize the food services building
Goal: Renovate Briggs Library
Goal: Complete HFA III
Goal: Brand UMM a top tier nationally recognized public honors liberal arts college
Goal: Increase levels of faculty participation and success in external scholarly awards, honors, and grants
Goal: Improve student academic profile: admit students in top quarter with average ACT scores of at least 25 and increase diversity.

Specific Examples
Goal: Retain a significantly higher proportion of students by reducing transfers and dropouts. Increase first year retention from 86% to 90%; second year from 77 to 85%; four year graduation rates from 40-60%; five year from 56 to 75%; and six year from 57-80%.
● PC: These goals remain unmet, and are likely not feasible. While our four-year graduation rates have improved somewhat (to 50%), and our six-year rates have improved somewhat (to 62%), the three-year rolling average for 1st and 2nd year retention are respectively 80.7% and 73%.

Areas of Progress
● Stabilizing and expanding enrollments from 1600 to 1900. Goal was 2100. Costs since 2006 have had notably slower growth than in 2002-2006 period.
● Evolving the curriculum in ways that are consistent with our mission, and take advantage of our existing strengths. Examples: Environmental Science, Environmental Studies, Sports Management. New initiatives in writing, creative writing and data science.
● Laying the foundation for improved alumni relations and community outreach: new Welcome Center, Jane Addams Project, ESL courses taught by students, and Office of Community Engagement activities.

Areas of Progress
● Leveraging the “green” initiatives. In 2012, we cut our campus carbon footprint by 40%, and 25% of our energy came from renewable sources. New majors, new grants, and second wind turbine. Many other successful initiatives: GPLLC, etc.
● Improving support for faculty development and scholarship: FREF.

Challenges
● The campus faces serious challenges to update and renovate existing mall buildings in terms of climate control and accessibility issues. Classroom space in the Humanities building (one example) is substandard.
Low salaries pose perennial problems for recruitment and retention of qualified faculty and staff. The number of failed searches and the high turnover rates take their toll in terms of faculty and staff productivity and morale, as well as in terms of the quality of the educational experience for students.

**AY 2013-2014 Planning Committee**
Jon Anderson, Jim Barbour, Michael Eble, Julie Eckerle, Jim Hall (ex officio), Arne Kildegaard (Chair), Jane Kill, Joseph Kleckner, Jayce Koester, Sarah Mattson, Leslie Meek (ex officio), Lowell Rasmussen (ex officio), Joe Vertnik, Jordan Wente

**C. For Information and discussion. From Provost Karen Hanson via Google handout. Update on U of MN Strategic Plan.**

**Overview**
In fall 2013, President Eric Kaler initiated a planning process to articulate a strategic vision and goals for the Twin Cities campus, aligned with Board of Regents planning. He called for an inclusive campus wide process that would outline an bold, aspirational, and achievable plan to build on the exceptional strengths and opportunities we have as a campus and set a general direction for key strategic priorities and decisions over the next decade.

The Strategic Plan will build on signal strengths and opportunities of the University of Minnesota Twin Cities as one of the country’s most comprehensive research universities, fortunately situated in a complex and vibrant metropolitan area and guided by a durable land-grant mission.

**The plan aims to:**
- combine University strengths more broadly and deeply to address “grand challenges”—the most pressing and complex problems facing the state, nation, and world;
- support excellence and reject complacency; build an invigorated campus culture of pride, ambition, and innovation;
- create a “University of Transformational Opportunity” where there is flexibility accompanied by responsibility and accountability and where field shapers can do their best work;
- build a culture of mutual engagement and create more partnerships between the University and our community, business, government, and nonprofit stakeholders across Minnesota and beyond; and
- create new 21st-century learning and career pathways for students; develop curricular and cocurricular opportunities that will be attractive to Minnesota’s most ambitious, talented, and motivated students—indeed, attractive to the nation’s and the world’s most talented students.

**Selecting Grand Challenges, implementing the plan**
The final plan also underscores that the three Grand Challenges topics sketched out in the plan are three examples of strong transdisciplinary work addressing grand challenges that is already under way at the University of Minnesota. The plan recommends a set of criteria for the evaluation and selection of the next grand challenges that will be embraced as institutional priorities. A process for selection will be developed in the implementation phase of the plan.

Implementation will also be effected through attention to the Strategic Plan in the normal processes of academic planning. This will start immediately with compact and budget processes. The goals of the plan will be connected in a variety of ways with those of academic and administrative units and the system campuses.

Also launching this fall will be continuity and implementation teams to shape next steps and develop benchmarks. Campus wide engagement and communication processes also will begin this fall.

Chancellor Johnson thanked Provost Hanson for the good summary and asked for questions from assembly members.

Janet Ericksen: How do you see the idea of grand challenges being implemented system-wide?
Provost Hanson: Each campus will need to think about their aspirations and how those might align with all of the campuses. Each campus can and will be looking at what they can stake their claims on.
Heather Peters: How can we improve on diversity hires and develop an aggressive approach for partner hires?

Provost Hanson: We have been engaged in some of the work for improving diversity hires through this year. Some colleges are much more attentive to the development and monitoring of applicant pools—we want to develop best practices and insist that those practices be followed. We need to make more of an effort to close the deal and retain the faculty we hire to enhance the diversity of the campus. We’ve been a little too complacent regarding the hiring of partners. We should be more actively involved and address quality of life issues—not just hiring a particular person because they might have a set of skills—but to invest in that person to become part of our community.

Pieranna Garavaso: The strategic planning initiative stresses on the necessity of meeting the grand challenges with research, scholarship and transdisciplinary work. This is something we have already been working on and it is a big challenge for those of us on a smaller campus. Will resources be available for system campuses?

Provost Hanson: Many of the smaller colleges on the Twin Cities campus feel the same way. While we will not have a huge infusion of external resources, we need to infuse awareness and engagement in grand challenges in the things we already do.

VI. Campus Committee Reports.

As chair of the Steering Committee, Jen Herrmann gave the following committee updates from the joint meeting of the Steering Committee and committee chairs.

International Programs Committee has met once to begin the process of appointment subcommittees to manage the different grant programs. The committee will help provide some budgetary support during international student education week; will be renegotiating the contract with the Learning Abroad Center; will address the relationship with international students policies and procedures as well as concerns that have been addressed regarding resources to support international students.

Faculty Development Committee has two larger tasks; the fall professional development day and the time-release program that is administered in the fall. The academic dean has encouraged the committee to look at additional professional activities for faculty.

Multi-Ethnic Experience Committee has several upcoming events scheduled in partnership with the EDI office—diversity workshops and Elder in Residence program.

Assessment of Student Learning Committee plans to be more proactive in terms of assessment. The committee has already approved three areas and the campus needs to be updated. Last year the committee voted on a schedule that was discussed at Campus Assembly. There is still an expectation that ongoing program assessment is taking place and email messages have been sent to division chairs. Multi-layered reminders with due dates and information about where to turn things in will be very helpful to the campus.

The Finance Committee will be reviewing budgets; will hear about annual gift endowments and how merit aid is working. The issue of critical fiscal metrics has come up and whether or not we can identify our fiscal metrics.

The Membership Committee will be meeting to determine committee replacements where needed. They will be developing a system for on-line or electronic voting next spring.

Faculty and P&A Affairs Committee main focus has been faculty salaries. There’s been some progress on increasing salaries and they will continue to monitor that positive process. The committee had a brainstorming session but some of the items are not in their purview so they may reach out to the other committees to jointly address some of those items.
The Scholastic Committee will be extending the usual invitations to hear about admissions and retention. There are some policy changes that may impact some of the ways we do things on our campus; the academic integrity subcommittee has been formed along with a subcommittee for international student academic experience.

The Consultative Committee has solicited the campus for concerns and issues that need to be addressed including salary issues, job family classification, IRB process, lack of communication about ESUP rollout, the abundance of events in the fall, air conditioning in Camden, and minutes not being forwarded in a timely fashion.

Functions and Awards plan to clarify some of the campus procedures for awards given because there were some issues last year with the nomination procedures. It was suggested that it might be worth reviewing the history and parameters of the Scholar of the College in terms of our mission and our students.

The Student Affairs Committee will be working on the student leadership eligibility policy and will commission a subcommittee to gather information on student employment.

Because it is a catalog year, so the Curriculum Committee will spend the majority of its time considering course proposals and program changes for the 2015-17 catalog.

Now that we have been using our new Constitution for several years, it may be time to review to see if there should be any changes or amendments. The Steering Committee will keep the campus updated and informed as they set a timeline during the fall semester.

Motion was made and seconded to extend the meeting by five minutes. Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

VII. All University Reports.

The following faculty members serve on University Senate committees:
Peh Ng, Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs.
   Peh sent out a message earlier about the proposed changes to retirement options.
   These policies are currently open for review and comment at the UWide Policy Library.
Jayne Blodgett, Social Concerns Committee
Heather Peters, Disability Issues Committee
Michelle Page, Senate Committee on Committees
Tisha Turk, Senate Committee for Educational Policy (replacement for Nic McPhee) and
   Senate Committee on Instructional Technology
Jess Larson, Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee
Michael Korth, Senate Committee on Finance and Planning
Janet Ericksen, Faculty Consultative Committee
Jim Cotter, Retirement Committee

VIII. Announcements.

Allison Wolf, student body president, reminded assembly members about health awareness week and Cougar Pawsitivity.

Cory Schroeder, student body vice president, announced that we are in the planning stages for a sustainability diversity conference to be held on November 15. Faculty and staff are encouraged to contact Cory if they would like to present at the conference.

IX. Adjournment.

Adjourned at 6:05 pm.