

2-14-2013

## Consultative minutes 02/14/2013

Consultative Committee

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/consult>

---

### Recommended Citation

Consultative Committee, "Consultative minutes 02/14/2013" (2013). *Consultative Committee*. 32.  
<http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/consult/32>

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 Consultative Committee 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).

Consultative Committee Meeting Minutes  
2/14/13

Members Present: Jim Barbour, Jim Hall, Heather Waye, Chad Braegelmann, Joey Daniewicz, Bonnie Tipcke, Nancy Helsper, Molly Donovan, LeAnn Dean, Brook Miller

Guest: Bart Finzel

The committee approved minutes from 9/18/12.

Bart described efforts to improve Orientation programs, and expressed a sense that we need to find ways to improve attendance. The request he made of Consultative—that we advocate for Administration to find funds to create orientation events across employee groups—had not resulted in any change.

Bart described the progress of the General Education assessment. The Assessment committee is conducting a survey of graduating seniors. Bart, Ted Pappenfus, Gwen Rudney, Tisha Turk, and Nancy Helsper will attend a general education institute in June. They hope to emerge from this with a plan for Gen Ed assessment that will be vetted with campus. This project is on schedule for meeting the accreditation commission's request that we provide an update regarding how we assess learning outcomes.

Bart updated us on the progress of the HHMI grant. He indicated that the coordinator, part of whose salary is not grant-funded, will make contributions to understanding how undergraduate research affects learning outcomes. Heather stated that HHMI is a doorway into additional grant opportunities. Brook asked whether HHMI was renewable. The answer was that often programs who receive HHMI receive it again.

Bart provided an update on faculty hiring—2 of the projected hires are complete, and an offer is out on a 3<sup>rd</sup>. Also, he described a move away from 1 year contracts for non-tenure track positions towards staggered 2-3 year contracts. The first round of 2-year contracts is underway, and new 2 year contracts will be offered. This provides additional security to non-tenure line faculty and stabilizes course offerings. Also, we will continue hiring pre-doctoral minority fellows. Bonnie asked whether we'd made any progress on hiring people of color. Bart indicated that the pre-doc program may help us recruit these faculty.

Brook asked about the ongoing situation of work processes in the absence of an assistant dean. Bart said that occasional issues bubble up that create uncertainty about work responsibilities and flows, but generally processes are working well.

Chad asked Bart's view of the RAR and how it fits in with his (Bart's) work. Bart indicated that he hasn't seen it as his role. However, RAR data has already been and will likely continue to be used in hiring decisions.

Molly described an MCSA proposal to advocate for more transparency in course evaluations. Bart indicated that he understands this desire, and mentioned that there is a process for making evals visible. However, the overwhelming majority of faculty have not allowed their evals to become visible. Heather said that, in her case, this stemmed from uncertainty about who would be able to review these evals. Jim described the process by which evals are loaded into the system.

Brook asked about a proposed Data Science program. Bart said Engin has proposed a course that might lead to a larger program.

Brook asked whether Bart's office could provide a more intentional forum for curricular and programmatic innovation.

With no further questions, Bart left the meeting at approximately 9:40.

LeAnn then gave an update on the bullying issue. Brook and LeAnn met with Sarah Mattson and discussed the issue. The substance of the ensuing conversation is, for now, confidential. It included commentary on the advantages and problems posed by having Consultative gathering information about the issue, the need for advocacy that makes the issue visible, the history of administrative responses to the issue, the role of other offices and committees in this issue, the advisability of promoting an "allies"-oriented program, the information in and limitations of the Pulse survey, and other issues. However, the group will meet next week to discuss 1) appropriate advocacy; 2) Consultative's role; 3) next steps.

~Submitted by Brook Miller