

3-3-2016

Consultative minutes 03/03/2016

Consultative Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Consultative Committee, "Consultative minutes 03/03/2016" (2016). *Consultative Committee*. 140.
<http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/consult/140>

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.

Consultative Committee Minutes

Meeting date: 03/03/2016
Meeting location: Moccasin Flower
Time: 4 p.m.
Note taker: Ted Pappenfus

Members present:

<input type="checkbox"/> n	Kelly Asche	<input type="checkbox"/> y	Brenda Boever	<input type="checkbox"/> y	Rita Bolluyt
<input type="checkbox"/> y	Rachel Brockamp	<input type="checkbox"/> y	Julie Eckerle	<input type="checkbox"/> n	Lisa Harris
<input type="checkbox"/> y	Megan Jacobson	<input type="checkbox"/> y	Jane Kill	<input type="checkbox"/> y	Lori Kurpiers
<input type="checkbox"/> y	Michelle Page	<input type="checkbox"/> y	Ted Pappenfus	<input type="checkbox"/> y	Elsie Wilson

Guests: Matt Zaske; Dave Israels-Swenson; Michael Korth (MSK)

Agenda

Guests Michael Korth, Matt Zaske, & David Israels-Swenson (Constitution Review Committee) to discuss proposal for annual review of chancellors and vice chancellors

Information in advance of the meeting - Michael Korth's Message:

As a result of the report you gave to Campus Assembly earlier this week, the members of the Constitution Review Committee discussed, at our meeting this morning, the idea of an annual review or rating of the chancellor and vice chancellors. One of the details that would have to be included in any proposal is the identity of a person or group that would be responsible for making it happen. We think the Consultative Committee would be an appropriate group to oversee such a review or rating but, before proposing a constitutional amendment adding such a duty to the description of the Consultative Committee, we would like to know what the current members of the committee think of the idea.

Therefore we request an opportunity to meet with the committee so we can get feedback on this idea. The conversation could easily broaden to include the nature of the review or rating and the expected outcomes but we particularly want to focus on who would administer it.

Notes from the meeting are as follows:

- Opening comments from MSK: Constitution says there should be an annual review of the Chancellor but that has not happened in recent years. MSK says it is useful as it would provide valuable information for the institution. An “annual rating” sounds less threatening. Review of Chancellor Dave Johnson years ago was “insane” as it was intensive and had several members on the committee. MSK suggests something much simpler would be better – especially if the model could be used each year with little to no modification.
- Rita: What would be the purpose of this rating? MSK – provides feedback: currently no mechanism for positive/negative critique of the Chancellor.
- Michelle: Faculty and students and get feedback but where does the feedback come from for administrators? Seems realistic that this too should happen for our administrators.
- Matt: When he was on membership, they talked with Jacquie about Vice Chancellor reviews. Seemed to be a privacy issue. When a vice chancellor has a review, it is hard to know what can be public and what stays private.
- Michelle: Feedback is currently solicited for Division Chair reviews but yet we don't know how the admin review happens.
- MSK: It is Mike's understanding that review at some level happens as Jacquie has hinted in conversations that she has been reviewed....but it is not clear what happens at the Vice Chancellor level.
- Michelle: It would be good thing if the campus is heard and feedback is gathered as this can be useful for administrators.
- Julie: Overall, likes the proposed model of the rating system. Why Consultative?
- MSK: It the most logical fit; perhaps the only fit. It is about communication and promoting communication.
- MSK: This is not a job performance review. It is a forum to get feedback from the campus.
- Lori: Would Consultative compile data?...Mike says yes...Mike suggest after the data is compiled, there is a meeting with the Chancellor to communicate the feedback in some fashion and then release the information to the campus in some form.
- Rita: Is there useful information from the Pulse survey? Mike: perhaps, but we seem to ignore it.
- Julie: Likes this idea of an annual rating BUT there is no administrative support for this committee. Do we qualify for administrative support?
- Michelle: There are other committees that too would benefit from administrative support. MSK: bylaws say admin support only for core committees.
- MSK: will this be an electronic survey? The committee felt that this was the logical form.
- Julie: What does the rest of the committee think?
- Jane: It should be done...we really have to do it.
- Elsie: It could be an electronic survey that is somewhat straightforward...the person identifies him/herself as a student, faculty staff, etc, and provides responses.

- Ted: concerns about this committee making summative statements as we are not in the position to evaluate their performance.
- Megan: Expressed some concerns about anonymity of those responding to the survey.
- Julie: Agrees there should be a meeting with the Chancellor as part of this process and there should be analysis done by this committee as our charge is to communicate results.
- Dave: View this as assessment of perceptions of senior leadership rather than performance.
- Michelle: Asked if there was some concern about backlash and retaliation about people that report to Chancellor.
- Lori: Her boss reports to the Chancellor; it's somewhat of a concern.
- Rita: The Chancellor doesn't have to respond to the committee's report if he/she does not want to.
- Ted: Asked MSK for clarification on what exactly he wants from the committee.
- MSK: (a) Is the committee willing to assume this role and (b) more details about how this might work would be useful.
- MSK: Do we want written comments as part of the survey?
- Michelle: Written comments are valuable.
- Elsie: If people self-identify, that is their own choice as part of taking the survey.
- Julie: Our recent effort to get Campus feedback re: governance was a good model and could be used in an eval of the Chancellor.
- Ted asked Julie: How many meetings would it take to get this done in a typical year? Julie suggested about three but is more concerned about time outside the meeting.
- Ted: endorses the idea but is concerned that adding this could potentially take away from the normal functions of the committee.
- Mike: We could shorten the survey to lessen the workload.
- Michelle: Focus more on questions with numerical responses.
- Julie asks the committee for a straw poll to see if we are in general support of this idea: most on committee are in favor of the idea so now we can talk specifics.
- Rita: Still would like buy-in from the Chancellor before this moves forward.
- Ted: give the chancellor the opportunity to see the survey and respond to it before goes out.
- Michelle: Feedback and input seem valuable and appropriate, but such an opportunity should not be so extreme as to allow Chancellor to hand-pick the questions.
- Julie asked Mike about the timeline: Mike: hopes to get something to the Assembly before the end of the semester
- Matt: Have it be for information at the March 23 meeting with a potential vote at the following meeting. The steering committee, however, needs a week in advance of that initial meeting.
- Julie: what about Vice Chancellors? Do we include them in this process?
- Time ran out so Julie concluded by informing the guests that the committee supports the annual rating and that the committee will continue to discuss the topic.

Meeting adjourned.