

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well
University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Consultative Committee

Campus Governance

11-8-2016

Consultative minutes 11/08/2016

Consultative Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Consultative Committee, "Consultative minutes 11/08/2016" (2016). *Consultative Committee*. 144.
<http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/consult/144>

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
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday November 8, 2016
8-8:50 AM Sci 2555

Present: Ted Pappenfus, Michelle Page (minutes), Angela Stangl, Elsie Wilson, Nancy Helsper, Alisande Alliben, Lori Kurpiers, Noah Pilugin, Ann DuHamel, Jane Kill

Absent: Dean Doneen, Kelly Asche

Approval of Minutes:

- Minor edits, misattributed comment. Minutes approved with corrections.

Faculty Turnover:

- Data from the last ten years shows an average of 5.7% turnover of tenure-track faculty (as per Nancy Helsper data sheet)

Common Meeting Time:

- Steering Committee presenting this at Campus Assembly tomorrow and seeks feedback on proposals. Nancy was at Association for Institutional Research in Upper Midwest meeting (AIRUM) and spoke with a Crookston person. They have a common time they use for convocations, not meetings. Have we checked with other campuses to see what they're doing?
- Proposals 1 and 2 would "spark outrage" among students due to an earlier start time (8AM courses are already not popular). The proposals would force labs to move to 5-8PM and we should get input from STEM students and faculty and TA's to see if they are willing to move. Studio Art may also have a similar situation.
- Nancy compiled data on what time courses are being offered on various days of the week. Few are teaching 8AM classes (for example, in Fall 2016 there are 23 classes at 8AM on Tuesday and 21 on Thurs). The Steering Committee should work with Curriculum Committee to think about why we teach when we do and what the impacts are. For example, Chemistry has data to show better performance in later courses. But maybe there are courses that work better earlier in the day.
- Classroom scheduling may be an issue if we move away from 8AM classes. Perhaps 8AM is a logical choice for a common meeting time. Perhaps the old proposal #4 could be revised with the 10 minute passing time contained in current proposals. Should we explore what it would cost in overtime for staff to meet early or late?
- What is the fundamental use of the common meeting time? If it is for committee meetings, how do we balance the work of the committees to ensure that we make the best use of the time? Would Campus Assembly meet during that time also? It

seems like in the current proposals the common meeting time would be both Tues and Thurs. What would be the impact of having common meeting on only one day?

- Practical issue of lunch. People gotta eat!
- Consensus that a common meeting time needs to be at least one hour, otherwise it is difficult to accomplish the needed work.
- Previous proposal 4 has potential if we shorten passing time. New proposals 4 and 5 have potential due to more than 1 hour meeting time. We recommend the Steering and Curriculum Committees invest in exploring those options.

Prioritizing new Consultative Committee items:

--From students (issues related to student committee members)

- class sizes are not what was promised (in larger majors there are much larger class sizes than the average 15:1 ratio cited in our publications; e.g., some students in larger majors are never in a class smaller than 25-30, even upper division classes.
- Need for faculty of color—students stressed the importance of this, especially for underrepresented students and international students.

--From faculty and staff (issues sent to chair)

- campus committee elimination (Steering Committee is looking at this)
 - common meeting time
 - advising—1/3 of new students without an advisor in their major or division of major
 - FERPA—APLUS issues
- UMM used to require committee chairs to review their committee's usefulness and charge every other year. Do we have a current process? Should the Steering Committee review committees? There seems to be provision for this in the Constitution. Ted was contacted by UMM's rep on the system-wide Committee on Committees to talk about a review process. Michelle's experience on Committee on Committees was positive as the reviews proceeded on a cycle. The workload for the committee members was not overly cumbersome and some authentic reflection and change occurred. We suggest that the Steering Committee adopt some of the practices of the all-U Committee on Committees or other best practices from similar institutions. We have academic program review so to have a cycle and timeline for reviewing committees and service would be parallel and helpful.

Advising:

- Many new students are without an advisor in their major or division of major

- There is a tension between balancing faculty advising workload and providing major advisors
- What are the pros and cons of having a few professional advisors that work with selected majors?
- What about a discipline-trained and approved faculty advisor from another discipline (e.g., a faculty member from another discipline who is trained and “certified” by a major—“Professor X is a Biology-certified advisor”)?
- Historically new students were presumed to be taking gen eds and didn’t need someone in their major. However, academic pathways have changed and in some majors if students do not get off to a good start their whole course of study can be damaged or delayed. In addition, we do not know and cannot predict which students will change their major and which will not, so this makes it impossible to prioritize major advisors for particular students.
- One suggestion was to have a conversation table for faculty to discuss student issues and get info about other majors
- In the past we’ve had advisors who are really good at working with undecided majors—are these advisors still needed and being used?
- Programs for first year underrepresented students have had unintended consequence of bottle-necking students even more—for example, one student in one of these programs had to fight to get an advisor in their major because there weren’t enough advisors in their major who were working with the program. Would it be possible for students from high risk groups to be ensured to get advisors from the majors?
- Students can feel a disconnect when they don’t have advisor in their division or major.
- Some students don’t know they can request to change.
- It was clarified that all first year students get success coaches and advisors. However, the case load of success coaches varies according to whether they are working with a grant-supported program (and which one). Sometimes staff (rather than faculty) are also advisors and effectiveness may vary. Faculty and staff of color may be called upon disproportionately to mentor and advise students, reinforcing the importance of increasing our faculty and staff racial diversity.

FERPA:

- Via APLUS, all faculty have access to all students’ records. Is that appropriate? Concern about letters of recommendation, students currently enrolled in courses—would faculty look at previous performance to make grading decisions? Should APLUS be modified in some way? There needs to be a campus and perhaps system discussion on this.

Priorities:

- Faculty of color issue identified as a top priority
- Second, advising issues and FERPA issues
- Finally, class size issue
- Crossed off campus committee elimination as a Consultative issue since another committee is taking this on

Additional issues to explore:

- When we talk with Admissions we should discuss the class size issue—many students feel that class sizes are not what were promised
- An additional issue for both Admissions and University Relations is that students have reported that we say/show we are much more diverse than we are. Photos used in publications seem to be disproportional between the populations they show and the actual makeup of UMM. Some students feel used/targeted for advertising purposes while other students are never featured due to race or appearance. There seems to be a tension between some students feeling tokenized or too visible and others who feel invisible

Meeting adjourned at 9:55 AM