

College of Education and Human Development Committees

CEHD Governing Council 2007–2008 Minutes

September 19, 2007

Attendees: Susan J. Wells, Gillian Roehrig, Cryss Brunner, Michael Harwell, Marlene Stum, Xiaojia Ge, Diane Wiese-Bjornstal, Dan Detzner, Sasha Ardichvili, Teri Wallace, Jane Gilles, Kristeen Bullwinkle, John Sonnack, Dan Sagisser, Deb Haessly, Michelle Ingram, Kristen Kangas, Paul Maeker, Tawana Terrell, Cheryl Morgan, Darlyne Bailey.

Opening

Cheryl Morgan called the meeting to order. She stated that Dean Bailey would be arriving shortly and reviewed the proposed agenda, suggesting we may want to proceed with introductions and electing a Chair. The members agreed. Everyone introduced themselves.

Election of Governing Council Chair

Susan J. Wells was nominated for the Chair by Teri Wallace and Teri Wallace was nominated by Susan Wells. The vote was taken and Susan Wells was elected Chair; Teri Wallace was elected Alternate Chair. Susan Wells began to facilitate the meeting. The first order of business was to review the new constitution for the College and the responsibilities of the Governing Council.

Constitution review

The new constitution gives the Governing Council more responsibility and power than last year's Consultative Committee. The GC has a potential to be really effective. It is very important that members bring comments and questions from their constituency group to the GC and to bring information back from the GC.

Dean Bailey

The Dean arrived during this discussion and said no council is more important than the GC is to our College. She thanked GC members for being the voice and helping to shape our new College. They are a model for how other colleges can work.

Establishing an agenda for the year

Within the GC charge in the constitution and the College's mission statement, the GC will need to set an agenda for the year. Dean Bailey led a discussion to begin to identify possible areas of focus.

Brainstorm agenda items.

1. The GC as a Hub for Communication – How/What/With Whom/When? (Teri Wallace)
2. Faculty, Staff, Student input – policy input /dialogue (Michael Harwell)
3. Clarity about work that was done in committees in past years – How will the work be done? What works? (Kristeen Bullwinkle, Susan Wells)
4. We should search out any existing concerns/questions/challenges as a result of integration of 3 and birth of 1 College (Jane Gilles)
5. It would be helpful to have an Intra–College exchange of vision, strategies of departments (Diane Wiese-Bjornstal)
6. How will we do and then assess operationalizing Article 4, Section 2 of the Constitution? (This is detailing of the GC's responsibilities.) (Teri Wallace)
7. P&T question – Merit review process, as distinct from formal procedures/form – GC would like to discuss the process. Also, how does GC assess, review, consult on things like this? (Dan Detzner, Gillian Roehrig, Susan Wells)
8. Would like to discuss ways of increasing transparency and the role of faculty governance at the U. Also, in an aside, not for agenda: Faculty governance – How is it done here? (Xiaojia Ge)
9. Role of GC in strategic planning and the compact process? (Susan Wells)
 - a. Strategic planning is one of the 1st orders of business for the College. (Dean Bailey)
 - b. The Dean explained that last year we built our compact around the Neighborhoods. The compact is bi-annual, in alternate years we come up with administrative plan.
 - c. Dean Bailey described some of the issues with respect to budgeting, as well as her fundraising and other income generating strategies.

10. A charge from last year that continues into the future: Research focus of the College needs to be continually underscored; the GC should continuously attend to this in all work done. (Susan Wells)
11. Assessment – 10S - M3 model will help evaluate the College (Susan Wells and Dean Bailey)
 - a. A discussion about the history and creation of the framework took place. Some of the major questions concern the mechanics of use and implementation, the role of existing committees and associate Deans and the nature of the work needed by the GC. The group decided on steps to facilitate operationalizing the model and agreed a design team would convene to take the next steps.
 - b. A Design Team was appointed to begin work on operationalizing the assessment tool. The design team will address:
 - i. Any tweaking of questions that is deemed necessary.
 - ii. What currently exists that could be used to respond to questions?
 - iii. What doesn't exist now?
 - iv. What should be the structure for how to go about implementing the assessment? The product of the design team will provide guidance to the implementation groups in the College (Multi-disciplinary, Multi-cultural, and Model for Engagement) which are led by the Associate Deans.

10S-M³ Design Team

Teri Wallace agreed to head it up and team members are:

- Teri Wallace (ICI)
- Paul Maeker (EdPA grad student)
- Diane Wiese-Bjornstal (Kin faculty)
- Marlene Stum (FSoS faculty)
- John Sonnack (P&A staff-Director, InfoTech)
- Kristen Kangas (FOE undergrad student)
- Dan Sagisser (CS/BU staff)

Future Steps

Dean Bailey will talk with Susan Wells and Teri Wallace about finalizing the proposed GC agenda for the year. Teri Wallace will convene the design team to determine next steps for the 10S – M3 model.

October 17, 2007

Attendees: Susan Wells (chair), Michael Harwell, Gillian Roehrig, Teri Wallace, Dan Sagisser, Jane Gilles, Kristeen Bullwinkle, Paul Maeker, Kristen Kangas, Cryss Brunner, John Sonnack, Deb Haessly, Marlene Stum, Sasha Ardichvili, Cheryl Morgan, Darlyne Bailey, Dan Detzner, Xiaojia Ge, Diane Wiese-Bjornstal.

Minutes for September 19 meeting were approved.

Susan Wells reviewed today's agenda and moved into discussion of the year's agenda for the GC based on the notes on the brainstorming session we had at the last meeting. The discussion at the last meeting focused on possible work for the year and led to a list of items that was presented to committee members for their review and prioritization. The question was, What should the GC pay attention to and when? The committee members responded that it would be helpful to have information about administrative deadlines and what's coming up, so we can review and make recommendations rather than receiving information after things are beyond revision. Information and discussions about P&T and the budget should come early in the year. Discussion of the potential role of the GC and the selection of an agenda for the year led to review of the GC description in the Constitution. Within the framework provided by the Constitution, the GC can decide, to some extent, what our job is.

One topic of great interest was P&T and faculty performance appraisals for merit review – There is a new format this year for the merit review. We'll invite Jean Bauer, chair of the College P&T Committee this year, and Nan Moore, director of HR, to come to the November GC meeting for a discussion of P&T. We'll invite Jean Quam, Senior Associate Dean, and Nan Moore to come to the November GC meeting for a discussion of merit review and the new FAR (Faculty Activity Report). We want to be consistent across the College regarding merit and P&T. There was a request for information about whether the College is planning a merit review process for P&A and Civil Service staff that would be implemented this year. No dates have been set for non-faculty review yet. There was a request that people have a draft of the FAR so they can see where it's headed. Cheryl Morgan will try to get a printout to send to GC members.

The committee members wondered whether hearing about these would lead to some kind of product from the committee. Yes, we will have written recommendations at the end of a review or discussion. Recommendations are non-binding, but the GC can also take a role in developing policies.

It was noted that the Nov 21 GC meeting is the day before Thanksgiving, so we will reschedule that meeting for

either Nov 14 or 28, depending on when the most people can come.

Two other things to address soon are: 1) strategic planning and the compact process and 2) communication issues and structural protocol. Dean Bailey said the Provost hasn't rolled anything out yet about the budget. We know that there is not much money available this year – \$13 million for the whole University. We won't be able to get anything unless it's an emergency.

Communication is an issue because the GC needs to be aware of important issues, but doesn't know when various things are coming up. Dean Bailey asked for a half-hour to update the GC on things going on at the beginning of each meeting. A calendar is being created with upcoming deadlines for HR and budget. It will be shared with GC members when it's ready.

The Dean mentioned a memo that she and Stephanie Dilworth, director of finance, will send to department chairs and center directors with lists of questions about the invitation to a conversation. When this memo is ready, it will be sent to GC members, too.

The 10S-M3 Design Team report was given by Teri Wallace. The task of the design team was to outline a plan for implementation that the college administration can carry out. Teri Wallace provided several handouts with historical information about the 10S-M3 assessment document and a list of recommendations for operationalizing the document, gathering data, and assessing the College's progress. Included was the creation of 3 work teams, one for Multidisciplinarity, one for Multiculturalism, and one for Model for Engagement. Each would have the associate dean assigned to that particular M (as per Dean Bailey's prior information) and a member of the GC on the team in addition to other suggested representatives. The teams would be asked to report to the GC in the spring. It was agreed that the GC team members should not chair the work teams. Each team should have a process for chairing or coordinating. Teams also will need resources and the availability of a graduate assistant was raised. Such help would be needed to help with the work of the team and for gathering data. GC volunteers for the work teams are Paul Maeker for Multicultural, Gillian Roehrig for Multidisciplinary and Teri Wallace for Model for Engagement.

Dean Bailey thanked the Design Team members and the GC for their phenomenal work. She said that no other organization in higher education is working on operationalizing their mission in this way. She then left the meeting for a pre-scheduled meeting with the President.

The discussion continued about the 10S-M3 performance assessment document. Some view it as a Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) process. Assessing self – How'd I do? How do I fix that? What will the indicators be? This year is the baseline year. The indicators will unfold and change. The associate deans will be important when it comes to indicators. Some members thought the term "accountability" conjures up the idea of punishment and economic consequences. An underlying concern is what kind of teeth the document holds and whether there is danger there? Members who participated in the drafting of the document in 2006-07 responded it was not designed around consequences. It's based on how things are and how to make things better. There was an agreed need for clarity. Some feel that the process is being rushed. One person said key indicators were the main stumbling blocks at other institutions. Suggestions were that some of the language be changed (especially the title of the document – The CEHD Performance Assessment and Accountability Framework: The 10-S Model and M3), that reporting be at the college-level and not at specific smaller unit levels, and that a FAQ be created so there is context and explanation for those unfamiliar with the document. Teri Wallace will draft a memo to the Dean covering two issues. First, it will include a brief background on what the document is, what is it for, how will it be used. Second, it will summarize the main steps in implementation. Kristen Kangas will help Teri. GC will review the draft memo and then Chair Susan Wells will send it to the Dean on behalf of the GC. It was suggested that the Dean then send the memo with her changes to the college as a whole so people will be more aware of it. The members approved the work of the Design Team and commended them on their work. The outline for implementation was accepted as written to be passed on to the college administration who will be in charge of implementation.

Diane Wiese-Bjornstal reviewed how the original 10S-M3 document was created last year by the College Consultative Committee. It was viewed as a self-study by many.

Discussion returned to the year's agenda.

Strategic planning and Compact planning. Do we want a conversation regarding strategic planning? There is concern about this, especially because of the deficit. Fiscal management, accountability, structure affect everyone. Two areas are: 1) are things working, and 2) allocation of resources and prioritizing.

At the December 19th meeting, the agenda should include the following: strategic planning; resources, fiscal allocations; how College administrative units are working; revenue streams coming in – where from, how much (this year units must generate all the money needed to pay their salaries and expenses plus 50% [N.B. ←not accurate. – DB]).

Communication, gathering information: Work teams should be up on the web soon. GC should be notified, so they can see what's happening. Ask Dean Quam to inform GC about certain things – ask for a list of headlines about matters of import to the college. It is important to establish a system for informing the GC, especially about the compact process and budget planning. In addition to the usual list of reviewers, include the GC on that list for areas including HR, Finance, Strategic Planning, space issues. Management decisions made by committee is a worry for some. The general feeling of the members was that we want to avoid micromanaging, but to stay informed. Susan Wells will draft a summary of our tasks and plans for the year and send it to GC for comment before finalizing.

One member was concerned about the GC taking on too much. We should pick something, not try to do everything on the brainstorming notes for the year (appended to minutes). Committee members agreed that our purpose in this meeting was to prioritize the many items that were listed as possible topics of conversation and review. For example, we should be reviewing progress, not creating the 10S-M3 document. We should be doing policy, not operations.

At the end of the meeting, the group approved some summary comments regarding the work of the GC this year.

- The GC is a policy review and policy making body.
- On the 10S-M3 work teams – GC reps on the administration's work teams should report back in the spring with something closer to a final plan for implementation. There may also be periodic review as necessary.
- Merit review process – The GC asked that the Dean put together a group to draft a College-wide policy to be presented to the GC.
- Communications – Need improvements and a system for communication between the administration and the faculty/staff and faculty/staff representatives. This will begin with the Dean in planning the work of the GC and with Jean Quam who will keep the GC apprised of potential policy actions in time for the GC to consult with faculty/staff/students and comment prior to the finalization of major college decisions such as the merit review process or the strategic planning goals.
- Regarding policy reviewing and policy making responsibilities, the Assembly votes on the Constitution and Constitutional amendments. It is within the purview of the GC to refer items to the Assembly for a vote.
- We will circulate this draft understanding among the GC members for review and comment.

November 28, 2007

Attendees: Gillian Roehrig, Cryss Brunner, Michael Harwell, Marlene Stum, Xiaojia Ge, Diane Wiese-Bjornstal, Dan Detzner, Sasha Ardichvili, Jane Gilles, Kristeen Bullwinkle, John Sonnack, Dan Sagisser, Debra Haessly, Michelle Ingram, Kristen Kangas, Velmer Burton (for Susan Wells), Darlyne Bailey, Cheryl Morgan

Guests: Jean Quam, Nan Moore, Jean Bauer

Materials distributed

Agenda, October minutes, Invitation to a Conversation memo, administrative planning dates, latest version of FAR

Gillian Roehrig called the meeting to order. She chaired the meeting at the request of Susan Wells.

Dean Bailey reported to the Governing Council on current issues.

Searches

Later today she plans to send an email to all faculty and staff about searches and 2009-2010 recruiting. In the past we have simply filled positions as people retired or left. We will be more mindful now using openings for "strategic investments". She has created a matrix with 4 or 5 questions that will guide decision making about both faculty and staff hires.

Burton Hall Remodeling

The University helping pay for a feasibility design study for Burton Hall. We need town square meeting space in both St. Paul and Minneapolis. She's been looking at the 2nd floor of Burton for that kind of space. It won't be as "green" as she'd like, because the third floor makes it impossible to have skylights for more natural light.

Neighborhoods

Neighborhood leaders were announced and their photos were included. We are all still getting to know each other and photos help, while providing a structure for multidisciplinary neighborhoods should also help us get to know one another.

GC meetings and members

Dean Bailey has made room on her calendar for the Governing Council meetings. She plans to attend GC meetings and stay for the whole meeting. She said that everyone on the GC has VIP status and therefore 24 hour access to her.

Invitation to a Conversation

The memo inviting department chairs to the Invitation to a Second Conversation was shared with the GC. This is the 2nd conversation, last year was the 1st. The department chair memo has one item (#7 Foundation Funds) on the list which is not on the center directors' memo. Last year she attempted to use zero-based budgeting, but no one came in with a blank slate, so while she and all others learned a lot, no department

really presented a true "zero-based budget". This year she's focusing on #2 Revenue Generation, increasing it and/or cutting costs. The expectation is that over the next two years departments will generate revenue that is at least 1.5 times greater than their expenses. This is a business model and similar to one that even our development officers operate under. They know that they must bring in more money than their salaries. Great ideas are being proposed by our department chairs. In January the Dean plans to share them with other chairs. No one will be penalized during this budget process. She wants people to build on good ideas. How creative can we be to get us financially healthy?

There was a suggestion that she meet with departments. People would like to directly ask the Dean questions. It would allay fears. The Dean agreed. She has asked Val Cremin to find out when department meetings are so she can attend at least one in each department next semester.

The memo also will go to administrative directors. Center directors already have it. The Dean believes that none of us can probably work harder, but we all can work smarter. The Dean offered dinner (at a nice place) for anyone who can come up with a smart way for people to get grants and still be able to teach. She wants to still have those people in the classroom.

Merit review process, FAR

Senior Associate Dean Jean Quam and HR Director Nan Moore joined the meeting to discuss merit review and the Faculty Activity Report (FAR). The blank FAR distributed today is the latest version. It is for data collection and does not change the way people are evaluated or the way raises are decided. It's for finding how many articles on X were published by our faculty last year, or how many people got honors, etc. The form will also be used by some P&A staff, if they teach or do research. They can add presentations, work in communities, etc., but this is not an ideal P&A form.

FSoS and SSW have used this form for several years. It's been changed and made easier to use. Nathan Kopka has devoted a considerable amount of time working on it. John Sonnack talked about Digital Measures, a well-designed system and includes many components and might be a good alternative to having our own data collection system. It's a hosted system, low in price. We would own the data, be able to export it, and Digital Measure will not re-use the data. Some other colleges are looking at it, too. It would be a good way for the University to be able to quickly find experts or other information. There was brief mention of the EGMS database (Electronic Grants Management System). People are required to keep it up (expertise database and others). Most don't like doing that. If we find a good system, information could feed into other systems. There would be no need to repeatedly enter the same information in multiple places. Deb Haessly mentioned a system the P&A group worked on.

Can the FAR be customized so administrative P&A staff could use it? There's fear that P&A would be held to the same standards as faculty, even though the scope of their work is different. You can bring more to meetings to discuss pay increases or promotions than would show up on the FAR. The Dean clarified that everything we're rolling out will continue to be fine-tuned over the next 2 or 3 years.

The merit review process is not being changed. So what is the importance of the FAR, especially for the GC? It's a common information gathering tool, collectively what our faculty are doing. It's at the GC, because the Dean wants to give us more information than normal, keep everyone informed, and let us ask questions. It was suggested that someone come to their departments to show them how to fill out the form and convince them that the software works as meant to and explain how the data will be used. The FAR is mandatory. It will help the Dean quickly and easily find experts in specific areas, work faster, be able to make people aware of opportunities.

EdPA faculty spent considerable time developing their own merit process. Is the FAR malleable? The Dean thought that we'd have a unified merit-review process by now. However, they're all different, creative, thoughtful, so we couldn't all have the same. She is concerned that we all use the same metrics. Equity and fairness are important.

FAQs (Frequently Asked Questions) for the FAR

People should send their questions or issues to Cheryl Morgan. What needs to be addressed up front? We will create an FAQ.

This is not merit review? No, but it is in FSoS and SSW. Sometimes people brought in additional documentation. Other departments and center have their own merit review process. Where are opportunities to gather data on Living into the Mission? They are not explicit, but there are a couple in there. After we do this, we'll find out what worked and what didn't.

Who does the merit review? Department chairs (or their designate) meets with each individual. Some departments have committees that make recommendations to the chair. Then the Dean goes over every single person with the department chair (sometimes their administrator is also present) and decides what everyone gets.

The Dean would prefer cost-of-living increases in addition to merit. She will be discussing this in her conversations with the Provost. The question of merit increases for CS/BU staff was raised. It will not happen this year. Issues of compression and equity across the College were raised. The Dean will be talking to the Provost about this. We need lots more money to correct this. It happens when the market increases faster than we can raise salaries. New hires sometimes start at higher rates than current employees. Issues of compression

and equity cover everyone – staff, faculty, student employees – all are included.

Jean Quam left. Jean Bauer arrived.

Will there be merit reviews for P&A this year? Yes, there will be P&A merit reviews as usual this year. We are waiting to set the timeline for these reviews until we have received more detailed information from the University regarding the compensation pool and budget timelines. Merit salary decisions are likely to be made in April or May. Is it consistent across the College? P&A performance evaluations will follow the procedures currently set up in the departments and centers within the College, although some P&A staff who provide instruction or conduct research may also be asked to complete the FAR. The College is moving toward a common accomplishments reporting/performance evaluation system for P&A that will be implemented for the performance evaluations in 2008-09. Merit salary recommendations are determined by the chair, director, dean – whoever you report to. The final merit salary decision rests with the Dean.

The bracketing for faculty has been moved. Last year it was the calendar year plus Spring 2007. Now we're using the academic year. It will require people to engage in prophecy, because it's all due before the end of the academic year. Last part of the spring gets lost.

P&T Process

Jean Bauer is the chair of our College's P&T Committee. She discussed the process and answered questions. The summary is the answers that were given to the questions.

The College has procedural guidelines. Each academic department has their own 7.12 statements that are unique to them. They outline criteria for promotion, or tenure or both. Last year Bill Doherty chaired a committee that looked at all of our 7.12 statements.

Promotion and Tenure is guided by University Senate policy and the Board of Regents. Student feedback comes from the student evaluations, but not more directly. Faculty can ask students to write letters to put in their dossier. The process starts at the department level, and then moves to the college level. It's all confidential. The college committee has one person from every department plus 3 other persons appointed by the Dean. After review at the college level, it's all sent to the Provost. Everyone they recommended last year got promotion or tenure. That's a very good record for us. There are different 7.12 criteria for different faculty levels. The materials in "the box" are compared with the 7.12 criteria. Next year there will likely be more activity.

There is not a university-level committee for this. It goes from the department to the college and dean, then to Associate Vice Provost Carney. All controversial files are reviewed by all associate vice provosts. The decision is then made at the Provost level. The Provost then makes recommendations to the Board of Regents. It's a very complex process and requires lots of work. People in the department cannot be in the room when they're voting on faculty in their department, because they have already voted in their department. Teams are set up that don't include the person in the department. Then teams report to the P&T Committee. They may not know the field, but they will be able to tell if criteria are met. When the P&T process doesn't work well, there is the University Judicial Committee. People can ask for a hearing if they feel the process was compromised. There was brief discussion of systems at other universities. Outside letters were discussed. Minnesota's open data law requires that people have access to the letters. The U Senate is looking at changing this. The concern is that outsiders might not be honest if they know their letters will be seen by the person being reviewed.

University's Northside Partnership (UNP)

Dean Bailey spoke at length about the UNP. Our College is the academic convener. She described the project and said all colleagues are invited to join in – faculty, students and staff. So far about 100 people at the University have come to the "roll-outs" and indicated that they want to be a part of the UNP.

December agenda

Suggestions were taken for the December meeting agenda. Funding came up first with how we deal with things like deficits, growth in administration, faculty hiring freeze rumor, levels of support.

This brought a question about the 1.5 in the Invitation to a Conversation Part 2 memo. It's a big deal. Where is the extra 50% going? It will go toward the structural deficit, equity adjustments, and new initiatives. If we get more in, then department chairs can have a strategic initiative fund, too.

The agenda discussion continued. Another suggestion was revenue sources for the college with specific numbers or proportions. Dean Bailey suggested that in December we talk about Money – revenue streams, budget issues, Enterprise Financial Systems, etc. She suggests that in February we look at academic programs.

Minutes

There will be a concerted effort to have minutes emailed to GC members within one week of the meeting.

December 19, 2007

Present: Susan Wells, Gillian Roehrig, Cryss Brunner, Michael Harwell, Marlene Stum, Xiaojia Ge, Diane Wiese-Bjornstal, Dan Detzner, Teri Wallace, Jane Gilles, Kristeen Bullwinkle, John Sonnack, Dan Sagisser, Deb Haessly, Michelle Ingram, Paul Maeker, Cheryl Morgan, Darlyne Bailey

Materials distributed: Agenda, November minutes, FCC December 2007 minutes re: Long-Term Financial Opportunities

Susan Wells called the meeting to order and reviewed the agenda.

Minutes

The November 2007 GC minutes were approved.

Dean's Report

Dean Bailey reported to the Governing Council on current issues.

The focus on the Dean's report was money: budget challenges, revenue streams and diversifying our College budget portfolio, and the new Enterprise Financial Systems.

FCC Report

The FCC report on long-term finances for the University was reviewed. President Bruininks, Senior VP Jones, Provost Sullivan discussed the University's long-term finances. We will have to be strategic, tighten the budget, invest in things that have impact and offer a greater return on investment. We will have to maximize efficiency and effectiveness. When bringing in new faculty and staff, market demands and our comparative advantages will have to be considered. How does our investment leverage additional resources?

CEHD Income, Budgets

Tomorrow 12/20/07 the Dean will have completed all the Invitations to Conversations. Our development director is has been very successful bringing in money, increasing the College gifts by two-fold. The Dean has brought in a couple of endowed chairs, one brand new one. Dan Huebner saw a Connect issue about Learning Technologies and decided to finance the Bonnie Westby Huebner Chair in Education and Technology. He has donated \$2 million; the return is 4.5%, making ~\$90,000 available each year. Aaron Doering, Assistant Professor in Learning Technologies in the Department of Curriculum & Instruction, is the first recipient of this chair. A professorship costs about \$2 million. The new chairs will be renewable in five year increments. The funding is intended to pay to support the chair. The professor's salary is paid by the College.

Q&A

How is the decision made about where new chairs go? University rules state that endowed chairs can only go to faculty. The Dean would like to change the rules. Chairs can be a recruiting tool. The funds can be used to build a lab, hire a GA or RA, go to conferences, etc. The dean tries to match the donor's request with the mission of the College. It is possible that a donor's offer may not align with the College mission and may not be a good match so the College mission is a critical element in seeking funding.

Tomorrow (12/20/07), the Dean is meeting with the Provost about our budget. Due to prior practices for tracking funding for the entire College, there was a surprising when all of the funding streams were considered together. Our deficit was more than \$10 million. Last year units kicked in 2% over the originally anticipated amount. The deficit is considerably lower now. Budget discussions always include ideas on how to maximize our current assets. For example, future discussions with the faculty will include ideas on how to best utilize their faculty development accounts.

The deficit raised questions about accountability. A couple of committee members asked, Where is the accountability for individual departments? The response was that much is worked out in the conversations between the chairs and the Dean. The deficit was not attributable to specific departments and included a range of fund types. Dean Bailey will be meeting with each Department's faculty and staff this spring. Rumors regarding the budget were discussed and the need for even greater transparency acknowledged. The question arose, what is the best method for ensuring transparency. It may not be sufficient to rely on Department chairs to communicate all fiscal issues to their units.

Programs

Mary Bents and Jean Quam have been reviewing programs in our College. Some are not bringing in money and won't, some are redundant. Decisions need to be made about where to support, trim, or form happy marriages. Currently, we have 12 undergraduate programs in CEHD. Minors are great, but majors are better in terms of our productivity. So one question might focus on whether some minors become majors, stay minors, or be folded into other programs.

There was a break in the discussion to hear from Stephanie Dilworth about the new financial system. Following that discussion, the focus returned to communicating the status of the College with the faculty, staff and students and the role of the Governing Council in facilitating communication and policy review.

Enterprise Financial Systems (EFS)

Stephanie Dilworth (HR Director) joined the meeting to discuss EFS, our new financial system. The current system CUPS is no longer supported by the vendor, so the University had to change. We're moving to PeopleSoft. HR and Students are already in the PeopleSoft system. This change is a major undertaking – account strings will be longer, about 15 digits. EFS will offer more flexibility for grants and professional development accounts. They can be tracked by people, so all of one faculty's accounts can be tracked together. EFS is now being tested, so Stephanie has only seen screen prints so far. After the testing, new Chart of Accounts (COA) training will begin, probably in April 2008. There are about 80 different trainings. What people take will be specifically related to their positions. There will be tests and assessments after the training. Some of the training is online, some is instructor led. Online assessments are required after each training session. Our College's structure is good for this. There will be new job descriptions for accounting people. July 1 EFS goes live. Accounts receivable will probably be flipped in September.

Impact on faculty and staff: We will have new account numbers, IDs, forms, processes. New procedures will be in place before the switch so people are used to them. Each department will have a liaison for the new system.

Returning to the discussion of the current status of the College, the Dean said she would be sending another email before winter break that would continue to help communicate recent information.

The Council members remarked that receiving an email about current issues is helpful but that it also leaves many unanswered questions. The Council members suggested holding an Assembly in February at which the Dean could do a review and update; for example, how we've made the mission more concrete. **We should plan for a College Assembly in 325 Education Sciences Building in February or March.** The members also remarked that it would probably be helpful to many people to hear some of the basics about how the budgeting is done since many people are not familiar with the budget terms and funding streams. Department chairs are natural messengers for this kind of thing. It would be helpful for them to share more of this at the departmental level.

Giving information should lead to any potential morale issues subsiding. Some examples of items that could be addressed include: Where does more revenue come from? What should we support based on that? How to triage requests? Undergraduate tuition doesn't bring in as much as graduate tuition.

Living into the Mission (orange sheet) was discussed briefly. It will now go to the associate deans to be used as preliminary guidance about implementing the 10S-3M document. They will become creating their work groups now.

The meeting closed with a request by the members to revisit the GC's role and methods. This is critical because this is a formative year for the GC so it is important to take time now to consider the core/larger questions of the GC's responsibilities and methods.

January 16, 2008

Present: Susan Wells, Gillian Roehrig, Michael Harwell, Marlene Stum, Xiaojia Ge, Dan Detzner, Sasha Ardichvili, Teri Wallace, Jane Gilles, John Sonnack, Dan Sagisser, Debra Haessly, Paul Maeker, Nicola Alexandra (for Cryss Brunner), Cheryl Morgan

Materials distributed: Agenda, December minutes, Governing Council sections from the Constitution, section from October 2007 minutes (What we all agreed on), the Brainstorming document (2007-2008 Governing Council Agenda), Living into the Mission implementation document.

Susan Wells called the meeting to order.

Minutes

The December 2007 GC minutes were approved. For the Governing Council, the members also discussed the ongoing format of the minutes and agreed that a summary format for the minutes with major points from the discussions rather than verbatim transcripts are the preferred method of recording Council business.

The Council convened this meeting without the Dean to have time to re-visit the Council's mission and goals and to determine how to carry out the responsibilities of the Council as outlined in the College Constitution. The agenda was reviewed with an invitation to the members to suggest revisions as necessary.

Terms

The terms of Governing Council members are currently one year. Changing this would require a Constitutional amendment. There was general discussion and agreement that staggered two year terms would be better. We will draw straws to see which representatives go long and which go short at the beginning. No constituency group should have all members replaced at the same time. Cheryl Morgan will draft the amendment to this effect and present it at the next GC meeting. The members agreed the drawing of names could proceed prior to the next meeting.

The Role of the GC

There was discussion about the GC's relationship with the Dean and how to institutionalize our work with any dean. A number of members remarked, so far we've been reactive and fairly passive. There were several suggestions regarding how to reorganize the Council's approach to its responsibilities so we can effectively have input before decisions are made.

1. We need to decide what we're going to do and that will inform our actions and help define our relationship with the Dean.
2. How do we establish policy? We're at a disadvantage compared to chairs meeting with the Dean. In some ways they function more like a governing body than the GC does. At this point, we don't know enough soon enough to have an impact on policy.
3. We also need a format for being able to raise issues from our constituency groups.
4. Some on the GC feel we don't have much power, while others feel we have more than we use. We do things according to our constituency groups. We have an obligation to tell the Dean if we think we're going in a wrong direction.
5. One suggestion was to delete the line "formulate and recommend policies" from the Constitution regarding Council responsibilities. It was generally agreed to hold off for awhile, but maintain an eye on how we address it and use it. While the GC has not taken a lot of control to date, we have potential to do that.

Some thoughts on becoming more a part of the process:

1. **Scheduling discussions.** Obtaining a schedule of main College and University deadlines, identifying the main things we're interested in is a start. We need to establish a schedule for next year, so we know ahead of time when the compact, budget, and other things are coming up. Principles, not specific details, should be our focus.
2. **Identifying the major issues in which the Council should be involved.** For example, the strategic plan has huge implications. Some major issues that should be addressed by the Council were identified. Issues such as Centralization v. de-centralization are big picture items with which we should be concerned. Priorities are also important – Where are we going to put our investments? For example, should the neighborhoods have funding? The structure of the College is a major issue as well. Merit reviews and direction of research was also mentioned. In merit reviews now community-related research is more valued, but what is the cost to departments for this kind of research? While there are differing views on what's major, there was agreement on a number of these items.
3. **Reports.** We should ask the deans to report important things to us and to explain their decisions and ways of making them. Ask Dean Bailey to bring 2 or 3 key issues needing our advice, rather than reporting on everything that's happened in the past month. Ask for a written preliminary report from the dean before the meeting or at least for specifics regarding the subject under discussion.
4. **Communications.** It is important for us to obtain information and to report back to departments and groups in a timely fashion. One way to keep up with current discussions is to obtain agendas or minutes from the

administrative or directors' meetings. This may not be realistic due to lack of items that could be shared in a timely fashion. We will pose this issue to the Dean, ask her to help us with this. We need information early enough so we can get reactions and bring them back to the GC and the Dean. We need to develop a process for the GC.

5. **Decision-making:** The question was asked, "There are so many different groups involved. Where do we fit in the process?" Who is making recommendations? Centralization in general in higher education is the trend. Faculty have input in academic direction and hiring. There are things as well that are in the power of the faculty, the students, P&A staff, the deans, etc. We have to feel strongly enough about something to use power. One possibility is to ask the Dean for representation on different groups. In addition, as the Dean suggests, Department chairs and center directors need to report more fully to their groups. This suggestion should be followed-up.
6. **Membership or representation on decision-making committees.** We could ask to be represented on committees that make decisions. The difficulty here is increasing the number of meetings we already attend.

Future meetings

Keep the meetings at no longer than 2 hours, from 1:00 to 3:00. Ask Dean Bailey to come at 1:30 and give her report and ask for input for approximately 45 minutes, so there is also some time following the discussion to determine whether we have specific recommendations or actions we wish to take.

College Assembly

The assembly is probably going to occur on March 5th. We'll have a videoconference using 325 Ed Sciences Bldg and 70 Peters Hall, so people don't have to travel far to get to the meeting.

10-S M-3 Small Working Groups

Teri Wallace reported on the upcoming meeting and process. She passed around a beginning template for implementation organized by Associate Dean for Research Johnson.

Chair Susan Wells will meet with Dean Bailey to discuss some of our concerns and the agenda and procedures and procedures for the rest of this year.

February 20, 2008

Present: Susan Wells, Gillian Roehrig, Marlene Stum, Xiaojia Ge, Diane Wiese-Bjornstal, Robin Murie (for Dan Detzner), Judy Lambrecht (for Sasha Ardichvili), Teri Wallace, Jane Gilles, Kristeen Bullwinkle, Becky Rapport, Dan Sagisser, Debra Haessly, Michelle Ingram, Kristen Kangas, Paul Maeker, Cheryl Morgan, Darlyne Bailey

Guests: Jan McCulloch, Rich Weinberg, Jean Quam, Cathy Schulz, Linda Bernin

Materials distributed: Agenda, January minutes, CPAC survey report, CSC survey report, Constitution Bylaws amendment.

Susan Wells called the meeting to order and welcomed new member Becky Rapport and Senior Associate Dean Jean Quam who is attending for Dean Bailey.

Governance Discussion

Teri Wallace introduced our guests Jan McCulloch and Rich Weinberg as the former co-chairs of the Constitution Committee. They were invited to share their views on governance and what was intended when the new CEHD Constitution was created.

Weinberg and McCulloch pointed out that the Governing Council is a cross between the old Senate and Consultative Committee. It has more teeth than the old Consultative Committee. The Constitution description of the Governing Council was written with flexibility in mind. There is value in a non-prescriptive constitution. The Governing Council should deal with important issues. As the "hub" of communication in the College, GC members should bring issues to constituents and to the dean, introduce information, issues, etc. A question was raised about the GC and decision making authority and policy making involvement. McCulloch clarified that the GC can make recommendations. They can call a meeting of the Assembly. If policies affect only one of the constituency groups, then only that group votes on the policy. If the policy affects everyone, then the whole GC votes.

The definition of governance is different to different people. We are not just faculty governance. One of the CS/BU representatives said that they have felt this is not the group to bring their issues to. McCulloch said this (GC) is the place to bring issues of a specific group. She suggested asking the Dean for guidance on setting the agenda. Let the dean know what's important, ask her what the issues are, give her the pulse of what's going on. The GC would get info out and facilitate discussion and process.

Dean's Report

Jean Quam reported for Dean Bailey. She mentioned that we are working on budget issues, slowly moving

forward. The March assembly is being postponed until April when the Dean can provide better information.

There were questions about budget, structural changes, and job loss. Rumors were mentioned, especially in response to the recent announcements about the new external relations unit and the technology structure changes. The GC would like more information about plans to deal with the deficit and an opportunity to offer suggestions.

CPAC Report

Cathy Schultz, chair of the CEHD Professional and Administrative Council (CPAC), reported on a survey conducted in the last year of staff in the P&A classifications. They had a response rate of 57%. Problems in culture were noted in the open-ended responses. The report is available on their web site -

<http://intranet.cehd.umn.edu/Committees/CPAC/>.

CSC Report

Linda Bernin, chair of the CEHD Staff Council (CSC), reported on their recent survey. The response rate was 24%. Some of their responses were quite similar to the P&A responses. Issues of concern to the CS & BU staff included the JEQ process required for job changes (promotions and raises), pay equity, respect, job security, community, and communication problems.

Dean Bailey joined the meeting during the CSC report.

The GC agreed to talk about these results at a future meeting and then invite Linda and Cathy back for more discussion. Both groups would like feedback from administrators and the GC.

Proposals for the College

There was brief discussion about the proposed amendment to the Constitution's Bylaws. The amendment proposes that GC members serve staggered two-year terms. Students at both the graduate and undergraduate levels asked that their terms continue to be for one year. The GC approved the revised amendment and the process for approval by the College as a whole was begun.

Assuming the amendment will pass and staggered terms will begin with Fall 2008, and moving to prevent the entire turnover of the GC, Chair Wells presented her randomly chosen list of current representatives who will serve one additional year without needing to be re-elected. **One year units are Educational Policy & Administration, Educational Psychology, Family Social Science, Institute of Child Development, and School of Social Work. Others, including the Center representative, will be elected this spring to two-year terms beginning in Fall 2008.** After discussion about whether this was advisable, the scenario was put forward as a second proposal to be voted on at the same time as the first proposed amendment. The GC approved adding this to the ballot.

For next month

Approval of the January 16, 2008, minutes was carried over to the next meeting.

March 19th, 2008

Present: Susan Wells, Martha Bigelow (for Gillian Roehrig), Michael Harwell, Marlene Stum, Tom Stoffregen (for Diane Wiese-Bjornstal), Irene Duranczyk, Sasha Ardichvili, Teri Wallace, Jane Gilles, Kristeen Bullwinkle, Cathy Schulz (for Becky Rapport), Dan Sagisser, Debra Haessly, Cheryl Morgan, Jean Quam (for Darlyne Bailey)

Introductions: There are several new people, so everyone introduced themselves. Irene Duranczyk replaces Dan Detzner as the representative for PsTL. Becky Rapport replaces John Sonnack as a P&A representative.

Minutes

The minutes for January 16th and February 20th were approved.

The agenda was reviewed. NOTE: Following the meeting, the minutes regarding the proposed constitutional amendment were amended to more closely reflect the conversation regarding the one and two year terms. The amendment to the minutes stipulates that the units designated as 'one year' units will have an election this year that will elect a representative to serve two years. The current elected representatives from the remaining units will continue to serve through next academic year. In Spring 2009, those units will hold an election for representatives to serve two year terms. This staggering of elections will enable the GC to maintain some continuity from year to year.

College Assembly

Plans for the meeting to discuss the proposals related to the Constitution Bylaws were reviewed. On March 24th Teri Wallace will host the meeting in Minneapolis in 325 Ed Sciences Bldg, Marlene Stum and Dan Sagisser will be the hosts in St. Paul in 70 Peters Hall. There will be technical support in both rooms. These rooms are

available to us without cost.

Elections

After voting on Constitution Bylaws amendment, there will be a memo from the Dean and GC, asking for nominations and an election for the designated unit. The memo will emphasize the need for elections rather than appointments to the GC

Questions were raised about voting. Specifically one person questioned whether students should get to vote, and another questioned having electronic voting. It was noted that these are constitutional questions and that amendments to the constitution may be proposed and voted on. In the interim, it is important to accept the current constitution and operate within it.

The Staff Surveys

P&A Survey Report

The GC reviewed the P&A Survey Report which was presented at the February GC meeting. There were recommendations in the main report. Culture change was more difficult for some. People from the former CHE and GC felt more equality in their former workplace. In the new College they feel less respected or valued. They feel the culture is worse. Job security issues worry them; there were multi-year contracts in CHE and GC, while in the new College there are only single year contracts. More broadly, P&A staff question whether their evaluation forms actually reflect their jobs due to the emphasis on such things as publication. The survey also reviewed salaries, turnover rates, reduced positions (% time), exit interviews (is salary satisfaction part of it?). Cathy Schulz questioned how to share data in a timely fashion. It took a long time to get a meeting to share the information with Ryan who will share the report with the Dean. Cathy (co-chair of CPAC) will go to administrators meeting in April to share information. There was a recommendation that she not wait to get information out. She was encouraged to send the report to deans, chairs, etc. Cathy wants a collaborative conversation. Respect is a big issue. They have asked to meet with the Dean. They are also asking for: exit interviews, multi-year contracts, use of all their vacation time, culture change. The issue of reclassification of P&A positions into CS positions was also noted.

The questions discussed included: Who needs to respond to recommendations, on what level? Should it be supervisors or a higher level? How can we address issues of equity within the college? Who can make contract decisions? (The response was, some are made in departments and some at the College level.) Other questions concerned the multi-year contracts for P & As. Questions were raised about who is eligible? What about people on grants that could end anytime? When giving people notice of non-renewal, we still have to pay them for full contract. A problem sometimes comes up when trying to recruit a national researcher for a P & A position but only being able to offer a one-year contract.

Following the discussion, it was decided each group (CSBU and P & A) should propose recommendations and future steps. The mechanism for dissemination and implementation will include follow-up recommendations from the GC, a letter to the Dean, meetings with the Dean and wide dissemination and follow-up activities on the part of the groups themselves with departments and with the college administration.

Regarding the multi-year contracts, it was noted that there are also rolling multi-year contracts. Nan and Jean have met about those things. Cathy Schultz and Jill Trites volunteered to be part of the group looking at P&A contracts, etc., but were never called. Jean Quam said she will look into this. CPAC is looking at things like the contract issue. They probably won't do the survey again until they get recommendations out. They may do it every 2 years. They should report data to Nan. CPAC should invite Nan to meeting to discuss these things. It was also noted that these surveys take a tremendous amount of personal time by those involved. There was a request for support from the College to enable this work to continue systematically.

CSC Survey Report

Many CS/BU staff indicated that things were ok. Why the low response rate? Sometimes people who feel disenfranchised do not respond. They think no one will notice or care, so why bother.

One common problem is that staff don't know who anyone is anymore. An example is the changes in finance staff and payroll people. Most people don't know who to contact anymore. There is too much change accompanied by growing inefficiencies. The CSC has not made any recommendations at this point. The survey was only done very recently. The GC asked for a set of recommendations from CS/BU staff. Hopefully they can come back to the GC in May.

Centralization of services was identified as a problem on both CPAC & CSC surveys.

Agenda for year

We referred to Susan Wells' memo outlining possible agenda items for the remainder of this academic year. Following are possible agenda items for this and next year.

- University plans for the St. Paul Campus are outlined in FAC (Faculty Advisory Committee) minutes. Departments might be moved.
- At the College Assembly there will be an end of year update from Dean: budget, etc. The GC had scheduled a

separate assembly about budget which was postponed from March to April. It's been postponed again. Will it really happen? In the last week of April, first week of May we'll have the big assembly and recognition event. The Dean and the GC called the assembly. We agreed to have the assembly. We should go ahead even if Dean is unavailable. Jean Quam will talk to the Dean about this.

- Size and complexity of the New College need to be more explicitly framed. We need to move on from Old College thinking.
- College-wide communication. Communication with Dean about GC work. Connect is how some people get most of their information about the College.
- GC operation. Recommendations for enhancing the impact of the GC were made. One recommendation was that meeting once a month is not enough; probably can't even do all the work with SWGs (small working groups) between meetings. Meeting more often is a problem, but maybe subcommittees would help. We have to make sure structure happens early on. Budget and compact information in the early fall! Plan agenda early so we get what we need in time to make a difference.
- The GC needs to be informed when work groups are formed. We might want to place people on these. SWG's are on the web, but not all of them. We need to get them all up there.
- From Chair Wells' memo: The topics for discussion in the GC can be proposed by members or by the Dean. Generally they will focus on five major issues: (1) College policies (including for example, space, HR, merit reviews among other things), (2) budget and compact, including for example, revenue streams, expectations of the college and of the units, current fiscal status, etc., (3) current business of the CEHD work groups/task forces, (4) concerns or questions brought to the GC by constituents and (5) the progress of the implementation and the annual findings of the 10-S/M3 review.
- Schedule of major events – when are things like the compact due? Having minutes from administration meetings would be helpful, but they don't have minutes. Much is confidential, so it would have to be removed. The GC is asking that the Dean make recommendations about how to deal with this issue.

Does GC chair need more help? There was a suggestion of time support for the chair, but the chair said that she would prefer that staffing support be increased as much as possible.

Suggestions for the April 16 meeting: a review of current policies under discussion with any questions/input regarding those that are still to be decided (this should include a mailing to GC members prior to the meeting giving any updates from the appropriate work groups/task forces); this may include updates on any current restructuring such as that in IT and the development of the College's policy manual.

The following were noted in response to the suggested agenda.

- St. Paul Campus Report
- Ryan Warren's work on a policy manual
- 10-S M3 Report
- Communication
- Centralization

Senior Associate Dean Jean Quam represented Dean Bailey at this GC meeting. She answered questions from GC members.

The President asked that the Dean go to Johannesburg, South Africa. The College's fiscal officer is going to appear on a panel there about College finances. Her travel was partly paid by the College.

Discussion about current news in the College:

Q. Has the Provost taken over the budget?

A. No. Lincoln Kallsen has been loaned to us to work on it.

Q. What changes can we make to balance the budget?

A. Tentative budget out to 2012. This gives us time.

We may slow down hiring.

The College administration hopes that natural transitions will help – people leaving or retiring.

Q. What is the status of the program review?

A. Mary and Jean reviewed them in the fall (07).

They looked at numbers, and gave data and recommendations to Dean in December.

Q. Teaching loads – Are we going to have standards?

A. There are no faculty who are not teaching or carrying a full load when all work is considered.

Other questions included requests for news on the Work Groups –

A. Work load (not yet meeting). Indirect costs (done – Dave Johnson shared it – should be put on web).

GC recommendation

The indirect costs should be in the Insider, as should the IT move.

CEHD Governing Council - April 16, 2008

Present: Susan Wells, Cryss Brunner, Michael Harwell, Marlene Stum, Xiaojia Ge, Diane Wiese-Bjornstal, Irene Duranczyk, Sasha Ardichvili, Teri Wallace, Jane Gilles, Kristeen Bullwinkle, Becky Rapport, Dan Sagisser, Debra Haessly, Michelle Ingram, Kristen Kangas, Cheryl Morgan, Associate Dean Mary Bents (for Dean Bailey)

Review and approve minutes from March 19 meeting, correct February minutes

The February minutes were corrected by replacing the second-to-last paragraph with the following. Assuming the amendment will pass and staggered terms will begin with Fall 2008, and moving to prevent the entire turnover of the GC, Chair Wells presented her randomly chosen list of current representatives who will serve one additional year without needing to be re-elected. One year units are Educational Policy & Administration, Educational Psychology, Family Social Science, Institute of Child Development, and School of Social Work. The one year units will have an election this year for two year terms to begin in Fall 2008. The remaining units, including the Center representative, will serve a second year before there is another election. This will mean that each year different units will be voting on their unit faculty and center representation. After discussion about whether this was advisable, the scenario was put forward as a second proposal to be voted on at the same time as the first proposed amendment. The GC approved adding this to the ballot. With this correction the February 20 minutes were approved and will replace the current version of minutes posted on the website.

March minutes approved with these corrections: 1) the addition of Jill Trites' last name on page 2; 2) to the paragraph on p. 3 beginning "Does GC chair ... " the addition of the following sentence – There was a suggestion of time support for the chair (in the form of a buyout), but the chair said that staffing support should be increased as much as possible.

Results of voting on the 2 proposals.

Cheryl Morgan will send an email to the College with the results of voting and clarification of which representatives continue for another year and which units must have elections this spring. She will also remind people that the GC is representative and must be elected.

Student retention/graduation data (Associate Dean Mary Bents).

As a new College in Fall 2006, we needed to start tracking our students. The small box at the top of the sheet (handout) labeled "2008 Provost Report" is freshmen who registered in our college. Associate Dean Bents reviewed admit data, enroll data, and retention rate data for these same students. One thing that will be a change for us will be Postsecondary Teaching & Learning. Those students were admitted into General Studies. Eighty percent of the students started in CEHD fall 06 and continued in 07. Our goal is to increase this percentage. The office of student services is creating many benchmarks to track the students. In Fall 08 we will have 230 freshmen students admitted into our majors. We will have another 200 students in the Access to Success (ATS) program in CEHD. There will also be 250 ATS in CLA and 25 ATS in CFANS. These students would formerly have been admitted to General College. The Regents have set a goal of 4-year undergrad graduation rate at 60%, 5-yr at 75%, and 6 year at 80%. The retention rate is based on freshman admission (typically-aged and full-time). They have been improving, but we need to continue to do better. The longer students take, the more resources they use to get through (our resources as well as theirs). The current distribution of students in CEHD degree programs is as follows: 40% undergrads, 30% master's students, 20% doctoral students, and 10% non-degree (certificate, additional licensure, professional development). Currently there are two programs that admit freshmen – Youth Studies and Family Social Science.

We are also tracking Enrollment Diversity based on student self-reporting. In Fall 07 we were at 31%. At the grad level we've been steady at 11 or 12% students of color. We need to look at how we're attracting students and how we're serving them once they come here.

Regents are attending to undergrad student retention, but we also track how we do with grad level students. MEd students don't appear to complete degrees, because, it's believed, they leave for teaching jobs after they qualify for a license. Associate Dean Bents has brought this to the attention of the Curriculum Council. There are several CEHD work groups focused on undergraduate students. There's a committee with representatives from each department working on Welcome Week. It's brand new at the U, starts on the Wednesday before Labor Day. All 5,302 freshmen will be on campus (it's required). All of our 430 students will begin one of their classes that week. Another group has been a task force looking at college requirements. An example is the Carlson School requirement that all undergrads study abroad. An additional group is focused on College level honors programs. It seems like the number of students is going down. If we can admit earlier our numbers will go up. At the same time we are attending to undergrad numbers, the number of grad students went down. We're working to do projections of enrollments out to 2013. It appears that Fall 2008 will be our low point in terms of numbers but by 2012 we will have regained.

We have admitted 230 freshmen for fall 08 – plus 200 ATS. Of the ATS students, 50 will be Commanding English students – those who have been in the U.S. less than 7 years and for whom English is not a first language. They get supplemental instruction in some of the classes. One hundred students are part of TRIO – federally sponsored low-income, first generation, and other criteria. The final 50 of the ATS students are

hoping to enter one of the CEHD majors.

Access to Success is defined differently for each college. We've learned from PStL what works well. They will have learning communities, read the same book (An Ordinary Man – author is coming here in the fall) for a common experience, additional mentoring, additional support. We have philosophy that all students need support to make the transition. Access to Success students may be doing more (FYE course) and joining a learning community in spring.

Kristen Kangas asked where she as a senior can give feedback about what works and what is needed. Bents suggested she talk to Mark Bultmann or Jennifer Engler. In discussing time to graduation, Wells asked if availability of courses was a problem. The students thought this was an issue. Some required courses are not offered very often and have only 20 or 30 seats available. In SW they have a problem with having enough faculty to teach the courses. One member questioned whether there have been administrative work groups talking about building the student body and at the same time needing more faculty instructors. Bents replied they track whether there is growth or decline in areas and try to react. We have one program that's very popular and has only one faculty member (BME). The U has set a limit at 5300 undergrad admissions. There is no cap on transfer students – whether internal or outside transfers. While we talk about the undergrads, we have to work on retaining the grad students, too.

Future agenda for the Governing Council.

Other items on the agenda are the master plan for St. Paul. We also have the 10-S discussion for next time. And we'll want an update from Dean Bailey and the Survey follow-up and recommendations. We will invite the chairs of CSC and CPAC to return to GC with recommendations. We will ask for information on the recommendations before meeting in writing. Other things on our minds are getting updates about things around the College.

Developing an information document for future Governing Councils (Susan Wells).

We had also talked about preparing an information document for ongoing GC groups for people who come after us. We have taken care of one piece of that with the people who will continue next year. The constitution is so broad, what are responsibilities, what are duties of chair (and possible co-chair)? We will write up guidelines (not rules) for the next group. It should be more accessible language, no need to read a big packet – plain and frank. We will have a summary that's easy to read, with more detail behind it. Professor Wells is willing to draft this if people tell her what to put in it – communications, responsibilities, other things in her memo. We could outline it here and she'll send us a draft. Purpose, membership, referencing the constitution – only need an executive summary – just a couple of pages (no more than 6). Have it follow the academic year, so it's timely and based on academic calendar. Earlier in the year we had questions about the budget. How about more info before people come on the GC?

Along with having an identity, purpose and goal crisis, we've been stymied by building a relationship with the administration that will help us go forward together. We have wanted to do that but are at a loss about how to go about it effectively. It will be up to members next year to make sure these things happen. It isn't just the responsibility of the dean or the associate dean or the chair or the members, but if we talk about what are the responsibilities of these various people, it would help next year.

One recommendation for next year is that there be a small working group that looks at whether changes are needed in the constitution and what they might be. Another recommendation is to implement the March memo. Talk about the roles of people. WHRE & EdPA are being merged effective Fall 2009. EdPA faculty were told they could talk about it. This brings up confidentiality. This needs to be in the document. We need two types of information – one involves confidentiality, the other is public information. This WHRE & EdPA info may be about timing.

Our expectations of one another, chair, co-chair, dean, members. Roles established for chair, dean, members.

One suggestion was, if we have a vice chair, then the vice chair could move into the chair position after one year. Another idea was to select the chair in the spring and begin meeting with the dean. If you don't elect in spring, then the new chair starts from scratch in fall with no preparation.

We also need to look back at minutes to see where we asked for information and make that list and assign specific members to go get the information. The agenda for the year will be determined by a fixed schedule of selected topics such as the budget and compact along with more topical subjects. The dean may bring items for discussion and we may ask for information. As members we can assign individuals to follow up on this in a timely manner. The chair will convene meetings, work with group to set agendas, communicate with dean and associate deans to get agenda items. Communication will help others understand how they can work with us. A glossary would be helpful, acronyms, neighborhood and block breakdown. Other responsibilities of the vice chair, dean, members? Talk about those that are structural changes and others than are more mundane and procedural. The dean does not always need to be here, having the associate deans at different times is also good. We would like to hear from the research associate dean and others.

Responsibilities of members – What are they? How to get action going rather than waiting for it to happen? We should be a two-way venue for constituencies. They get info from us, but we bring info from them to the group. We should send a representative if we can't come and it should be the same person each time.

Add alternates to the listserv. The alternate for each group represented should be the same person throughout the academic year.

How about doing things? As members we have more responsibility than we've been taking this year. Members

should be proactive. It's important to bring information to the meeting (as Michael mentioned concerns about budget, etc.), so we can do some problem solving or at least make recommendations about what kinds of things might need to be paid attention to. We can make recommendations and expect that we hear back. The GC should identify at least one member responsible for tracking each major topic throughout the year. If there's one thing we determine to focus on and act on, we would be more visible to our constituents. This is critical to happen very early in the fall. We could start with CSC and CPAC surveys. Put this on agenda for next meeting – allow time at end of meeting to identify the issue to focus on for early next year. Write to us about ideas if you have thoughts ahead of time. Is there a way to elect next year's chair this spring? It isn't in the constitution that way. How should we do this? What structure, what procedure?

Election of the Chair. Do we want to agree to structure of having the chair elected in the spring? It will be for this year only. In future years, we'll elect vice chair in the fall. This year's group will vote for next year? That's not fair. Or people who are elected this spring could vote and elect the chair in the spring? We have to have some procedures and we can establish them without changing the constitution. The issue is not whether we have a vice chair or not. Maybe from start members should be briefed about what committee's charge was. Have vice chair be the alternate for the chair and help the chair do the work. We could have that happen after the spring elections – have the new membership vote on chair and vice chair. Whoever chairs should have experience on the GC, should vote in spring time so that the person starts immediately. We should establish a subcommittee to set up guidelines for this process.
