

Coordinating Team Meeting

October 25, 2012

Present: Bailer, Baszile, Bazeley, Buller, Bush, Callahan (co-chair), Chapin, Creamer, Dahlstrom, Dowdle, Faimon, Haynes, Huang, Kiper (co-chair), Paxton, Pickerill, Robinson, Stefanski, Womack-Smith, Zhou

Summaries from each Target Goal Team (TGT):

TGT 4 summary: They had disparate pieces -> one document; worked on vision statement as bullet points; Struggling with developing metrics; to date, metrics are a laundry list; They recommended conducting surveys regarding perceptions among different constituents to develop a baseline; they may need that to further develop metrics.

Questions/Discussion:

- What are things we've been unable to do because our organizational structure is fixed? What matters? Whose perceptions matter? Discussion followed that overall efficiency can be determined by data; also need to develop effectiveness; If we are very effective in accomplishing other target goals, then this goal is achieved;
- Leadership sets the tone - it can allow transformational thinking to come forward or be a barrier to it.
- Perception matters - it drives behavior; survey instrument has to be designed to capture sufficient information to make decisions; Need to understand and identify the problems and where they exist; Create a baseline; Measure current state and ask what it should be and minimize the gap; Think about student:faculty ratio, student:employer ratio and faculty:staff ratio; Those parameters need to be determined.
- Hard part is what is the institution going to look like? Currently it is based mostly what we offer on the input side, but we need to move to being more outcome based, i.e. what we produce; Outcome measures may be imposed on us and defined for us, e.g. from gov't. Need vision and then metrics.
- They were asked which objective leads to dissolving silos? Not clear
- Suggested meeting with other chairs to coordinate

TGT summary 5: They discussed aspiration statement and objectives and how we convey them to constituents; defining coordinating = contentious, some thought of it as storage house, others as control; current draft hadn't been vetted to whole group; Aspirational statement has changed with more focus on actions; They want to hear what other groups are doing; They asked what is innovation? Is it something MU hasn't done before or is it something that no one has done before. Representatives of TGT3 agreed - There are so many things MU isn't doing, it isn't innovative.

Questions/Discussions:

- Looking for more transformative goals, not so much innovation; Nothing transformative about how we interact with alum; there are probably too many specifics in the action steps; Perhaps more examples, e.g. University standards;
- Objectives should be to "create" not "affirm";
- Difficult to come up with action steps; can come up with a metric, which may have to change;
- Can we bring what we are doing into the 21st century, e.g. how to telecommute; leverage emerging technology to further student training;
- NOTE: there needs to be metrics within the TGT; setting very high expectations within TG3 and 5 will force creativity - it will require a different kind of thinking;

TGT1 Summary: Came to conclusion they were thinking incrementally so they thought about trajectories instead; Legacy Industry and disruptive innovation were 2 phrases that caught their attention; Also experiential learning - how partnerships become more critical; Relevancy and nimbleness = 2 other concepts; They created 3 scenarios for the future: currently in Miami 1.0; 1.5 = incremental; 2.0 = major release; 3.0 = vapor ware;

Questions/Discussion:

- Missing flexibility; shortening time is not necessarily => value;
- Remember diverse students;
- General education requirements need to be addressed; size/scale, especially with respect to faculty role;
- Create space for innovation - and need time
- Consider regional campuses
- Student leadership and residential experience components are missing
- The a la carte analogy, i.e. that students will select what they want/need from a "buffet" of courses, but they need help picking what you need
- Three scenarios were excellent because it helps to understand what is incremental and what is transformative; the CT would like to see TGT 1 make choices about where we'll be. What is value proposition at MU?

TGT2 Summary: New objective added; how will it ensure flexibility, innovation, e.g. waivers may encourage people to stay in a job even if it is not a good fit; consider flexibility in professional development; transformation is at the intersection of these goals and it is hard as individual teams to reach the intersection; They suggested we be revolutionary - throw out the time line and start thinking how we think about this whole thing differently.

Questions/Discussion:

- Push concept of work day; there is a feeling that the institution does not trust employees to do their work, but we need measures to show whether or not they are being productive;
- Concerned about faculty career ladders;
- Are GA considered to be employees?
- Dissolve silos by educating people about what others are doing.
- Break the barriers between faculty and staff;

TGT3 Summary: They feel like they are inching along; so many things MU hasn't done; we need a narrative/context - emphasize trends that address diversity of college bound population and the fact that they will be less well prepared ; also consider how technology changes the landscape AND we

have been focused on doing the "morally right thing to do", but change is happening; World is changing and problems more complex - need cognitive diversity and that will help problem solving; They took information from Selingo session and a session with Foster; They also sent (Jerome) Conley, (Cheryl) Young and (Ron) Scott to AAC&U conference; They think they are going to be at the intersection of other teams; all of this could drop when Fisher case is decided by Supreme Court - numbers could be eliminated; They think we should, at least, reflect national diversity; need to rethink everything, e.g. admission standards, marketing; and make sure they are successful here;

Questions/Discussion:

- Need to consider diversity in the learning experience;
- Importance of cross course and co-curricular experiences;
- Make this goal part of our values - create a culture where the administration is not your worst nightmare if you step out of line, your peers will be;
- Suggestion - look at MU value statement and update it;
- Objective 5 - important; need a diverse population other than US
- Who we recruit (students) is an issue; we need to appreciate diversity part of the admission process; Recruit students who will contribute to campus. Create Living Learning Communities more intentionally; MU could have a mardi gras week - celebrate difference, e.g. wear masks; learn a second language
- Need cultural competence for students/staff; opportunity for staff to participate
- Need more emphasis on global;