

MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
RETREAT NOTES
SEPTEMBER 17-18, 2013

Present: Chair Clarence Hightower, Trustees Ann Anaya, Margaret Anderson Kelliher, Duane Benson, Alexander Cirillo, Cheryl Dickson, Dawn Erlandson, Philip Krinkie, Alfredo Oliveira, David Paskach, Maria Peluso, Thomas Renier, Elise Ristau, Louise Sundin, Michael Vekich and Chancellor Steven Rosenstone

Board of Trustees Retreat

The retreat was held at Ruttger's Bay Lake Lodge, Deerwood, Minnesota.

Welcome and Introductions

Chair Clarence Hightower welcomed everyone at 1:30 p.m. on September 17, 2013. He also introduced Trustee Elise Ristau whom Governor Mark Dayton appointed as the state university student representative effective September 1, 2013.

Chair Hightower reviewed the agenda. Session one is on board governance and the roles and responsibilities of the board. It includes a review the board's "Protocol for Working Together" document that was developed at last year's retreat. The board will also hear a summary of the results of the self-assessment survey. The objective for this session is for members to have a candid discussion on how the board is doing and how the board can become even more effective in its governance role.

The second session is on the draft "Charting the Future Report," specifically the guiding principle and recommendations. The board will consider:

- if the guiding principle is the right direction;
- if the six recommendations are the right ones, and
- provide input on the narrative and format for the final document.

The last session is a review of a draft of the board and committee workplans for the coming year. Chair Hightower added that this is the first time that the board will see a complete picture of anticipated agenda items.

Chair Hightower acknowledged the members of the public that are here today as observers. He added that there will not be any time for public comment during the retreat.

Chair Hightower introduced Dr. Terrence MacTaggart, the retreat facilitator. He is a well-known higher education leader and scholar, with deep Minnesota ties. Earlier in his career, he was the chancellor of the Minnesota State University System. He also served twice as the chancellor of the University of Maine System. He has consulted with many boards and their chancellors and facilitated numerous board retreats. Dr. MacTaggart has a doctorate and master's degree in English Literature from Saint Louis University, a Master of Business Administration from St.

Cloud State University, an honorary doctor of law degree from the American College of Greece and membership in Phi Beta Kappa.

Dr. MacTaggart commented that nearly all higher education systems and institutions across the nation are grappling with the same issues as Minnesota State Colleges and Universities. He added however that few have developed a change program as purposeful, transparent, collaborative, and results-oriented as MnSCU's. The system has directly addressed the big issues with the work of the Strategic Workgroups and the recommendations in the draft report called "Charting the Future." He also complimented the board on its "Protocol for Working Together" which he described as a triumph of simple language.

Session I: Role of the Board, Review Protocol for Working Together and Board Self-Assessment

Dr. MacTaggart reviewed the characteristics of high performing boards by drawing a diagram of a triangle. At the bottom are good boards that focus on fiduciary responsibilities along with the institution's reputation, integrity, risk and brand. Better boards are in the middle and they add relationships, connections and communications to the fiduciary responsibilities. The best boards that are at the top of the triangle do all of the above plus they work with the chancellor to lead change. Dr. MacTaggart commented that it takes courage to lead change

There was a discussion about the role of the chancellor versus the role of the board and how to balance the relationship between them. The board's leadership role is in setting the vision and strategic direction with sound governance, policy and oversight. The chancellor is the chief executive officer who carries out the board's vision. Some tensions are natural and healthy in good board and CEO relations.

Dr. MacTaggart referred to several points in the document "How Boards Contribute to Positive Change (and how they don't)." Boards can contribute intellectual capital, perspective, and good judgment by acting as "thought partners" with the chancellor and engaging in upstream discussions of major strategies, initiatives and problems. Pitfalls for boards to avoid include, "confusing intellectual capital and relationships with governing authority and becoming an operating instead of a governing board."

Chancellor Rosenstone commented that strategic discussions occur during committee meetings and meetings of the entire board. Also, joint committee meetings are scheduled when the topic warrants them. He continued that committees can develop specialization in their areas because they can work in a deeper fashion. Trustee Dickson noted that concurrent meetings may allow more time for deeper discussions. She added that it would be good to have sufficient time for the committees to do their work. Trustee Oliveira added that he thought student engagement and participation could be improved.

Chancellor Rosenstone thanked the board for the discussion on the relationship issue. He added that he was pleased to hear endorsement of concurrent meetings.

Review of Protocol for Working Together

Dr. MacTaggart facilitated a discussion on the board's "Protocol for Working Together." The

trustees remain supportive of the document. They discussed adding a vision statement written by the chair and the chancellor. Regarding "Board Members' Expectations of Each Other." Trustee Anderson Kelliher commented that the board could do more to celebrate student success. Trustees also discussed who speaks for the board. Chair Hightower commented that the official spokesperson is the chair of the board or his designee.

Review of Results of Board Self-Assessment

Dr. MacTaggart summarized the board self-assessment results. Trustees expressed that there have been significant accomplishments under Chancellor Rosenstone's leadership. The accomplishments included: the Strategic Framework, the Strategic Workgroups and their draft report, clean audits, and receiving additional resources from the legislature and the governor.

Trustees felt that the following areas could be improved: clarifying the role of the board, linking governance and vision, and balancing the allocation of time in meetings between listening, discussing and deciding. The trustees would like to be engaged earlier on important matters. Other areas that were mentioned for improvement were board development, support for the system's agenda after a decision has been made, and how to convey a sense of urgency about the challenges facing the system.

Discussion of the Results of the Board–Self Assessment

There was discussion about becoming more involved in the recruitment and selection process of board members. Chancellor Rosenstone commented that during the last round of the recruitment process, the board chair sent the governor a list of desired skills/characteristics.

Trustee Anderson Kelliher suggested that in the area of development, the board could occasionally bring in an outside expert on a topic of interest. Trustee Anaya suggested that an alignment of board development, communication, and branding could result in a recognition or awards gala, similar to the All-Skills USA event. Trustee Krinkie suggested inviting the chairs of the house and senate higher education committees to come to the board as a way to try to establish a different relationship with legislature.

Chair Hightower concluded the discussion at 5:10 pm by thanking everyone for their good participation. He reminded members that retreat would resume at 8:00 am the following day.

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Dr. MacTaggart welcomed everyone at 8:00 am. He explained that this session focuses on the "Strategic Framework" and the guiding principle, and the recommendations contained in the draft report "Charting the Future."

Session II: Guiding Principle and Recommendations in Charting the Future

Chair Hightower's Introduction

Chair Hightower remarked that this is the board's third retreat with Chancellor Rosenstone. Two years ago, as a new chancellor – barely 6 weeks on the job – he shared with us what he had learned from his 6-month, 4,000 mile listening tour to 29 campuses and communities across our state. Chancellor Rosenstone told us about the ways that Minnesota is counting on us:

- to open the doors of educational opportunity to all Minnesotans;
- to work with communities and businesses across the state to ensure that our graduates have the skills and capabilities needed for successful careers and for communities across our state to prosper; and
- to provide extremely high value at an affordable price.

He described some of the challenges our state and our colleges and universities were facing. The chancellor shared the ideas that he and the Leadership Council forged to clarify the direction we should all be heading and the commitments we should make. Discussion at our September 2011 retreat, throughout the fall, and the chancellor's consultation with students, faculty, and staff, led to the board's formal adoption of the Strategic Framework for Minnesota State Colleges and Universities in January 2012. It is comprised of three powerful commitments:

It affirms our commitment to providing access to an extraordinary education for all Minnesotans:

- to our faculty and staff providing the best education available in Minnesota, preparing graduates to lead in every sector of Minnesota's economy.
- to continuing to be the place of opportunity, making education accessible to all Minnesotans who seek a college, technical or university education; those who want to update their skills; and those who need to prepare for new careers.

It affirms our commitment to being the partner of choice to meet community and business needs across our state:

- to our colleges and universities being the partner of choice for businesses and communities across Minnesota to help them solve real-world problems and keep Minnesotans at the leading edge of their professions.
- to our faculty and staff enabling Minnesota to meet its need for a substantially better educated workforce.

It affirms our commitment to delivering to students, employers, communities, and taxpayers the highest value / most cost effective education in the state.

In addition to the Strategic Framework, Board Policy 3.36 Academic Programs was amended in November 2011. The second paragraph states:

The academic programs of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities should prepare graduates for work, life, and citizenship. Academic programs should create graduates who are creative, innovative, and able to respond with agility to new ideas, new technologies, and new global relationships. Graduates should be able to lead their professions and adapt to the multiple careers they will have over their lifetimes. Graduates should have the ability to think independently and critically; be able to resourcefully apply knowledge to new problems; proactively expect the unexpected, embrace change and be comfortable with ambiguity; and be able to communicate and work effectively across cultural and geographic boundaries.

The Strategic Framework and Board Policy 3.36 have provided clear direction to the work we have done over the past 2 years. The chancellor, the Leadership Council, as well as faculty and staff across the system have done great work to indeed move us forward. For example,

- Presidents, faculty and student-led "extraordinary education" discussions have led to innovative initiatives flourishing on our campus across the state.
- Learning outcomes have been developed for nearly every academic program.
- We have set aggressive goals and have begun to implement new initiatives for student access and success as well as student and staff diversity.
- In partnership with the Department of Education, we are taking the steps needed to better align secondary and post-secondary education, and we will have a study session this fall to update the board on this work.
- We have built the Campus Service Collaborative which is on track to delivering tens of millions of dollars of savings each year to our colleges and universities – dollars that can be reinvested in our academic programs and that can help protect affordability.
- We have implemented new strategies to increase retention and completion as well as ease transfer of credit.
- Through our state-wide workforce listening sessions and our partnership with the Itasca Project, we are aligning our academic programs with workforce needs to ensure that our graduates are prepared for successful careers in every sector of Minnesota's economy. We will have a board study session on this as well this fall.
- We have developed and deployed institutional performance metrics to track our progress. These metrics will be discussed again this fall as we consider updating the board's accountability dashboard.

In short, we should be proud of all that we have accomplished together over the past two years. We face some huge challenges that threaten our ability to deliver on the commitments in the Strategic Framework and in Board Policy 3.36. At last year's retreat, we discussed the nine "briefs" that the chancellor and the cabinet prepared that described the big challenges we face:

- Long-term population trends in which a larger share of Minnesotans are moving to a handful of metropolitan areas.
- Dramatic growth in the diversity of the students we must serve.
- Changes in technology that provide new opportunities for how students can learn, how we can teach and support their learning, and for how we can work together.
- The changing nature of work and changes in what it means to be well prepared for jobs and careers.
- The growing need for us to demonstrate the capabilities of our graduates.
- Increased competition that affects our enrollments in degree programs, in customized training, and continuing education.
- Funding shifts that threaten quality, access, and affordability.

As Chancellor Rosenstone has said repeatedly since our first retreat two years ago, the current way of doing business is unsustainable. Business as usual won't allow our colleges and universities to meet the critical challenges they face. The challenges threaten our ability to deliver on the commitments in the Strategic Framework and in Board Policy 3.36. As the chancellor stated two years ago, "the greatest risk we face is the risk of business as usual." He also challenged us two years ago to use the years ahead as "the moment to put aside old

assumptions and, in the words of Richard Florida, ‘build the infrastructure of the future, not just patch up that of the past.’”

So, to meet these challenges we need to

- think differently,
- think bigger,
- work together in new ways,
- reach farther, and
- play smarter.

The current way of doing things is unsustainable. Simply continuing to cut budgets and try to grow revenue is important, but it is not sufficient. We also need to redesign the way we do things. Last November, the chancellor asked three workgroups to tackle a set of questions and develop strategies for addressing our challenges. Those questions appear on pp. 27-29 of the draft report, "Charting the Future." It represents the best judgment of 46 students, faculty, staff, presidents, and board members to identify the strategies to address the questions posed about how to meet the challenges we face. Our task this morning is to give feedback on whether the draft guiding principle and the six draft recommendations help address those challenges.

In charging the workgroups, the chancellor did not put on the table our core value of providing an opportunity for all Minnesotans to create a better future for themselves, for their families, and for their communities. The Strategic Framework and Board Policy 3.36 are not on the table. These are rock solid commitments that were not turned over to the workgroups for debate. On the table are the strategies we should pursue to address the challenges that we must meet to enable us to deliver on the Strategic Framework and on the kind of education described in Board Policy 3.36. Put differently, the draft report is not about who we are, or the kind of education we are committed to providing, or who we are committed to serving. It’s about how we should do some things to enable us to deliver on our commitments.

So, the question before us today is whether the guiding principle and the recommendations are strategies that help us move in the right direction. If not, how should the draft recommendations be improved? We need to keep in mind as well that the report was not designed to describe or prescribe everything we do – it is an answer to a fairly discrete set of questions that arise from the challenges we must address.

Finally, the draft report offers strategic directions, not a detailed implementation plan. That is by design. First we must decide on the strategies, and then turn to the specifics of implementation. Chancellor Rosenstone will begin to work with Leadership Council on an implementation plan once this phase of the work is completed. So, here are the steps ahead.

Today is part of a broader consultation process.

- Chancellor Rosenstone has communicated with all students, faculty, and staff encouraging them to read the draft report and offer feedback and suggestions.
- Leadership Council has discussed the draft report on two occasions and most presidents have led discussions about the report on their campuses.

- The chancellor has met with student and faculty leadership; consultation with students and each bargaining unit will continue.
- Cabinet members have consulted with their campus-level leads (e.g. CIOs, CHROs, CAOs, advancement leads).

The strategic workgroups will meet on three occasions in October to review the feedback and discuss a revised draft. Feedback from our discussion today will be shared with the workgroups. The final report will be presented at the November rather than October meeting of the Board of Trustees to provide additional time for workgroup deliberation in October. If the board endorses the final recommendations in November, Chancellor Rosenstone will bring to our January board meeting a draft of a detailed, multi-year implementation plan.

Chair Hightower acknowledged and introduced the presidents and members of the chancellor's cabinet who were present for the discussion: the Leadership Council Executive Committee: Presidents Earl Potter (chair), Ron Anderson, Larry Lundblad, and Edna Szymanski; two presidents who served as conveners for the workgroups, Presidents Scott Olson and Joe Opatz; and Cabinet members: Vice Chancellors Mark Carlson, Michael Dougherty, Laura King, John O'Brien, and Managing Director Colin Dougherty. Chancellor Rosenstone introduced Karen Hynick, who serves as the chancellor's fellow and has helped shepherd the work of the workgroups. She will take notes so that our suggestions can be shared with the workgroups.

Chair Hightower encouraged the trustees to stay at the level of overall strategy and not get bogged down in the thousands of details that each strategy will necessarily entail. Are the draft guiding principle and the draft recommendations useful strategies for addressing the questions that were raised for meeting the challenges we face and for delivering on the commitments that we have made? In evaluating the draft report and recommendations, questions to consider are:

- Is it better for students and the education they receive?
- Does it advance our partnerships with businesses and communities?
- Does it improve our stewardship of resources?
- Is it fair to our employees?
- Does it help address challenges we face?

Chair Hightower said that the moment we are facing as a board is, in many respects, at least as challenging as the moment that our predecessors faced when the Board of Trustees first met in July 1995. We are stewards on behalf of the people of Minnesota and it is our responsibility to ensure that our system of colleges and universities delivers on its full promise. Minnesota is counting on us. We either shape our future or it will shape us. The Alan Kay quotation on the cover of the draft report puts it nicely: "The best way to predict the future is to invent it."

Leadership Council Comments

Earl Potter, president, St. Cloud State University, commented that Chair Hightower has done an excellent process of bringing this forward. The Leadership Council is fully committed to the recommendations and the three commitments, the centrality, in the Strategic Framework. The Leadership Council has considered this for many months. They met in a retreat last week and the

results are presented in a memo to the board that was distributed earlier. The memo included revisions to the guiding principle and five of the six strategic recommendations.

President Potter continued that the presidents quickly wanted to get down to the details. It took some discipline to stay at the high level which meant that some questions went unanswered. The hunger for detail was set aside, and we were able to focus on the six recommendations. The Leadership Council is nearly unanimous in the recommendations. The conversation was deep. An example is the recommendation of a systemwide academic plan. President Potter said that he disagrees – we need a plan, but it should be adaptable to the communities that are served by the system’s colleges and universities. This shifts the focus to capacity and performance in serving Minnesota. Each recommendation reflects the conversations we had last week.

Discussion

Before opening up the floor for discussion, Dr. MacTaggart encouraged everyone to:

- First seek to understand;
- Focus on ideas/objectives;
- Avoid detailed word smithing; and
- Respect process.

Guiding Principle

Dr. MacTaggart read the revised guiding principle:

Transform Minnesota State Colleges and Universities to better serve students, our community partners and our state by forging deeper collaborations among our colleges, universities, and system office to maximize our collective strengths, resources, and talents of our faculty and staff.

In providing the context for the guiding principle, President Potter explained that each president is most concerned about advancing his / her college and university. He added that there needs to be a way to speak to each other differently, to engage as a learning community for a purpose. One example is to share what is not working well along with things that are working well.

The principle underscores the commitment to working as a team. The Leadership Council strongly supports the guiding principle and six recommendations with additional suggestions of ways to improve /enhance each recommendation moving forward.

Chair Hightower asked if there was a substantive difference between the guiding principle that the board saw in June compared to the revised one in the memo? President Potter replied that there is no substantive change in the guiding principle.

Strategic Direction #1:

Strengthen our education programs through greater coordination and collaboration among our colleges and universities in academic planning, course development and delivery, and student support services.

Chancellor Rosenstone commented that most of the dollars spent on marketing are to compete among ourselves; not in competition with the other colleges. This direction is a change in philosophy and communication.

President Lundblad noted that the focus is on collaboration, but until the allocation framework and the reward structures change he cannot collaborate until he sees where this is going and what it will mean for his college.

Trustee Benson proposed listing the obstacles that are in place that prevent collaboration. As one of the authors of the enabling legislation, creating a statewide system with self-autonomy created an obstacle at the outset. He suggested that the board may want to change the legislation.

President Szymanski added that she has benefited from being part of a system and having colleagues to consult with when she has questions. She has collaborated with President Potter, and they have chosen to do a better job with each other so that the students are able to succeed. President Opatz agreed that the recommendations require a different way of thinking. There are challenges in the metro area with the technical and community colleges. Strategic direction number six (redesign of the system's financial and administrative models) is an area where he felt that the board can bring perspectives.

Trustee Renier expressed that during his ten years on the board, the system has been cutting, cutting, cutting. Collaboration and entrepreneurial are in conflict – the system needs a different way to incent. Chancellor Rosenstone responded that campuses will be stronger with collaboration.

Trustee Anaya compared the systems 31 institutions to the United States. Each state has its own identity and each one is proud to be a part of the United States. The states are independent but there is buy-in for overall participation to the country. She suggested looking at the services we provide, our identity, and how we are representing the institutions to advance the buy-in.

President Olson explained that over the years the board has been concerned with program closures and openings. One example is that Minnesota State University, Mankato and St. Cloud State University were both looking at closing their aviation programs at the same time. They collaborated and a program remains.

Trustee Sundin acknowledged that the board has been concerned about program closures and openings. She asked if there are other institutions that have different funding mechanisms to foster student success besides head count.

Trustee Dickson complimented Chancellor Rosenstone and President Potter on the memo. The preamble is done well and was needed. She continued that two of her concerns that she shared with the chancellor are things that are buried in the report. They are culture change and the bargaining units, who are our partners. These two things are where the board needs to say what we can do to help make things happen.

Trustee Anderson Kelliher commented that she also appreciated the memo. What makes the best lasting change in systems like ours is self-determination. It is a founding core principle of what we do. Strategic Recommendation #3 does not allow self-determination. We are being very prescriptive. We will get more cultural, lasting change that will stick if we allow it to come up over the overall framework. Trustee Cirillo added that when people collaborate it usually is to

win. He cited 3M and its various divisions as an example. Each division is differentiated but has a place in the company. The company makes the divisions whole.

Trustee Erlandson suggested thinking a little bit outside of the traditional model. What if there is no money. If we do not work together, the outside is going to beat us. Managing the system's physical assets needs to be included along with working with employers and communities.

Trustee Krinkie noted that 3M sells off and buys units as markets and system change. MnSCU has not closed any of its institutions. Serving students and supplying services for them is a different dynamic. We need to do more to understand the market and from where our students are coming from. Trustee Sundin added that a technology plan should be integral and considered along with the academic and facility plans.

Strategic Direction #2: *Certify the competencies our graduates have mastered.*

President Potter explained how the system certifies the level of competency of our students. The first layer is accountability. We are engaged as a system with nine partners developed by university faculty across the country. The system uses the College Learning Assessment (CLA). During discussion, trustees commented that we need to better integrate and link this recommendation to Board Policy 3.36 Academic Programs and continuous improvement.

Chancellor Rosenstone reminded the trustees of the study session last May on enterprise risk management. MnSCU should define the standards for our graduates or someone else will do it for us. Concern about brand, market share and going after students we will be able to demonstrate capabilities of our students. The trustees supported this direction.

Strategic Direction #3: *Eliminate the gaps in access and education success for students who have been traditionally underserved by higher education.*

President Potter commented that the language is somewhat ambiguous. He added that one thing the board could do to help with this direction is to work with P-20 and in the community with the community-success models. The system is not funded to do this and it is expensive. The allocation model funds enrollments. Chancellor Rosenstone noted that given the demographic changes in Minnesota, the system has to do more for traditionally underrepresented students. One step is to recruit and retain a more diverse faculty and staff.

Trustee Erlandson shared that she used to serve on the foundation board of Minneapolis Community and Technical College. Its focus is on access because they found that there are two key barriers for access for individuals who do not have a familial perspective – transportation and childcare issues, etc. The bullets under this direction should include services that support access, including connecting parents to educational opportunities. Best practices could be shared and replicated at other institutions. Trustee Sundin commented that she liked the description in the original document better than this one. She would like to see multi-generational opportunities so that entire families could go to school together. Trustees expressed that the language in this direction could be more aspirational.

Strategic Direction #4: *Collaborate to deliver an excellent, comprehensive, cost-effective statewide approach to online, interactive, learner adaptive instructional technologies and student support services.*

President Potter commented that the system does not need 31 different approaches to delivering online courses. Chancellor Rosenstone added that this direction fundamentally speaks to quality. We have to be really good at delivering learner adaptive instructional technologies. Vice Chancellor King added that we need to address the technical barriers so students can take multiple courses at different institutions. The workgroups did not recommend MOOC's. The trustees supported this direction.

Strategic Direction #5:

Collaborate to deliver innovative, comprehensive workplace solutions to employers across our state.

President Potter explained that continuing education and customized training have been a focus of the two-year colleges. These programs can be expanded in new markets across the system through collaboration. Trustee Sundin commented that the trustees would like to see reports on these programs to understand where we are today. The trustees supported this direction.

Strategic Direction #6:

Redesign the system's financial and administrative models to align with the objectives in the strategic framework and the strategic priorities recommended above.

President Potter noted that there is a philosophical difference between funding what we do from incenting to bringing change. We have to get this right in order to accomplish the objectives. Chancellor Rosenstone noted that the Leadership Council talked about governance. Vice Chancellor King added that the Leadership Council had a governance discussion on the decision-making model; how we negotiate labor contracts, etc. The role of the board question asked earlier by Chair Hightower asked is right...governance needs to be a part of this.

Trustee Oliveira commented that while all the focus is on internal, we are forgetting to look at the outside and our image. Dr. MacTaggart asked if the group agrees to add one more recommendation about making this more external? Chancellor Rosenstone added that the first thing to hear from the board is that we are a team and not 31 ships passing in the night. Trustee Erlandson commented that the recommendation to make this more external would tell our story.

Trustee Paskach inquired how integrated will the system be as the recommendations unfold? What will this look like to students? What will they see when they tap in? Chancellor Rosenstone commented that as he read the recommendations for the first time, he asked himself if this would be better for students. President Potter commented that there is a relationship with students. Learning in a relationship teaches differently than in an online course. He prefers hybrid courses.

Concluding the discussion, Dr. MacTaggart commented that his sense of the feedback on the recommendations in the draft report is that this is a system where people want to work together to achieve them. Chair Hightower added that this has been a good conversation and that it will be

shared with the Strategic Workgroups who have more work to do before they come back to us in November with their final report.

Dr. MacTaggart reviewed a document “Why Transformation Efforts Fail,” by John P. Kotter, a professor at Harvard Business School. The following reasons apply equally to colleges and universities:

- Not establishing a great enough sense of urgency;
- Not creating a powerful enough guiding coalition;
- Lacking a vision;
- Under-communicating the vision by a factor of 10;
- Not removing obstacles to the new vision;
- Not systematically planning for and creating short-term wins;
- Declaring victory too soon; and
- Not anchoring changes in the institution’s culture.

Dr. MacTaggart thanked the board and the chancellor for the opportunity to facilitate the retreat. The trustees and chancellor thanked Dr. MacTaggart for his service.

Session III: Board and Committee Workplans for FY2014

Chair Hightower explained that draft board and committee workplans for FY2014 is subject to change as it lists only what is currently anticipated at this time.

Chancellor Rosenstone reviewed three study sessions that were slated for the board in October – the final report from the Strategic Workgroups, an update on the transition from secondary to post-secondary education, and the Board of Trustees Accountability Dashboard. Following discussion, the study session on the accountability dashboard was moved to January. Chair Hightower reviewed the Executive Committee’s schedule which listed meetings in October, March, and May. Trustee Dickson suggested adding an Executive Committee meeting in January.

The committee chairs briefly reviewed their agenda items. Trustee Vekich and Vice Chancellor King reviewed the agenda items for the Finance and Facilities Committee. Trustee Renier and Vice Chancellor Carlson reviewed the agenda items for the Human Resources Committee. Trustee Sundin requested adding a review of international students and health insurance coverage. Vice Chancellor King explained that the system is monitoring possible revisions as the federal health care regulations mature. Trustee Sundin remarked that there are issues that can be addressed more immediately such as timing of notification and payment and a website with access to information.

Trustee Anderson Kelliher and Interim Vice Chancellor O’Brien reviewed the agenda items for the Academic and Student Affairs Committee. Trustee Anaya and Executive Director Buse reviewed the agenda items for the Audit Committee. Executive Director Buse announced that it appeared likely that there would be a need for special meeting in December on the 2013 audited financials. Trustee Alex Cirillo and Interim Vice Chancellor O’Brien reviewed the agenda items for the Diversity and Equity Committee.

Trustee Oliveira inquired if the survey results from the Minnesota State Fair would be available. Vice Chancellor Dougherty explained that the survey was designed to bring people into the booth. About 7,000 surveys were completed. Chancellor Rosenstone responded that the results will be shared with the board, but he cautioned in making any interpretations. Trustee Sundin expressed that she would like an opportunity to provide some feedback on the State Fair activity.

Trustee Erlandson suggested assigning technology issues and the purview of advancement to a committee. Chair Hightower responded that the board needs to figure out a way to handle advancement type issues – perhaps a study session. Chancellor Rosenstone suggested that the board could receive periodic updates on the operations. There are three activities in advancement – government relations, public relations, and fundraising. Major fundraising does not occur at the system level. Vice Chancellor Dougherty issues quarterly reports on scholarship tracking. Another item is promoting branding. He suggested a study session for the board in May or June that will include the facts and a set of ideas based on evolution of Charting the Future.

Conclusion

Chair Hightower thanked everyone and said that he was pleased that the objectives he had laid out for the retreat had been met. He added that the conversation on the "Protocol for Working Together," was good, and he asked trustees to hold each other accountable for adhering to the protocol. In addition, the conversation on the "Charting the Future" draft report will help inform the Strategic Workgroups as they revise their final report and recommendations. Trustees can expect to receive occasional updates on the draft committee and board agenda items. Last, Chair Hightower commented that when an individual trustee makes a request, he will touch base with others to see if more than one person feels that way before proceeding.

The retreat ended at 2:00 pm.