

**Minnesota State Colleges and Universities**  
**Board of Trustees**  
**Charting the Future Study Session Notes**  
**June 22, 2016**

**Present:** Chair Michael Vekich, Trustees Ann Anaya, Duane Benson, Kelly Charpentier-Berg, Alexander Cirillo, John Cowles, Dawn Erlandson, Robert Hoffman, Margaret Anderson Kelliher, Philip Krinkie, Maleah Otterson, Thomas Renier, Elise Ristau, Louise Sundin, Erma Vizenor, and Chancellor Steven Rosenstone

**Convene and Introduction**

Chair Vekich called the study session for an update on Charting the Future to order at 10:50 AM. He expressed appreciation for the information provided within the three quarterly reports. He urged the board to consider what is presented and how lessons learned will impact other work occurring throughout the system.

Chancellor Rosenstone expressed his commitment to the promise of Charting the Future. He echoed Chair Vekich's appreciation for everyone involved. He remarked on the progress across initiatives over the past year and encouraged everyone to consider how our complex organization continues to engage and communicate as we move forward.

Jaime Simonson, managing director for government relations, and Ron Anderson, vice chancellor for academic and student affairs, presented the Charting the Future quarterly report to the board. Ms. Simonsen expressed her confidence in the commitment and skills of Vice Chancellor Anderson and Project Manager Nicole Merz as they continue to move Charting the Future forward in the coming year, as she transitions into her new role in government relations.

**Work Plan Status**

Director Simonsen reiterated that Charting the Future is a multi-year effort. She reviewed the goals, aspirations, and activities of the Charting the Future initiative, including the eight implementation teams in FY15, the recommendations provided, and the development of the FY16 work plan. FY16 saw the beginning of implementation across the initiatives.

Director Simonsen drew attention to the progress that has been made across all initiatives in FY16. All workgroups have submitted recommendations to the Leadership Council for their respective initiatives, all projects led by colleges/universities have completed 75% or more of the FY16 project tasks, and 19 of 21 projects led by vice chancellors have completed 100% of FY16 project tasks. She expressed the importance of the change efforts as the focus of our success, not just the progress of each initiative.

Director Simonsen identified the organizational and cultural change that was expressed, by campuses, in three key areas: collaboration, direction and communication. She reminded the board that the most important outcome of Charting the Future may not be in the initial work plan, nor the progress made on individual initiatives, but in developing our ability to work together and think differently in a more collaborative way.

Vice Chancellor Anderson provided additional information about the progress on specific initiatives, by division. Throughout FY16, colleges and universities have continued to report on initiatives that they are responsible for leading, while the vice chancellor's did the same for the initiatives they were responsible for leading. He expressed the good news that all colleges, universities, and divisions have made significant progress.

Vice Chancellor Anderson highlighted specific achievements within each division. Within Diversity and Equity, campuses have done a significant amount of work engaging their communities in the creation of diversity plans, which were submitted to Chancellor Rosenstone this past month. In Finance, the Technical Advisory Committee is in the process of developing a new allocation model. Preliminary recommendations have been drafted, shared, and are under review. In Human Resources, the HR-Transaction Service Model has made considerable progress. In ITS, progress is being made and the work will continue through FY17. Academic and Student Affairs has completed a significant amount of work. Recommendations have been submitted for each of the workgroups to the Leadership Council. Four transfer pathways are now completed, which campuses will begin preparing for implementation in the fall.

Vice Chancellor Anderson identified two initiatives that were slower to progress, including online strategy and comprehensive workplace solutions. He expressed confidence in the plans that have been put together to move the work forward in FY17.

### **Change Efforts Across the Organization**

President Barbara McDonald, North Hennepin Community College, introduced the work of the Academic Planning and Collaboration workgroup. She presented information on the makeup of the workgroup (a representative group), the charge of the group, and the activities they undertook to come to the three recommendations they submitted to Vice Chancellor Anderson and the Leadership Council. The workgroup reviewed academic planning processes that occur at local campuses as well as across the nation. They received input from chief academic officers on academic planning as well as policy that exists regarding academic planning. She pointed out that the recommendations went to Leadership Council and the plan is that those recommendations will go forward to campuses for stakeholder input before moving the work forward.

President McDonald outlined the three recommendations that were submitted.

1. System policies and processes should ensure that academic planning drives budget, facilities, technology, diversity, and other planning priorities.
2. The system will have a comprehensive academic plan that provides a framework for the collective academic aspirations and priorities of system colleges and universities.
3. Each college and university will have a comprehensive academic plan that advances its distinctive mission, culture, and academic priorities.

Dani Heiny, chief diversity officer, Riverland Community College, introduced the diversity planning process at the college. She discussed the goals identified by Minnesota State Colleges and Universities: increase diversity with students, employees, and vendors, reduce achievement gaps, create more welcoming campus environments, and build partnerships with communities.

She discussed the diversity toolkit, template, and support provided by staff within the Diversity and Equity office at the system office. Riverland Community College President Adenuga Atewologun led the diversity planning process, which she expressed, made a big difference for Riverland, as it made it a priority. This work is repositioning Riverland to work to employee and student strengths, advance student priorities, and re-envision Riverland's future. The diversity plan identifies priorities for funding and focus in the coming years. Riverland is positioned as a change agent in the community. The college is gaining a reputation in the community as a bridge to success. The diversity planning process has allowed Riverland to align with the goals of Charting the Future. They will continue to meet the commitment of the board, Minnesota State Colleges and Universities, and the presidents to continue to do this work.

Suzie Bruser, chief human resources officer, Dakota County Technical College and Inver Hills Community College, introduced the HR-TSM model. Her work and commitment is focused on helping the colleges and universities human resources divisions get to where they need to be as a system. She articulated the collaborative nature of the process to develop this model. She noted that there is not always agreement, but the focus is always on what's best for employees and the system. The process has had challenges, including the change management that needs to occur as this model moves forward. The TSM model will allow human resources teams to focus on other much needed work that they currently don't have time to do because of all the processes that need to get done. Four service centers have been identified. She discussed the fear around what these service centers mean. They are having conversations with leadership and employees on what this means and what it looks like. Patience and support will be needed as they continue to move this major project forward.

### **FY17 Work Plan**

President McDonald continued the discussion with how Charting the Future will move forward in FY17. The Leadership Council met in May to discuss the development process for the work plan. A small group of presidents developed a draft of that plan, and presented it to the Leadership Council in June. She articulated some of the changes that have been proposed for the plan, including the merging of certain overlapping initiatives, as well as the removal of those initiatives that became operationalized in FY16. Presidents articulated changes they wanted to see, the most important of which, was communication of continued progress.

Vice Chancellor Anderson discussed the lessons that have been learned around communication. The Coordinating Committee will be drafting an improved communication plan for the Leadership Council's review in August. Also, budget and resources that will need to be put in place or discussed as the work continues to move forward. Vice Chancellor Anderson expressed the importance of recognizing the impact that may not be tangible, but that we can "feel." In the coming months, Charting the Future's FY17 draft work plan will be finalized and shared out for stakeholder consultation. A revised draft and communication plan will be presented to Leadership Council in August. Following the adoption of the plan in September, Gantt charts will be completed.

Trustee Otterson expressed her thanks to Jaime Simonsen for all of her hard work. She asked the board to consider if the structure of Charting the Future represents what we need as we go forward. She commented that the process has not necessarily represented every group, identifying that she has heard that there have been a few problems. Chancellor Rosenstone identified that the Coordinating Committee's purposes is to resolve problems in various bargaining units.

Trustee Benson asked how time and resources are allocated for something that is quality related. How can we get assurance that all of these activities will result in increased quality? Vice Chancellor Anderson answered that the outcomes and assessment will be realized after full implementation. Chancellor Rosenstone expressed that various models have been presented to the board for regular updates or adoption, such as the HR-TSM and allocation model.

Trustee Sundin asked if there is a difference between implementation and operationalization. Vice Chancellor Anderson answered that we have used implementation broadly to include planning and beginning to operate in a certain way, but operationalize means that it is part of the fabric of our institutions and the work the institutions does, not a separate initiative.

Chair Vekich adjourned the study session at 11:34 am.