

Minnesota State Colleges and Universities
Board of Trustees
Study Session
Charting the Future Update
January 27, 2016

Board Members Present: Chair Michael Vekich, Trustees Margaret Anderson-Kelliher, Duane Benson, Kelly Charpentier–Berg, Alexander Cirillo, Jay Cowles, Dawn Erlandson, Robert Hoffman, Philip Krinkie, Maleah Otterson, Thomas Renier, Elise Ristau, Louise Sundin, and Chancellor Steven Rosenstone

Absent: Trustees Ann Anaya and Erma Vizenor

Convene and Introduction

The Minnesota State Colleges and Universities Board of Trustees held a study session on January 27, 2016, at Minneapolis Community College, Minneapolis. Chair Vekich called the study session for an update on Charting the Future to order at 11:20 am. He summarized the commitment of the board to the work of the Charting the Future initiatives. He asked that the board think about the information being provided and to consider whether it is sufficient for what they need.

Chancellor Rosenstone continued the introduction of the CTF initiatives and provided the recent history of CTF work. He discussed the CTF work plan, the campus based initiatives and the work that is being done, as “on track.” Presidents and vice chancellors understand the importance of the work and the board supports that. He reiterated the commitment of the students to this work as well.

Jaime Simonson, managing director for government relations, presented the Charting the Future quarterly report to the board and provided an outline of the study session.

In order to ensure accountability and provide oversight for the work being done on campuses as well as at the system office the following mechanisms were put into place:

1. Quarterly Reports (first report delivered today)
2. Board Study Sessions (first today, and one in June)
3. Convene Coordinating Committee (met three times)

Work plan status

Campus teams have been formed, all projects led by colleges and universities have launched and are on track. All projects led by vice chancellors have launched and are on track.

Lesson learned in the fall: Gantt charts in fall mapped out extremely aggressive timelines. They did not address the amount of time that would be needed to allow for campuses to understand the initiatives, engage all stakeholders, and determine how best to approach the work. Most campus teams launched towards the end of the fall term. Recognizing the extra bandwidth needed to take on this work, Nicole Merz was hired in January as the project manager to provide support in Academic and Student Affairs.

College and University Examples

President Scott Olson, Winona State University (WSU) shared how his campus has approached the CTF initiatives. He addressed the importance of honoring the uniqueness of each college and university and the variety of approaches that campuses are taking to achieve the CTF goals. His campus has engaged students, faculty, and staff to determine what work has already been done, is in process of getting done, or still needs to be accomplished. The campus also looked at the nature of the work evaluating whether it should be led by the system office or the campuses. This opportunity of engaging the community has served them well as they have moved forward, as all feel like their voices have been heard and they are engaged in the work. In addition, WSU has also held open forums (Inter Faculty Organization (IFO) and the Minnesota State University Association of Administrative and Service Faculty (MSUAASF) held their own), discussed at meet and confers, and convened university-wide discussions.

President Olson presented data on the fit of the CTF initiatives with WSU campus stakeholders. Across initiatives, there was strong support for the CTF initiative work, however, they were also able to prioritize which initiatives were most important to the stakeholders of the WSU community.

President Annette Parker, South Central College (SCC), presented on their approach to the CTF work. They have established a college-wide steering committee to lead the work. The committee is representative of the campus community. The committee mapped the CTF initiatives to existing college committees to determine where the work would be done. They determined from this initial step that they needed to formalize their committees further to ensure that all stakeholders were represented on the committees and worked diligently to ensure that each committee had a representative group of students, faculty, and staff. A reporting structure was established for the committees back to the steering committee to ensure accountability and oversight. Committees were asked to do a gap analysis of their current strategic plan and to ensure that each of the CTF initiatives were embedded within the plan.

President William Maki presented from the Northeast Higher Education District which includes five colleges. They have organized CTF work by using existing college and district structures. Student success is an area that was identified as needing additional attention. They have thus formed opportunities to create new structures to address some of these issues, including academic advising. Because of these new structures, there has been an increased focus on sharing across colleges to improve student success. He expressed the need to continue to respect differences between the colleges in how they implement the initiatives while also finding themes where colleges can work together. The ability to share across the colleges has been incredibly beneficial.

Trustee Cirillo asked how we will determine if CTF continues to be a priority on campuses and within the divisions. How do we keep the sense of urgency? President Olson offered that because it is built into the college structure, it ensures that the work will continue to be a priority. The work that needs to get done fits nicely into their campus work plans. President Parker also addressed timelines and how that keeps the work going. The committee structure keeps things moving and ensuring we're meeting our goals.

Trustee Otterson expressed her concern that the format of CTF and campuses engaging in the work in a non-uniform way will not ensure the work gets done fast enough, puts too much pressure on the presidents, and that students are having a hard time with the changes. She expressed her belief that the format will not work and will not create change. Chair Vekich asked Trustee Otterson if she had any empirical evidence regarding this. Trustee Otterson replied that she did not bring any but that she could get some.

Director Simonson continued with the quarterly report progress. The quarterly report process has brought clarification to what was committed to, where there are gaps, and opportunities to resolve those gaps.

Trustee Otterson asked when in the process will we know whether this approach is working. Director Simonson responded that CTF is about both the work plan and the initiatives getting completed but also about colleges and universities identifying how to work together to address issues our entire system faces. The type of engagement that is occurring with students, faculty, and staff around these issues is occurring due to CTF.

Chancellor Rosenstone reiterated what Director Simonson expressed. He agreed that there is a tension between getting the work done and what the presidents said they wanted to get done and how much work there is to get done. That tension is going to exist. There are manifestations of the changing culture about how we approach things as a system that goes beyond the individual initiatives within CTF. These types of collaborations and communications didn't happen prior to CTF. There is a shared responsibility between the system office and the campuses themselves. There are things that the system office can lead, but on other initiatives the campuses need to take the lead. There is variance between colleges and universities in terms of where they are at relative to where we are supposed to be. Trustee Anderson Kelliher agreed that because this is in the strategic plans of the colleges and because of the quarterly reports, we will ensure the progress is on track. Chancellor Rosenstone added that these initiatives are also in the vice chancellors' work plans.

Chair Vekich asked what is the biggest concern regarding completing the CTF initiatives. President Parker answered that she doesn't have any concerns that she would bring to this group at this time. President Maki shared that he has concerns about the resources available and needed to ensure that the work is getting done. President Olson shared that much of the work is easy to check off the list but other initiatives are more difficult and will take more time and resources to accomplish.

Chair Vekich asked if there was a common understanding of the deliverable in June. President Olson answered that yes, there is a clear understanding of what needs to be delivered in June. President Parker agreed.

Trustee Cirillo asked if there was a way to help the organizations that are struggling. Can we help ensure that they are getting up-to-speed and on track? Director Simonson asked to hold that question until Vice Chancellor Ron Anderson's portion of the presentation. Director Simonson shared that all campuses have launched a campus CTF team. Some of the campuses

are still finalizing those appointments. Campuses have varied structures, but integration of the work into the existing structures of the campus has been critical.

Initiative Highlights

A chart was shared that summarizes the progress across all of the colleges and universities on CTF initiatives. Another chart shared the progress across the divisions for system office initiative pieces. These charts indicated that overall the system and campuses are on track with their initiative progress. Director Simonsen provided brief highlights of some initiatives.

Diversity Plans: A small workgroup developed a tool kit to help colleges and universities to create or modify their diversity plans. The focus of the plans is on student success, addressing the opportunity gap and address five areas:

1. Work with partners to reduce and eliminate the student success gap
2. Increase diversity of students and strategies for retention
3. Increase diversity of faculty and staff and strategies for retention
4. Build effective partnerships with communities of color
5. Ensure a supportive and welcoming environment

Initiatives led by Vice Chancellor Mark Carlson include the Human Resources Transactional Service Model (HR-TSM). Vice Chancellor Carlson provided an introduction at the November Board meeting and will share an update at the March board meeting. In addition, the initiative to *Improve the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty and staff* was launched this month. Vice Chancellor Carlson and Associate Vice Chancellor Sue Appelquist presented a draft model at the January Leadership Council meeting. The Intentional Recruitment and Retention model leverages data and carefully examines the needs of the organization well before vacancies occur. These are the two fundamental steps toward achieving a much needed MnSCU comprehensive recruitment and retention strategy.

The initiative to *Replace or re-engineer ISRS* is on track. Vice Chancellor Ramon Padilla will share an update at the March Board meeting. In six weeks, 33 listening sessions were held and 1,265 students, faculty, and staff provided additional feedback through an online survey.

The majority of the initiatives at the system office are being supported or lead by academic and student affairs. Vice Chancellor Ron Anderson addressed the board. He shared 3 categories of CTF work in Academic and Student Affairs (ASA):

1. ASA is responsible for leading
2. ASA is responsible for supporting campus-led work
3. Existing groups that are doing the work

Observations: A number of opportunities have been identified on how ASA can help to support campus-led work. Campuses are in different stages of this work and thus determines the level of support that they will need from ASA. For example, 1.2.2 to address students access to technology. Campuses were asked to assess their students' needs around technology. ASA is

able to offer a common tool to assess this information, which allows us to benchmark across the colleges and universities, and provides a uniform way to assess. He expressed his appreciation for his campus colleagues in determining where consistency of approach is necessary and when campuses unique approaches are needed.

Vice Chancellor Anderson provided one initiative highlight on the initiative to develop a comprehensive strategy to increase awareness and development of e-textbooks and open educational resources (OERs). Thirty-three faculty participated in the December online faculty training in the review of OERs, linkages with faculty across the country and other campuses to do peer review. ASA administered a grant process to develop resources and/or increase the use of OERs on campus. Eight colleges and universities were awarded a grants. The grantees needed to show that their work would lead to an increase in affordability and accessibility for students.

Trustee Anderson Kelliher asked about Riverland Community College with gigantic savings and Bemidji with the lowest savings. Vice Chancellor Anderson answered that perhaps this is due to the scope of the work that is being done. Director Simonson added that the grant to Riverland is for a faculty who teaches at multiple campuses and accounts for the high potential savings. Additional information on each grant will be shared with the board. Trustee Charpentier-Berg asked if a database is being developed to hold these resources. Vice Chancellor Anderson shared that there are three databases or repositories of these textbooks that are being developed and available for use.

Coordinating Committee

Student Josh Hanson addressed the board as a co-chair of the coordinating committee for CTF to provide an update on the progress of that committee. He discussed the committee makeup, which is representative of the MnSCU community (18 different colleges and universities and students, faculty, and staff). This structure is beneficial due to the variety of ideas, but can also slow the work. Recent discussion included which documents the group should be reviewing and what discussions the group should focus on. Documents have been selected and uploaded for all members to review. At each meeting a representative is asked to share about initiative highlights. The committee determined the structure of the quarterly reports and discussed the implementation of initiatives.

Director Simonson closed by addressing the next steps for the CTF initiatives. There is additional work to be done and Leadership Council and the board will be discussing what those potential next steps will be.

Trustee Otterson asked if there was a more quantifiable way to address the initiatives. Director Simonson shared the quarterly report received by each of the campuses and divisions has been posted to the CTF blog. Trustee Otterson asked how often the CTF blog is updated. Director Simonson shared that the blog is updated when there is new information to share. Individuals can input their email addresses to follow the blog.

Chair Vekich adjourned the study session at 12:25p.m.