

# **University of Missouri Board of Curators**

Summary of One-on-One Interviews conducted by  
The Bernard Consulting Group, Inc.

July 19, 2016

**BACKGROUND**

In preparation for the July 22, 2016 meeting with the Board of Curators, associates of The Bernard Consulting Group, Inc. (BCG) conducted one-on-one phone interviews with the individuals listed below.

Curator Don Cupps	Interim President Mike Middleton
Vice Chair Marcy Graham	Chief of Staff Zora Mulligan
Student Representative to the Board of Curators Patrick Graham	MU Interim Chancellor Hank Foley
Chair Pam Henrickson	UMSL Chancellor Tom George
Curator John Phillips	UMKC Chancellor Leo Morton
Curator Phil Snowden	MS&T Chancellor Cheryl Schrader
Curator David Steelman	General Counsel Steve Owens
Curator Jon Sundvold	
Curator Tom Voss	

Note: Curator Mary Nelson was out of the country during the timeframe for conducting the interviews and therefore did not participate in an interview.

The purpose of the interviews was to get the interviewees' thoughts on the following two questions:

1. What thematic areas should be considered as part of the University's long-term vision/direction?
2. What are the most critical priorities for the University to address in the next three years?

Associates of BCG analyzed the interview data and developed common theme headers for clusters of two or more similar comments. The common theme headers are intended only to facilitate reading of the document. The interview data is shown in the next section of this report.

## DATA ANALYSIS

### 1. What thematic areas should be considered as part of the University's long-term vision/direction?

#### **Asset to Missouri**

- Demonstrating and clearly articulating our critical role as a strong economic driver in the state. We demonstrate but we don't necessarily clearly articulate. We need to make very clear that we are important to what happens to the state of MO. We're an investment and have a given great return to the state.
- The primary purpose of the school is providing education to citizens of MO, but we need to also make sure we communicate to the state how the university benefits the state in more than just an academic way. We don't do a good job of explaining to the citizens and legislature how we contribute to overall welfare of the state. We need to do a better job of publicizing this – our research, extension programs, and health care system.
- What we need is to have a high quality value proposition defined for all our constituents. The legislature needs to know that we've created tremendous value for the state. We need to create a value proposition not just in their minds, but have it established in the minds of everyone across the state. There is an extension service in every small town in MO, but most people don't know it's part of the system. We need to get that message out to the legislature, students, parents, the community – all key stakeholders. I think they value most of the same things. It's a matter of how to communicate it. We're suffering in the area of state support. We're missing the people that need to understand us because we're not communicating in the right way. The message isn't hitting the spot.
- Reinvigorating the mission of the system and the four public campuses as the state's preeminent system of public higher education and research. We need to take our rightful place as the second largest employer of the state.
- We can be leader in health care in the Midwest and expand beyond the Midwest. We have a huge medical complex that serves MO and beyond. We have great relationships with other hospitals, Cerner, and the Tiger Institute. We rank highly across the country in how we do medical records. We're on the cutting edge in how we do medical records, how we do outreach to patients, and how we share information with other institutions. We can expand on this even more.
- What do we have to do to support our brand? What's key to our brand? In certain communities its research, it's economic development, it's jobs. We're creating satellites for the Columbia SoP so we're educating students closer to where the shortages are. We're educating them closer to home. That's a strong message to send to some of the smaller communities. We need to work on strategies for them. We don't have to invent anything. We're doing this, we're just not communicating it effectively.
- Become more of an integral part of the community. Provide things that are needed by the state and citizens - education and research.

#### **Diversity and inclusion**

- Embracing diversity and inclusion. Many universities fall into the trap of thinking this is only about students but it's also about faculty, staff and administration. It's important on campuses and at the system level. I think this is also a critical priority.

**Follow-up: What might be an indicator of progress?**

- How we work with each other and treat each other. I'd like to feel that people are working their way through stages of understanding and moving from diversity, which is numbers, to inclusivity, which is relationships.
- We want to maintain the diversity – not speaking of minorities here – but the different elements of culture between the four campuses.
- Accessibility and affordability. We need to integrate with public and private universities in MO, broadening the recognition of transferability of appropriately juried credits from public and private schools and other two and four year institutions, including some accredited distance learning institutions. We need to make it more affordable and not necessarily focused on the residential 4 year experience. Think more part-time and less depth.

**Accessibility and affordability**

- One issue to decide regarding the long term vision and direction is having accessibility and affordability on one hand and selectivity on the other.
- Identity – Are we a top flight AAU school or a fairly close to open access school for all MO students? There is a diversity of opinions on these questions.
- The first thematic area is making sure the system continues to work toward providing accessible and affordable education.
- As a land grant institution, and as the flagship university for the system, the focus has to be on making sure that education is available to all people in the state, not just students. The citizens of MO benefit from research and extension programs. We need to maintain access not just for students but make resources available to all citizens of MO.
- Better defining the role of the system schools in the array of MO public four-year institutions. The University of MO for years needed to be affordable and accessible because it was the only comprehensive school in the state. I think our role in the state now is to be more selective, but we seem to be stuck in old mold that our schools aren't different from other schools, only bigger. We need to better distinguish our current role.

**Follow-up: Is there tension between being a land grant institution vs. being a top notch institution?**

- Since I'm new, I may not know the balance of both. Accessibility and affordability to kids from the state is huge, but we should also be attracting the best and brightest kids because of our programs.

**A unified system with diverse campus strengths**

- Rethinking relationships and rebuilding trust confidence between the system and campuses, and between the campuses themselves. There needs to be a customer focused vision that addresses how the system supports the campuses. We had that for a while but as issues occurred last fall and prior to that, the system became really closed off on the campuses. It's somewhat change management in that it needs to be engagement of the system, campuses and employees. We need to involve the campuses in decision making and vision setting.

**Follow-up: Is there a potential lack of clarity of the role of system and the role of campuses?**

- Yes, and it's become more pronounced. There is big value in the system but there was some overreach by the system in trying to show value, when those things can be done at campus level.

- Identity – What kind of institution do we want to be? At the system level there are questions if we are a unifying force for the four campuses that provides strong leadership in all areas or if we are a holding company – a back office service provider that makes it easier for the campuses to deliver on their ideas of academic and student affairs.
- System structure. How we promote the uniqueness of the University of Missouri system, at least within MO and the Midwest. Looking beyond the campuses and considering all of the parts of the structure – the extension service, MU Health, the land grant status, and our international and global programs. Nobody knows much about the extension services. We get two hours of information per year on MU Health. We need to be prepared to coordinate the international programs between campuses and be prepared for the acceleration of those. All of this is the system and is of great value to the State of Missouri. We have to focus more on the benefits of system as broadly redefined. Most importantly, we have to talk and act as a system. Essentially, the system offices are on the MU campus. We need to be system focused. We need to focus on education and how to improve the economic state of MO citizens. We need to share the positive message of the uniqueness of the system as it is more broadly defined. The role of the president is to be the leader of the system, and the face of the system with the legislature and the people.

**Follow-up: Is the role of the system governance or to provide back room services to the four campuses?**

- The board has to provide overarching governance of the four campuses and make decisions that affect campus decisions. We have to view it as a system.
- We need to present ourselves as an integrated system. We can provide back room services in HR and finance, etc.; these need to be administratively centralized with functions reporting to central administration. Making sure all four campuses aren't developing things without coordination, e.g., policies regarding sexual harassment.
- Most importantly, we need to have a separate identity of the system and the campuses. The system shouldn't be housed on the MU campus.
- The system has to work for all four universities. It can't be Mizzou, and then the others. The president has to understand how all four universities contribute to the system. Going forward, it's important that we give support to the other three schools, especially as the other campuses are experiencing growth. They need to get their share of the pie. We need to ensure the system is working for the alumni and donor base for all four campuses.
- We need to be as coherent a system as possible. We want to make sure we are coordinated as much as possible while still allowing for differences among the campuses.
- By nature of having a system with four campuses, there is some uncertainty as to who we are. We haven't figured out how it all fits together. The four campuses work independently and have to a certain degree different missions and purposes, but there are a lot of overlaps, too. The system and organization could be stronger if there was more coordination, more buying in to the overall mission and vision of all the campuses together. Part of the nature of the beast is that we are part of a system but there is competition between the four campuses. That can be good, but also not good because the campuses look out for their interests and there might be a competition for funding, like UMKC needing funding for their new arts center, which might take away funding from UMSL. There needs to be more coordination and understanding of the overall purpose of the system and four campuses collectively.

- We could be a lot stronger as an institution if we talk about ourselves as one institution with faculty and students working in an interdisciplinary way. We've never acted like one enterprise, but rather as separate universities. Each campus grew their own constituencies. We would be much better off if we thought of ourselves as one. Lots more collaboration across campus boundaries. Right now we have back office service providers for the campuses. On the academic side, in terms of faculty and research we'd get more grants and be more creative. We could market our colleges much better-- the flagship and the three satellites.
- The University of MO system, the land grant public research university for the state has two missions. One is to provide areas of excellence – be a broad range university but with very specific areas of excellence that we should project to be international leaders in. Each campus should have areas of excellence and that's part of our strategic plan. I feel very strongly that we need to be not an exclusive university that is going to focus on our US News ranking, but we need to make sure education is accessible and attainable for all students. We want to be ranked favorably, but I'm reluctant to make our admission standard so high that we exclude those who may not have the top ACT score but are bright enough to succeed, just so we can raise our ranking. Do we want to be like Michigan or Arizona State? I tend toward Arizona State or somewhere between those two. I don't want to grow any of the campuses to the size of Arizona State but I don't want to make our system inaccessible.
- The system president has to have that vision of what the four campuses bring to the system.
- This system is different than what I thought it would be before I got here. I thought it was one university that is geographically distributed – a federation of universities. It's actually more like a confederacy of universities with really strong states' rights. The four schools are autonomous. We need to admit that we are a confederacy, a loose confederacy of four autonomous institutions. The long-term vision is to turn the confederacy into a federacy then into one university, but that won't happen in MO. Alumni, faculty, people, and politicians won't like it. It has to be a loose confederacy. The role of the system is administrative services.
- The system is heterogeneous but it's managed like it's homogeneous and it's not.

### Renowned for research

- Elevate ourselves to put us in a stronger position with AAU. We can do this only if we increase research dollars.

#### **Follow-up: looking out 5-10 years, ideally, what would we see?**

- Being like a Michigan where the whole Midwest area gravitates to us and Missouri is considered a leader because we have great diversity in the four campuses. We compare with MIT and Cal Tech. We can set ourselves apart. We have the basic assets in place. We have a great bond rating. We've made strides in diversity and inclusion. We have addressed a lot of issues and we have good people on board. We shouldn't have similar problems in the future. The whole country seems to be in a state of unrest but I'm hopeful MU won't be one of the campuses where there is more unrest.
- To be a top research institution. Research needs to be improved.
- Being a world class research institution from an academic side. We sometimes get away from that – what a land grant institution is. This just doesn't include Columbia campus. MO S&T is a shining star in Rolla.
- It's important for at least one of our members to be a highly respected research institution. We owe that to the state and to the state's economy. One or more of our

campuses could have the mission/vision of becoming a major, highly respected academic and research institution. MU is most likely to be the one to do this. That's part of who we need to be. The flip side is that we're in the Midwest and we need to provide an education to people in the state to help the economic engine run. We need to be more mainstream, more homegrown and provide an education to those who will be engineers and doctors in MO.

**Follow-up: Take a dual path of being a research one institution without sacrificing accessibility and affordability?**

- That's a good way of putting it. Our obligation to provide a good education to engineers and teachers, etc., but also be a premier research institution. We're not terrible in that area but there are challenges we're dealing with that may jeopardize our research standing.
- We need to be a great research university. Teaching is important but we have to double down on research. We are the state's research university.

**Strengthen our AAU position**

- One focus has been and should continue to be our membership in the AAU. We need to keep this in front of us all the time.
- We've always been concerned about our status with AAU. If we do what we've talked about we'll get more research grants, be the go-to place in the Midwest, etc.
- We're an AAU university and have been for a long time. Because of the way resources are managed, and because the state doesn't give enough money, we're at the bottom of AAU in all measures. This is a problem to address going forward.
- Overall, how big a deal it is being a top research institution. We need to get back on track with the AAU.

**Diversified resources**

- Resource enhancement, from both the public and private sectors.
- Finances
- Fiscal responsibility. We don't want to always be reactive to the legislature. We need to do more with public/private resources, translate the research outcomes and reduce reliance on increasing the student population to finance bricks and mortar.
- How we get funding from the state – our funding measures – encapsulate what we are all about and who we are.
  - 6 year graduation rates. We accept students who progress through the system and eventually get a degree or certificate.
  - Our one year retention rates.
  - Our pass rates on licensing exams.
  - Peer reviewed research. This probably pertains more to MU because MU is in the AAU, but there is probably a trickledown effect to the other campuses.
  - The proportion of operating expenses that's put into the teaching mission of the university. That's not vision but it's hard to have a vision if we don't satisfy these measures.
- Annual fundraising – we have to rely on a diversified portfolio of resources. In spite of the issues and bad press we've had, our donors are still stepping up to the plate.

**Build relationships / image**

- Building trust and enhancing relationships with state and national leaders, as well as the citizens of MO and state and federal delegations.
- To be recognized as a premier institution.

- Make sure it's something students, faculty and Missourians feel proud of.

### **Enhanced education**

- The university is 175 years old and has had trials before, but we have to think longer term and get past the short term challenges. I doubt that we're unique in trying to change. Academia doesn't mesh well with modern social media and how you integrate those two things together has been a big problem. Integrating ourselves into the new world is something that will have to happen.
- Figuring out what we want to be and getting into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Prior to the last year or so we discussed how to balance online course work with bricks & mortar challenges.
- Distance learning and its effect on faculty. Acceleration of e-learning and the effect on/opportunity for the faculty. Part of the revolution in higher education is that there will be more distance learning and this will have an effect on makeup of faculty. We need to have a different way of evaluating professors. We need instructors who know how to teach well with distance learning.
- Remaking of higher education, e.g., innovations, flipping the classroom; change the method of delivery to how students prefer to learn. Increasing full-time faculty who aren't tenure track but are good at teaching. We need to understand how students best learn and what are the times that are most convenient to them for learning.
- Continue with our outstanding programs and get better, and be recognized nationally and internationally.

### **Functionality of the Board / shared governance**

- Board reassignment of tasks. Changing roles and responsibilities, at least in our system.
- We need to encourage the appointment of curators of a more diverse background, and those who will commit to being a curator first and putting their occupations second.
- We need fewer reports. Committees shouldn't duplicate administration. We need to refocus the board on strategies. We need more open discussion with respect to strategies, and we need to embrace public participation in the discussion of risk and strategy.
- We should work toward having a two-year term as chair of the board. Currently, 90% of our time is spent listening to facts, 5% is spent doing what we have to do by state law, and 5% is spent thinking about strategies.
- There needs to be clarity with respect to shared governance. It needs to be shared with administration, faculty and the board. There has to be more transparent communication with faculty. We need to have an outcomes orientation in order to move forward with change, particularly in regard to distance learning. We have to revamp our view of shared governance and be more collaborative while not giving up responsibility to implement and facilitate accomplishment of the mission.

### **Remaining comments**

- The reality is that what is the long-term vision isn't the right question. The question is what should the system do – what's its mission? Its mission is to supply low cost services to all four universities. The problem with that is that it's a good deal for three of the schools – UMKC, UMSL and MO S&T. It doesn't work as well for MU because when it's resource allocation time the system says one for each but we pay proportionately. MU pays more and uses the system more but the doctrine of fairness says that all are equal. It's a confederation of unequal universities.
- We own a hospital. We need to address the issue that the hospital has to give top patient care besides doing top medical research.

- We're still in a growth mode but at the same time, we have to be accountable for the degrees awarded. Enrollment is good but ultimately it's about degrees awarded.
- You can't separate the vision from the priorities. Our vision is to be an outstanding state supported land grant university. Land grant is very important and everything that goes with that.

## 2. What are the most critical priorities for the University to address in the next three years?

### Diversity and inclusion

- Diversity inclusion
- Build confidence in the Columbia campus. We're not racists, and we have a lot of great people there. We've taken a bad rap. Other universities have similar things going on; ours just blew up and the nation focused on it.
- Reestablish with students that it's a safe, diverse, and friendly institution.
- Reestablish with the faculty that they'll be treated properly and that they are partners with us.
- The highest priority is to convince students it's a safe place to be. The president doesn't have to talk this up with the external community all the time, but it does need to be talked about internally. Tell the faculty, administration and students that you believe in diversity and that this will be a focus.
- The new president should really be focused on making sure the students, faculty and administration know it's going to be a diverse environment.
- Diversity inclusion
- We need to be a leader in things like diversity, retention and graduation rates.
- Ensuring that all students, faculty and staff in all four campuses, the extension offices and health care system feel like the university is an inclusive environment where they can succeed without barriers. The role for next president is not only in diversity but in all areas. Students, faculty and staff need to feel included and that system is on their side and the school is a place where they can succeed. The stakeholders should feel empowered by the university and that they can do their best teaching, learning and research.
- One is continuing our efforts to turn our racial catastrophe from November to a positive by continuing to invest in inclusion efforts. A lack of commitment by the board to this issue would set us back. I would like a serious commitment by the board to continue this initiative.

### Leadership

- Leadership - We've struggled so greatly in that area that it's always top of mind.
- Get permanent president in place.
- Leadership. The next president will play a critical role in hiring new leadership and in enhancing existing leaders to become better leaders, including some board members. It's likely that over the next three years some leaders will retire.
- Ensure continuing stable, quality leadership. We have too much turnover. The length of tenure has been short.

- We have to get the next president right, and get someone who can lead. They may not check all of the boxes, but they can lead. I'm more interested in finding a good leader than in checking all of the boxes.
- Talent assessment at top level. I hope he/she will go to great lengths to collect information on the current leadership and figure out what decisions need to be made.
- Recruitment to fill gaps and retention. We are approaching 50% interim leadership. The ability to recruit and retain top level personnel is crucial.
- Progressiveness – being forward looking. We have been challenged in recent times with getting out of the hole of continuing to review everything that happened last fall. There are several causes for that but we have to move forward. Hiring a new president will be giant step in that direction.

### **Rebuilding our reputation / relationships**

- We need a really good cheerleader who can wow the community at large.
- Brand restoration. Changing narrative about the university and erasing a lot of bad, old stuff. The brand wasn't clearly defined before the crisis unfolded last year. The average Missourian has no sense of what the school does. Negative thoughts accumulated in the last year. The identity of the school has to be the underpinning of a good brand. The four campuses have mostly solid brands. At system level we need brand restoration and identity in the worst way.
- Relationship rebuilding, in the system and with external constituencies.
- Improve the state's perception of the U of MO system. We need to optimize our support from the state.
- Repairing the brand and image of the university with people outside of the system. Reassure the public that the we are still committed to quality education and research. The new president has to be committed to ideals of the university and committed to repairing the image and brand and get it back to a place where it is respected nationally and internationally.
- We need to strengthen the relationship with the state legislature. We need to do a better job of repairing relationships and make sure legislature is 100% committed to the school. Make sure they know it's more than teachers and classrooms. Make sure the new governor is an ally of the university and willing to go to bat for it. We need people outside of the university to be on the side of the system.
- The most critical priority is restoration of reputation or enhancement of reputation. We've taken a hit in the last year, most of which I think is undeserved.

### **Financial sustainability**

- Ensuring financial sustainability. I'm aware of the Moody report and what it looks like will happen in MO, and it's not pretty. We need increased accountability, responsibility and obligation, and we'll have to be clever about how we resource that. Both recurring funds for growth and sufficient capital to rescue our aging infrastructure.
- We have a cap on tuition. We have to be careful and competitive and spend dollars wisely.
- Resource enhancement. MO is a low tax state. I think we're ranked 45-48 in terms of state funding for higher education. Money from the public sector isn't very good and won't be over next three years. We need to hold our own and increase on public side. Developing the private sector side is an important aspect as more public institutions look to the private sector to fill the void. Along with that is the importance of creating efficiencies so the dollars can go further. We seem to have more of a revenue problem than an expense problem, not that we can't improve on the expense side.

### **Follow-up: Have you seen any innovations as far as tapping into the private sector?**

- Most schools are looking to the private sector. Some will mention intellectual property and licensing, but I think there is limited opportunity here. We need to do it as part of our mission, but it's not going to be a big revenue enhancer.
- Public/private partnerships, e.g., in construction, programming. We have to balance this against academic freedom so we don't become captive to our private partners, but there is potential there.
- Communications. We do a horrible job getting our story out and putting our best foot forward. When crises come along there isn't much to balance against that.
- Convince the legislature to fund the school properly. Constitutionally, they are supposed to fund us properly, but it's a very fiscally constrained state right now. We have to figure out how to convince them that the school is a gem and that it will pay off to invest in it; that the students who come out of the school will make the state a better place to live in. We also have to convince the community at large of this.
- A short-term and long-term priority is how to finance the university with declining state support. The dichotomy not unique to the university. We have less than half of the budget coming from the state, but we are hamstrung with state requirements, and we have to go out and raise a lot of money.
- Long-term financial support is critical.
- Fiscal responsibility – how we sustain our university given decreasing enrollment and increased competition.
- We have to figure out funding. Every year there are swings in funding. Appropriations are flat and increases are small. It's almost impossible to adequately plan but I don't know how you get a more consistent funding level, one with more predictability.
- I was completely shocked with the time and energy I had to devote during the first 6 months dealing with the legislature and trying to secure an adequate solution to our budget conundrum. I would like to see some efforts to get some reliable funding so we can spend our time planning rather than begging for monies everywhere for half a year. I think that's the nature of the structure we have in Missouri. I don't know if we can get the state to commit to a certain amount.
- Funding from the state and a proper balance of tuition and fees is something to continue to address. This occupies most of our time. It's hard to be creative and entrepreneurial when you are trying to meet the bottom line. We have some restrictions from the state that make this difficult, but on balance, we've had a good year with the state.
- Drive shared services. The cost structure is higher than it needs to be because we aren't sharing. We need to drive systems and get the back office as lean as possible. We have recruiting systems that aren't on the same platform. We need to find the best system and use it. If you have to put an interface in front of it that works for your campus, do it. We're missing the boat on IT.

### **Recruitment / enrollment**

- Bolster enrollment
- We need to demonstrate that we're doing the best job in recruiting students and improving graduation rates, and that students are leaving school with less debt.
- We need to provide support for high performing yet needy students. A lot of the small communities see the university as the enemy because the students leave the community to go to school and don't come back. We need to help communities create strategies that will make the community attractive to students so they'll come back after college.

- Declining enrollment. A lot of Midwestern universities have declining enrollment. Our enrollment issue can't be totally blamed on the issues we've faced, other factors play into the declining enrollment, too. It's time for careful thought outside the box to address this. We can't keep doing the same thing over and over – that's not the answer. There needs to be enlightened thought and dramatic changes in the way we provide education and how we convince students to come to us.

### **Stability**

- Stabilization
- One of the most important priorities is stability but not to the point of stagnation. Some of the current problems are as a result of stagnation. We have a lot of people who have been in the same position for a long time. As they started to retire and changes developed, there became a domino effect of everyone leaving the organization. We anticipated some of that, but with the layering of the recent unrest and questionable hires it became more than we expected. We need to stop the hemorrhaging and get stability, but not anchor everyone to the point that nothing ever changes.
- Stability. Not that we're unstable, but we're not as stable as we need to be. It seems like one thing after another is tearing at the stability. We're not as healthy now as we were a decade ago. The new president and the board will have to be a big part of this, particularly the new president. The deans and faculty will also have to help bring stability to the campuses and system. The new president can't do it all – he/she will need a board that works together.

### **Build on strengths**

- Growing our national and international presence and reputation in research and scholarship. Recognize the unique value all four campuses bring to the system.
- The Columbia campus is doing tremendous things and the campus at Rolla is growing, and we need to be promoting this. Emphasis should be on talking about what the schools are doing right.
- Pursuing excellence. We're a little schizophrenic about that. Other than the journalism school, we don't have national recognition. Are we going to pick a school and turn it into the best X school in country and seek the faculty necessary to make that happen? This is a question for MU really. Rolla is up and coming, and UMKC is trying to become a nationally recognized art school.
- Increase in funded research is critical. We need to communicate that the research is leading to things that are important in the state, e.g., health care.
- Identify what you are trying to do at each school and fund that. Don't try to fund each one equally – one for one.
- Continuing our outstanding programs. Quality is a linchpin. UMSL is a state university but it's hard to get into. If you weaken the quality of the programs and lose accreditation, that's a first step to a downfall.
- Across the system we all have different priorities. MU will do everything it can to remain in the AAU. That hinges on research funding. The system is not in the AAU – MU is in the AAU. UMSL had a record number of graduates this past year. That's a strategic goal for us. To get uniform priorities across the system will be difficult.

### **Structure and governance**

- Recognizing and addressing the changing environment for higher education. What it means for the system and campuses, leadership, all involved, and what it means for resources. Often campuses are left to navigate their way. Universities aren't always at

forefront of change. What can we do to help the system, campuses, leadership? Are different resources needed to manage the change? The real issue is that the pace of change is accelerating and we need to be proactive, not reactive. Really understanding change management is key to being a healthy productive system. Some decisions are made on the system level but implemented on the campus level. There isn't time to mourn the loss that all change creates. We need to be thoughtful that it's changing rapidly and be understanding of what that means.

- System structure and focus
- What is the relationship between University Hall where the system is run, and Jesse Hall where the MU campus is run? There have been issues with the system president wanting to run the MU campus. I think it's vitally important that the president and chancellor of MU understand what role University Hall plays and what role Jesse Hall plays. I've seen egos clash over this question. The perception is that the system president is president of the MU campus. That's a critical point.
- Structure and governance are critical priorities to be resolved. What does the system want to be? The system is like the Marine Corps in that the system changes to follow the leadership. It's been better in some years than in others, but the quality depends on the understanding of the president. Some presidents understand that their job is to support what the chancellors are doing on their campuses. The president's job isn't to unify the campuses because each campus is different and needs to focus on its strengths. The system is too small. It should include Truman and MO State, and then you could do role and scope around the state.
- Another priority is that MU doesn't have its own board like the other schools do. The MU Chancellor doesn't have another group that can talk to Curators. MU needs a board that can help guide the school. Since we are four autonomous campuses, shouldn't each campus have a board?
- Board management. Managing the board will be job number one, otherwise the board will push back constantly in 9 different directions on whatever path the president tries to take.
- Third thing is the behavior of the board. It may be that they are in crisis mode after having lost the president in the flagship territory. They are really micromanaging and it is quite disruptive. They probably feel like they need to make sure that everything is going well.

### **Affordability of education**

- Maintaining affordability. This is true of all universities, but we have to find innovative ways to make education affordable. It's getting expensive.
- We have to maintain affordability. We have a dual obligation to do a better job of recruiting and keeping high achieving students, which helps build a great university. Arizona State redid their vision, and they define themselves by who they let in and not who they keep out. That's what I'm looking for in a president. Someone who can build a great research university that has a sense of obligation and not entitlement. It's tricky, and not easy to put together, but other institutions have done it.
- Another thing is that we can't become more expensive.

### **Outward / forward looking**

- A priority is that we really understand our obligations to the community. There are problems with insularity and a feeling that we can go it alone. We need to look outward more and inward less.

- We need to understand that the university serves a purpose greater than itself. The parts to the puzzle are philanthropy, high achieving students and high achieving faculty. It's a broad, difficult jigsaw puzzle to put together.
- For more than a decade a difficulty has been that many have tried to say that what's good for the university is good for the state, instead of asking what's good for the state and how can we do that?

### **Remaining Comments**

- Engaging campuses in meaningful ways of setting vision and making vision.
- Get research going more to help with our AAU standing.
- Remaking of higher education, including distance learning.
- The president needs to handle the political front and minimize the time chancellors need to spend in Jeff City. Keep me where I can control what I can control.
- There is conflict within the university between being an academic institution and a business/corporate institution. One criticism last Fall was that university was running itself like a business and academics - the human side - weren't at the forefront. There needs to be higher emphasis on the core mission of providing education and clarifying the priorities in terms of the business side versus the academic side. An example is the issue with the graduate students and the benefits provided to them. The perception is that university was giving graduate students the short end of stick to benefit itself at a financial level. A lot of graduate students felt like they were slighted on academic and employment benefits because it was in the best interests of the school. That's a complicated example because there are a lot of reasons why the university had to remove some benefits. The school needs to make decisions that are in the best interests of the human resources side of the students, faculty and staff, not just the business side.
- We need to work on rebalancing graduate student and undergraduate student numbers. In the last 10 years it's gotten out of whack and there aren't enough graduate students. We added undergraduates because we needed more funds. This is something that should be worked on at all of the campuses except UMKC – they actually need more undergraduates. That will do as much to help the resurgence as anything, but getting there takes money.
- Establishing a shared vision is the most important thing to do over the next 12 months.