

College Administrative Retreat
Hilton Garden Inn
April 15, 2008

Attending- R. Steele, Brenda Williams, Leon Ressler, Chuck Strauss, Deanna Behring, Seogchang Kang, Brenda Bernatowicz, David Sylvia, Bob Elkin, Kristen Saacke-Blunk, Bhushan Jayarao, Neal Vines, Mike McDavid, Paul Wangsness, Marilyn Corbin, Rich Marini, Jim Travis, Diane McLaughlin, Mark Sharer, Tracy Hoover, Bruce McPheron, Nancy Franklin, Greg Roth, Barb Christ, Roy Young, Larry Pruss, Daney Jackson, Mary Jo Depp-Nestlerode, Bill Devlin, Tim Kelsey, Gary Perdew, Ann Dodd, John Floros, Vivek Kapur, Tom Richard, Ernest Hovingh, Terry Etherton, Dennis Calvin, Bill Kleiner, Mary Wirth, Judd Michael, Tom Schaffer, Gary Perdew, Jim Shortle, John Coupland, Marcos Fernandez, Jillian Stevenson, John Ziegler, Chris More, Jill Findeis, Gary Felton, Mary Barbercheck, Janet McDougall

Dr. Steele gave the welcome and commented on the process of strategic planning going on for the past ten years since he came here and how far we have come. In July 1997 started in a new position here at PSU and went in front of the strategic planning council to defend the college plan. At that time had 147 action items. He said he feels good about what we've done over the years. We continued to put focus on the plan and put resources where our priorities were.

Another thing going on in the past ten years is that we had birth and evolution of consortiums and institutes (Huck and Children Youth and Families). During our planning there was planning and development of these institutes; this is where new FTEs and new resources are. Institute directors are giving periodic updates to deans and chancellors. Things that are going on today are things that were talked about ten years ago in the interface. Others are being spawned e.g. School of International Affairs.

I'm very proud that in our planning we've stated clearly what our priorities are and we stated these institutes were part of our priorities and we've aligned these priorities with what is around us. We are continuing to make sure we look more like the rest of the university. We are not as different from the university today as we were 10-15 years ago. Another new thing in this planning cycle is the university is very active in strategic planning. We have involvement with the Board of Trustees in our strategic planning. A Future of Land Grant University committee has been formed; Bruce McPheron is on this committee. We are firmly positioned. We have lots of planning going on internally and also around us that we need to be aware of. As I receive the electronic copy of what the deans and chancellors received from institutes I will circulate this. We've come a long way in the last ten years, "Do you share the same comfort level or what is your comfort level with where we are?"

In conversations with Provost about planning there is no question that we are far closer to the top in upper tier. Our engagement internally and externally with stakeholders is what stands out. Our plan perfuses out to tens of thousands of people. Our process approach, our commitment to aligning our resources with priorities, aligning indicators and our engagement is what stands out to Old Main.

A key point is that I hope to put a sharper point to where we are. Are we appropriately structured to meet the pace of change institutionally nationally within our disciplines? I don't think we are but I am curious to see what you think. This was a big part of the charge of the sustainability committee. We've changed our structure a lot over the last ten years but have we changed it the right way?

In May, 2005 we asked Brent to come in and help us determine how to work through our strategic plan. Now we have asked Brent to come back and help us to focus on our plan today.

Dr. Steele welcomed Dr. Brent Ruben.

Dr. Ruben started by saying, “we have a challenge today.” We have results of the seven teams. He talked about the national context in higher education and referred to the Spelling Report. There are incredible pressures on accrediting, assessment. We need to find ways to make clearer to the public how vital this is.

Today we want to --

- take the results of all the work of the seven teams,
- Give summaries of 5-10 minutes.
- Move toward to a series of strategies to move these initiatives forward.
- Capture initiatives for each program area.
- Determine criteria to be satisfied to decide priorities?
- Vote on these priorities.
- By end of day we'll have more focus and clarity on what priorities are.

Bio-based and Renewable Energy- Tom Richards and Greg Roth

The report was broken into 3 areas – resident education, research and outreach. We are lacking the focus in the college in training in bio-renewable systems. There are important areas we can push forward as a college.

- We proposed to pull together a new minor that students can participate in while participating in another major. This would serve faculty working together and stimulate cross fertilization. To achieve this, graduate students encourage existing faculty to participate in this minor.
- We need to work to include topics on bio-based materials and bio-energy in all of our courses. Develop new course in sustainable bio-analysis.
- Need for retraining.
- Offer some sort of a certificate in bio-renewable systems.
- There are lots of opportunities for outreach with a priority area in youth education. Start out with energy and bio-renewables and build on topics of biomaterials. Stimulated by or worked into 4-H and FFA youth programs already going on in extension and collaboration with other colleges across looking for similar programs. This would fit well with university initiative to be green.
- Outreach area – interested in developing a broader base of technical specialists across state to support other extension agents to deliver alternative energy and bio-renewable programs. Suggest alternatives to current hiring process to bring these people on board to train.
- Maximize co-hires and think about systems challenges. The college is penciled in for six positions in PSIEE; two of these are happening right now. What the next four positions are is a very important question. Proposals are being evaluated. We need more faculties in systems questions and we need to make positions that will be very exciting in other colleges.
- Biomaterials need to emphasize – college needs to connect with materials strengths we have in other colleges.
- Restructure college seed grant programs to cause cross-fertilization to try to facilitate systems challenges. Have a tiered system so proposals that come up with single investigator have “x”

amount of dollars; two investigators get more funds; fund according to number of investigators to encourage teams to build themselves and have room for investigator work. Develop incentives to build teams.

Q: on seed grant –centers and institutes have their own type seed type programs; think it is poorly coordinated. There is a lot of money out there – putting it altogether you can get a lot of money and there is a lot of room for improvement in our college on how to handle this.

A: there are many ways institutes handle this. Need to figure out that opportunities are widely encouraged.

A seed grant is a direct outgrowth of planning process – we didn't pull figure out of the air; maybe the number should be larger.

Q: what affect will natural gas drilling in PA affect importance or total priority with regards to whole topic of energy with increase of this resource and focus on alternative energy?

A: it is important to engage in this process. Extension is leader on this already. Wide recognition this is an opportunity for us and we are a player in this. Have figured out how to access natural gas and we are trying to level playing field. This will not solve our energy problems – but looking at our natural energy demand it will not last for more than 15 years. Our outgoing resource is continuing to shrink – have fewer outgoing fossil fuels each year. There is a gap on what can be supplied and what natural resources can provide.

Q: Regarding faculty co-hires – did you discuss possibility new hires could help in resident education area to teach and cross over functional effort?

A: priority to get the right co-hires is to focus on specific questions. Each person has to provide other benefit to college. It's hard to project outreach part of program. Big opportunity in new minor is to flush out teaching capability. 10-20-30 year timeline of training teachers will help.

Q: what are some research areas that we need to focus on? Core to bioenergy side is trying to find out what systems work in PA. (cropping systems, forest systems in PA). In future we will see more bio-refineries with biomaterials and bio-energies .

Our college could take lead on energy policy area. There is a demand for teaching in this area. There is also a demand in Washington for this. If we can figure out how to strengthen in this area it will take many colleges to take the role.

Policy and economic issue that come up in all groups – look at cut across issues and how we might organize ourselves to address these issues and play leadership role in energy process.

Importance of consortia and institutes and culture they have affected across campus. Institutes deserve credit on how we submit grants. We have not been effective player in materials institute. There are cross cutting things in other areas – keep in mind opportunities – we have not exploited this within the college.

People in county offices are being asked questions in areas they have not been trained in. We do have people with this expertise and we'd like to strengthen these areas with people with the knowledge to strengthen our college and make us able to better interact with other colleges.

Priorities

1. **New minor**
2. **Retool outreach – for broad public –make more effective use of existing skills**
3. **Maximize energy systems-faculty co-hires a priority**

Q: Lag in findings seems tremendous in impacting our resource markets.

A: Policy piece addresses this issue re: implications rapid industrial development; different world than two years ago but farmers and foresters are market driven. We need policy people thinking about this question.

We're not behind in terms of technology. There is an invisible pool that has 500 billion dollar investments in higher technology. There is tremendous research at PSU that our college can leverage, and promote and add value to.

The whole world's economic situation, the declining of the dollar; we are not unique in struggling with issues. We are trying to build long term relationships to work together and partner in development of new technology. Long term investors might be an asset in the future for funding.

Economic Sustainability Task Force-Jill Findeis and Judd Michael

- 1) Systems (farm, forest, local, regional economy)
- 2) Period of opportunity, especially for places with urban proximity-fortunate to have rural and urban areas – positive aspect lot of innovation across the state we can capitalize on.
- 3) Fundamental transformation-energy, natural resources. (we know impact this can have and we need to be on top of)

There are a lot of forces that makes it difficult for the college and nation. We tried to focus ourselves and think of main drivers of change and what opportunities can we capitalize.

Priorities

1. **Center for Innovation for Entrepreneurship (or Center for Green Entrepreneurship)**
2. **Improving access to high quality food**
3. **Transitions to sustainable farms, forest, communities**

Mechanisms to facilitate Entrepreneurship in the college.

Entrepreneurship is the practice of starting new organizations or revitalizing mature organizations, particularly new business, generally in new response to new opportunities

Center for innovative entrepreneurship

- Catalyst to address future need of the commonwealth, industry, students—educate undergraduate and graduate students, take advantage of technical system.
- We already have a lot of these strengths. Green tech science
- Examples include nanotechnology, carbon sequestration energy
- Weaker –commercialization taking our technology and patents into marketplace
- Technology vs. entrepreneurs
- College can come into play with new center to be key player to be green tech boom on entrepreneurial side of green tech.

Entrepreneurship Center

Potential partners - PSIEE, ENRI, Biomass Center, Dairy Alliance, NRCRD, Metro Center, Goddard Chair, etc. – something in every unit in college could be folded into this.

Synergy between consumers in urban areas with keen interest in healthy foods – let's take advantage and focus on this – will help on demand side. Clear up questions on what is health food?

Suggested TV or radio show on honest talk on food? What is it we know about food – we could make a contribution here.

Needs to be intercollege efforts – multiple university. Tie into things biobased group talked about – we need to be on map with these types of things. Tie into local communities – look at economical and ecological sustainability.

Our feeling is we need to have larger focuses to get college on map – partner with other colleges.

Q: How many people in PA are economically disadvantaged to high quality food?

A: Don't have answers today but we can get this information and share with you.

Our thought – rising fuel prices, fresh foods and vegetables – how will this play out in long term with consumers. Not enough is done on marketing side.

Q: Improving access to high quality food – nutrition education outreach thrust or research program to enhance food or combination of both?

A: looking at it from economic sustainability side – producers of organic interested in local foods production, local markets, looked at distribution across state of PA. How do we serve clientele and traditional clientele? We had good representation. Need more research on marketing side to put together value and supply chains.

People would argue the nutritional value of organic food; this is a marketing thing.

There is a lot of debate on what is healthy vs. not-health food. Need honest talk on foods so we begin to understand what is healthy and good for us.

Distribution of farms across PA in 2002 there were about 58,000 farms; there are lots of opportunities to try lots of things.

Comment there is a narrow focus on #3 – leaving a lot of people out.

Undergraduate areas left out of entrepreneurial areas.

Food Safety and Quality, John Coupland and Bhushan Jayarao

Priorities

- 1. Microbial ecology**
- 2. Business development**
- 3. Food and health**

Other areas of importance include - Nanotechnology, education in food processing, food safety training, preharvest, Food biosecurity, food diet, health values, food and values, food and health, and discover and develop bioactivities.

Dollars are being spent in food service settings, providing food safety training, many views on who is responsible for food safety. College can provide useful education. Pre-harvest is a very undeveloped area. Business development has many hurdles to overcome to start producing food in PA and to do it safely with a focus on safety. Food bio-security –communications in disaster situations – terrorism and bio-terrorism. Provide systems in the event of these outcomes.

There is an argument of what food quality is.

- We need to understand where people are coming from – how and why people are eating what they are.
- Broaden our stakeholder base – what sort of people does this include?
- Broaden the Ag Council.
- Communicate idea of food and values.
- Hold a freshmen seminar taught at college level exploring food system.
- Have a where food comes from, organizing seminar.
- Broaden voices we hear so we are more willing to engage in what people want and how they see food.
- Encourage people to eat better diets – food and health
- Discovery/development of bioactivities—drug discoveries, isolation of bioactivities

Shortlist

Microbial ecology

-graduate program, undergraduate courses

Support business development (safety emphasis)

-extension educators in SE/Capitol

Food and health

-faculty/extension educators—make better diet/style choices

Q: there is a demand in population to address nutrition/health issues

A: to fulfill our needs we need to partner with colleagues in other colleges

Protection of Plant Animal and Human Health. Seogchan Kang and Ernest Hovingh

Complexity of diseases requires multidisciplinary approaches. There is limited integration of research education and extension in most current systems in the nation (opportunity to come up with solution to bring component together to present to state as a nation to be leader in nation).

- Cultural change in college needed; buy-in from faculty will not happen
- Facilitate formation of teams across units and colleges – need participation from other colleges and institutions to make us unique and strong or it will become difficult to bring resources to us
- Numerous institutions have made efforts to address animal, plant and human health over the past few years.
- Conduct market research to identify and promote unique opportunities to enhance existing strengths and build new ones
- Integrate international perspective/problems and cooperation in research and educational programs
- What can we do to help people that need our help and build relationships

- Develop center/institute to facilitate faculty working in animal, plant and human health, etc. more of a mechanism to encourage faculty and prioritize some of these areas.
- Keep extension and teaching component in this – extension has been perceived as lacking in this area in the last few years.
- When we think about forming teams the general threat is that we are afraid of it; it takes years to develop relationships.

Priorities

- 1. Facilitate team-based interdisciplinary teams (research, extension, education)**
- 2. Establish a mechanism based on market research/needs assessment to guide program priorities dynamically**
- 3. institute/Center for animal plant and public health—facilitate faculty work in these areas**

Q: how does this center differ from complex systems – use our model and take advantage of informational science.

A: Data is here somewhere but we don't have tool or mechanism to bring these together.

Q: are there specific diseases you could concentrate on? What turns pathogenic virus into non-pathogenic virus? What would this group do that is unique to PA that would add value to PA?

A: There was hesitation to pinpoint one disease – difficult to identify from plant, animal to human disease?

Q: did you consider any other things that attach humans, plants or animals?

A: talked about terrorism, eco-terrorism, etc.

Sustainable Environments-Jim Shortle and Mary Barbercheck

1. Enhance multi- interdisciplinary capacity in research, teaching and outreach
 - existing centers
 - new centers (water, quantity and quality will be enormous issues) fit into initiatives at university level as well as college level. Sustainable Environments, and forestry, biodiversity, invasive species)
2. Increase audience diversity effectiveness of existing extension resources
 - partnerships
 - technology
3. New environmental courses on current topics
 - Service (address student's issues)
 - Recruiting (offer courses on topics of high interest to them)
 - Critical analysis

See existing problems relevant to college, livestock agriculture, water pollution, and odors – big issues for stakeholders in PA. --issues we are addressing and issues we continue to work on.

Biosustainability needs to be integral to college . PA will be impacted by climate change. How do we respond to emerging issues?

College has embraced multi-disciplinary approach seen in a variety of initiatives. Key concern is continuing down this path and making sure we are making investments in areas we need to have impact within the state. There will be a lot of policy issues in a lot of context we need to have. Leverage

expertise we already have to have scope of expertise in a big impact. What other resources do we need to have a broader impact in environmental areas?

1. New courses on hot topics
2. Water quality, air quality, biodiversity and sustainability
3. Enhance capacity of existing centers
 - environmental health

Priorities

1. **things relating to land use change/cover change and water in the environment**
2. **water quality and quantity, air quality, sustainable ag and forestry, biodiversity**
3. **water quality policy**
4. **land use policy**
5. **Curricular revitalization of ERM**

Comment on inducing curricular evolution – do we feel we need 700 kids in ERM again? Is this the way we should go? We already have a major that is across the college.

Strengthen partnerships – actually say we are going to focus on partnerships.

E-Learning – David Sylvia and Diane McLaughlin

Priorities

1. **Establish e-learning office and advisory council**
 - establish finance subcommittee
2. **Program selection criteria established.**
3. **Increase visibility and representation of e-learning CAS.**

Technology infrastructure is ever increasing and getting better than ever. The network is where we thought it would never be. Our resources are dwindling so we need to find better ways to do things. By having on-line courses we can generate revenue.

- To explain opportunities, needs to be done on cost recovery basis, college provide base support. Develop subcommittee to determine costs associated with office/courses.
- Criteria focus on identifying courses with opportunities to generate revenue –go with post baccalaureate activities, food safety, environment, sustainability, opportunities for rapid growth. Advisory council would make decisions for program development.
- To take advantage of new technology for teaching; increase college visibility within university, have e-learning representative on committees to get exchange of information in terms of development of pieces of materials.

There is strong need to have a strong office in the college. eXtension could be used. We need to organize ourselves and move forward with this in a positive way.

We should also have someone look at support services to make sure on-line courses are completed.

There is flexibility in revenue sharing.

Look at market research to see what is done on inside as well as the outside.

We were a charter member of ADEC and this goes back decades.

We need to have exit strategies as well as entrance strategies.

- extension was created to be more relevant.
- How will you prioritize which courses will be done?
- An important piece is to find out how to fund this office/council and sustain it.
- A good model is in EMS where they have a successful program.
- Ideas put forward would be reviewed and needs of people and the state would be taken into consideration.
- This could be an area where we could strengthen many areas.
- Develop archival library – owned by college. Have server that will hold this information so these educational resources can be used.

College Sustainability Report-Gary Perdew, co-chair

The college has less and less money from state and federal appropriations. Budget shortfall could be as high as 29 million dollars. With this in mind we've approached this report with concept in the overall sense the college can't be all things to all people . We have to narrow down what we do and we will have to be very good at what we do.

Identify areas we are already excellent in that we want to expand in.

Identification of areas of excellence and program priorities

- College needs to decide which areas that it wants to be nationally competitive in and develop or sustain critical mass.
- Because of shrinking base support there needs to be an increasing recognition that we cannot be all things to all people.

We have to discuss what we are going to be good at and what we are not going to do.

The committee talked about sustainability and systems approach—we make recommendations of how we will get to this and be efficient and effective. This is one way to look at how we change the models of how we do things.

Programs that don't generate outside funding but only college funding have to be looked at very closely. We have to get better and become more like the rest of the university and that they are growing without base funding. There has to be recognition of what the cost is of new areas.

What makes us unique – what can we do better

With development of new centers comes new administrative structure. There is a cost implied to these centers. Referring to the chart, centers are largely focused on research. Graduate students are utilized in classrooms and laboratories. There is a multiplier effect for faculty.

Centers create a new trend and balance, increase visibility of what we do. We can do things as a center we could not do otherwise.

Administrative reform, creation of the funding group and exec. Advisory body.

- Replace the existing faculty advisory board with an executive advisory board composed of recognized leaders from outside and inside the college. (attack problems brought forward by administration, etc. –tackle specific problems)
- Provide advice on new possible initiatives to be proposed at the university level.

Discussed concept of getting engaged in being driver of new initiatives at university level and play proactive. We would be a participant in this because we would be driving the agenda.

Institutional change – creation of institutes around program priorities and making the transition from departments to schools.

- How can a program priority grow into an identifiable and sustainable group within the college; a center or institute?
- Explore a plan to develop another school within college (e.g. plant sciences) or would only a center/institute be necessary
- How will the area of energy be handled?

Look at other models of how departments are structured. The idea of maintaining a department as the way money flows but increasing peoples alignment to a center that is crossing multidisciplinary lines.

Controlling costs-historical assessment of how money is allocated to every department. These numbers have not changed over 10 years. Should there be reassessment of these budgets? Department allotment is how you begin your fiscal year not how you end the fiscal year. Should we adjust these numbers? If you ask a department to do more and then look at the 204-teaching budget and it has not changed-- what is the incentive to do more? As faculty do you feel if you do more there a shifting of resources to get more funding?

4-15-08 Afternoon session

Discussion of College Sustainability Report

- Reason structure is good regardless of what type is if you have the critical mass with expertise in the specific area.
- Develop mechanism to facilitate key folks in a discipline and find the balance
- It comes down to individuals and their desire to participate.
- There is a lesson learned to have too many smaller centers/institutes/schools with mediocre expertise vs. larger ones with top notch expertise.
- Develop a culture that encourages people to transcend into various boundaries without expectations of permanence. It's not recreating administrative structure but creating an environment to work across boundaries.
- Look at it as a reward system or determine what carrots to put out there to provide incentive
- We are trying to find better ways to do things we are already doing
- If you don't single out some of these it is hard to be proactive to push out there—this is where it intersects with program priorities. Only invest resources in the ones that are priorities.
- Question of whether or not the collective wisdom is to push out there in some way.
- Cultural change to gets group to self assemble – and visibility of Centers and/or this expertise is important
- Do centers work best at basic level?

Criteria for prioritizing strategies

- Critical to a one mission element
- Potential for external funding
- Cuts across mission elements
- Key stakeholder concern
- Potential impact
- Addresses critical void
- Critical mass
- Prerequisite
- Potential for linking to other PSU units
- Potential for impact and visibility within PSU
- Potential for impact and visibility beyond PSU

Operational

- Form consortium integrated team to address issues of disease
- Problem solving
- Flexibility
- Mechanisms to support and reward teams
- Multidisciplinary and multidisciplinary

Cross-Cutting

Looking inside CAS

- Review seed grants – level of support, process to support
- Centers (linking cross-college interests) e.g. entrepreneurship
- Teams, multi-disciplinary and interdisciplinary
- Partnerships
- Make better use of technology

Looking Outside

- Policy issues (e.g. energy, partnership possibilities)
- Materials
- Strategic campus research/outreach partnerships

Reconstructed priority lists to consider.

Lists to vote on –each person can vote on 4

- Biobased products minor
- Retool outreach for new publics
- Energy co-hires
- Center for Entrepreneurship / support business development with safety emphasis (add this emphasis from food safety/quality recommendations)
- Value added/niche food
- Address “Sustainability” in farms, forest, communities
- microbial ecology
- food & health
- plant, animal, human health (2) form center/mechanism to facilitate interdisciplinary linkage for research, extension and teaching in pertinent plant, animal and human health areas
- ERM
- Environmental partnership
- Environmental topics

Rankings from votes

- 1) Center for Innovative Entrepreneurship or Center for Green Entrepreneurship, etc. (34 votes)
support business development with safety emphasis (add this emphasis from 1.3)
- 2) Form center/mechanism to facilitate interdisciplinary linkage for research, extension and teaching in pertinent plant, animal and human health areas (19 votes)

Food and health (faculty and extension educators) stands alone plus cross cutting within college and across university linked to e-learning (19 votes)

Launch multidisciplinary intercollege initiative to address issues relevant to sustainable farms forests and communities. (19 votes)
- 3) Innovate organization of faculty (RTO) across units and colleges to enhance research, teaching and outreach in water quantity and quality, air quality, sustainable agriculture and forestry, biodiversity and other environmental topics. (18 votes)

- 4) Retool Outreach for new publics, including youth programming and renewable energy technical expertise (17 votes)

Form research and outreach initiative to focus on economic opportunities for value added and niche market food and fiber products. (17 votes)

- 5) Microbial ecology-graduate program, undergraduate courses, research emphasis (cross-cutting within College and across university) (16 votes)

- 6) Establish a new biobased products and energy minor (11 votes)

- 7) Make energy co-hires a college priority (focusing on systems questions) (7 votes)

- 8) Strengthen partnerships to increase number and diversity of clientele, improve outcomes (4 votes)

- 9) Innovate undergraduate curriculum in ERM and other environmental topic areas (3 votes)

Brent split the room by tables to discuss recommendation of College Sustainability Report (pg. 1, 2, 7 of the report).

Group A (3 tables at front of room)– talk through resource issues (Items 1,3, 4, 5)

Group B- (4 tables in back half of room) talk through organizational recommendations (items 6-8)

Consider whether short term or long term item

Group 1

- #1 short term – focus on identification of metrics and process. On-going assessment for areas of excellence
- #4 futuring group – adopted as written – envision this group providing scientific advice with stakeholder input. Start planning this group – agenda item for upcoming leadership meeting. Decided group should be together for a period of time; there will be a period of time needed to educate group.
- #5 rather than replacing existing groups revitalize existing groups – has to do with transparent decision making – need to talk more about this. (deans, unit leaders should make strategic decisions).

Group 2

- #1 short term but will be on-going over time. What are criteria used to determine whether an area of excellence.
- #3 initially some short term investments but long term shifting resources among units a process needed to get this time. Merit – what deserves merit to reassign resources
- #4 Futuring group of value to college – long term. Once put in place will continue to go on in future. How do we define who is on group, how large of group, what types of people, external people on committee – what type?
- #5 revitalize as group indicated. Challenges – look at current way vs. way we want it to work. How long serve on committee? How do rotate off? How will advice be used in college to strategize how to use this in future?

Group 3

#5 Adopt and could be implemented rapidly in short term but needs to be commitment to advisory process that empowers people to advise. Next steps are to inform committee advisory

#1 good idea – implemented over long term – continuous issue, define criteria how you would evaluate

#3 merit – good idea – long term process for implementation for review of budget, how money is being spent; development of criteria

Discussed #4 – trying to clarify what this statement means. Ag Council should not be excluded from committee but add more people to group.

Group 4

- Didn't understand #7. Multi-faceted web of programs we deliver. We already have framework in place and are already doing this type of work.
- Acknowledge aspects in our organization where you end up with single programs that are no longer as critical as they once were.
- #6 and #8 – try to identify key resources put into depts.. and how they will change if organization was different.
- Agree that what we are looking for are ways to facilitate outside normal bounds; educational vs. research.
- Continuing to build a culture to reward folks to move across boundaries. Have mechanisms in place – evaluate whether these are working. Recognize things that are barriers to bringing these together
- Sometimes barrier in working across systems is knowing what others are doing.

#8 – What school would contain that expertise? We will still need to go across administrative boundaries to accomplish what needs to be done. Consensus for #8 did not identify actual savings under a School structure.

What is not working right now is that our problems are always multidisciplinary and we have some excellent best practices that have come from bottom up. And all are facets across the college. When problems arise we aren't sure how to assemble this group. What made these groups work and what are common threads?

Do institutes and centers only work for research? They can be education and research. Structure follows the function – look at where you have success stories, grassroots. What made this work instead of assuming it was structure, etc.?

Group 5

#6 and 7 are short term but would be continuous.

#8 – long term would be working through.

Culture change needed for 6 and 8. How do you create this interaction. Needs interaction. Issues and hurdles –decisions were made where the money is. How do we shift resources around to make this more appropriate? By putting people in schools you may lose some disciplinary strength. Departments that are too large you are just creating another hierarchy and administration. How small is too small?

Next steps – maybe there should be a group of faculty on a committee to build a new structure with us in future and have them engaged with bottom up approach with definite time frame.

#7 – empowerment program teams and funding of program teams means a shift of resources. There would have to be a change of operations.

Group 6

#6 and 8—structural change may not work. History goes many years and tried to merge units but many have failed because of cultural issue. Need good justification and support among faculty to have structural change.

Support ideas of putting our resources into balancing affect. If we put everything on research dollars we are no different from outside organizations or College of Science. It is important to incorporate several factors to measure into metrics. Think about the service component of land grant institution. We could lose our strength if we only address issues of visibility and research and then once lost it will be difficult to regain it.

Demands and funding issues have changed and we cannot remain as we were to survive. We need to market our abilities to survive. People like to see new things so “re-packaging” ourselves will benefit us. We have to have a way of maintaining what we do so we don’t lose everything if what we choose to do doesn’t work.

Group 7

Institutes help create a focus for interdisciplinary work. They get a lot of publicity and visibility. Create same synergy to advance visibility of our major issues. Bring benefactors that would like to help us. Have a business plan to help drive this part of organization.

#6 and #8 – span of support and supervision around a unit leader. Cooperative extension and focus on programs is a committee presently with goal to align so they are more effective in program delivery, buy-in of county extension educators, viability.

What two pieces of advice would you give to dean about what is to be done next.

Stakeholder group input – more diversity

- Tenure system is more of an impediment than a help
- Expedient decisions – should be made quickly , manner that it’s done should be transparent
- Work groups should be identified to come up with metrics and/or groups should be determined to do this
- Define excellence
- Bring together new younger faculty and engage them in conversations of what they need to bring about systems and approach to change culture of organization and what to do to get us there
- Means and ways to increase and award across research and extension
- Use some of priority areas as a guide to pull teams together so faculty/staff and educators know we are working from this plan
- There’s a need for a futuring committee – get a cross section of new issues to table and bring variety of interest together (give new perspectives) on an on-going basis for new topics of future

Dr. Steele thanked everyone for the advice. He asked, “who defines excellence?” And, said it is “all good advice and the challenge is what to do with this advice.

Steele said he was going to start the meeting saying to works as college leadership team not a planning group, but he chose not to. This groups has shown you are leaders, and thank you for being leaders. We have 2 ½ more months before we have to submit report to the Provost.

In closing 1) our job isn’t done. Nobody is getting excused as we walk out the door. 2) we have a good sense of where we’ve been and a good sense of where we are going.

In a conversation about structure institutionally and within the college over the last ten years we’ve added to the administrative overhead. As we created centers and institutes at the university level, is this a transition state to something new down the road? Where are we headed institutionally in terms of our alignment? We have colleges that are unique to other institutes of higher education. Where are we headed; is this model to a step of consortia or where are we going in the next 30 or 40 years? We have just about doubled our college over the last ten years. If there are good ideas there is no shortage of money; if you have good ideas with good people behind them the money follows.

We have real issues internally in our social sciences and plant sciences. I don’t’ think we’re optimally organized in these two areas for the next 20 years ahead. We are not done talking about it. Where do we begin? Should we look at plant sciences? Have we done what plant sciences suggested in the last study groups?

Institutionally with all activities going on there are two areas; 1) health sciences consortium is in deep trouble. Leadership needs to emerge from this group if the group is to stay intact and emerge. Should this be us? Rural health, urban centers, interface. Should we be putting the \$5 million we put in family living salaries and push to move forward?

Interfaces of institutes; this is a big interface and we are not quite there yet with institutional technology. We are not tapped into IST enough where they have expertise to mine data. We need to discuss this – should we be involved?

One thing we haven’t talked about but we need to talk about is that units should identify jointly funded strategic investments that would have greatest impact of helping achieve units articulated vision. What would this be?

Dr. Steele thanked Brent for his willingness to come back and help move us along.

Ann said to send emails or keep comments coming. There is a lot more work to be done until we have something to turn into the Provost.