

**2020 Task Force  
November 10, 2015**

*Present: Hon (chair), Torres, Graham, Sheehan, Christiano, Wright, McAdams, Kelleher, Babanikos, Norberg, Krieger*

Town Hall Summary: Questions about comms science department, focus on experimental research, faculty vote questions, very tense, few concrete suggestions, continuing concern about makeup of committee

Torres: Guidance we got from retreat about boldness was disconnect from what we heard in town halls. Demoralizing.

Questions were about the process, not substance.

Have to focus on shared governance model, even though we have a variety of stakeholders. Colliding philosophies.

Feedback on importance of diversity. Fuchs is focused on increasing need-based aid.

Confusion about what industry is? Are we a professional school? We have a communications sciences and disorders. No one is looking at cultural studies.

Pushback about image of balanced portfolio. Perhaps we should say it's diversified.

Lots of struggle around meaning of words. Terms are loaded. Applied. Experimental.

Is this task force effort premature? Maybe faculty want to talk about what faculty wants to be.

Many people don't feel valued.

Unclear that we can identify aspirational goals. Need to focus on outcomes and metrics.

Recommendation that we use president's process.

People didn't have issues with contents of plans. Many of the comments were fair.

We need to fix undergraduate teaching. Inconsistency across classes.

Lots of pushback to having non-faculty. Lots of people concerned that they don't feel like they have input.

Lots of people wonder why we have this task force at all?

Process is shrouded in mystery. Not what we're used to. As a committee, we're not being transparent about our steps. We need to show our work.

People think we're hiding something.

We just need a vision for which we can get consensus.

What if. . . we focused on being unique in execution of goals of excellence in academia, teaching and service., with innovations in how we get there.

Let's take the three plans and put them together.

Did anyone offer anything about plans they liked? Only about process.

There is a divide among faculty and staff, which has been surprising

There is an enthusiastic spirit among people in this college.

Staff feel left out of discussion.

All about framing.

Moving forward, let's loop back with synopsis of what we're hearing from town hall. Remind that TF was composed to get all components. TF was built of research faculty, professional faculty and staff. Tie in diversity. Let subgroup integrate plans.

Vision follows university's goals. You can't argue with that. There aren't any priorities.

What is our story? How are we differentiated?

This will go thru faculty approval

Should staff get to vote? They should get to approve too. Problem is that things are going well. Staff and untenured people work hand in hand with faculty.

Hold open meetings to discuss specific strategies.

We should do a survey.

Subgroup will meet.

