

2020 Task Force 11/17/2015 minutes

Attendance: Ann Christiano, Mindy McAdams, Robert Norberg, Tom Kelleher, Katrice Graham, Amy Jo Coffey, James Babanikos, Janice Krieger, Matt Sheehan

Co-Chairs: Linda Hon, Randy Bennett,

1. Minutes approved
2. Overview of process
 - a. Historically Division of Media Properties had representatives, listed as faculty, as participants in the shared governance. We have additional areas (PATH, The AGENCY, INC, etc) and no longer have representatives listed as faculty
 - b. May need updates to constitution, but would not be feasible by December
 - c. Will need to include both faculty and staff in the decision making process. Diane mentioned surveys
 - d. Should we do a special town hall for staff?
 - e. Recommendation to allow leadership to focus on climate, while task force
3. Department meeting feedback so far
 - a. What are the goals of the task force?
 - b. What metrics show areas needing approval
 - c. Further clarification on meaning of “public interest” “social change”
 - d. Who are the eyes we want to be distinctive in?
 - e. Are we creating new or building on areas we’ve already focused on
 - f. Concerns on faculty turnover and lack of full time faculty in the department
 - g. We need more dimensionality, running from idea to idea, no incentive to do more
 - h. Deep and thick, versus far and wide
 - i. Can we create new
 - j. Our territory is captured by undergraduate departments (clarify)
 - i. Strategic communications and management is present in all departments, but, we don’t collaborate it across departments until it gets to the graduate level? Should we talk about structural issues?
 - k. The process is revealing issues that may need to be addressed prior to completing the strategic plan.
4. Discussion
 - a. We are in need of analysis
 - b. We need leadership on priorities and goals, so we can discover “what are the problems we are trying to fix”?
 - c. Our goal ask a task force is not to fix problems, but to cast vision for what the college should be in 2020
 - d. Are we speaking too much about process? Should we just allow leadership to address the issue of process and mistrust, while simultaneously continuing with the committee visits?
 - e. We should go back and be more transparent about what we’ve done so far. Then curate the concerns that have been brought up that fall outside the realm of the task force.

- f. We should tackle the responses separately from the tasks of the 2020 committee.
5. Next steps
 - a. Finish the department discussions
 - b. Make it known that our primary focus is feedback on the vision and content suggestions
 - c. Create a sheet to describe the process and how we identified the pillars. This document should be included with the goals document
 - d. Place process issues in the parking lot
 - e. Focus on completing the vision
 6. Strawman Review: 2020 Strategic Framework
 - a. Section 1c, explicitly listing “demographic” diversity
 - b. Questions on certain tactics omitted
 - i. Determined that tactical items will be included on a second document. This document is primarily a goal sheet
 7. Tactical ideas
 - a. Search committee process recommendations for diversity in candidate pool
 - b. Structures to encourage more collaboration/ faculty exchange
 - c. Increased recruitment of doctoral students (diverse grad students)
 - d. We can’t fix where we are without implementing new strategies and intentional targeting of solutions
 - e. Are we calling this a Goal Sheet or strategic framework?