

CJC 2020 Task Force  
September 2, 2015  
8:30-9:30 am

Attendees: Linda Hon and Randy Bennett (Chairs) Mindy McAdams, James Babanikos, Tom Kelleher, Benny Torres, Janice Krieger, Katrice Graham, Bob Norberg, Randy Wright, Ann Christiano, Matt Sheehan

By phone: Diane McFarlin and Spiro Kiouisis

Agenda Item 1:

Diane thanked us, reminded us of 1. strong mandate from colleagues. We will find resources to support the committee. 2. Consider the college at large: students, departments are not the guiding force. 3. Seek opportunities in the margins and at the intersections. Our alums and people in industry are not clearly in one field or another. 4. "The Longtail strategy" vertical business could no longer support business, and we need to build new businesses to make up for what's been lost. In the same way, we need to find new ways our grads can find fulfilling careers.

Spiro, 1. Like curriculum task force, you have an aggressive timeline, but you have momentum from retreat. 2. From an outcomes standpoint, focus on brief and succinct over long and elaborate, something we can share with a variety of stakeholders. 3. Address this from POV of college as a whole: academic and professional venues, various stakeholders, our research and professional mission, residence ad distance, revenue and service, paid and applied research. Be bold. Dream about where we want to be. 4. Go for consensus, not unanimity.

Randy: Timeline: we'll meet through September to determine priorities, then start socializing through faculty through town meetings and other processes. By thanksgiving, recs to Diane and Spiro.

## **Approach**

Randy: let's talk about exercise for first meeting. We could talk about our vision, or start with where we are and how we transform.

One participant recommended starting where we are. We have good building blocks and this is not a "green field" opportunity. We need to be rational and tangible about what we can accomplish.

Others preferred to take a "blank slate" approach--we can always pull back. Let's start with the most freeing thing. Starting with where we want to be. Let's

add constraints later. Without an ideal, we can't move anywhere. Let's find what perfect looks like and get as close as we can.

Constraints aren't always bad and will force us to define something actionable. Helps to have some boundaries, but not right away.

One asked: Do we believe that the current situation is really problematic? Is communication college the right paradigm, or are we Kodak? Is that our solution, or is that itself too limiting. Solutions might be different if we lead with most vibrant structures.

"Understanding our scope is good. We're going through a lot of institutional change—President Fuchs wants us to be top 3 . That could influence our thinking. Possible tension between what parent org wants us to be and what we are.

"Perhaps we can derive guiding principles from that—like our land grant status.  
"

"There's an opportunity to pick our competition and criteria."

"Our schools are not critiqued or ranked by any external measure."

"Faculty productivity stats are from 2012. "

"University goals would have us prioritize research and fundraising"

"We can help define Fuch's goals.

Comms schools are hugely different. Let's look at competition in the right light. Most of our students choose us during preview. Our competition is largely other colleges and programs within UF, including marketing, theatre, English lit. Many on this campus have no idea what we do. One comment: "I have the first-ever double graphic design and ad double major—yet that seems like such an obvious combination. Florida students aren't looking at rankings. And focus on that creates competing interests."

The group agreed that there is consensus to think bold, without constraints.

"Dreaming big is scary and worthwhile. Let's create safety around that."

One member pointed out that there are other strategic planning processes underway. Let's not be counter to those. Do we put those on hold until this discussion is done? Group agreed those groups should be subgroups, and shouldn't work against the other. Other efforts should be informed.

## **Audience**

Let's focus one meeting on stakeholders. And match ambitions to figure out what makes us look good to university. Let's prioritize and think who we need to leave behind.

Question: can we look at stakeholders and figure out what they want from us, aggregate those things and look at where there's commonality before we eliminate any.

We can be streamlined about consumer journey, from applicant to donor.

To be a top-3 school, we're going to have to think outside Florida, outside the country.

Make it work outside and it will work inside.

Apple doesn't create products for what people want. Create what they don't know they want.

We worry a lot about donors, but they don't care what you're great in as long as you have proof you're great. The rest of our changes will make them happy. Important: employers and industry. And our media properties have a whole different set of constituents. And we don't talk about them.

If we're relevant to the industry, everything else follows. On the academic side, corollary is other institutions

In industry, connecting with gators is kind of a weirdly strong connection that we're not leveraging. Not the same for others.

A key audience has to be provost and board of regents—looking at research, teaching and service

## **Wrapping Up**

For next meeting, Randy and Linda asked the task force to pick a stakeholder, envision stakeholder and our expectation of what college will offer.

Stakeholders:

Students: Undergrad, Master and PhDs

- PhD: Tom, Linda
- Master: Mindy
- Undergrad: Katrice, Ann and Benny

Internal Faculty: Linda and James, from the retention issue

Industry: Amy Jo, Benny, Randy W, Ann

University and Funders: Janice

Alumni: Randy B

Peer institutions: what they will be jealous of?

**Next Meeting:** September 8 at 3 p.m.