Executive Summary
University of the 21st Century

Background

We began these discussions with a SWOT analysis, and based on the thousands of specific responses by more than 700 people, we found that key areas of perceived challenge could be broken down into four general areas: academic and research priorities; financial health of the institution; culture; and a category we could never quite adequately name that included demographics of the student body, internationalization, engagement and technology. We set up committees and advisory groups (which involved nearly 300 people) and asked them to look at each of these areas.

Those committees sent forward recommendations after concluding their discussions. Those can be found at http://louisville.edu/21stcentury/committees/reports/nov-2014. Although each is written in a different voice and with differing levels of detail, they are full of good ideas and initiatives. Our work this year is to broaden the conversation, find more information, and begin **to implement**. Some committees found that the original premise was much more complex than originally posed, and some issues surfaced that were not part of the original agenda but nevertheless emerged as important areas for action. So, the following is my integration and summary of key themes, key directions and next steps, including areas where we already have begun implementation of some initiatives.

The committee reports read quite straightforwardly, but if you read between the lines, you'll find a sweeping set of recommendations for change, which I have loosely organized under six sections:

I.   **Focus on Students**

However things change, we will remain a university. Students, and the faculty/student relationship, are at the heart of what a university is, so it is not surprising that much of the conversation over the last year has revolved around our students.

IA. The Undergraduate Experience
The students themselves have identified key areas they would like to see addressed. These include: 1) additional student academic success initiatives (centralized or more efficient advising processes; centralized online transfer process; enhanced retention programs for at-risk students; enforced deadlines for text-book orders; transparency in use of student fees; publication of professors' evaluations; more international opportunities); 2) a greater emphasis on communication (centralized on-line calendars, better notification of events; more online and mobile functionality); 3) more opportunities for engagement (increased opportunities for research, community service, better coordination of mentoring staff and programs, better tracking of faculty and staff engagement); 4) more space (on-campus housing and increased security; better food and opportunities for healthy lifestyle; more public gathering spaces; study spaces; more library study space and expanded hours; more space specifically for graduate students).

The engagement committee likewise recommended that we enrich the educational experience of our students by connecting them to meaningful and real world issues, cultures, communities and opportunities. The international committee urged us to expand opportunities that connect our students to different cultures and peoples in ways that provide them with a diversity of perspectives and better prepare them to enter a global economy. The technology committee noted that more technologically

savvy students would bring increased expectations for faculty expertise and that both students and faculty deserved access to the best technologies that allow them to explore, discover and innovate. The culture committee specifically addressed the need for faculty to put student learning at the center of their thinking about their roles, and urged us to review a number of our programs and practices, including a review, evaluation and possible rethinking of student orientation, advising, rewarding success, teaching innovation, enrollment management and engagement in research. Everyone thought our size was about right, but there might be opportunities to expand our professional programs and provide greater opportunities for adult learners and greater access for international students and more support for our students (and faculty) to travel abroad.

IA. Next Steps:
We'll meet with Dean Mardis and the SGA executive leadership team, who should take ownership of this set of recommendations. We are already implementing some of them:
- space needs will be addressed through library expansion/renovation projects either completed or anticipated for completion over the next two years
- affiliation agreements to be renegotiated with housing
- SAC expansion will create more meeting space
- the remodel of HSC instructional space and library is complete
- the new Belknap instructional building space planning team is scheduled to begin meeting after Thanksgiving to develop plans for a 155,000 sq. ft. structure
- retention initiatives for Pell eligible students are being developed
- greater international recruitment and development of a campaign for scholarships for international travel is also in planning stages
- The Office of Communications and Marketing already has developed a more robust calendaring function, and a "way finding" app will go live in spring, 2015.

Dean Mardis and the SGA executive leadership team should create a grid with each initiative marked, assign responsibility for developing, and track progress. Some initiatives (publication of evaluations, for example) will need to be discussed with the Faculty Senate, just as an example, and many will require work with my office to coordinate with activities that other offices or academic units already have underway.

The international committee basically recommended that we hire a top level administrator to guide our thinking about international issues, that we expand the number of international students here, and that we provide more scholarships to support our students traveling abroad. Since these are largely student-centered initiatives, I've included them here. As above, I'd like the International Center Advisory Committee to look at the report, make recommendations regarding acceptance of the ideas in the report, but, for any they accept, create a grid, timeline and budget and person responsible for implementation.

In the meantime, we are considering two things. First, several universities have contracted with companies that provide recruitment services to bring qualified international students to the university. In addition to the value that they themselves bring to our campus, the additional tuition dollars these new students bring to the university can be used to support further international activities, such as study abroad opportunities for faculty and students, travel support, more programming and coursework that supports cultural diversity and exchange on

our campuses. Second, we are considering hiring a part time (at least for the current year) faculty member who has extensive experience developing international programs to help us build a strategic plan for international activity at UofL. We're also working with development to generate scholarship support for international experiences for our students and faculty.

IB. Graduate Students

While not specifically addressed in most of the committee reports, SIGS has convened a work group specifically to look at the changing landscape for graduate education. In addition to PLAN, which is a comprehensive academic and professional development effort coming from SIGS, a number of new support initiatives for graduate students are emerging, including consideration of alternative career paths, grant writing, entrepreneurship and support for dissertation completion. Over the last year, SIGS also has focused on graduate student success. Dean Boehm has been asked to evaluate each Ph.D. program at the university in terms of students' progress to completion of degrees, assistantship support for the program, and reputational data, if available. We have added masters-level graduates to our Office of the President scorecard so we can begin tracking them for our Board of Trustees.

IC. For Consideration:

A number of the issues students raised around student success have also been highlighted in the reports of the culture, technology , engagement , international, and academic and research committees. We've made huge improvements in our graduation rates in the last 10 years, but still have a long way to go. Two things now need to be considered. The first is general education, for which we have formed a task force that will recommend changes in our university-wide program to be sure that, regardless of major, our students all have a strong liberal arts and sciences core at the heart of the curriculum. That task force on general education will need to look at what it is we value as a university, and what we believe all our students need as base knowledge to move into their roles as key decision-makers in a democratic society. The task force is largely composed of Arts and Sciences faculty, but representatives from others schools are also included. Dean Kimberly Kempf-Leonard, Dale Billingsley and I are planning a day long "general education symposium" to be scheduled in mid-January. We will bring to campus some thinkers around general education to kick off this initiative.

A second idea is more controversial. Many of the concerns the students voice are echoed in the culture committee report, and as we look at duplication of efforts, multiple offices all working with the same issues, problems of transfer between units and students' attempts to navigate the different policies in each school, problems with advising, especially between units and in the hand-off as students move into majors, we may have reached the point where we need to create a freshman admitting unit. I'd like to create another task force to focus on this issue, and it will be a discussion item with the deans. I am aware of the sensitivity and all the good reasons people give to not do this. But I'm also aware that despite the work of a lot of people we have not found viable ways around all the barriers that we ourselves create that hinder student success.

II. Faculty and Staff/ Culture of Excellence

Because achievement of our goals rests so clearly on the work of our faculty and staff, I'm grateful that numerous reports, including those from the technology, international and engagement committees addressed faculty and staff needs. The most in depth set of recommendations came from the culture committee.

Their recommendations go to the heart of the task ahead of us if we are to thrive in the rapidly changing higher educational environment. Quite simply, we must create a work environment that inspires people to be engaged, creative, innovative contributors and which enables success. We must make time to communicate more effectively; to break down silos and realize that collaboration will be the key to future success; to acknowledge the critical role of faculty and staff by developing recognition programs and bringing faculty and staff salaries to the median of our benchmarks (including many ACC schools). The culture committee addressed work environment; communication; diversity and inclusion; and students (already summarized above).

IIA. Work Environment:
Trust and transparency are key to creating a culture of excellence. Trust is developed from the sense that people receive fair treatment, regardless of position in the organization, and without transparency, trust is virtually impossible to establish. People need to know what is going on so that they can align to the larger goals, they need to hold each other to high levels of performance and accountability, and they must have opportunities for professional development and growth. A culture of excellence values diversity and creates sane and understandable policies that are consistently and fairly enforced. The committee recommendations include instituting high levels of accountability, insisting on consistent implementation of procedures and policies, expanding opportunities for professional development, streamlining bureaucratic processes, and reaffirming our robust commitment to inclusion.

IIB. Recognition and Reward
Probably nothing in any of the committee reports will be seen by the campus community as more important than this one is. If we believe, and we do, that the significant accomplishments of this university are due to the efforts of excellent faculty and staff, our commitment to tangibly recognizing that must be real. The committee report urges us to "reimagine, rename and recharge" the Great Places to Work Committee, develop more robust formal and informal recognition programs, address salary compression, review promotion criteria, and provide equitable compensation compared to our benchmarks.

IIC. Continuous Improvement and more support
The culture committee identified a number of ways to institute continuous improvement programs. These include: enhanced training and professional development opportunities; stronger recruitment and retention initiatives; professional development programs in management and leadership; and more user-friendly policies, in general.

IID. Communication and collaboration
The committee recommended that we expand our communication program to include more opportunities for feedback and two-way communication. They recommend investing in strong internal messaging and increased collaboration which places renewed emphasis on the "one university" concept. The committee also emphasized the importance of communication and collaboration with students, encouraging a seamless set of programs that will guide students from admission to graduation and emphasizing the importance of faculty engagement with students.

IIE. Diversity and Inclusion
The committee recommended that we continue to emphasize the importance of a diverse community and reenergize our work to create an inclusive, welcoming environment. The also suggest that we implement policies and practices which ensure that people are treated fairly and equitably.

II A-E. Next Steps
Two things are immediately underway and I'd like to propose three more.

First, OCM is already looking at its internal communication program and considering how that needs to change to be more effective.

Second, last year a committee began working on a faculty salary benchmark study. They presented their results to me in late August. I've generally shared those findings with various groups on campus and will go through the detail of the study with the deans next week. I'm anticipating the results of the staff salary benchmark study by mid-November. We'll distribute all of that, but the faculty study itself estimated that we'd need about $8 million to bring faculty salaries up to where they need to be. We will need to develop a plan to find that money.

Dr. Dunn and I are asking all the deans to develop hiring plans for their departments, including sources of funding such as endowment, carry forward, existing open lines, reallocating lecture lump sums to tenure track lines, grants, clinical income and distance ed income, hoping that we can save some of the VSIP funding to increase the salaries of existing faculty and staff.

Third, cultures are notoriously hard to change, in part because cultures themselves teach us to see and interpret things in a certain way. Becoming "enculturated" into an institution means that we've successfully learned the shared patterns of meaning. In other words, we think that what we are seeing and what it means is real because the culture itself has taught us to do that. I believe that we will have to bring in some outside consultants on this one and give most of this report to a newly charged committee or committees to – with the consultants' help -- develop specific programs and initiatives that will address the four areas that were identified as critical for change. I would especially welcome advice from you, since I believe that if we don't successfully take this one on much of the rest won't matter.

Fourth, it's alluded to here and stated more strongly in the engagement committee's report and flirted with in the technology report, but the combined set of changes these documents set forth will require us to think of ourselves and our work differently. So, for faculty, the three legged stool may remain unchanged, but much of what is being suggested here asks us to look at how we do our work and the work itself differently. We must simultaneously hold ourselves to higher standards of accountability for outcomes and the impact of our work, but also expand our ideas of what work can or should be rewarded (think community engagement, clinical practice, entrepreneurial invention, technology innovation in or out of the classroom).

So, how do we reward teaching that truly embraces mentoring and includes our students in our scholarly work, our engaged community work, our work around the importance of critical understanding and cultural diversity? If part of what it means to be a metropolitan research university includes engagement with our community, and we do work which uses our disciplinary or multidisciplinary knowledge to create a measurable good for that community, how can we evaluate that as part of scholarship, research and creative work activity? I'd like to work with the Faculty Senate and get their advice since we may need another group, or the Senate itself, to look at these issues around faculty work and evaluation.

Many of these issues apply even more to staff. As we've talked about for the past year, staff roles are also changing and staff have long felt that the criteria used to evaluate them are very

subjective, that those who work hard are not more rewarded than those who work "proficiently," and that there are very few opportunities for advancement, especially for people of color. As we are redesigning ourselves, this has to be a good place to work for them too, and much of our work around process redesign should result in different, but hopefully, better and more rewarding work for them.

III. Systems, Processes and Infrastructure

We began the year with a consideration of "new" budget models. That pretty quickly turned into conversation around shared services models, which eventually resulted in reviews of our entire compliance structures, accounting structures, chain of command around financial accountability, policy structures, and our ability to technologically support any of it. So, I've included the "budget committee" and "shared services center" committee reports, but as other events and crises have emerged, the work of these groups has been absorbed into larger initiatives. The work of these groups has been good and meaningful and will provide good context and advice as we move forward.

III. Next Steps
For now, we are putting discussion of changing the budget model on hold. I suspect this will come back in a year or so, since we do need to do it, but there is other work to do first. As most of you know, Strothman was hired to review a number of our systems that seemed to have failed us as we dealt with another major fraud issue at the university. Some issues are university-wide, some specific to the Health Sciences Center, but we need to deal with all of them now. So, I'm not going to go into all the detail here, but we've asked the compliance oversight committee and Dave Barker, associate vice president of audit services, and his group to begin collecting all university policies so that we have them all in one place. We'll then begin the process of updating, reconciling (some of our policies actually contradict each other), and identifying gaps.

Next, we need to begin a process of rethinking how we do things, bringing our practices and systems into line with what a 21st century university needs to do. This will include finance, HR, IT (specifically PeopleSoft) and supply chain issues; it will include harmonizing business rules, standardizing processes, and using technology to automate some things that we're doing manually now (I'm hoping for electronic signatures on grants!). And because the issues are so connected, this process redesign will affect services models. Several units have been piloting these, and we'll continue to monitor impact as they move forward. As we've stated before, our goal is to create more efficiency and better ways to do things. Ultimately, we'd like to better support the academic activities of the university with less paperwork and bureaucratic work for faculty to do, but with better staff support systems to do the work that needs to be done. These changes are fundamental to our ability to move forward.

IV. Academic and Research Priorities
The goals of this area are straightforward: to discover new knowledge by fostering multidisciplinary collaborations; to understand where we have the best opportunities to be recognized for world class excellence in scholarly and research and creative activities so that we can continue to build those areas to their fullest potential; and to ensure that our students have access to the highest quality education possible through the 21st century.

IV. Next Steps

This discussion has been moving along four parallel lines, which we'll bring together in mid-January.

First, the committee began with the very smart idea that we should be thinking of priorities in terms of niche excellence and existing strength; community need; student interest; and opportunity for partnerships or in some cases funding. They then began to identify areas that they thought met the criteria, and spent time refining these.

Second, I've asked all the deans to send a short document that identifies existing disciplinary strengths in their schools; multidisciplinary collaboratives that their schools would have significant interest in pursuing; and areas of future excellence or need.

Third, under Bill Pierce's leadership, the associate deans for research have been meeting and have identified critical areas of strength that are responsive to current areas that are being funded by national agencies.

Fourth, the schools of medicine and engineering are working in areas that are multidisciplinary, collaborative and ripe for significant external funding. Both schools have also aggressively been developing strategic plans which identify areas that have been the focus of concerted effort over the last several years. While this is not exclusive or exhaustive, we've selected three areas to use as examples of what multi-disciplinary collaboratives could look like. Advanced manufacturing brings together multiple areas within the Speed School; involves corporate partners and community members; attracts federal funding involving multiple universities; includes faculty, staff and students; and invites potential participation from arts and sciences, business, law and social work. In the school of medicine, cancer and restorative medicine are two areas with similar potential for cross-campus and community collaborations. Within the Health Sciences Center, the partnership with KentuckyOne Health brings a wealth of opportunity for interdisciplinary work, some of which could involve other parts of the university.

Clearly, these areas are just a start, and there will be more. The recently submitted CTSA grant also brings huge potential for cross-university collaboration. More discussion will lead to more ideas, but some emerging additional areas that people have talked to me about include mental health disparities, digital literacy, public history, sustainability, renaissance studies and cultural studies.

In mid-January, we'll bring together the deans, department chairs and select faculty to bring these streams together. As has happened through this process, the ideas we began with have morphed considerably, so that our goal now is to think about where there is existing excellence and how do we support that; where are these opportunities for collaboration so that strong areas can be stronger together; and where are new areas that can help us build upon the national excellence we already have to further strengthen or identify new areas around which to build the future.

V. Engagement

There has been a lot of conversation over the last year around the idea of "engagement." Some of this has been spurred by our reapplication to be named an "Engaged university" by the Carnegie Foundation, but more deeply around the question of what it means to be a "metropolitan "university. I

have long maintained that metropolitan is not an accident of place (we're a metropolitan university because we're located in a city), but is definitional in terms of the kind of research university we will be. And by that definition, engagement is central.

So, our clinical programs are a prime example of how the research of our scientists connects with the practice of our physicians to bring cutting-edge treatments to the people of our community. That's engagement. The Kent School of Social Work is closely connected to Louisville Hotel, where those who are homeless and destitute can not only find a place to live, but learn how to make a living. That's engagement. Our history department is developing practices for public and digital historical analysis. That's engagement. Our students travel the globe through the international service learning program, helping those less fortunate benefit from the knowledge they have from their educational programs here. That's engagement.

The engagement committee sets forth a series of recommendations designed to expand our internal conversation about what engagement is and increase our understanding of why it is so critical to our mission. They end with a discussion of how we might rethink our reward and recognition programs to acknowledge this important work.

> ### V. Next Steps
> A good deal of work around this topic remains to be done. Based on the advice of the committee which guided the Carnegie application and consistent with the recommendations from the 21st Century committee, Dan Hall and I will set up an engagement steering committee. As first steps, this group will be asked to work with the engagement subcommittee report and consider how to move forward with their recommendations. They will also choose a half dozen "engaged" programs that are on-going at the university and develop assessment rubrics so that we can begin to assess impact. We will also ask each dean and vice president to determine how "engagement" is defined and recognized within the unit.

VI. Technology

This discussion began with the question of how much involved the university should be in "on-line" instruction But like many other committees, this group's discussion and recommendations moved them well past this question and into a larger discussion of what advances in technology mean for us overall. Their basic recommendation is that the university needs to develop a technology vision, but that vision should at least include investing in a technology infrastructure that will support the academic and scholarly work of the institution. They recommend infrastructure changes; a technology incubator that will support faculty who do want to use technology in their work; better support for faculty and students using new technologies; and improvements in classroom facilities to allow 21st century teaching to occur. They also recommend using technology to provide students with 24/7 access to services and to explore the use of competency-based education.

> ### VI. Next Steps
> The new instructional building on Belknap and the new classroom space on HSC will allow improved classrooms with high-tech capacity. Gale Rhodes and the Delphi Center are developing the technology incubator idea, and the College of Education and Human Development is developing a limited competency-based education model for use with adult learners. I'd like to give this report to the Academic Computing and Technology Committee for further consideration.