



Implementation Team Report Cover Sheet

Implementation Team: Comprehensive Workplace Solutions (CWS)

Which Charting the Future Report Recommendation(s) did your team address?

5. *Work together under new models to be the preferred provider of comprehensive workplace solutions through programs and services that build employee skills and solve real-world problems for communities and businesses across the state.*

The value proposition for comprehensive workplace solutions is to drive regional economic growth by providing employers with an integrated, strategic solution for talent acquisition, development and management; a purpose that is supported by a statewide network of expertise and products.

Within this context, “comprehensive” means developing strategic relationships that embrace three key roles that employers play in higher education:

1. Employers as a customers
 - Customized training programs
 - Professional development, credit and noncredit instruction
 - Talent from academic programs
 - Consulting and research services
 - Assessment services
2. Employers as co-producers
 - Curriculum development and guidance
 - Grant partners
 - Job shadowing, site visits
 - Internships, apprenticeships and service learning
 - Guest lecturers
 - Adjunct faculty
3. Employers as advocates and supporters
 - Advisory board membership
 - Equipment and in-kind contributions
 - Sponsorships and contributions
 - Legislative support
 - Advocacy for mutual benefit



Recommended Initiatives (Summary)

Initiative 1:

Confirm and endorse the value proposition for our colleges and universities to provide comprehensive workplace solutions for employers.

This proposition requires validation by both our internal stakeholders and by employers who need access to talent solutions through our program graduates, career services, continuing education, customized training and foundation relations.

Initiative 2:

Identify resources for serving employers to share among our colleges and universities, at a regional or industry-focused level, to enhance our capacity to provide comprehensive workplace solutions and fulfill our value proposition.

This initiative requires the creation of a resource repository(ies) that identifies expertise of faculty, talent (students), training staff, equipment and other resources. The resources should be searchable and accessible to our internal constituents and, potentially, by external customers. A service cooperative would identify uniform business practices and processes to support this capacity and to facilitate fair apportionment of revenue and expenses.

Initiative 3:

Develop a uniform revenue and expense model that supports the value proposition and that recognizes total contribution of improved access for employers and communities, resulting in benefits to students and faculty, and overall strength of workforce development in a regional economy.

This model should recognize multiple revenue streams (e.g., allocation/investment, earned income, grant revenue, contributions, and sponsorships) and different kinds of costs, including (1) fixed costs (core staffing, technology, facilities, equipment), (2) semi-variable costs (sales, non-targeted promotion, R&D) and (3) variable costs (product development and delivery costs, targeted promotion, R&D, and grants).



Initiative #1:

Confirm and endorse the value proposition for our colleges and universities to provide comprehensive workplace solutions for employers.

This proposition requires validation by both our internal stakeholders and by employers who need access to talent solutions through our program graduates, career services, continuing education, customized training and foundation relations.

What is the Current State?

- Ambiguous definition of who, why and how we are serving
- Inconsistent approach to business relations
- Lack of widespread employer awareness of MnSCU capabilities

What is the Desired Future State?

- Become a key partner in training and development of employees in Minnesota.
- Put employers’ needs first. From an internal focus of “what we are allowed to do” to “what customers want.”
- Dramatically increase employer awareness.
- Improve and enhance employer utilization of MnSCU talent.

Risk analysis

- Unrealized goal in Charting the Future recommendation 5.
- Competition increases. Competitors will serve the needs of business and industry and loss of market share for MnSCU.
- No longer considered the best option for meeting employers’ talent development needs.
- Lost opportunity for MnSCU to be a leader in Minnesota’s workforce and economic development.

Type of Initiative (check all that apply):

- Institution
- Inter-institutional
- Systemwide

Suggested Timeframe for

- Completion:**
- Early Win (< 6 months)
 - Medium Term (6-18 months)
 - Long Term (> 18 months)

Ease of Implementation

- Easy
- Moderate
- Difficult

Action Steps:

Action Step 1. Validate the value proposition with internal stakeholders.

- Present the Business Canvas to Leadership Council for review and feedback.
- Identify several institutions to convene internal leaders to review the Business Canvas and discuss the implications for their college or university.
- Collect feedback from state bargaining units and student associations.

Action Step 2. Validate the value proposition and service delivery model with employers to confirm a pilot process, permit testing the concept through pilot institutions, and to commit to identify, make accessible and share resources (faculty, curriculum, Subject Matter (SM) expertise, equipment, relationships, staff, technology, etc.).



CHARTING THE FUTURE
FOR A PROSPEROUS MINNESOTA

1. Convene focus group of employers with college and university representatives to further refine how a comprehensive approach would serve their needs – focus on actions that would further clarify how they wish to receive services as customers, co-producers and as supporters and advocates.

2. Launch pilot implementation process to:
 - Define criteria for participating as a pilot institution(s) or collaboration of institutions.
 - Develop a request for proposal process that provides a structure to meet the intent of offering comprehensive workplace solutions.
 - Identify pilot institutions through a request for proposal process to establish CWS models.
 - Provide sufficient funding (from the system-level) to incent participation in the pilot process.
 - Evaluation of pilot success that informs new CWS organization structures within MnSCU. Measure both successes and barriers through formal evaluation.

Policy barriers, interdependencies, or other concerns:	1) Support for the value proposition by the bargaining units	2) Cultural views with the employer as customer and organizational structures	3) Financial risk
Resources:	1) Funding (investment) for RFP	2) System, college and university staff support	3) Support from system office Advancement Division to broadly communicate the value proposition to employers and to understand results of the pilots



Other Suggestions:

For action step #2, pilot the proposed approach with college and university consortia. By implementing a pilot program, we can evaluate how internal stakeholders (i.e., college and university administrators, staff, faculty and training representatives) react to changes and determine how external stakeholders will respond to changes in service delivery and measure levels of satisfaction. The following table illustrates what a “before and after” scenario might look like for a college or university that implements a pilot program.

	Current State	Future State – What Pilot institutions work to deliver...action steps:
Training	CE/CT reps are SMEs	Faculty are available as SMEs; outreach may be done by “generalists”
Outreach	Individual efforts by CE/CT, career and foundation staff that serves departmental efforts, but not necessarily the institution	Aligned efforts on behalf of the college; perhaps create a “business outreach associate” that represents the college
Funding	Net income-driven for individual departments, responsibility-based budgeting, auxiliary service	Create efficiencies through partnerships with other departments; willing to invest upfront (technology, personnel, DEED). Seed or investment money for pilot projects that is separate from the allocation.
Communication	We offer what we have or ask for what we need or what reps ‘know’	We ask employers what their talent needs are and how we can support them.
Structure and Organization	Separate CE/CT, career services, and foundation, by college	Employer relations teams, either within the institution or as a consortium of institutions in a region
Technology, an “MLS”- type system	Each college has its own inventory of courses and programs	An accessible inventory of CE/CT courses and programs; and an accessible list of resources and faculty expertise
Market presence and funding	Restricted by the capability of an individual college or university to offer only what they have available as an institution	Growth in market potential due to a more comprehensive approach to assisting employers with their talent needs; possibility of efficiencies in delivery
Process Improvement	Different missions, definitions, business practices, models of delivery for workplace solutions	All commit to the importance of and the support for serving the talent needs of the state. Clarity about how colleges and universities can serve differently and yet be supportive of each other



Initiative #2: Identify resources for serving employers to share among our colleges and universities, at a regional or industry-focused level, to enhance our capacity to provide comprehensive workplace solutions and fulfill our value proposition.

This initiative requires the creation of a resource repository(ies) that identifies expertise of faculty, talent (students), training staff, equipment and other resources. The resources should be searchable and accessible to our internal constituents and, potentially, by external customers. A service cooperative would identify uniform business practices and processes to support this capacity and to facilitate fair apportionment of revenue and expenses.

What is the Current State?

- Given financial constraints of many of our colleges and universities, many are unable to provide services to employers in a comprehensive way.
- There exist substantial resources to serve employers through our colleges and universities career services, foundation relationships, customized training, research, but these resources are not integrated or easily accessible to support meeting employers needs (and to support our strategic relationships with employers as customers, co-producers, or advocates and supporters.

What is the Desired Future State?

Sharing resources will permit institutions to increase and grow outreach efforts and conduct needs assessments, regardless of whether they have the capacity to provide a service, as resources and partnerships to serve needs will be more readily available.

The value proposition is embraced, i.e., the ability to promote and offer a comprehensive menu of services and opportunities to employers for talent management and development.

Risk analysis

- Lack of capability to inventory and provide access to timely and current information.
- Business practices for HR and contracting continues to inhibit access to common resources.
- Inability to fully serve employers need due to limited local resources as opposed to comprehensive approach.

Type of Initiative (check all that apply):

- Institution
- Inter-institutional
- Systemwide

Suggested Timeframe for Completion:

- Early Win (< 6 months)
- Medium Term (6-18 months)
- Long Term (> 18 months)

Ease of Implementation

- Easy
- Moderate
- Difficult



Action Steps:

Action Step 1. Create an inventory of subject matter experts (SMEs), both faculty, trainers, career services specialists, and curriculum.

- Define what resources are needed
- Define what format is best to create access
- Identify a common methodology for creating an inventory
- Create or identify a repository of information
- Inventory resources available from partnerships/institutions
- Create an inventory of SMEs and business outreach associates, i.e.,
- Direct the centers of excellence to be ‘allies’, technical assistance for collaboration and to create the inventory (by industry area, faculty, curriculum, and CE/CT capabilities) that pilot consortia would have access to

<p>Policy barriers, interdependencies, or other concerns:</p>	<p>1) Lack of standardized financial practices. Existing policies do not provide the flexibility to serve employers in a comprehensive</p>	<p>2) Lack of trust in the process (buy-in) for financial and other outcome measures to support cooperative resources</p>	<p>3) Limited resources for data collection and analysis.</p>
<p>Resources:</p>	<p>1) Research capacity specific to comprehensive workplace solutions</p>	<p>2) Funds to develop an repository system with easy access</p>	<p>3) Staffing to orchestrate for development of the repository</p>



Initiative #3: Develop a uniform revenue and expense model that supports the value proposition and that recognizes total contribution of improved access for employers and communities, resulting in benefits to students and faculty, and overall strength of workforce development in a regional economy.

This model should recognize multiple revenue streams (e.g., allocation/investment, earned income, grant revenue, contributions, and sponsorships) and different kinds of costs, including (1) fixed costs (core staffing, technology, facilities, equipment), (2) semi-variable costs (sales, non-targeted promotion, R&D) and (3) variable costs (product development and delivery costs, targeted promotion, R&D, and grants).

What is the Current State?

- Our current funding framework is based on institutional autonomy and a sense of competition among colleges and universities.
- Financial practices vary significantly across the system, which makes collaborative work difficult to implement and aggregation of impact and accountability difficult to measure.
- CE/CT is viewed as an auxiliary service by many institutions, and metrics and measurements drive competition and inhibit collaboration.

What is the Desired Future State?

A uniform revenue and expense model and revised accountability measures are needed to test the pilot design of comprehensive workplace services (both within and across institutions) and the development of a shared repository of resources would improve services and enhance the education and research missions of colleges and universities.

Risk analysis

- Continued competition among institutions that results in employer confusion.
- Disenfranchised employer partners, continued reduction of capacity and lack of continuity of service to our employers and communities.
- Inability to launch and conduct pilots.

Type of Initiative (check all that apply):

- Institution
- Inter-institutional
- Systemwide

Suggested Timeframe for

Completion:

- Early Win (< 6 months)
- Medium Term (6-18 months)
- Long Term (> 18 months)

Ease of Implementation

- Easy
- Moderate
- Difficult

Action Steps:

1. Position comprehensive workplace solutions as mission-centric to our system colleges and universities as opposed to an auxiliary enterprise.
2. Form a representative work team to identify a model for financial accounting that defines types of revenue streams and costs (fixed, variable and semi-variable).



CHARTING THE FUTURE
FOR A PROSPEROUS MINNESOTA

3. Identify a set of accountability measures to be addressed by each institution or collaboration to assist in measuring progress toward desired goals.
4. Form a work team to work with the pilot institutions to support and document their work, specifically financial and HR practices, goals, accountability and other forms of evaluation to ensure that students, faculty and employers are being served.
5. Pilots will inform the development an accountability matrix for comprehensive workplace solutions.
6. Identify financial, human and technical resources to implement the shared repository (Initiative 2).

<p>Policy barriers, interdependencies, or other concerns:</p>	<p>1) Resistance to change, especially changes in financial policies and practices</p>	<p>2) Difficulty identifying measurable goals or outcomes, especially for collaborative organizations.</p>	<p>3) Creating a balance between common definitions and different business models that reflect historical practices for technical colleges, cc's and u's.</p>
<p>Resources:</p>	<p>1) Dedication of personnel to the proposed work teams</p>	<p>2) Possible – consulting expertise to explore different revenue and expense model(s)?</p>	<p>3) Leadership from system CFO and c/u CFOs and presidents</p>