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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which Charting the Future Report Recommendation(s) did your team address?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redesign our financial and administrative models to reward collaboration, drive efficiencies, and strengthen our ability to provide access to an extraordinary education for all Minnesotans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Redesign the current financial model to incent and reward collaboration, Strategic Framework Commitments and Charting the Future recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Encourage entrepreneurial opportunities for our colleges and universities to independently and collaboratively develop new resource streams and serve more students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) White Paper: Collaboration and Cooperation as a Central Theme Across Charting the Future Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) New systemwide human resources transactional service delivery model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teams would complete the next two pages for each initiative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative #1: Brief description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redesign the current financial model to incent and reward collaboration, Strategic Framework Commitments and Charting the Future recommendations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the Current State? Problem that is being solved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MnSCU colleges and universities compete with each other for students and resources and are challenged to capture and capitalize on the benefit of collaboration and cooperation, believing instead such activities do not reap fiscal incentives or rewards, but rather end up costing resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the Desired Future State? The difference the initiatives will make for our students, colleges, universities, and the communities we serve. Note impact on the strategic framework and the strategic performance metrics, if applicable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The goal and primary focus of this initiative is an allocation methodology that is financially sustainable and enables the cultural changes necessary to reward optimal student success in the areas of retention, graduation, transfer and employability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are working through this initiative to increase the number and scope of inter-college/university collaborations and partnerships and to create systems that financially reward and/or incent increased effectiveness and efficiencies (e.g., shared services, common practices). We seek to support, incent, and reward performance metrics as established by colleges and universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk factors Identify the risks of continuing in the current state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Losing the sense of urgency. The pace of design and decision-making must remain aggressive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continuing and increasing inter-college/university competition for students in like or same programs, business and industry partnerships, and other financial resources;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Slow improvements in direct student services and/or business practices that promote consistency, economies of scale and efficiency, thus limiting resources available for student-focused service improvements;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaborations that do not meaningfully impact student outcomes or result in increased efficiencies/improved service delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Persistence of a cultural framework that resists collaboration and cooperation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Initiative (check all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_ Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ Inter-institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Systemwide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Timeframe for Completion:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Early Win (&lt; 6 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Medium Term (6-18 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Long Term (&gt; 18 months)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_ Easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Difficult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consider elements such as consultation, policy changes, resource commitment, and general feasibility.
**Action Steps:** Identify the action steps that the team recommends for moving this initiative forward. Teams may specify action steps for institutions, inter-institutional, and/or system. Examples include communication, consultation, engagement, policy, training, and other issues that the team feels should be addressed in implementation.

1. Create a design team
2. Establish design objectives
3. Run scenarios, test, consult
4. Revise scenarios, test, consult
5. Additional consultation with Leadership Council, Statewide groups
6. Board approval

**Policy barriers, interdependencies, or other concerns:**
Identify, as specifically as possible, the policies and practices that may pose a barrier to implementation and one possible means to deal with each issue; connection to other work.

1. **Interdependencies with other CTF teams**— need for macro-level objectives and policy direction from other work groups—what are the behaviors we wish to reward/incent?
   
   **Mitigation:** Coordinated communication with other teams; sharing of materials and best thinking; prioritization of initiatives and ideas

2. **Technology must be sufficient** to support a revised design
   
   **Mitigation:** Phased implementation plan, leverage other changes

3. **Real or perceived barriers (policy or statutory) to data sharing**
   
   **Mitigation:** Seek advice through Office of General Counsel and the Attorneys General, prioritize review and creation of amendments to system policies and procedures

4. **Transitioning from current practice to future desired state**
   
   **Mitigation:** Coordinated communication, create a “hold harmless” period, phase implementation plan

5. **Need for work effort surrounding other revenue sources beyond allocation** (e.g., tuition and fee structure)
   
   **Mitigation:** Communication and consultation on policy considerations surrounding certain revenue sources

6. **Role of campus/regional efforts** within the system level efforts needed for this change.
   
   **Mitigation:** Communication and consultation in each phase of project development and implementation

**Resources:**
Identify, as specifically as possible, the top three resources required to move forward implementation and associated opportunities for reallocation. Examples include approximate budget, extra personnel, special technology, etc.

1) Coordination and communication with other work efforts
2) Consensus on measurable outcomes for incentivizing or rewarding
3) Staffing commitment from campus and system office content experts

**Other Suggestions:** Please share any additional ideas from the team on initiative implementation.
Supporting Documentation

Research and References

- Current MnSCU Allocation Framework
- Tennessee Higher Education Commission Outcomes-Based Funding Formula

Best Practices

Performance funding and allocation of resources within higher education systems are varied, with no consensus as to what constitutes ‘best practices’. Limited data is available, and none substantiating one methodology as preferable over another.

Gallery Walk Feedback

*What did you hear from stakeholders? How did it help the team inform and refine this initiative?*

- Competition for funding in the framework prohibits meaningful collaboration – enrollment numbers, academic programs offered
- Current culture(s) within the system discourages collaboration and cooperation among colleges and universities.

Other

Attached:

*DRAFT conceptual diagram* of modifications to the current distribution of resources model (Allocation Framework)
Additional Ideas and Initiatives

Optional: Please provide a list of additional ideas and initiatives that the team considered and believes should merit further discussion.

We will provide one comprehensive list of additional ideas and concepts discussed by the team.
Minnesota State Colleges and Universities

Allocation Framework - Current vs. Concept

(Percent of total reflects current state appropriation distribution)

- Multi institutional programs
- Academic collaborations
- Student success
- Workforce educational priorities
- Access & opportunity
- Leveraged equipment
- IT
- Commodities
- HR
- Campus Services Cooperative
- Governance

Institutional Base Allocations (83%)
- Instruction & Academic Support
- Student & Institutional Support Services
- Facilities
- Library
- Research & Public Service

Priority Allocations (4%)

System Set Asides (8%)

System Office (5%)

System and Regional Support Services
**Initiative #2:** Encourage entrepreneurial opportunities for our colleges and universities to independently and collaboratively develop new resource streams and serve more students.

**What is the Current State?**
State appropriation and tuition and fee revenue are currently the primary fiscal resources available to our colleges and universities. These resources are limited. New resource streams need to be developed, nurtured and sustained to ensure the viability of each college and university within the System.

There exists within MnSCU examples of successful partnerships between colleges, universities and external entities including student internships, corporate scholarships and training contracts, but there is not common knowledge about these partnerships across institutions; this often leads to competition and unnecessary duplication.

Additionally, students on MnSCU campuses struggle with a variety of academic and social service needs that affect their ability to successfully complete a credential and/or transfer. They often struggle to support themselves through work study and limited external employment while attending classes and attempting to build a professional portfolio.

**What is the Desired Future State?** By implementing the following strategies (not rank ordered), we will increase our ability to achieve Goal 2.1 of the MnSCU Strategic Framework: “Our colleges and universities will be the partner of choice for businesses and communities across Minnesota to help them solve real-world problems and keep Minnesotans at the leading edge of their professions.”

1. System-wide enrollment management strategy that includes recruitment, retention, graduation and/or transfer.
2. System-wide strategic guidance and encouragement for engaging external resources, e.g., grants, business partnerships, community partnerships, leveraged equipment.
   a. Increase number and type of student employment opportunities (on- and off-campus) related to students’ field of study. Data from the National Association of Colleges and Employers shows that employers were twice as likely to hire students they had hired as a paid intern as students who were taken on as an unpaid intern or had no internship.
   b. Expand sponsored scholarships for all types of students.
   c. Create opportunities for MnSCU employee corporate internships as part of professional development plans.
   d. Increase number and type of corporate partnerships to encourage use of MnSCU colleges and universities for customized training.
3. Creation of comprehensive “concierge”/student navigator service that connects students with appropriate services (e.g., transfer, employment, social service options) based on their individual needs. (See attached diagram)
4. Catalogue of examples of successful partnerships that bring in resources to colleges and universities.
5. Encourage inter-campus collaboration and cooperation in these areas.
### Risk factors
*Identify the risks of continuing in the current state*

- Continued competition across colleges and universities for corporate partners
- Limited information for students about transfer and employment opportunities
- Limited knowledge about the needs of communities and businesses
- No common platform and management system for information-sharing or communication across colleges, universities and the system office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Initiative</strong> (check all that apply):</th>
<th><strong>Suggested Timeframe for Completion:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Ease of Implementation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Institution</td>
<td>_Early Win (&lt; 6 months)</td>
<td>X Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Inter-institutional</td>
<td>_Medium Term (6-18 months)</td>
<td>_Difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Systemwide</td>
<td>X Long Term (&gt; 18 months)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Action Steps: Identify the action steps that the team recommends for moving this initiative forward. Teams may specify action steps for institutions, inter-institutional, and/or system. Examples include communication, consultation, engagement, policy, training, and other issues that the team feels should be addressed in implementation.

1. Develop System-wide enrollment management strategy that includes recruitment, retention, graduation and/or transfer.
2. Develop System-wide strategic guidance and encouragement for engaging external resources, e.g., grants, business partnerships, community partnerships, leveraged equipment.
   a. Create research project to answer the following questions:
      i. Percent of students participating in internships
      ii. What are the typical, current employment statuses of students at colleges/universities?
         1. Hours
         2. Type of employment
         3. Employment limitations (e.g. for international students)
   b. Build a repository of information related to college/university partnerships with corporate and community entities
      i. Research number and type of businesses and community agencies partnering with each college/university including rates of success and areas for improvement
      ii. Create an easily-accessible online catalogue
   c. Increase number and type of student employment opportunities (on- and off-campus), focusing on students’ field of study.
   d. Expand sponsored scholarships for all types of students.
   e. Incorporate opportunities for MnSCU employee corporate internships
   f. Increase number and type of corporate partnerships to encourage use of MnSCU colleges and universities for customized training.
3. Creation of comprehensive “concierge”/student navigator service that connects students with appropriate services (e.g., transfer, employment, social service options) based on their individual needs. (See attached diagram)
   a. Research examples among peer systems and other state and national agencies of career “OneStop”/concierge-type services.
   b. Review current service models with MnSCU colleges and universities.
   c. Create pilot project including implementation, evaluation and sustainable funding models and seek volunteers for participation.

4. Identify, acknowledge and reward inter-campus collaboration and cooperation in these areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy barriers, interdependencies, or other concerns:</th>
<th>1) Risk: Labor contracts establish allowable parameters</th>
<th>2) Risk: Financial aid regulations and limitations</th>
<th>3) Risk: Policy, procedure, statutory prohibitions (example 60/120 credit limitation)</th>
<th>4) Risk: Cultural resistance to collaboration</th>
<th>5) Cultural resistance to corporate involvement in higher education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify, as specifically as possible, the policies and practices that may pose a barrier to implementation and one possible means to deal with each issue; connection to other work.</td>
<td>Mitigation: agreement between bargaining units and management on the value of internships as a viable employee professional development</td>
<td>Mitigation: ensure employment opportunities meet federal regulations for work study including for international students</td>
<td>Mitigation: building in non-credit internships and off-campus employment opportunities</td>
<td>Demonstrate value of successful collaborations in the areas of student success and employee satisfaction</td>
<td>Encourage faculty, staff and student involvement in development and launch of all corporate and community partnerships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resources:
*Identify, as specifically as possible, the top three resources required to move forward implementation and associated opportunities for reallocation. Examples include approximate budget, extra personnel, special technology, etc.*

1) college, university and system office staff expertise (e.g., in HR, financial aid, career services, IT)
2) Consultation with other CTF teams (e.g., Workforce Solutions, Academic Planning, Student Success, Diversity)
3) Businesses and communities with interest in partnering with the college and university system

Other Suggestions:
In addition to creating architecture and culture changes necessary for expanding collaborations with internal and external partners, providing a vision of the college and university position within a larger ecosystem that includes local communities, regions, the state of Minnesota, the nation and the world.

Supporting Documentation

Research and References

  - Data point or recommendation: College graduates will receive better, timelier information on pay and career paths if colleges partner with business to understand current labor market needs.
  - About 60% of employers offer internships
  - Percentage of paid versus unpaid interns differs by sector
  - Includes average wage info
Data point or recommendation: Recent graduates with a paid internship had a 63% chance of getting hired out of college versus 37% and 35% for unpaid interns and students with no internship respectively.


**Best Practices**

Collegiate Employment Research Institute: http://www.ceri.msu.edu/

Career OneStop: http://www.careeronestop.org/ReEmployment/Veterans/

ISEEK model: http://www.iseek.org/

National Association of Colleges and Employers: https://www.naceweb.org/

**Gallery Walk Feedback**

Over 650 Gallery Walk viewers selected this set of ideas (internships, corporate partnerships, etc.) as a priority for System Incentives and Rewards.

**Other**
Additional Ideas and Initiatives

Optional: Please provide a list of additional ideas and initiatives that the team considered and believes should merit further discussion.
Concierge/Navigator Model Diagram

1. Student connects to campus-based concierge/navigator

2. Concierge/navigator connects student to needed **resources**

3. Student can move to next step on path to enrollment, retention and graduation or transfer
Concierge/navigator is trained in:

a. first-hand knowledge of campus or community resources
b. first-hand knowledge of regional, system and state/nation/world resources or knowledge of who to contact or knowledge of process for making contacts
c. understanding of needs (or able to find articulation of needs) from identified resources

*Resources are defined in this model as:

a. academic (advising, programs available, tutoring, transfer, etc.)
b. student life (financial aid, clubs, organizations, campus services, etc.)
c. outside resources/social services (housing, health needs, child care, etc.)
d. employment/internship/mentorship (through college/university, business and agency partnerships)
White Paper: *Collaboration and Cooperation as a Central Theme Across Charting the Future Initiatives*
Offered by the System Incentives and Rewards Team
June 2015

*Cooperation* can become a reality only if we change our conceptual approaches...
— United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2014

Background

As the System Incentives and Rewards Team (SIR) began working on a roadmap for Concept 3, *Support and encourage multi-institutional administrative and academic coordination*, it became evident that multi-institutional coordination, collaboration and cooperation comprised the single most integrated theme across the entire *Charting the Future* project. As a result, SIR chose to create this white paper as the starting point for developing the system’s philosophy for creating, enhancing and/or expanding such interaction across MnSCU as well as a set of current and proposed initiatives that bring cooperation, collaboration and coordination to a new level. In order to make such change happen, we must begin with a commitment to changing the nature of relationships within our system, at all levels. We would recommend that the system’s operational philosophy should focus on creating a new balance between our current “federation style” environment (a group of states with a central government but independence in internal affairs) and an emerging environment that acknowledges the varying degrees of dependence and interdependence on one another. This new balance will support policies, principles and practices that improve student success, institutional effectiveness and service to our communities of interest.

Collaboration Continuum
As demonstrated in the model below (CITATION), cooperation is just one type of relationship that can exist between people as well as within and between groups, organizations and systems.

Based on this model, cooperation is not the same thing as collaboration or coordination, although all three are non-competitive forms of relationship. It’s important to make these distinctions to ensure that all stakeholders who may be engaging in expanded types of relationships across MnSCU have a similar understanding when using these terms. Shared vocabulary and understanding is absolutely foundational to promoting a successful effort that encourages cooperation, collaboration and other methods of positive relationships between campuses.

While it is clear from the diagram above that these terms do not mean the same thing, they are used in common parlance interchangeably. Jesse Lyn Stoner suggests we distinguish between these terms so that we better understand the nuances of each (March 18, 2013) [http://seapointcenter.com/cooperation-teamwork-and-collaboration/](http://seapointcenter.com/cooperation-teamwork-and-collaboration/).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compete</th>
<th>Co-exist</th>
<th>Communicate</th>
<th>Cooperate</th>
<th>Coordinate</th>
<th>Collaborate</th>
<th>Integrate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competition for clients, resources, partners, public attention.</td>
<td>No systematic connection between agencies.</td>
<td>Inter-agency information sharing (e.g., networking).</td>
<td>As needed, often informal, interaction, on discrete activities or projects.</td>
<td>Organizations systematically adjust and align work with each other for greater outcomes.</td>
<td>Longer term interaction based on shared mission, goals, shared decision-makers and resources.</td>
<td>Fully integrated programs, planning, funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Collaboration** is working together to create something new in support of a shared vision. The key points are that it is not through individual effort, something new is created, and that the glue is the shared vision.

**Coordination** is sharing information and resources so that each party can accomplish their part in support of a mutual objective. It is about teamwork in implementation. Not creating something new.

**Cooperation** is important in networks where individuals exchange relevant information and resources in support of each other's goals, rather than a shared goal. Something new may be achieved as a result, but it arises from the individual, not from a collective team effort.
Current CTF Initiatives
Our premise, as stated previously, is that multi-institutional coordination, collaboration and cooperation is a single integrated theme across the entire Charting the Future project. As such, it is also an impactful strategy that MnSCU could adopt to make real change.

The table below displays concepts and ideas developed by CTF implementation teams. All involved some level of cooperation, coordination or collaboration, and were developed for the most part independently from the work of other teams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Team</th>
<th>Gallery Walk Concepts and Ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Diversity           | • Support faculty and staff relationships with community partners representing populations marginalized in and by higher education, as well as new immigrant communities.  
|                     | • Coordinate with P-12 education systems and community partners to recruit students from historically marginalized groups who are interested in teaching.  
|                     | • Coordinate with P-12 education systems and community partners to prepare and place teachers from historically marginalized groups.  
|                     | • Create a systemwide diversity strategy. |
| Competency Certification and Credit for Prior Learning | • Systemwide, faculty-driven development of Competency Based Education and Credit for Prior Learning options.  
|                     | • Develop a systemwide protocol (policy, procedure and practice) for consistent coding, documenting, transcripting and transferring of competence based credits across institutions. |
| System Incentives and Rewards | • Redesign of the system’s financial model to provide for incentives and rewards for successful, meaningful collaboration.  
|                     | • Creation of a systemwide enrollment strategy.  
|                     | • Creation of a systemwide strategic plan for engaging external resources (grants, partnerships, leveraged equipment).  
|                     | • Creation of comprehensive student navigator service that connects students with appropriate services based on needs.  
|                     | • Creation of a catalogue/database of successful collaborations and partnerships that exist across the system.  
|                     | • Creation of a set of a system HR model consisting of shared practices and protocols that would reduce risk, improve recruitment/retention of talent, improve customer service and increase the reputation of the system. |
| Comprehensive Workplace Solutions | • Develop a systemwide mission that uses collaborative work to ensure the best possible service is delivered to partner businesses and communities, including CE/CT, career services, alumni/foundations, student government/organizations, faculty, staff and administration. |
Collaborate to maximize resources and increase the impact of our outreach to employers and the community (e.g., defined gateway for employers to access relevant resources, shared marketing resources and efforts, aligned business practices).

- Create shared portfolios of information for employers (e.g., courses, programs, equipment).
- Develop repository of information for college and university staff in career services, CE/CT, foundation relations, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System level sharing and development of best practices for use of technology as an integrated part of the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System level support for faculty in instructional design that allows multiple methodologies/ pedagogies for content/instructional delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create system level strategy to increase awareness and development of e-textbooks and Open Educational Resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a systemic approach to identifying and developing high quality courses/programs for online delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop system level strategy to ensure all students have a computing device that is supported by the college or university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create intentional communities within the system to increase collaboration and sharing of best practices such as innovation/ideation centers, or collaborative work groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Planning and Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a collaborative and coordinated academic planning process that advances affordability, transferability and access to programs and services across the state. The <em>Transfer Pathways for Baccalaureate Completion</em> report provides a roadmap for improving transfer across the system. This roadmap requires significant faculty-led collaboration and cooperation across colleges and universities in order to create transfer pathways that are of the highest academic integrity and navigable by advisors and students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Team</th>
<th>Gallery Walk Concepts and Ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Success</td>
<td>Examine best practices in student advising and developmental education in order to create/expand partnerships that prepare students for success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examine best practices in educational technologies and work to select, host and fund technology tools that integrate with ISRS (or its replacement).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Technology Systems Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a system level set of principles that govern the adoption of business processes and create a formal, collaborative, managed and responsive Business Process Management framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a system level framework for balancing campus autonomy with standardization and alignment of policies, procedures and practices, enabling seamless student registration and transfer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create common identity and identification practices for the system, including a single email location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current examples of collaborations and non-competitive relationships can be found on the MnSCU Charting the Future website [here](#).
Additionally, we have heard a couple of examples of collaboration and partnership efforts that currently exist within the system. The following were shared informally with the authors:

- Normandale Community College and MnSCU Information Technology Department completed a project to share student data for university students taking classes at a college campus; has resulted in presentation at MnSCU IT conference and post-conference guidance given to campuses wanting to implement similar solution (contact: Allison Alstrin, Normandale Community College).

- Minneapolis Community and Technical College (contact: Christopher Rau, Minneapolis Community and Technical College) and MState payroll hubs (Patrick Nordick, MState CFO) provide payroll services to other colleges, universities and the system office.

Similarly, some ideas in various stages of development aimed at promoting collaboration in the future (sources: Allison Alstrin, Project Consultant for Partnerships and Collaboration, NCC; and Christopher Rau, Director of Finance, MCTC)

- Incentivize campuses to solve problems by rewarding them when their solution is adopted by other campuses (e.g. a reward could be a “badge of honor” on campus website).

- Innovation-sharing retreats/conferences to showcase projects where funds are awarded for projects showing greatest positive impact (on students, finances, etc.).

It is clear that expansion of non-competitive relationships is viewed by the community as key to building a future that is substantially more student focused, beneficial to institutions and responsive to student and community needs. Developing the personal, organizational and systemic capacity to engage in these kinds of relationships, and build off of current ones that are already showing promise, is needed.

**Research**

Why should we cooperate, collaborate or coordinate work across the MnSCU System? Relationships are integral to the human condition. Data on the topic of cooperative relationships spans many literatures and may be relevant to better understand how we accomplish new relationships at a broad level.

Most research-based arguments for cooperation (as well as competition) are founded on the principles of evolutionary biology which suggests that “only fittest survive.” For example, cooperation within groups is often used to compete for scarce resources against other groups; this may be why team sports are so popular across the world (Tauer, 2009). We even cooperate to improve our own reputations (Haidt, 2007). Cooperation is essential to survival. For example, cooperation has been proposed as a key strategy in solving global crises like lack of access to water (UNESCO, 2013). Beyond access to resources, however, cooperation bonds people to each other in sometimes unexpected ways. For example, people sometimes cooperate in seemingly unselfish ways as when strangers helped strangers after bombs injured runners and others at the Boston Marathon in 2013 (Tannenbaum, 2013). The recent launch of an electronic application called *impossible* creates a cooperative structure where people can
grant wishes to strangers through technology (https://cyber.law.harvard.edu/research/cooperation). And in terms of work environments, Smith et al. (1995) noted that cooperation is “fundamental to management success” (p. 7).

Given the importance of cooperation in explaining individual, group and organizational behavior, what do we need to know and do with this information to change the kinds of relationships we have with each other across MnSCU?

**Guiding Questions**

In order to come to an agreement about how to change the balance of competition, cooperation, collaboration and coordination across MnSCU campuses, the following questions should be considered as the framework for a conversation on this important theme.

1. How should competition, collaboration, coordination and cooperation be defined?
2. What principles are key to the selection of one or the other “c” strategies when designing new relationships?

**Implementing New Kinds of Relationships**

Implementing change requires building a solid foundation for the new relationships we desire to promote. Building that foundation should include the following steps:

**First, create an architecture.** Providing a framework or architecture on which to build the effort will encourage engagement, measurable progress toward desired behavior changes and appropriate consistency across the system.

- define criteria for what meaningful competition, coordination, cooperation and/or collaboration looks like;
- encourage, recognize and reward the chosen strategy appropriately;
- create parameters under which instances of competition are healthy and result in stronger programs and better strategies to serve students; and
- incent expansion of the work to include additional entities that are compatible and ready.

**Second, create a culture.** There have been many publications and articles about the importance of creating a shared vision and belief statements when beginning projects or programs geared toward systemic change. It only makes sense that we follow the advice these offer. Through the feedback opportunities within Charting the Future (Myldeas, Twitter posts, fall and spring Gallery Walks), staff, faculty and students shared stories about change ideas that were unsuccessful because of resistance, misunderstanding and fear.

Integral to increasing better, more meaningful relationships within and between colleges and universities as well as with businesses, organizations and agencies is a shift in the cultural paradigm that values competition and rewards a ‘winner take all’ mentality. In order to
facilitate this attitudinal shift across colleges and universities, employees and stakeholders must begin to recognize and internalize that they exist as part of a larger and more complex “ecosystem” which includes student needs, campus needs, local community and business needs, regional needs, state/nation/world needs.

The “See It/Own It/Do It” model from *Moving from Strategy to Results Through People* (AchieveGlobal, 1999) explained below is a good illustration:

- **See It**
  a) Create clear case for change, taking time to share common principles, values and beliefs
  b) Demonstrate leadership commitment to the change/project/program

- **Own It**
  a) Demonstrate the “what’s in it for me?” [Please see Dan Pink’s TED talk, “The puzzle of motivation” http://www.ted.com/talks/dan_pink_on_motivation?language=en]
  b) Have a clear implementation plan (what, when, how, where)

- **Do It**
  a) Develop skills and knowledge
  b) Provide reinforcement through recognition and rewards

**Third, communicate and educate.** Creating or modifying cultural and instituting systemic change requires careful, deliberate and frequent communication and continuous education. Collaboration and cooperation efforts require targeted communication so that communities working together establish clear expectations and shared goals. Communication and education protocols should be clear, complete and accessible.

By carefully selecting the vocabulary and methods of communication used, leaders can mitigate misunderstanding and confusion. By deliberately and intentionally communicating with all constituencies and interested parties, leaders provide a climate for mutual respect, honesty and a genuine desire to understand and meet the needs of all concerned.

In order to create multiple opportunities for discussion and education, there must be numerous instances of communication in addition to numerous and varied communication methodologies used. As collaborative efforts evolve, additional information should be shared and emerging issues addressed.

In addition to these important elements, communication should be widespread whenever possible. Frequently, significant effort begins, only to find that a similar effort currently exists that could be expanded or modified rather than re-created. As illustrated early in this paper, the *Charting the Future* project has multiple concepts and ideas created that have common elements regarding collaboration and cooperation.
As a system, it seems that we are ready to take the steps necessary to coordinate and expand existing efforts as well as new ones. Creating a mechanism for systemwide sharing of collaboration and cooperation efforts would enable efficient and sensible increases in the number and scope of such efforts throughout the system. Having examples to follow, partnerships to join and/or assets to capitalize upon will only make the system more responsive to the needs of its students, faculty, staff and communities.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we offer this document to the *Charting the Future* project leadership for consideration as the CTF effort moves into its next phase. It is our attempt to collect the best thinking of the teams regarding the balance of competition, collaboration and cooperation that leads to excellence in effort and results. We hope this ‘think piece’ spurs meaningful conversation at leadership and local levels. It is not meant to be a roadmap to follow, but rather a compass to guide.
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Other information

**Initiative #4:** New systemwide human resources transactional service delivery model

**What is the Current State?** Campus HR staff currently lack the capacity to focus on more strategic priorities because they are consumed by transactional tasks foundational to HR department operations. Campus HR operations operate in an independent manner with a high degree of process variability. This variability results in significant transactional error risk.

**What is the Desired Future State?**

The system would be better served by employing a transactional hub HR model that delivers non-cultural, transactional work in a timely, consistent, and error-free manner to our employees. See Appendix for graphical illustration.

In the future state, the following benefits would be realized:

- Risk reduction (e.g. payroll issues) and overall reduction in cost per work unit (e.g. paycheck processing) by having standardized, common processes
- Better recruitment and retention of HR employees
- CHROs and other HR staff would have the capacity to handle strategic, campus-specific issues and issues of general concern to the System – e.g., could focus on developing campus employee skills in change management, project management, cultural competency and so on
- More professional development opportunities and expedited hiring processes if employees could be hired/transfer across campuses
- Improved employee and student employee satisfaction with HR services
- Better college, university and System reputation

**Current state risk factors** Identify the risks of continuing in the current state

- Continued and expanded risk for inaccurate transactions that result in financial, regulatory and reputational harm
- There is limited ability within staffing complements to cover unexpected or unplanned staff absences and vacancies in order to get necessary work completed
- Inconsistent amount of professional development and training opportunities at all levels (cross-reference MnSCU Employee Survey)
- Tension between internal staff development and the goal of expanded hiring practices
- Not enough time to devote to strategic issues on campuses
- Labor market constraints

**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

Consider elements such as consultation, policy
**Action Steps:** Identify the action steps that the team recommends for moving this initiative forward. Teams may specify action steps for institutions, inter-institutional, and/or system. Examples include communication, consultation, engagement, policy, training, and other issues that the team feels should be addressed in implementation.

- **Year 1: Conduct Foundational Work**
  - Create HR design team to vet work of campus-specific issues
  - Targeted communications plan created; begin delivering
  - Regions identified
  - Physical space identified
  - Works streams identified – e.g. payroll, benefits
  - CHROs identifying key work streams with their teams
  - Determine # of FTE needed for work streams
  - Technology infrastructure designed to support each region’s shared services
  - Design training plan
  - Create standardized processes and templates
  - Create virtual space (e.g. SharePoint) where tools and templates reside
  - CHROs develop detailed change plan for their campuses
  - Develop an evaluation plan

- **Year 2: Begin Initial Deployment**
  - HR employees begin to move (virtually and physically) to regional hubs
  - Develop and refine processes and associated templates
  - Begin measuring productivity and satisfaction at hubs and campuses

- **Year 3: Create Full Implementation and Develop Continuous Improvement Framework with trainings, audits and review of metrics**
  - Continue training
  - Create audit team that reviews and provides measures on effectiveness

**Policy barriers, interdependencies, or other concerns:**
*Identify, as specifically as possible, the policies and practices that may pose a barrier to implementation and one possible means to deal with each issue; connection to other work.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Risk: Labor contracts dictate parameters</th>
<th>2) Risk: Practices will change dramatically</th>
<th>3) Risk: Technology is not currently aligned to meet this initiative’s needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation: Use a three-year phased plan to get to full implementation</td>
<td>Mitigation: Change plan, evaluation plan, communication plan and</td>
<td>Mitigation: Create IT/HR design team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources:</td>
<td>training built into</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify, as specifically as possible, the top three resources required to move forward implementation and associated opportunities for reallocation. Examples include approximate budget, extra personnel, special technology, etc.</td>
<td>1) Technology to support changes in HR model</td>
<td>2) Extra training personnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Suggestions:
*Please share any additional ideas from the team on initiative implementation.*
Quarterly(?) transactional workshops
Supporting Documentation
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Best Practices

Two presentations related to HR informed our January meeting:

- Anita Rios, Director of Talent Management, System Office spoke about a talent management model that could be better utilized if CHROs had time to devote to more strategic issues rather than managing process issues like payroll
- Sue Applequist, Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, System Office, and Keith Balaski, HR Payroll director for one of the System payroll “hubs,” discussed the FAMA project as a pilot for using shared processes across all campus HR departments

Gallery Walk Feedback

We checked the HR model draft (v1, 12/19/2014) against the Gallery Walk open-ended feedback and found that approximately 40% of the comments could be addressed by implementing an HR model with shared processes, more focus on employee professional development and strategic issues.

Other: Charting the Future Summit: HR Model Break-out Session

Session Take-Aways

- This is not about losing budgets but about moving to a more efficient and transformational model
Need to communicate to employees and get feedback from employees on benefits of the new model

Need to determine where we should have autonomy versus shared practices

Most Exciting Aspects of New Model

- By moving to transformational we’ll have/be able to create/be able to focus more on:
  - Professional development, leadership opportunities, pathways for staff
    - Relates to succession planning
  - Sabbaticals, internships, job exchanges
  - More diverse workforce, better cultural understanding/cultural competence
  - Doing performance evaluation well
Additional Ideas and Initiatives

Optional: Please provide a list of additional ideas and initiatives that the team considered and believes should merit further discussion.
Appendix

**HR SERVICE CONTINUUM**

**Regional HR Service Model (RSM) Concept**

The overarching goal of the RSM concept is to serve students by providing exceptional campus support. Through a team approach, and by leveraging the power of our system, HR products and services are delivered in a manner that allows campus HR professionals to focus squarely on the unique strategic management and leadership issues impacting their institution. Critical transactional processes are removed from their day-to-day involvement and vital expertise is clearly defined and available to swiftly assist when needed.

---

**Transactional**

- Shared Service (Regional Hub)
  - Benefits/Retirement
  - HR Transactions
  - Payroll

**Transformational**

- Center of Expertise (System Office)
  - Labor Relations
  - Leadership Development
  - HR Policy/Procedure

- Local (Campus)
  - Change Management
  - Diversity, Equity and Inclusion
  - Strategic and Workforce Planning

---
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