

Staff and Leadership Development Steering Committee

Friday, December 14, 2007
9:30 a.m. -3:30 p.m.
Metropolitan State University, Library

Minutes

Present: Mary Bongers, Ed Choate, Todd Harmening, Jeff Hudson, Ray Jensen, Jan Mahoney, Betty Mayer, Heather, McGannon, Don Mercado, Anita Rios (facilitator/recorder), Tina Royer, Gary Simon, Julie Smendzuik-O'Brien

Absent: Keith Balaski, Cathy Bisser, Todd Jagerson, Lori Lamb, Ann MacDonald, Celeste Ruble

Guests: Bilal Dameh, Linda Skallman

I. Welcome

Anita Rios welcomed committee members and introduced new member Gary Simon, who also hosted the working session. She also introduced Bilal Dameh, who is now working on e-learning initiatives for Staff and Leadership Development and the Center for Teaching and Learning.

II. Building Capacity in the System for Employee Development

Using a polarity management framework, steering committee members brainstormed methods to better manage both system resources and campus resources for employee development (to gain the positive benefits from each and minimize the downsides).

Action: small groups agreed to type up their recommended action steps and red flag indicators and forward them to Anita Rios for inclusion on the polarity map.

Action: action steps will be discussed and prioritized at the next steering committee meeting.

III. Updates/Announcements

A. *Staff Development Survey* – Anita Rios reported that there was a 46% response rate to the survey, which is exceptionally good and replicated the response rate from 2005. Complete survey reports will be available from OERG in mid January. At that time, the survey subcommittee will reconvene to analyze the results and draft a summary.

B. *Staff Development Grant Awards* – Ray Jensen reported that there was a 60% response rate to the call for staff development grant proposals. He announced that 23 awards were given out to colleges and universities. Areas of improvement identified by the grant committee included: 1) develop a workshop to help campuses create staff development plans; 2) provide examples of good staff development plans online; 3) provide examples of successful grant proposals, so that applicants can see the kind of detail need in their proposal.

Action: The staff development grant committee will meet one more time to revise the application form and create examples that would be helpful for the next round of grants, if this activity is funded again through initiative funds.

C. Administrator Development Program – Jeff announced that he is working on an administrator development program, which will be integrated with the new administrators orientation program. He is working with Vicki Schoenbeck to coordinate. The name has been changed from managerial development program to be more consistent with our terminology in MnSCU and to better identify the intended audience.

D. Executive Development Task Force – Tina Royer announced that the Executive Development Task Force convened for the first time in November 2007. Members include: Tina (chair), Jan Mahoney, Julie Smendzuik-O'Brien, Todd Harmening, Bob Hoffman, Keith Stover, and Larry Litecky. The task force is charged with identifying development needs for presidents and vice presidents.

E. Performance Evaluation Web-based Tool – Don Mercado reported that the grant proposal was funded to allow several institutions to test a web-based performance evaluation tool that they've identified. The contract with Promantek is still in process. As soon as it is executed, pilot campuses will be able to begin testing the tool. The pilot campuses include: Lake Superior College, Office of the Chancellor, MCTC, Century College, and Riverland. Test groups on each campus will be limited to 25 people.

F. Leadership Competencies – Anita Rios announced that she presented the final draft of the leadership competencies to the HR Committee of the Leadership Council in early December. Next steps include creating examples of how to use the competencies for hiring, performance evaluation, etc.

Action: Ed Choate, Betty Mayer, and Gary Simon volunteered to serve on a subcommittee to develop examples of good interview questions and performance measures that incorporate the leadership competencies. Ed Choate nominated Lori Lamb to serve on the subcommittee as well.

IV. Review of Planning Templates and Discussion

Todd Harmening and Heather McGannon shared planning templates with the steering committee and gathered feedback from the committee to improve the templates.

V. Succession Planning Discussion

Anita introduced guest Linda Skallman, Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources and one of the committee's sponsors to join the succession planning discussion. Because the Board of Trustees is currently focused on this topic, it seemed like an opportune time to discuss it with the steering committee. Linda shared some background with the steering committee, saying that the Board would most likely focus on Chancellor and President succession issues. Linda and Anita walked the steering committee through a powerpoint presentation which will be shared with the Board on December 17. The presentation included the following:

- 1) Link to System's Strategic Direction
- 2) Components of a Succession Planning Effort
- 3) What we're currently doing related to Succession Planning

Then, committee members were divided into small groups to discuss the following questions. (Ideas generated from the small groups are compiled in bullet form below each question)

- 1) ***Why should we address succession planning now?***
 - Already behind "Tsunami" Effect

- Have not done it before
- Board of Trustees has interest – leverage it now
- Right thing to do
- Use as point of entry to HRD planning
- Incumbents know “we” “they” need successors
- “Survivor scramble” – suffer if not done
- To be successful into future – competent and able folks
- Can influence the culture of your institution path to lead “up”
- Relate succession path to career path
- Fear/Panic
- Efficiency Hiring
- Proactive
- Shape Organization

2) *What is our vision for succession planning?*

- Address Sys – regional campus levels
- ID Position and knowledge lost and how to x-fer
- Ask key position holders to document need to have processes
- Streamlined and expedite process
- Staff Development
- Sketch assignments “Quality”
- Identify potential folks to work with
- Viewed as part of whole HR Management System (Not an episode)
- Development as “regular” part of our business development culture
- Unique things about MnSCU – and what do we need on our people?
- “Attraction” model
- Org. wide Vert & Horiz
- Efficiency Hiring
- Preparedness
- Shape organization

3) *What are the key positions or linchpin roles in MnSCU that we should focus on? (In other words, for what essential jobs do we need to be developing talent?)*

- Finance
- Jeff Hudson’s
- Nursing
- Its
- Deans/provosts/VPs/President
- Specialty HR (WC/Comp/bennies)
- Any curriculum development and on-line learning
- Academic deans
- CFOs
- CAOs
- People of color (as Presidents) – get into pipeline early

(Presidential Culture – stepping stone to elsewhere – falling behind in compensation of training personnel)

- CHRO – Big jump from Senior Personnel Officer
- Deans/Assoc Deans
- Hi-level/Prof Acct.
- IT Managers
- Presidents
- HR

4) What role does the Steering Committee want to have in succession planning?

- Do it all
- Articulate urgency
 1. Data Sharing
 2. Story of President Leaving
 3. ID Position, look at these 4 questions
- Facilitate communication and resources, influence
- Share competency and exec
- Dev. & Admin Dev. Info
- “Show” them how it is done
- Help leaders direct staff to next level
- SLD is building talent foundation.
- Development Tools/Programs
- Advocate Funding
- Advocate Systemic Solutions

VI. Wrap-up

Anita asked steering committee members to say what was valuable to them about the working session and what might they recommend focusing on for the next full-day session in April. There was consensus that the working session was worthwhile and that it was good to have a development component to the day.

Recommendations for April’s working session included:

- Survey results, measure against 5-year plan and recalibrate
- Focus on workplan and do an update
- Succession planning (mentioned 4 times)
- Continuation of polarity management (refresher)
- Discussion re: how to engage campuses that are not doing staff development
- A development activity for the steering committee
- Review competencies and how we put them into action

VII. Wrap- up

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Next meeting: February 22, 2008, 10:00-12:00 noon, Wells Fargo Place Building and ITV