

## TRANSITION TEAM MEETING MINUTES

### January 27, 2004

**PRESENT** – Dr. Ron Abrams, Mark Collins, Nikia Fletcher, Dr. Pete Grant, Doug Hanuscin, Mary Heller, Brooke Henwood, Rose Hughes, Bob Lewis, Sharon Miller, Terry Miller, Jim Olive, Penny Snyder, Susan Sukys, and Dr. Paul Sukys

Meeting opened at 3:04 p.m.

#### **I. Discussion of Minutes and Team status**

Minutes from the January 20, 2004 meeting were approved with the following change; room 097F was indicated in the minutes as the room assignment for the January 27<sup>th</sup> meeting. The actual meeting room is 098F.

**Terry Miller** (Business Division) was welcomed as a new member of the Transition Team.

#### **II. Review Process status**

**Rose Hughes** presented the Team with two articles following the January 20<sup>th</sup> general meeting (*The Professional Organization* and *The Innovation Organization*). During this meeting, **Rose Hughes** shared that the articles were provided as a means of giving the Team a fresh perspective or a new way of thinking about the current task [responding to Gardner Shaw #4]. Discussion about the articles led to concerns about the current tasks of the Team and their relation to the recommendations of Gardner Shaw.

**Jim Olive** and **Terry Miller** shared concerns with why the Team is considering addressing Gardner Shaw #4 with restructuring. **Jim Olive** expressed a concern that a restructuring (or reevaluation) of the college, as a whole does not address items #3, 4, and 5 of the Gardner Shaw Recommendations. **Terry Miller** also shared concern with duplication of efforts with the Transition Team and the Congress. Discussion ensued with several Team members providing feedback about the focus of the Team to date.

**Paul Sukys** explained that early in their deliberations, probably sometime last summer, the Transition Team decided that the best way to explore whether the president and the vice presidents are providing the level of leadership required by the college at this time (Recommendation #4 from the Gardner Shaw report) was to examine who those leaders are leading and where that leadership is headed.

The philosophy behind this approach was the belief that the most effective way to conduct the study was to first determine what the people at the institution need in order to get their jobs done effectively. This meant looking at the entire institution, including the basic goals and values promoted by the college. Once the team had a vision of the basic goals and values of the institution, it could fashion the roles of the leaders as well as the roles of people actually doing the day-to-day work of the institution in the trenches.

Among the goals and values discussed was the core idea that we want a learner-centered, multi disciplinary, user friendly institution in which everyone cooperates with one another by

communicating, learning about one another's' jobs and responsibilities, and focusing on the students' welfare first.

Eventually the team decided that the best way to reach these goals and to fulfill these values is to promote leadership based on the servant/advocate leader model. This model promotes the idea that the role of every leader at the college (including not just the president and the vice presidents but also deans, chairpersons, and other middle management leaders) is to help everyone else at the college do the job that they have to do, and to do that job well.

With these central values and goals in mind, several models of the entire institution were introduced and discussed. The consensus of the Team is that there is no duplication of effort or overlapping responsibilities here because the Team intends to turn the results of their recommendations to the Congress, to the President' s advisory group, and the Board of Trustees.

During the discussion, **Brooke Henwood** submitted an article for review (*Creating and Achieving Your Ideal Organizational Culture*).

## **II. Discussion – What is the planned response?**

The Team reached consensus that its purpose for the upcoming weeks is to present concrete recommendations responding to Gardner Shaw #4 to the Congress and Administrative Cabinet. Those bodies can then act of those recommendations as necessary. **Jim Olive** raised the concern of the order the two bodies would receive the information. Procedure on which body would receive the recommendations first is yet to be determined.

As suggested by **Dr. Grant**, the Team will generate a sort of preamble to the recommendations so that the persons reading the information will be clear on how the Team arrived at the recommendations. This preamble will also define the link between the Team recommendations and the Gardner Shaw recommendations.

The Team will spend its remaining weeks pulling together information from accumulated literature in an effort to generate a concrete proposal(s) of action in response to Gardner Shaw #4. When asked, **Dr. Abrams** shared that the Board of Trustees would be comfortable with the Team proceeding in this manner.

## **III. Review of upcoming meeting schedule**

The next scheduled meeting of the Transition Team will be Tuesday, February 3 at 3 p.m. in the Board room.

Meeting adjourned at 4:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Nikia L. Fletcher (419.755.4813)