

Task Force on the Future of Education at UND

Appendix H

Public Comments

The Public Comment survey was created in response to Provost Link's request to solicit feedback from the university community on its Final Report.

A request for public comment, accompanied by a message from the President and Provost, was distributed to the UND community at 9:49 am, Monday, October 18. Survey respondents were directed to the Task Force web site where they could find the Final Report, appendices, and a link to the survey. A second call for feedback appeared in the University Letter on October 20, 2021. A third campus-wide notice was emailed on Tuesday October 26. Notices were also distributed through the University Senate, FacTalk, and Student Government. The survey closed at 11:59 pm, Monday, November 1.

The survey asked the following questions:

- Q2 – Please indicate your primary connection with UND (select one: Faculty, Staff, Student, Community Member).
- Q3 – Please use this space for comments about specific solutions and strategies.
- Q4 – Please use this space for general comments about the Final Report.

A total of 205 responses were received. Of these, 110 contained feedback originating from 75 unique IP addresses. Table 1 summarizes the number of responses based on respondents' reported connection to UND. Some IP addresses were the source of multiple responses.

Connection to UND	# IP addresses	# Responses
Community	2	2
Community/Faculty	1	2
Faculty	38	60
Faculty/Student	2	5
Faculty/Student/Staff	1	6
Faculty/Staff/Unknown	1	3
Student	10	12
Staff	20	20
Total	75	110

Comments from all 110 responses (Table 2) are arranged in reverse chronological order according to the submission date.

Each response has a unique code (Column 2). Initial letters indicate the respondent's reported connection with UND where C = Community member, F = Faculty, S = Student, and T = Staff, X = Unknown. This designation is followed by a two-digit number according to increasing IP address for each designation. Multiple responses from the same IP address share the same number followed by a, b, c, etc. A few responses from the same IP address reported differing connections to UND. They are prefaced by: CF = Community/Faculty; FS = Faculty/Student; FST = Faculty/Student/Staff; FTX = Faculty/Staff/Unknown.

Texts for Q3 and Q4 are presented side-by-side for each response (Columns 4 & 5). When only Q4 was answered, Q3 was left blank. When only Q3 was answered, the Q3 and Q4 cells are merged. Responses are unedited, except to remove special characters introduced when respondents copied and pasted their comments from a different text editor. Some comments span multiple pages.

Recorded Date	Code	Please indicate your primary connection with UND.	Please use this space for comments about specific solutions and strategies.	Please use this space for general comments about the Final Report.
11/1/21 7:58 PM	F38b	Faculty	<p>1. Greater flexibility regarding page 2 allocations (i.e. 10% per course) is important to permit creativity and innovation in teaching.</p> <p>2. Greater flexibility is needed regarding what is valued in regards to faculty research, teaching, and service. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning and developing pedagogical materials such as games should be more highly valued in faculty contracts. Likewise, the boundaries between teaching and service should be recognized as more malleable: mentoring and engagement with students should be more highly valued.</p> <p>3. Valuing student feedback is important, but research makes clear that student evaluations of teaching are highly problematic and tend to disadvantage already disadvantaged groups, such as minoritized groups and women. SELFIs were intended to help with this, but reduced response rates mean that they favor even more the few students who do respond, likely exaggerating those discriminatory tendencies. Comparing scores across courses, departments, and disciplines is highly unfair, given that student evaluation scores are heavily influenced by grades received and other elements that are inaccurate assessments of student learning.</p> <p>4. Developing ES courses specifically to achieve ES goals is a good idea in terms of student learning. But here, too, it will require significant effort to reward faculty for developing and teaching such courses.</p> <p>5. The MIRA model tends to undermine most of the recommendations in this Final Report and in my comments above.</p>	<p>While I would quibble with some details, I appreciate and value nearly all of the proposals made in the Final Report, and urge the campus leadership to follow through on these recommendations.</p>
11/1/21 5:52 PM	F35	Faculty		<p>I am concerned by how many--almost every one, in fact---of these recommendations have already been tried in the past, by unacknowledged tensions between the recommendations themselves, and by the resource- and structure-blind nature of the proposals. Interdisciplinarity, to take one example, is not simply a matter of "culture" or will, but entails concrete questions of resources and institutional constraints. Same thing for diversity, or revising Essential Studies. I am also concerned with seeming misperceptions underpinning the report, such as the supposed "restrictiveness" of four-year plans.</p>
11/1/21 4:00 PM	T18	Staff		<p>It may also be beneficial to add initiatives to enhance a Universal Design for Learning for students with high levels of stress/anxiety since levels have gone up significantly for all students across the board but are particularly high for students of minority groups, such as LGBTQ, students of color, students with disabilities. Some ways to reduce anxiety/stress are teaching students study skills and finding ways to increase goal orientation, self-regulation, self-efficacy, and (collaboration between) support services.</p>
11/1/21 3:55 PM	F27	Faculty	<p>Most encouraging to me is the desire to expand our outreach to under-served communities--throughout the state, region, and beyond. For example, for several years, absolutely no one has cared about our academic unit's significant contributions in terms</p>	<p>This report is so heartening as it is clearly NOT window dressing for decisions already made behind closed doors in the upper echelons of the academy. It is grounded in the realities of our</p>

			<p>of teaching, scholarship and service related to North Dakota's Native peoples and communities (including significant federal funding that included student scholarships); worse, actions have taken by UND administrators that actually undermined this work. Sections C7 & C8--rethinking institutional fiscal and academic structure to improve student learning; empowering faculty to actualize educational change--are at the heart of what UND appears to be sincerely remembering how to do. Indeed, we seem to be slowly reclaiming our fundamental mission as a state institution of higher education, and that is a fundamental shift away from where we've headed over the past few years. Rather than shift more funding to the Grand Challenges (p. 37), I think there are many seasoned faculty who would recommend that this be revisited entirely in terms of how it is configured and administered.</p>	<p>institution, its strengths, and its significant challenges. I truly commend the committee for charting a path forward in which all can significantly contribute. To implement it means a significant cultural shift from where we have been the past few years. Reconfiguring intra-institutional collaboration is critical, and necessitates a cultural shift away from years of top down control (and an organizational culture of fear and silence). Actions speak louder than words. A long string of interims in key roles (deans and VPs, especially) is both symptom and cause of that is harmful to an institution. A careful reading of this report more than suggests that different skill sets (and value sets) require consideration in future searches and hires. Finally, everyone who works at UND should be able to articulate our vision and mission as an institution, and why they are proud to work here. We have a long way to go--this report makes me think we might get there.</p>
11/1/21 2:20 PM	F24d	Faculty	<p>Solution 7 speaks to pedagogy and the teaching of classes. A huge effort was invested by faculty to create HIPs rubrics. Under Karyn Plumm's leadership those rubrics have largely been sidelined and ignored. She relegated decisions about if courses met the criteria of the rubrics to the people teaching the courses rather than through developing a process that made sense. just because you call something HIP it doesn't mean it is. We need to get this work back on track if we area going to continue to calm our students have high impact educational experiences.</p>	<p>Many of the report recommendations have or do exist in some form on campus but often they are not implemented universally or consistently. A self- study needs to take place so that we can gather campus models.</p>
11/1/21 2:15 PM	F24c	Faculty	<p>I completely support Solution 8. Faculty and staff should be trusted with information and decisions if we want a campus culture that values innovation and collaboration.</p>	<p>I so appreciate the sections which call for greater transparency. Our campus culture under former leadership was not open and information was only shared if it was considered "on message" by leadership.</p>
11/1/21 2:11 PM	F24b	Faculty	<p>I wholeheartedly agree with the call for an Essential Studies Task Force. This is e largest credit producing program on campus. In the past it was award winning. Currently it is not well led or guided. The leadership in place does not attempt to engage faculty in conversation about student learning in the program, and has failed to come up with a workable assessment plan. The program should be vibrant, innovative, interdisciplinary and student-focussed. Instead is suffers from neglect and poor leadership.</p>	<p>The report has a number of strong ideas and is encouragingly forward looking.</p>
11/1/21 2:05 PM	F04b	Faculty	<p>Three cheers for the recommendations for Essential Studies! So many things resonate from Challenge 5 recommendations - this is a frank and forward-thinking assessment of ES that identifies real issues on campus. Administrative acquisition of our once award-winning, faculty designed and led gen ed program has left ES with lackluster institutional support and diminishing faculty (and student) buy-in now. Yes, shared governance still exists in name (ESC) as a check on the administrative leadership, but the visible deprioritization of the program to a fraction of an administrator's portfolio speaks louder than the supposed institutional "priorities" of the liberal arts and innovative learning. Yes to a program review and to thoughtful ES program-level assessment.</p> <p>High impact practices trended and crashed as they fell under the same leadership centralization. HIPs live on in courses taught by pockets of dedicated faculty, but institutionally the current leadership has diminished the transformative ability for student learning. No need to continue this if the institution only supports HIPs on paper (or in marketing materials or an admin's contract) but not in classrooms.</p> <p>This carries over into Challenge 2 recommendations, which also raise excellent points. Our frustrating past institutional history of killing successful (and budding) interdisciplinary programs, such as FYEs and learning communities, crush the will to retool or attempt innovative programmatic changes. A signal that leadership rewards teaching and curricular innovation to increase student engagement and learning (rather than punishes for economic drivers such as insufficient SCH generation and tuition revenue and flat 10% P2 assignments) would be a welcome change. Rebuilding relationships</p>	

			that demonstrate that the VPAA (and VPAA team) actually trusts faculty and values their input on curricular matters is a top priority.	
11/1/21 1:13 PM	F26	Faculty	There are two items I find particularly problematic. First, from page 17, "...we believe that most of the strategies proposed here will come at little to no additional cost, just a shifting of effort and strategic investments." I do not find this sentence to be credible. There are numerous calls throughout the report for restoring positions we once had (examples that come to mind include an ES Director and a Director of Interdisciplinary Studies). Filling these roles will require search costs, faculty salaries, fringes, et al. Even if these direct costs are "covered" by shifting resources from other areas, there are still the adjustment costs associated with changing positions for those taking on these roles, and for those who may no longer be employed, if we shift resources away from what they are currently doing, to fund the new positions. Second, from page 40, the suggestion to remove the page 2 designation of 10% per course and to allow for course allocations to be negotiable. I see this as an administrative nightmare. While I acknowledge that new course preps, or particularly innovative courses, might very well take more than 10% effort during a given semester, determining an appropriate percentage, with consistency across departments and colleges, will be very a daunting task. Even more problematic, it seems to me, is the case where a faculty member has been teaching a course for several semesters/years/decades with little change, who might be giving less than 10% effort to the course. Trying to determine an appropriate reduction below 10% is unlikely to result in a satisfactory outcome for either the faculty member and/or the chair/dean. I think having the 10% allocation balances this out across a faculty member's career. While it is not perfect, I think the benefits of using it outweigh the costs, and that additional discussion should be undertaken before any change to this policy is made.	My overall impression is very positive. I appreciate the tremendous effort (thoroughness) that went into creating this report. The main impression I have from the report is a request (plea?) to re-establish a focus on teaching at UND. I think this is appropriate, and timely, as quality teaching is what will bring and keep undergraduates at UND. I appreciate the strong emphasis on the importance of liberal arts, as well as the several attempts to connect liberal learning to careers. I think making the connection is important, since my experience with prospective students (and their parents) suggests they are very much focused on jobs as a primary reason to attend college.
11/1/21 1:05 PM	T20	Staff	The specific solutions and strategies make sense overall but are not quite as bold as the situation warranted. In many ways, the strategies are predictable for current realities being faced by UND.	The final report has much more information which helps outline the thinking behind the recommendations and adds needed additional information to provide context for some of the recommendations to be clear. I applaud the report for its focus on incentivizing new instructional methods, interdisciplinary education, real world practice, inclusivity, and experiential learning. I also appreciated the advocacy for flexible learning models.
11/1/21 12:15 PM	T12	Staff		The creation of the report was a well lead, transparent process that benefited the entire UND community. The Final report is thorough, on target and addresses aspects that I have seen as a long-time employee. Appreciate that the work of the Task Force on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion is woven throughout this report. I hope that the President and Provost act upon these recommendations.
11/1/21 11:03 AM	F32	Faculty	I think the Committee has done a huge amount of work and articulated very specific strategies for achieving their identified goals. I commend them on their amazing work! I think this report addresses critical concerns in the marketplace. What are the key questions being posed by the marketplace to institutions of higher education? I think fundamentally, what has been called into question in recent decades is (i) whether higher education is still generically a mechanism for upward mobility, and (ii) how accessible is it?	I think the Committee needs to acknowledge the importance of UND's Research Mission to its goals. First, research is important because that is how scholars ultimately achieve career advancement. Whether one agrees with this or not, that is simply what the market for scholars values. Scholars deliver our programs, interact with our students, and support their success. We want the best scholars in the classroom. If we want to

			<p>I think this report provides specific solutions by UND to those questions. I do think one point that may be lost is the need to continually benchmark our programs to market outcomes and to make those outcomes transparent and known - how well are our graduates doing after they leave UND? People want to know what the returns to college majors are going to be:</p> <p>https://www.washingtonpost.com/education/2021/11/01/college-degree-value-major/</p> <p>What is a student's expected return on investment from coming to UND?</p> <p>As I said, I think we need to have a stronger organizing message that doesn't get lost in the specifics. A statement such as this one (that heads the Introduction):</p> <p>"UND's primary mission is to provide an excellent education to our students and help equip them with the knowledges and skills that will facilitate their success in whatever path they pursue in life."</p> <p>may be adequate, but one needs to ask: Isn't that what every (other) institution of higher learning would say about itself?</p> <p>What does UND stand for in the marketplace? How could we "specialize" the above (pretty generic) primary mission statement to UND? I'm not a marketing person so I'm not going to be able to offer a great PR message, but, I do think that the message needs to speak to: (i) reaffirming that UND's programs deliver on people's aspirations for upward mobility, (ii) that UND has built a community that is conducive towards and also committed to expanding access for such opportunities for upward, mobility to people of all backgrounds, and (iii) that who we are as a public institution that enjoys the support and confidence of residents in this rural state makes us particularly well-placed to deliver on (i) and (ii).</p>	<p>attract (hire) and retain high quality scholars, then, we need to assure them that their career priorities are recognized and supported at UND. That their coming to UND will not constitute a "dead end" for them; otherwise, no one of quality would want to join our team. That UND is a place with the research culture, environment, and support that is conducive for achieving scholarly excellence hence affording them opportunities for advancement in their fields.</p> <p>Second, in an increasingly competitive market space for higher education, higher value will be placed on our ability to differentiate our product and stand out. There are a range of ways that any institution can differentiate itself - sports teams, cost, community characteristics, instructional delivery (e.g., small classes with substantial access to professors), etc. But, one of those ways is certainly "institutional scholarly reputation". UND needs to be known for general scholarly excellence across campus (that provides assurance for the quality of its programs), and it needs to develop substantial reputation in key areas. Our competitors in the marketplace for students will be challenging us across the entire spectrum of differentiation possibilities; we really cannot afford to ignore any aspect especially one that is so central to what we do as an institution of *higher* learning: scholarship.</p>
11/1/21 10:54 AM	T15	Staff	<p>Where's the sections detailing what UND currently does and how the recommendations would improve functionality/effectiveness, etc.?</p>	<p>This report reads like a literature review and it's painfully obvious the task force members did not discuss their findings and/or recommendations with the 15+ individuals specifically named by former Interim Provost Debbie Storrs, as UND resources. As a result, the report implies none of the recommendations have been implemented and/or tested for their effectiveness at UND.</p>
11/1/21 10:07 AM	F04a	Faculty	<p>Attention to Challenge 1 is definitely warranted, especially UND's commitment to regional Indigenous Nations and the success of our Indigenous students. Given that this was also a key finding from the DEI Task Force, leadership must strive to fulfill these recommendations. This can also help serve the state as our K-12 teachers develop the newly legislated curriculum on Native American history.</p> <p>Furthermore, housecleaning within the Enrollment Management unit appears necessary, given the details of the report, to ensure equitable treatment and pathways for success for all students. Where is the balance between the inherited practices and the most inclusive practices?</p> <p>Infusing reports with wise words from poet Nikki Giovanni was a welcome addition to an official report. More clever examples of the influence of humanities on our lives, please.</p>	
11/1/21 12:03 AM	F25	Faculty	<p>recommendations and incentives are a great starting point for re-focusing faculty effort on teaching, but in my opinion these will never be strong enough. We need to establish a strong culture of high standards for faculty professionalism, particularly around teaching. Some form of continuing education (something required for almost every other profession) needs to be REQUIRED of faculty. Basis tech skills need to be REQUIRED, all faculty should be able to use video conferencing, word processing, email, the internet, etc. Resilience has been unevenly distributed across our campus through the covid-19 pandemic, and those that are hanging on by tenure alone are obvious. We need to move into the new normal with a clear understanding of our role and an ability to rely on our peers for equal amounts of work and participation. This includes obvious service obligations, but also teaching- students who experience low</p>	

			<p>impact lecture become resistant or hostile to more impactful, more challenging modalities elsewhere. Consistently high standards in teaching will benefit students and faculty both. These standards must be reflected in recorded promotion guidelines. There must be a mechanism for removal of non-compliant faculty, we can no longer allow faculty who act in conflict with the stated mission of UND to hide behind the supposed rule of "academic freedom" granted to them by tenure status.</p> <p>In building partnerships, more standards in core courses needs to be discussed at least across the NDUS system. Evaluating transfer credits needs a complete rehaul and the goal must move beyond just trying to get as many students as possible. This does not convey quality. Subject specific conversations should be happening across the NDUS system to ensure at minimum common courses are similar - like intro bio, intro chem, intro english, etc. This quality should be held up by nationally published standards where appropriate.</p> <p>The point on DEI integration and increasing the strength of the essential studies program is the most important proposed solution. The budget model currently discourages these solutions. This goes hand in hand with increasing our standards for faculty teaching across the board. It must be everyone's responsibility and we must build that culture through incentive, reward, and mandate. "I don't have the experience or knowledge" cannot continue to be held as an excuse for the lack of DEI relevancy of many courses or the straight opposite of harmful exclusionary practices in the curriculum - outdated terms, discriminatory practices, etc. By allowing this to be explained away undermines all of our professions. By definition, a PhD or equivalent graduate degree is training in how to think, in how to learn. This can and should be applied broadly and faculty must demonstrate their ability to change and adapt, or they must be eliminated from our campus community, else we run the risk of them draining the finite resources of creativity, energy, and innovation of those that will. It also continues to send a message to students that this is not a constant in their education, in their future, where the research cited in the report clearly demonstrates that DEI and globalization is our future.</p>
<p>10/31/21 11:08 PM</p>	<p>F23d</p>	<p>Faculty</p>	<p>Re-establishing an ES Office and a faculty ES director centers the ES curriculum and the liberal arts mission within the faculty and provides an important counterbalance to the administrative, front-office power dynamic under the current arrangement. Naysayers will point to the ES Committee as the faculty stronghold for ES; however, the committee is composed of a rotating membership by design. The only permanent position in the current ES governance model is held by the administration through the Provost's Office, giving a clear advantage to the upper administration in its governance.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that the current arrangement came after the fairly sudden dissolution of the ES office and its ES director several years ago. The change happened with no discussion at the University Senate other than to inform senators that an ES director was no longer needed. In practice, the title reappeared some months later within the Provost's Office, and many faculty felt deceived. A return to an ES office with a faculty director will also require an honest review of this recent history and how the ES Office and the ES director should relate to the Provost's Office. If the ES director is buried in the hierarchy by reporting to a vice provost, most faculty will not see that much has changed in terms of governance or trust. Also, the Provost Office handles multiple concerns, including student success and enrollment. These responsibilities--each important--can be seen as at odds with each other and should not be invested in a single position. It would be worth exploring an ES director with dean-level status.</p> <p>The ES faculty director should be tenured (not on the tenure track). Unless the work of the ES director were to be recognized as "counting" toward tenure in ways that have not historically been recognized, then placing someone who does not yet have tenure in such a position would be setting the individual up for a difficult, if not impossible tenure process. The most likely result would be the individual not earning tenure. We should not set people up for failure. At best, having an ES director on the tenure track would likely result in diminished attention to the work of ES or in ES being co-opted as the publication pipeline for the purposes of earning tenure. Neither of those possibilities would support quality in our ES program. That said, actual recognition of SoTL as a legitimate area of scholarly activity would be an important improvement for both a tenured ES director and the faculty, especially those who teach ES courses. A NTT ES director, as suggested in the appendix of the report, is a well-intentioned but bad idea. A NTT ES director would not have the same important protections as a tenured faculty member and would be on a short-term contract (possibly even 1 year), creating a higher likelihood of turnover instead of the stability necessary to guide and grow an innovative program.</p> <p>Engaging faculty in the ES program and creating a shared feeling of community, pride, and commitment would be very helpful. There is a precedent for this, but the work in ES has not been one of community or celebration since the office was dissolved. For example, assessment of ES as a program once included multiple faculty on multiple levels, but that no longer happens. There once was an ES showcase of student work (a best practice), but that was also discontinued under the vice provost who assumed ES director duties. Communication about ES to those teaching ES courses has all but ceased, except for some communication about the revised analyzing world view learning goal (as new courses need to be added) and indirect "requirements" of having ES statements on syllabi if teaching ES courses. A return to faculty conversations and input in ES program assessment across campus, not just limited to the committee, would be welcome and useful. As someone who regularly teaches ES courses, such conversations about the program from the perspective of other faculty working on other goals enhanced my ability to speak with students about what they were and would be learning through their ES courses and helped me reinforce connections between the learning goals and the courses they were taking.</p>

<p>10/31/21 10:27 PM</p>	<p>F23c</p>	<p>Faculty</p>	<p>Solution 5.d: Frankly, this point raises many concerns for me. Since accreditation of professional programs would require certain classes, this seems to imply ES courses. Is that the intent? Also, how would life experience be assessed? Placement tests? Letters of recommendation for employer/supervisor (without concern for expertise)? Time in a position? How will the integrity of the curriculum be maintained? No one is served well if a degree from UND diminishes in value.</p> <p>That said, I do appreciate that solution 5 raises important questions about how a student, particularly a non-traditional student, moves through our programs. Again, my concern is that student success has too often been pitted against the curriculum.</p>
<p>10/31/21 4:27 PM</p>	<p>F02c</p>	<p>Faculty</p>	<p>Solution 1: I am surprised that the report does not address support for recruiting and retaining international students, particularly those who are still building fluency in academic English. Resources to support language needs have all but disappeared in the last 10 years. While language needs may represent a minority, being positioned to provide such academic support is important to the academic mission and initiatives that promote DEI work on campus. Simple places to begin: a designated EL specialist in the WC.</p> <p>I am also surprised that there was not a call to increase study abroad or similar educational experiences that emphasize direct engagement with diverse people and places. Being open and welcoming to diverse people has an important corollary--being open to examining and reflecting on one's own experience and position.</p> <p>The future of HE is one that assumes a more diverse student body not as an afterthought but as a state of being. Are we ready as faculty to meet the needs of diverse learners not only in terms of race, ethnicity, and gender but abilities? Most faculty are not prepared to determine "reasonable accommodations" for students with dyslexia for example or for mental health needs (chronic depression, bipolar disorder, etc.) or simply for learners transitioning from high school IEPs to a university. As we serve more non-traditional students, we may encounter any number of students who have undiagnosed learning needs. To be clear, DSS and OSRR have been responsive and supportive, but they are not able to do it all. Faculty need regular time to learn about these diverse needs and how to offer productive, empowering support - ideally before a student is in their classes.</p>
<p>10/31/21 4:03 PM</p>	<p>F02b</p>	<p>Faculty</p>	<p>Solution 8.2 I wholeheartedly endorse a review of the 10% per course designation on contracts. This move is particularly important for NTT teaching faculty, who can find themselves wondering if their FT teaching load is actually seen as less than full-time effort in the eyes of the university.</p> <p>NTT faculty understand the budgetary necessity of having a flexible tier of teaching, research, and clinical faculty. However, review patterns of NTT faculty contracts to see where 2-, 3-, or 5- year contracts can create better working environments, promote program stability, and incentivize innovation that takes more than a single year to bring to fruition. Strategic use of multi-year NTT contracts should not be seen as a substitute for tenure-track faculty positions, but they can be beneficial to the administration, departments, and individuals.</p> <p>Along with stability for NTT teaching faculty and in support of building capacity, set aside funds for professional development or sabbatical-type funding for NTT. The funds could be awarded for course buy-out to allow concentrated study or for summer workshop support that keeps NTT current in their fields and/or in teaching, learning, and assessment. Such strategic investment in NTT faculty could pay off through less turnover, higher student retention, and better learning environments.</p>
<p>10/31/21 3:37 PM</p>	<p>F02a</p>	<p>Faculty</p>	<p>On Solution 2 & Solution 6.b An ES task force led by full-time faculty seems like good practice. We have engaged in such review work in the past, so beginning with a clear, informed sense of the program's history would be an important place to start. B & C: Aligning the language of ES to employers may be a good idea as long as the focus is on communicating shared values and</p>

			<p>desired skills rather than a revamp of what the ES program learning goals and outcomes are (which should be a separate process). I'd like to see an effort to change the way we talk about ES on our campus more generally. Even with the label of "essential," I still often hear students, advisors, and faculty refer to "getting the courses out of the way." Administrators implicitly devalue the ES courses when, for example, the courses become the focus of transfer evaluation practices that pressure the acceptance of courses based primarily on brief catalog descriptions that are more likely to list content topics than learning outcomes.</p> <p>Finally, many ES courses in the 100- 200- level are taught by NTT faculty who are less likely to serve on university committees (for many reasons). As a result, voices who know best the value and the challenges of ES courses may not be present in key conversations. These NTT faculty are also more likely to be cut during a budget crisis because they are on year-to-year contracts. While the work of NTT faculty is often stellar, the dynamic creates the threat of destabilization for courses that are deemed "essential" and the best place for students to experience or "access the liberal arts curriculum." I was glad to see the situation of NTT faculty addressed elsewhere in the report, and it should be clear that the ES program would benefit from the suggestions given there. I would specifically like to see the strategic use of two-year and three-year contracts for NTT along with investment in professional development specifically for NTT so that these faculty are included in the push to value and reward excellence in teaching, mentorship, and service (Solution 6).</p>	<p>and initiatives (due to budget cuts, new trends, multiple changes in leadership, departmental restructuring, etc.). It would be foolish, for example, to pursue an interdisciplinary studies initiative without consulting with Dr. Tami Carmichael. (To name only one example.) Faculty who once worked on any number of innovations named in this report (HIPs, first-year experiences, degree and ES pathways, interdisciplinary, service-learning experience, innovative programs/majors that fit regional and national employment trends) have valuable insight that we need to hear and understand about what worked, what didn't, and why things stopped. It is also important to remember that those currently in positions in the upper administrative divisions (deans offices and up) who might be called upon to lead the solutions in this report may not be the experts in many of the areas named in this report. We have made great strides in restoring trust on this campus. Whatever comes of this report must strengthen that trust, not undermine it.</p>
10/30/21 4:29 PM	F30	Faculty	<p>Eliminate MIRA. Adjusting its levers will not be enough.</p> <p>The contract "page 2s", with their hard coding of effort percentages for teaching, need revision or abandonment. The fixed percentages were mandated by a rigid VPAA. Various schemes to defeat the system (such as placing effort percentages in the wrong categories to evade "the 10% rule") are in use across campus. Stop the farce.</p> <p>I support the liberal arts mission of the university, but the committee is wrong to say that that liberal arts uniquely create a future-proof education. Nor are liberal arts the only places where problem solving is modeled or taught, etc. I suppose the defensiveness is a result of feeling that liberal arts has been under attack for some years, but nobody at UND feels much cared for -- an outgrowth of MIRA. Scientists, mathematicians, and engineers suffer here, too.</p>	
10/29/21 4:58 PM	F06	Faculty	<p>Everything about this report resonates with me, but I would single out the Report's desire to re-center Liberal arts as the foundation for a "Future-proof" and "robot-proof" future. Beyond this, the Report's call for a faculty led review of ES, the re-establishment of a faculty-led ES Office, a renewal of shared governance in general - with its string recommendations for reinstating the funding for the FIDC and SSAC in particular - strike me as being important steps in renewing shared governance at UND. And the Report's careful linkage of the recruitment and retention of a more diverse student population with the renewal of AIS and several Indigenous-related programs, institutions and initiatives on campus is incredibly well thought out. Finally, the solutions related to C7 and C8 - starting with establishing UND's "intentionality and investment in teaching excellence as [our] central mission" - are absolutely wonderful to see. I could go on and on - but I love everything about this section of the report.</p>	<p>I am truly impressed by the report. It is thoughtful, well-researched and perhaps most importantly, its core recommendations/solutions are completely realistic and doable. The focus upon diversity - and how it may be best achieved in regards to indigenous communities and Tribal Colleges - is particularly appealing given the demographics of this region. I was also heartened to see a strong focus upon excellence in teaching and serving our students. Best of all, this Report provides an integrated plan of action. All in all, the authors and team members are to be congratulated on a job well done.</p>
10/29/21 4:04 PM	T16	Staff	<p>Solution 1.1: What are the current metrics related to the diversity (or lack thereof) of the student population relative to the state and its foreseeable future demographics? What are the institution's goals relative to diversity metrics (i.e. how will UND measure success of efforts to expanded efforts)?</p> <p>Solution 1.2: How will programs/support services that are critical to the success of underrepresented and/or under-resourced student populations be determined? How will investments in such areas be prioritized?</p>	<p>The conclusion notes that most of the strategies proposed "will come at little to no additional cost, just a shifting of effort and strategic investments." From what current efforts and strategic investments will resources be diverted to support these task force recommendations without increasing costs?</p>

			<p>Solution 1.3: It appears this solution is a prioritization of solution 1.2 to focus first on the Indigenous student community. I appreciate the suggestion to survey the partners to determine way to better serve regional Indigenous communities. Its appear UND presumes to know what the communities desire, at least in part, based on recommendation 1.3d.</p> <p>Solution 2: The solution title reads as though UND as an institution doesn't support/value the liberal arts. Is this the belief/finding of the task force? If so, what evidence suggests this to be the case? I don't understand how solutions 2.b and 2.c would be implemented.</p> <p>Solution 3: What cultural barriers exists that are currently preventing interdisciplinary collaboration? Identification of the barriers will help the institution determine solutions to reduce them. What incentives (referenced in recommendation c) are needed to encourage collaboration? Additional pay? Increased budgets? Course releases? The impact of collaboration on student success and retention seems like they should be strong incentives to collaborate. What stronger incentives currently exist that are preventing collaboration? How does contractual distribution of effort negatively impact interdisciplinary efforts?</p> <p>Solution 5: I appreciate the concrete recommendations in this solution.</p> <p>Solution 6: What metrics will be used to measure the outcomes of excellence in teaching, mentorship, and services to implement incentives/rewards? Will the metrics be universal across colleges/disciplines?</p> <p>Solution 7: I appreciation the recommendations in this solution. How are we utilizing the platforms we already launched (i.e. Riipen)? How can we expand the use?</p> <p>Solution 8.1: The current budget model shifted fiscal responsibility and accountability to the colleges (and other decentralized units). How are the colleges/units engages faculty/stakeholders in fiscal decision making? From where should funding be reallocated to restore funding to the standing senate committees?</p> <p>Solution 8.2: What are the "optimal" instruction related budget levelers? What indicates the current levers are inaccurate? Recommendation 8.2d of this solution doesn't fit with the general solution title related to the budget model.</p> <p>Solution 8.3: I appreciate the specific recommendations in this solution.</p>	
<p>10/29/21 3:01 PM</p>	<p>T14</p>	<p>Staff</p>	<p>Use of the budget levers on page 40 appear inconsistent with the allocation of Undergrad dollars. a 60/40 split does not correlate specifically to dollars received but rather the influence of the student credit hours between record and instruction, which becomes the value to allocate the respective pool of monies. Shifting 60/40 split to a instruction heavier percentage would overall reduce revenue to more colleges than would it would help under current enrollment trends.</p>	
<p>10/29/21 2:55 PM</p>	<p>T19</p>	<p>Staff</p>	<p>Staff interact with students, often at pivotal points in their educational careers in a supportive capacity, and yet Solution 7 mentions plans for only faculty and students being recipients of "impactful professional development and culturally educational opportunities". How will the campus achieve the goals in this document if it leaves behind half of its workforce and community? Particularly, how will it go about "strengthening academic programs and support services that cultivate inclusion" (p.16) if the staff of those programs and support services are not included in any cultural competency training?</p>	<p>How are librarians, who provide information literacy instruction integral to essential studies across all levels of programs, included in the various recommendations in this document which discuss incentivizing and supporting faculty instruction? Throughout the document, "instruction" is taken to mean only faculty, even though faculty are not the only ones providing instruction. See also solution 6, 8.2.c, 8.3.d, and C8.</p>

			<p>I could not agree more with the conclusions of C2, C3, and C7 regarding the MIRA model's anti-collaborative influence. The libraries on campus have been particularly impacted by this model. Currently part of the Library Resources of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences' mission is to act as the home library to the College of Nursing and Professional Disciplines, even though that college's funding for library resources goes exclusively to the Chester Fritz Library, which has a totally separate budget and administration from SMHS Library Resources. This situation has translated into strained relationships between the libraries and their liaison departments, as well as hamstrung the SMHS Library Resources Department's ability to support the CNPD as they do their other patrons. I would like to see this document's recommendation of more fiscal support of "instruction-related activities appropriate to the primacy of teaching to UND's mission" translate directly into a more equitable model of funding for library resources across campus, potentially via greater inclusion of librarians in decision-making bodies, from which they are traditionally excluded by their "staff" status.</p> <p>I could not agree more with C1's recommendation 1. Well done, and about time!</p>	<p>I feel deep unease about the idea of a "servant university" in a document espousing equity and cultural consciousness. This positioning of the university as a "servant" of any kind seems like a bizarre strategy calculated to pander to parties which might want to cut our funding. Further, it demeans the effort, strength, creativity, and value of our university community, which deserves the respect of the population of our state, with whom we should strive for an equitable relationship.</p>
10/29/21 1:45 PM	T01	Staff	<p>I agree very strongly with all of the following;</p> <p>Solution 1.3: Restore strong and collaborative relationships with Indigenous Nations in what is now known as North Dakota and the region, including tribal colleges and universities (TCUs). Survey UND's Indigenous faculty, staff, students, and alumni, as well as Indigenous partners to determine the ways in which we can better serve regional Indigenous communities. (C1)</p> <p>Partner with TCUs and Indigenous communities to create inter-institutional programs that will help increase local capacity based on Indigenous communities' stated high priorities. (C1, C9)</p> <p>Rebuild and expand American Indian Studies (AIS) with strategic faculty/staff hires, prioritizing hiring Indigenous faculty members in a variety of disciplines. (C1)</p> <p>Reestablish the American Indian Center as a dedicated space for UND's Indigenous community and fund onsite, dedicated student support services. (C1)</p> <p>Expand student services and create microsites at partner institutions according to local needs to address the challenges many Indigenous students face with family/community commitments (e.g., transportation, internet access, cohort building, childcare, support services). (C1, C9)</p>	<p>I commend the University for the continued aspirations for a more inclusive environment and alternate methods of teaching and learning; for striving for improvements and working toward improvements for all of ND.</p>
10/29/21 9:59 AM	F22	Faculty	<p>none at this time</p>	<p>none at this time</p>
10/28/21 5:12 PM	F08	Faculty	<p>Need to cogitate more on this...too much to absorb when only a short window of commentary when the process to have the report done took the time that it did.</p>	<p>I appreciate the great amount of work and thoughtful reflection provided by the various members of the committee and am grateful that so many subcommittees took the time to do the research, to listen to the stakeholders, and to provide the specific solutions and strategies. That being said, I am "from Missouri" and the current administration has to "Show Me" that: 1) emphasis will be on continuing to engage the stakeholders as this process evolves; and 2) more attention will be give to prudent fiscal management and adaptive reuse of existing buildings as much as possible because the literature shows that recycling structures has an overall carbon footprint less than demolition and new construction. Just an old professor's musings based on a long time at this campus.</p>

<p>10/28/21 1:08 PM</p>	<p>F24a</p>	<p>Faculty</p>	<p>Changing the fixed percentages per course in faculty contracts is essential if we are going to move forward with innovative approaches.</p>	<p>There are a lot of very good ideas detailed in the full report that need to be followed through on. I see this in some ways as a needed corrective to a campus culture that has not been forward looking and does not adequately value teaching and service.</p>
<p>10/28/21 10:07 AM</p>	<p>T07</p>	<p>Staff</p>		<p>I was truly excited to hear about the task force and that UND was looking to be visionary and strategic. As I read through the different sections of the Future of Education Final Report, the future part seems to be missing. I see many things that UND was doing before it went through the state's allotment that handed us large budget reductions. Those reductions were done with little impact on enrollment and retention. No data shows that reinstatement will have any different result. There appears to be lots of history in this document with very little future. I understand part of that reason as predicting the future is difficult and always inaccurate because no one has perfect future vision.</p> <p>I was expecting to see identifying new labor market needs to make sure our degrees are forward looking and ones that our students can use to get a job or suggestions coming from more of a student focused view. With the increase of institutions offering online programs, students can go to college anywhere. Why UND? What will UND have that the students care about and will make them want to attend and stay in attendance with us (whether face to face or online)?</p> <p>This report seems to focus on very small subsets of population. Are we thinking that is the future of higher education? How do the students value the essential studies and liberal arts? If they don't see the value, they will just go some where else. Does that concern or impact what we are doing? In fact, many employers are now saying if the employee can prove they have the skills to do the job they don't require a degree. That would seem to be very concerning to our future.</p> <p>The report indicates that these items can be done with no new costs; however, there was no indication of stopping things or reallocation of efforts so the only way to accomplish these items is additional costs with no indication of what will be the additional revenue generated to cover. As an example, there must be a cost to removing the 10% course standard. How was that evaluated? What are the results/outcomes? Are they quantifiable?</p> <p>During the Clifford presidency, UND was notorious for spending on special projects of key personnel (faculty and staff). Back in that day, there was limited competition, growing enrollments, and few financial concerns. I am concerned that many of these items are flashbacks to that simple time not the reality of our future. The fact that a budget model even made it into this document is an example of being non-strategic. The budget model has not had anything to do with the decline in our student credit hours which is the major cause of the crisis in our financial situation. Is the task force saying that if a budget model does not specifically incentivize collaboration that faculty will not do it? Because prior to the current</p>

				<p>model, no unit had any idea where any of the money was going. There was no incentive to do anything because you got the same amount of money whether you were growing or shrinking. In fact, any additional tuition money went to the President and Vice Presidents. That was more incentivizing than what we are currently doing - where we can track every dollar and where it goes and much of the dollars are going back to the units that generated it?</p> <p>There are things to consider in this document, which could help Vice Presidents and Deans factor into their action plans and priorities as it relates to UND's Strategic Plan. There are numerous items in this document that seem to require the expending of resources. Where are the sources of funds that will cover these uses? Where is the future in this document? I don't see in this document any of the concerns that I have heard students and potential students express.</p>
10/27/21 11:51 PM	S03	Student	<p>As a distance student, I appreciate the ability to continue my education even though I cannot attend in person. I see so much potential for UND to lead the future of collegiate education in the future, particularly if it will continue to embrace distance students and increase its use of technology (well made content delivery and online courses) in the classroom. But the one on one interactions with other professors and students is just as important. I hope that UND will continue to expand its online offerings, while also embracing ways to keep distance students connected to the campus. For instance, the graduate studies departments does a good job at opening up many of its activities to distance students. Online (face to face) meetings opportunities like that are an important part of feeling connected. I hope that departments will try to keep distance students involved in research and activities that occur on campus as well. I also hope more professors continue to improve their delivery of online content. I think UND will fall behind as independent online courses increase in their ubiquity and quality if they do not continue to embrace the possibilities of online learning while meshing it with the importance of face to face instruction and the campus experience.</p>	
10/27/21 9:33 PM	F28	Faculty	<p>Several of these strategies (e.g. diversifying UND and engaging students in high impact practices) have obvious intersections. Promoting historically excluded students' participation in a high impact practice such as undergraduate research requires having a diverse faculty that engages in research that can draw a wide array of interests. Living learning communities require a diverse (and non-segregated) on-campus living community to realize the benefits of living with people from different backgrounds.</p>	<p>While I believe the emphasis on the faculty role is warranted, I believe there is a place for student affairs professionals that have a large role in accomplishing these goals. Unfortunately, this report barely has any mention of their role going forward.</p>
10/27/21 8:58 PM	F38a	Faculty	<p>For Solution 6.b, one possible reward for non-tenure-track faculty would be to prioritize qualified instructors for hiring into tenure-track openings.</p> <p>Solution 8.2.c mentions allowing higher teaching percentages for innovative and excellent teaching. A step past this would be to allow tenure(track) faculty to use developing innovative teaching to count as research. (This could also fit into Solution 6.)</p>	<p>Should we mentioned developing and adapting OER? It could fit well into Solution 4 or 6. Having it count as research or at least teaching would be one way to reward that work.</p> <p>We could aim for percentages of faculty that are full time (currently 65%) or tenure(track) (currently 66%). Or at least commit to not dropping below certain thresholds.</p>
10/27/21 4:48 PM	F11f	Faculty	<p>This report is an excellent example of faculty work and the importance of faculty governance. The committee should be commended on their thoughtful recommendations. There are clearly reoccurring themes that appear throughout the various solutions including relooking at the MIRA model to increase collaboration and equity, bring back faculty lead voices and oversight in various areas, and a desire to be encouraged, not discouraged to innovate.</p> <p>In C2 the recommendation that the MIRA budget model should be adjusted to support collaboration across colleges is important to many faculty and allow for greater collaboration and innovation. Prior to this model there were much greater opportunities to collaborate across campus, but now departments and colleges are siloed, which is the opposite</p>	<p>I am thankful for the task force and their exceptional work. After reading the report and providing specific feedback regarding certain areas there are a few themes that occur. First, faculty are ready and willing to serve and have a voice in shaping the future of UND. However, faculty will not be successful if they meet roadblocks by vice provosts, deans and other administrators that either dismiss innovation or just ignore faculty voices. This needs to change. There have been many administrators appointed to positions and given oversight to critical areas to UND and their lack of willingness to grapple with difficult questions or need to streamline have hurt UND programing. If change occurs it also needs to</p>

			<p>outcome that was promised when MIRA was presented. It is clear from several recommendations that the MIRA model is not working and if it is as flexible of an instrument as we were promised when introduced, then we need to make the changes to allow it to work for us. Additionally in C2 there is discussion of faculty page 2 contracts that restricts team taught courses to a certain percentage and forces uniformity that does not allow for all forms of collaboration.</p> <p>In C5 the discussion of recasting Essential Studies to make it affective and faculty lead should be a high priority to restore the innovation and excellence of those courses. Currently, the oversight has been ineffective and assessment of these courses has been greatly diminished. The suggestion to create an office with a tenured or tenure track faculty to oversee Essential Studies should be implemented as soon as possible. However, if this faculty has to report to the vice provost who has been overseeing Essential Studies they will not be able to innovate in an effective way because this office has overseen the most recent changes to the Essentials Studies that disempowers faculty and dissolves effective assessment.</p> <p>C6 Discusses flexibility in the educational experience and reworking MIRA to encourage interdisciplinary opportunities. This makes perfect sense and because MIRA was presented as a flexible system it should be easy to rework because UND values interdisciplinary work. However, it has been difficult to get clarity regarding MIRA when working with the VP of Finance and Operations. Often that office or position cannot clearly articulate how funding is being dispersed in an effective way to faculty who are attempting to use the model to grow programs. There seems to be a need for leadership and oversight to fundamentally utilize MIRA in an effective way for faculty that is not happening with current leadership.</p> <p>C7 Discusses reworking fiscal and academic structures to support SoTL and faculty lead budget oversight. This is a reoccurring theme that asks for faculty to be a part of the discussion making and oversight and should be addressed. To support the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) there also needs to be a relooking at the effectiveness of TTaDA and the vice provost overseeing online education. There was a shift to move SoTL support for faculty to TTaDA but also combine with online education and it seems that online support has been uplifted where SoTL has been diminished. Separating these or relooking and the structure would allow for innovation and autonomy.</p> <p>C8 Discusses empowering faculty and supporting faculty teaching and service. Particularly important in this section was the discussion to remove the standard 10% per course in faculty page 2. This standardization does not allow for any creativity in teaching and in my experience has short-changed faculty. I have been asked to teach more and receive less credit for teaching 3 credit courses just to make these percentages work. It takes advantage of faculty and does not allow for new teaching ideas. This area also discussed supporting faculty service. It primarily discussed service to UND, however outside professional service is also to be supported and valued. Often times faculty are leaders in their field, but it is almost unknown to UND because there is no means for discovery of what the faculty is doing. I think UND is under-appreciating the work of the faculty or at least not celebrating the exceptional scholars and leaders because service is so under valued.</p>	<p>be met with administration who are willing to support these changes.</p> <p>Second, MIRA seems to be a problem that does not allow faculty to collaborate and silos departments and colleges. The larger affects are that faculty are not spending time with faculty outside their college or department and brainstorming, problem solving and creative thinking are not happening. To blame this all on a budget model might seem hyperbolic, but the ripple affects are huge.</p> <p>Finally, I believe that UND is an exceptional University that has struggled over the last five years. The former provost made faculty feel that their voices did not matter and decisions were made without input and there is now distrust. I am hopeful that meaningful change can occur very soon and UND can have an open trustful dialogue with faculty and administration.</p>
<p>10/27/21 10:16 AM</p>	<p>F09b</p>	<p>Faculty</p>	<p>I agree that we should both support and attempt to retain diverse faculty that are hired. This means that some of the suggestions around diverse students -such as feeling welcome, able to form a community, feeling "heard" need to be developed for faculty as</p>	<p>I appreciate the many fine ideas in the report. I look forward to moving forward on several of these. I think UND and the wonderful community here are well positioned to be adaptable and</p>

			<p>well.</p> <p>I appreciate the suggestion of allowing students to have individualized mentoring by faculty but this will necessitate allowing faculty to account for their time differently (as mentioned elsewhere in the report).</p> <p>I like the idea of a free on-line course for family and would be interested in contributing to such a course.</p> <p>The concept of inter-institutional programs with Tribal colleges is nice but it is nearly impossible when working with NDUS institutions - so greater flexibility in accounting procedures, student registrations, issuing of transcripts and accounting for faculty time will need to be addressed for this to work.</p> <p>We definitely need to re-establish the American Indian Center as a dedicated Indigenous space. Having that space "negotiated" out from the original promise can easily trigger feelings of historical trauma and lack of trust, not just among the students but among Indigenous staff and faculty as well.</p> <p>More faculty led involvement in Essential Studies might be a great idea but since this is at least the third re-making of GS/ES please do not undercount the efforts and work it has taken to get ES to where it is today. Try to build on that work and create a structure that will allow stability and support for the program into the future.</p> <p>The ability to declare a major based on interdisciplinary and Essential Studies courses already exists in the College of Arts and Sciences. ASny new model should examine that offering first.</p> <p>A shortened path to degree attainment is not always a good learning, maturing, mentoring, interning, exploring, etc. path. Just "getting it over with" quickly is the wrong connotation and runs contrary to many of the other suggestions in the report. Removing unnecessary hurdles and allowing flexibility is fine but speed of degree attainment as a dominant goal seems to undervalue education and the learning process.</p>	<p>welcoming while addressing both future work-force needs but also future individual learning and self-improvement goals, as well as future community strengthening and networking goals.</p>
10/27/21 9:12 AM	F03g	Faculty	<p>I'm very strongly in favor of Strategy 7.d, at least with respect to the experiential learning part. I think the task force for including it as a recommendation. For this to succeed, it will be necessary to alter departmental evaluation criteria to ensure that work on applied problems with community and industry partners counts as scholarly activity. That type of thing is incredibly time-consuming work. Since it does involve an element of scholarship, it's not at all inappropriate to see it as a type of scholarly/creative activity. But not being traditional scholarship or necessarily tied to traditional extramural funding means it will naturally not be a focal point if departments aren't willing to credit faculty who are doing it. The current environment would, in fact, likely lead to professional penalties for faculty who do this type of thing.</p>	
10/27/21 8:28 AM	F11e	Faculty		<p>For those who have been at UND for awhile, the report reads like a catalog of things that we've done before. That's not a criticism of the task force. More a complement. The criticism belongs to the past and current administrators who through neglect, hostility, or poor judgment set us back many years. We could be (and in some cases were) at the forefront of some of the topics being recommended. Although many people who were involved in past things (now being repropose) have left, there are still many on campus that must be integrally involved in leading this renewed effort.</p>
10/26/21 11:09 PM	F15	Faculty	<p>With respect to the following solutions offered: Solution Four: I firmly believe collaborative discussion and efforts need to be taken to expedite curriculum change processes at</p>	<p>The report is nicely organized, but I think some of the contents from the appendices should have been incorporated to a greater extent. Often</p>

			<p>UND. We routinely get outmaneuvered by regional competitors because we cannot quickly adjust our programmatic offerings in a timely manner. To enable innovative teaching, we should consider separate processes for different types of curricular changes or create a mechanism to pilot and enact sweeping programmatic changes more quickly (provided they are fully planned, etc.).</p> <p>Solution Four: Some ideas around innovative practices require some direction in terms of instructional modalities for UND. Some colleges and units were mostly online before COVID-19, others were pushed in that direction. Is there a larger plan to the types of offerings UND wants to encourage? Choices around face-to-face, HyFlex, and Online impact inter-college programs and services.</p> <p>Solution Eight: Re-examining issues related to the MIRA model and calculations of faculty effort are critical to realizing the proposed solutions. Further, it makes sense to leverage expertise like Ttada and the College of Education and Human Development to support research and scholarship of instructional practice and outcomes at UND.</p>	<p>appendices can be interpreted as having lesser importance, but some of the information, stories, and background information provided is really useful for making sense of the issues identified. It would also be extremely helpful to be able to see major points from the report with a list of efforts in progress (or completed) toward the recommendations make by the workgroup. During COVID-19, I feel we got better at various forms of electronic communication, like blogs on the UND site, so I feel like transparency and regular updates regarding the status of these items is a reasonable request.</p>
10/26/21 8:50 PM	S04	Student		Perhaps we should rename our school to the University of what is now known as North Dakota.
10/26/21 6:12 PM	F37	Faculty	I am very concerned about Solution 8.3: Improve institutional research on teaching and learning and student success, particularly point a: Establish a research arm of the Teaching Transformation and Development Academy dedicated to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). The College of Education and Human Development is the research arm of the university associated with the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. CEHD has experts in teaching and learning across the educational pipeline, which includes undergraduate and graduate education. Faculty from other colleges also engaged in the SoTL. It would be wonderful if the university provided more resources for CEHD's and other colleges' research endeavors in SoTL rather than providing funds to development a research arm in a non-academic department.	
10/26/21 5:27 PM	F12	Faculty	<p>Seems like the conclusion of the task force is, the primary solution for most of our future educational challenges lies in getting DEI rooted in all aspects of education. Is this the primary concern "only big issue" we have in addressing the "future of education"? "Diverse" is mentioned 18 times and "Diversity" is mentioned 24 times, inclusion 13 times (using word search) We have more challenges than integrating DEI into everything.. For example, mental illness is NOT mentioned at (0 times). It rampant with COVID in education, yet we are not doing anything to address the future of education in light of the fact that suicides, depression, and other mental illnesses are on the rise in young people. These are the students in our classrooms. Outside they look good, inside, regardless of race/social status/gender they are hurting, struggling to find meaning/value. Emotional Intelligence is non-existent. Students do not have resilience in the face of real life struggles. Once of many ways this report is lacking.</p>	<p>1) On Page 18, states, "Goal 5 of the Strategic Plan, which emphasizes the value of a diverse student body and the need to "encourage/ensure students from underrepresented groups fully participate in enrollment growth, retention, and graduation...." Not just equal, but equitable access to education and the opportunity to succeed lie at the heart of the university's mission.'</p> <p>Question: in light of above statement, How does equitable access look different than equal access to education? How is equitable access at the Heart of the UND mission?</p> <p>2) On Page 5 - "Greater human diversity means more ways of thinking, a wider range of ideas and perspectives, as well as a greater chance of finding better solutions to any problem. Which I agree. On page 18, you state, "Diversity -An understanding and appreciation of diverse people, experiences, and ideas.</p> <p>Question: I like this statement for all people, but the way it is worded, saying "diverse" people, I am not sure I understand the intent. Does that represent less than ALL people in the class room whether they are the "dominant" culture or not (dominant is term used on page 22 - which I find offensive, and at best undefined)? Who is NOT diverse? Is that just fancy way of saying non-white people at UND?</p> <p>Overall, as I read this entire document, the focus is not on the future of education (Webster definition - the action or process of teaching</p>

				someone) Instead it is about transforming education to be focused solely on groups, races, differences, have/have not etc...
10/26/21 4:50 PM	T13	Staff	<p>Recommendation 2.1 (page 20) there is a statement about students making money through scholarships. There is a population of students who receive scholarships from outside agencies. A couple suggestions to ensure UND's scholarships are being used most effectively.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Give Student Finance awarding authority to UND and UND alumni scholarships. Colleges and departments do not have access to a student's full financial aid package. Student Finance would best determine strategic use of dollars while meeting donor intent. 2. Reduce the number of stackable UND and UND Alumni scholarships students are eligible to receive. 	
10/26/21 4:17 PM	FST01f	Staff	As an alum of a liberal arts university (Valparaiso University), I greatly appreciate the proposed strategy of recasting Essential Studies as liberal arts. My liberal arts education equipped me for interdisciplinary conversations and projects while also increasing my desire to be a lifelong learner. The idea of having first-year students take targeted liberal-arts courses was used at Valparaiso when I was a student and those courses helped me see greater connections between all areas of life while also giving me opportunities to reflect on my own life experience.	
10/26/21 3:25 PM	F09a	Faculty		I commend the task force for its efforts. Clearly much work and careful thought has gone into what they recommend. The next step should not be to hand things off to administrators, though...especially given the lack of confidence much of campus has in some of the ones likely to be the implementers of these ideas. Instead, given the significant number of recommendations that are really recommendations to return to things we've done before, a systematic process of consultation with those involved in that past work should be undertaken. The experience and dedication embodied in colleagues within our midst can be a major time saver in making progress on the current set of ideas.
10/26/21 3:16 PM	FS02e	Student	<p>There was little mention of industry in the future, other than the headers. Students are coming away from the liberal arts model unprepared, ill-equipped, and with sub-standard professional tools. Embracing industry as trainers on campus, in the classroom, and out in the field should be the standard. Professionals are who the university is charged with preparing. Right now, UND fails to do that across many departments. Contract courses with in-demand skills are absolutely necessary and the course offerings need to be relevant, not just classical for "well-rounded" students.</p>	The university has a lot of headwind and searching for applicable alternatives to traditional education is the only way the institution will thrive. The campus is empty and it is not because of Covid.
10/26/21 3:13 PM	T06	Staff	I appreciate that there is a recommended focus on the experience of the distance learner, specifically the emphasis on helping them feel connected to the campus as well as to other online students. This is something our department has been striving towards for a number of years, so I appreciate seeing it formalized in the report.	It's apparent that there is a desire to focus on the Essential Studies program, but the real challenge is connecting ES courses to "life after university", to quote a phrase used in Solution 3. Many students do not understand the value of why they need to take an arts or humanities course when they are going into a science field, for example. If we re-evaluate and re-build the ES program, there needs to be a strong connection to the real world.
10/26/21 2:59 PM	F21	Faculty		The report should define who are "under" - funded, -represented... students.
10/26/21 2:47 PM	FST01e	Faculty	<p>Talent scouting and recruitment; Redirecting and integrating funds to establish robust financial aids and scholarships for talented enrolled and prospective students. Coming up with targeted guidelines for scholarship eligibility. Follow-through plan to ensure funds are being spent properly.</p>	As a higher education organization, it is concerning that finding and recruiting talent has no place in this strategic plan to improve the future of education at UND. A robust scholarship system for talented individuals, recognized in k-12 education, can significantly promote our university in terms of education and research.

10/26/21 1:18 PM	F11d	Faculty	I'd have serious reservations about something like 5.d - validating or bypassing course/other requirements based on prior training or life experience. There are the logistical problems of how this could be done with integrity (through standardized tests? Aren't those falling out of fashion?). There's also the philosophical problem of how this type of thing could easily be at odds with other recommendations from the task force - especially those focused on liberal learning and gen ed. Would we be more likely to validate someone's life experience for ES requirements or major requirements? I suspect it's the former, in which case I'd contend we'd be working against other stated TF goals. It also seems to me to run counter to the intent behind liberal learning. How will someone get an education that expands their horizons and ways of thinking if they aren't exposed (such as in a gen ed course) to things distinct from their life experiences? Perhaps they know how to write a memo, but might the fact of taking a composition class set them on a path to writing the next great American novel?	
10/26/21 1:12 PM	F03f	Faculty	There's much going on in Solution 5. For some time I've liked the notion of "incremental credentialing," but keep finding lots of devils in the details. If we can make it happen, that would be great.	
10/26/21 12:20 PM	F34	Faculty	There is a typo in Solution 6, a. i. (on the website at least). I believe it should say "contracts" not contacts.	In general, I think this is good. However, I am disturbed by the lack of mention of increasing the amount of tenure lines in the faculty. Is that not a priority? There are mentions of improving stability for non-TT folks, which is fine, but where is the drive to adjust the balance between non-TT and tenured faculty? Non-TT are gradually becoming the majority in some departments, which has huge implications for lots of things, not just research, but also promotion and evaluation. Like: who's going to evaluate people if there are not enough people to do evaluations?
10/26/21 12:06 PM	CF01b	Faculty	<p>Many of the listed solutions sound excellent. I will say that they will only be effective if the people or groups of people selected to work on these areas are given both the authority and the resources needed. I also think that some people who are currently in positions of authority who have consistently blocked or neutralized previous efforts, like the ones listed in this document, need to be removed if this plan is to have any legs.</p> <p>One specific point I would like to mention: the need to reevaluate faculty contracts and the across-the-board listing of each class as 10% of effort. We all know this is just nonsense -- there are so many differences in the types of courses taught (number of students, mechanisms of delivery, types of learning goals like writing intensive, etc.) that there is no way that generalized percentages are adequate. It devalues faculty work and discourages creativity and collaboration as well as a department's ability to have any initiative or creativity in how it chooses to use its people and approach its curriculum. The current method also discourages interdisciplinary teaching, which we all know is more work than teaching a disciplinary class alone. If we truly want to strive toward interdisciplinary teaching and learning -- and indeed we should want to -- there will need to be more flexibility in faculty members' and departments' ability to determine the percentages of teaching loads. As President Armacost says, we need to trust our people -- those people being chairs and faculty -- to make these decisions.</p> <p>I would add one other thing to this document that I think is ESSENTIAL if UND is to move forward in the admirable ways listed in this document. And I cannot say this strongly enough: ALL ADMINISTRATORS NEED TO BE EVALUATED REGULARLY BY THE FACULTY AND STAFF WHO INTERACT WITH THEM. And the results of these evaluations needs to be made public, at least to the campus community. It has been literally years since I, as a faculty member, have had the opportunity to provide any kind of feedback regarding the dean of our college or any other administrator. Faculty and staff must undergo rigorous annual evaluations, and faculty teaching evaluations are made public. Our administrators need to be held to the same standards. Also, a further point: there are many "administrators" who have been</p>	Kudos to the committee who did this remarkable work - especially during such a difficult time. I am so appreciative of everyone's time and effort! The last few years have been brutal at UND, and I hope this document and the President's and Provost's support in bringing it forward mean that we have turned the corner and are finally going to try and build up UND and not continue to tear it apart.

			<p>hand-selected by past Vice Presidents and Deans to serve in positions that wield great power over campus processes and programming. These people have never been vetted by faculty or staff and never are evaluated by people who work with them and "for" them. There are many unfortunate situations that currently exist on campus, such as the mess that is the Essential Studies assessment program, that could have been avoided if people could have provided evaluations of those "in charge" who are not competent.</p>	
10/26/21 11:50 AM	FS01b	Faculty	<p>Overall I find myself least impressed with Solution 4. Not that what's there is bad, but I don't see anything beyond a recommendation to maintain the current situation. To me a more aggressive stance would be to help bring faculty along who may not be "willing to experiment" with innovative approaches, etc. Solution 4 has a bit of a "preaching to the choir" feel to it. I think reaching a bit more might be a better goal to have.</p>	
10/26/21 11:49 AM	F17	Faculty	<p>Strategy 1.3.b is right-on conceptually, particularly the focus on what the TCU's priorities are...and not ours. As for strategy 1.3.e, I'm unclear on what exactly a microsite looks like. Kind of like an extension office?</p>	
10/26/21 11:34 AM	S01	Student	<p>While the University is interested in attracting new and under-served student populations, it should guard against the continual decline in standards and rigor that has plagued the U.S. educational system for decades. We've reached a point where receiving a college degree is almost meaningless, in terms of what can be expected of college graduates, because our educational system has become watered down by declining standards that allow more people to pass, since rigor has been eliminated in favor of ensuring that everyone entering school can pass and nobody fails. Liberal arts education, while certainly necessary, has taken precedence over more necessary disciplines, like STEM, that result in better, higher paying jobs. We need more focus on the heavily valued and sought-after disciplines, and, should there be any need for precedence, focus on highly sought education, first and foremost. In other words, liberal arts need to take a backseat to those disciplines that offer the best chance for future financial success of the individual in society. Collaborative teaching opportunities, where multiple Professors all have some responsibility for part of a class, are not utilized enough by this University, like many, and needs to become a more regular occurrence. It should be the norm, not an oddity. In fact, Professors should be mandated to find ways to create collaborative classes with other Professors. This will also help satisfy part of innovative and instructional design and delivery. If Universities do not embrace this sort of opportunity, then students will seek out free opportunities such as MOOCs and resources like Khan Academy to fill those niche opportunities, and, soon, universities will be defunct relics. Likewise, more flexible and modern degree programs and, perhaps even more importantly, credentialing opportunities in every possible discipline, also need to be mandated and the norm - otherwise, again, students will seek them out outside of Universities and erode the usefulness or need for traditional academics. More importantly, Professors at Universities such as UND need to have far more real world experience outside of academics that allows them to be better educators than we currently have. Much of what is taught in Universities is, largely, useless information or that which can be looked up in references later, while critical thinking skills and experience with real-world concepts and scenarios goes almost unnoticed. We teach what to think, not how to think, and it should be the complete opposite. Again, this is why so many are giving up on the traditional academic system. Why go into debt for a worthless degree and have to deal with ridiculous policies and politics in the meantime, only to get out in crushing debt and be offered positions that don't pay as much or more than those whose requirements never require formal education? If kids streaming video games of themselves playing video games can ear hundreds of thousands of dollars while people who receive post-graduate degrees in STEM earn far less,</p>	<p>Overall, I have high trepidation and fear over the future of UND and the traditional educational system, given the planned focus of this University. Despite reading a few important topics being discussed in the present list, I do not see enough attention being given to the full range of issues we need to be tackling, moving forward, nor a plan to do so to redevelop a robust educational system that will help the U.S. continue to thrive. Our standards and benchmark metrics have been suffering in comparison to the rest of the world for decades, with a slow trickle downward on those lists, and I see nothing in this Task Force Report that indicates a change from that direction back toward impact and exceptionalism. Whereas we need Universities to start maneuvering like a high performance and precision fighter jet being operated by a skilled pilot, I see a cruise liner that is slow to change and may end up striking a more permanent rock structure in the distance that has more staying power, like free and cheap educational resources, like Khan Academy and others, that have come to offer what Universities cannot and are unwilling to.</p>

			<p>on average, then we've got a major problem. Universities are not offering real solutions to real problems, as evidenced by this Task Force list and trajectory. Newer learning styles, such as HIP and the like (as well as work styles like hybrid and remote), are almost certainly here to stay. It will be difficult to ever take that back, now that it has been offered. Thus, society must be updated/modified in order to better accommodate those scenarios, such that we don't further erode the rigor, standards, and abilities achieved through that new paradigm. Early empirical results indicate that such will happen, unless we have educators and professionals with the right skill-sets, particularly computational and organizational, to accommodate that. It's clear that Universities, which are usually slow to change or course-correct, have been just as such in the face of forced change. If that weren't true, then there would not have been difficulties or "unusual circumstances" in the face of the Pandemic. In general, an increase in the number of young, responsible instructors and Professors who can handle the necessary new skill-sets required to thrive in the face of our changing world, while maintaining rigor and standards, are not just important - they're required. It may even be time to begin insisting upon required retirement ages and lengths of tenure to ensure this requirement is met.</p>	
10/26/21 10:57 AM	T03	Staff		Great work!
10/26/21 10:48 AM	F36	Faculty	<p>#3: This lays out some great strategies for interdisciplinary collaboration in education. The primary challenge in this lies in the Myra model--who gets the tuition dollars when more than one department collaborate. Also, in (d), I think a more specific plan needs to be developed for considering workload for faculty when teaching collaboratively. The amount of workload credit that is given when co-teaching is a disincentive to working collaboratively.</p>	Great work! Thank you to the committee members!
10/26/21 10:45 AM	F33	Faculty	<p>The strategies nearly completely ignore budgetary realities, which make their implementation an impossibility (without eliminating something else, which, guess what, somebody will not want to eliminate).</p>	This is a backwards-looking wish list of how people wish things were. If this is the future of UND, then UND is going to be left behind extremely quickly. To serious folks who care for the future of UND, this report is an embarrassment.
10/26/21 10:43 AM	F20	Faculty	<p>Considering UND has a history of commitment to our American Indian population, particularly the INMED and other successful programs, we should further develop/support and empower these processes. In particular, working closely with staff and allowing admissions access to students who identify as AI and Alaska Native are imperative. We should aim and strive for excellence and improve our retention and matriculation by supporting students from the get go and also by providing them scholarship opportunities.</p>	Our students and population will greatly benefit from inclusivity and working toward creating a safe space for American Indians and others in the scholastic arena. Thank you for making efforts and creating a thoughtful report.
10/26/21 10:34 AM	F16	Faculty	<p>Great strategies overall! Looking forward to positive changes coming soon!</p>	In order to make UND a peaceful and welcoming environment for Indigenous students and faculty, it will be imperative to eliminate all "Sioux" logos and continued use of that name in UND related groups and events to avoid further dehumanization of Indigenous Peoples, and messages that directly contradict human and racial equality.
10/26/21 10:32 AM	FST01d	Student	<p>I have major problems with professors and faculty not responding to my emails. I have marked things that are important as a high priority, and I still do not get an email back. Communication is so important for education and I believe professors and students</p>	Get the professors and staff to respond to emails and understand the importance of communication.

			both need to read emails and respond to calls. When students get an email, we are expected to respond back right away. Professors don't have the same expectations. It has to be a two-way street.	
10/26/21 10:31 AM	F05c	Faculty	Great report and strategies. I support the move to more online courses. I support Essential studies that are relevant to the world today and are available online. I always think conflict resolutions and critical thinking courses should be a part of Essential studies curriculum.	Great work! Thank you to all who were involved in the project.
10/26/21 10:31 AM	C02	Community Member	Solution 1.3 - LAND BACK	
10/26/21 10:30 AM	T08	Staff	if you want to attract and keep people, you need to lower the barrier of entry, and train people to do the job, or have higher pay.	
10/26/21 10:26 AM	S02c	Student		This looks like a giant waste of money. We do not need to actively waste time and money on trying to get underserved student populations. If a student wants to come here, they will. Have you ever seen Harvard run an ad anywhere? No, because people really want to go there. I would bet over 95% of the students here were not convinced to come here through targeted advertising.
10/25/21 10:42 AM	F11c	Faculty	Solution 8.d has, of course, already been tried - and came about due to the recommendations of a different task force a number of years ago. It's interesting to see that the current task force sees the elimination of the faculty-led ES admin structure as having apparently been a mistake. If this recommendation is adopted, it would be appropriate to examine why the current arrangement has failed - and what made the previous arrangement succeed (or at least better). The principle of an increased faculty role is correct in my opinion, but without examining why things have gotten so bad with ES may mean that current problems persist into the future. I realize Solution 2 may in part address this issue.	
10/25/21 9:38 AM	F03e	Faculty	Solution 3 is good. The creation of such a culture will require an environment in which that culture can take root - and thus I commend the task force for noting the need to create departmental incentives and administrative practices supportive of such a culture change. Missing, however, is mention of administrative leadership and existing knowledge. We've done things like this before, and have people on campus with the necessary knowledge and experience. It would be an unfortunate waste of time not to involve those individuals on the front end of work that will be done.	
10/25/21 9:01 AM	C01	Community Member	<p>1. (Report Future of Education at UND p.9 Solution 2 c, Solution 3; p.11 Solution 7 c)</p> <p>Chancellor Mark Hagerott's talk for UND (Feb 2021, (Feb 2021, https://und.edu/academics/university-senate/_files/videos/ed_task_force_2_3_21.mp4) should be studied carefully. His concerns under, "danger of technological momentum\lock in" are real and yet not widely appreciated in the more general media. His suggestions for establishing a Science, Technology, Environment and Human/Society Program would be important for UND. Hope UND will develop the idea with a campus-wide, loosely-connected consortium, including concerned faculty members and students. Their active participation is critical.</p> <p>It is important not to focus the program exclusively on STEM or aerospace science per se, rather it should include liberal arts disciplines such as history, philosophy, sociology anthropology, economy etc. I see the first question as, "Is it acceptable to us humans to lose the control over our lives and world events to AI/cyberspace?" Though the program needs major support from STEM areas, this question is one for humanity, really. Start by taking a from-the-ground-up, informal approach. It should support a campus-wide lecture series to generate interest and involvement, and encourage events on related issues through multiple, small-group discussions.</p>	I see much improvement. Thank you for working on this!

		<p>Through liberal arts education students should have chance to think about and comprehend the challenge. For instance, during a freshman orientation, incoming students at UND should address the obstacles our society is facing today. Students should have a chance to hear, think about and discuss major problems for which we do not have any good solution. Our leadership, the faculty and the students together should try to identify the problems and work toward common goals to overcome them. After all, the University should be, as it has been traditionally, a community of teachers and students (scholars), and students need to exchange ideas and learn together. They need to realize their active participation is the key to the success of the real University experience.</p> <p>Perhaps oversight of the program should belong directly to President and Provost. Of course, one ought to realize they have many other pressing responsibilities, but in the old days, President Clifford, for instance, used to take on some degree oversight of such large-scale projects.</p> <p>The Chancellor's other suggestions, like developing partnership with other organizations, require further careful examination.</p> <p>2. (Report Future of Education at UND p.12 Solution 2 c, Solution 8.3)</p> <p>Importance of understanding students' learning process: We all realize that students in 2010-2021 are different from those in the 1980's. However, it appears to me that beyond sporadic conversations, and beyond the efforts of narrowly-focused small groups of researchers, a broad, systematic effort toward really understanding modern students is still missing. Much is said about this, but I think we simply do not know how today's students are acquiring or handling new skills or knowledge. Not understanding this and developing a new teaching approach would seem destined to lead to miserable failure, which in fact we have often observed among many groups of students.</p> <p>The following are my observations.</p> <p>(a) Students do not retain what they just learned. It seems they lack short-term memory. I recall for instance that at a meeting of the American Physics Teachers one of speakers pointed out the importance of 3Rs, where he meant, Revisit, Review, Refine. The truth is that if I would ask my laboratory students what we did in the lab during the previous week, more than half of them do not have a clue. Moreover, incoming students do not remember what they were supposed to have learned in high school, or even middle school mathematics. In physics math is the language. If students cannot handle simple algebra we cannot proceed to next step.</p> <p>(b) Modern students are civil, good in multi-tasking, are reported in the literature to have higher IQ (https://www.apa.org/monitor/2013/03/smarter) compared to older generations. However, a technical subject like physics requires a capability for deep concentration, which appears to be lacking among many students. They don't seem to be able to focus, follow the logic of a succession of sentences or as few as two equations. So, the entire subject does not make sense to them at all. I suspect any other subject that requires some logical process is facing a similar type of challenge.</p> <p>(c) The terms, "critical thinking" and "problems-solving skills," must mean differently depend on the discipline. Nevertheless, these two skill sets are fundamental for survival and success in the modern, complex world. However, if students are not equipped to retain knowledge they have learned and don't have</p>	
--	--	---	--

			<p>the ability to concentrate, how can students even gain such skills?</p> <p>(d) Is the, “traditional Revisit, Review and Refine” approach still an effective teaching strategy? If so, we should put more effort to implementing it.</p> <p>3. (p.10 Solution 4) Importance of experiencing true satisfaction by doing and succeeding at challenging tasks by themselves: Yet better, students do some things better than their teachers. Such a learning experience will last.</p> <p>There should be no room for fake approval such as assigning high grades or giving praise for half-baked performance or when the student response clearly misses the point. Students need to see a clear error signal, when a thing is actually wrong or doesn't follow logically. (Sometimes we observe that a student response is, “not even wrong.”) This provides proper contrast so that true praise is meaningful and thus more genuinely rewarding. Students need to see the fact that teachers really want them to succeed.</p> <p>4. (Solution 5 b, page 10) Interdisciplinary effort is really a must in the modern world. Yet, we need to take careful review of our past experiences properly into account. A half-baked effort, such as teaching a low enrollment graduate physics courses remotely in cooperation with NDSU, where we failed miserably in 1990s, has to be noted and taken into account. The cause of failure then need to be examined by the faculty in order to judge whether a fix might be possible today. It's usually a big mistake to legislate such an innovation top-down from outside the departments involved.</p> <p>5. Importance of Plan B: Our highly technology-based civilization today is fragile. For instance, if the internet is broken down what can we do? It is important to develop a robust backup plan. In terms of general education, students need to realize the importance of having a Plan B and being ready for such obstructions.</p>	
10/25/21 8:45 AM	F03d	Faculty	1.2.e is an important equity issue. Whether one agrees with an increasing move toward online education, if we're doing it, we should do the right thing by those students.	
10/24/21 5:55 PM	F18	Faculty		Many things being recommended were features of UND in the past. Lots of people with institutional expertise and commitment were cast aside in favor of individuals who are currently situated to be involved with these recommendations but who have demonstrated their lack of fitness for their positions. The tendency lately has been to ignore and sideline those with expertise...that must change if morale is expected to improve and good progress is to be made on the work of the task force.
10/22/21 4:49 PM	F03c	Faculty	I strongly support the intent behind Solution 2, although care will need to be exercised by anyone who attempts to “align the language of a liberal arts education and Essential Studies with what employers and students are looking for.” Educators’ judgment needs to count for something, and thus purely “aligning” with what employers and students think is best seems to improperly tip the balance against faculty judgment. Of course, the good news is that well-publicized studies consistently demonstrate that employers value many typical liberal arts learning goals.	
10/22/21 4:46 PM	F11b	Faculty	I like strategy 1.2.d, although it sounds like a reversion to the days before the professional advising model was adopted. How will this not be duplicative?	
10/22/21 11:43 AM	F19	Faculty		The metaphor of “conductor” is used to conceptualize the type of leadership necessary to help enact the recommendations. I fear that many of the current individuals in the necessary

				<p>positions are precisely the wrong people to be filling such a “conductors” role. Any serious attempt to act on the recommendations must start with an honest reckoning of the significant shortcomings some administrators have demonstrated in their positions. The work ahead will be difficult. To accomplish it will require trusted and competent leadership, something that is lacking in a number of higher-level positions.</p>
<p>10/21/21 2:37 PM</p>	<p>F13</p>	<p>Faculty</p>	<p>“Offer students more individualized advising during their first-year experience that will help them find more personally meaningful course choices. (C5)” After speaking with many first-year students, a common theme that has arisen is that their assigned advisors either do not or are not effectively helping guide students in their first-year course selections. Students enroll in courses they are not interested in, and by the time they figure out they have the ability to drop a course or switch instructors, it is too late into the semester. I know of 2 first-semester students who have withdrawn this year because of ineffective course advisement.</p> <p>“Provide all students quality individualized mentoring by faculty throughout their academic career. (C8)” It would behoove UND to factor into faculty contracts a fairer percentage for student advisement. 5-10% of a full-time faculty contract does not nearly cover the amount of time allotted to mentoring students (face-to-face, emails, and Zoom sessions). Some faculty go the extra mile, while others are very rigid with the time they extend to students. If faculty were incentivized a bit better to offer more individual time with students, then we may see better relationships between advisor-advisee and better success rates.</p> <p>“Restore strong and collaborative relationships with Indigenous Nations in what is now known as North Dakota and the region, including tribal colleges and universities (TCUs).” This is a HUGE plus!</p> <p>“Rebuild and expand American Indian Studies (AIS) with strategic faculty/staff hires, prioritizing hiring Indigenous faculty members in a variety of disciplines. (C1) d) Reestablish the American Indian Center as a dedicated space for UND’s Indigenous community and fund onsite, dedicated student support services. (C1)” I am unsure why UND severed this program and the AIC in the first place, but it is encouraging to see it being reborn.</p> <p>“Rethink administrative practices like the contractual distribution of effort and tenure/promotion policies to better promote and encourage interdisciplinary efforts across colleges to develop courses and programming to meet societal needs and encourage multidisciplinary thinking about issues. (C2)” Many non-tenure track faculty feel like ‘why should I go above and beyond when my contract can be terminated at any point?’ By providing career stability, faculty may likely give more because they are invested and feel like they are a part of a long-term solution instead of being a short-term band-aid.</p> <p>“Create a dedicated office for Essential Studies, directed by a faculty member with tenure-track or tenured status, to engage faculty from across the UND academic community, helping the whole campus feel a shared commitment to the program. (C5)” Excellent. It would be great for students and faculty alike to have a single go-to source to help navigate the complex maze of courses and their respective category assignments.</p>	<p>Generally, I disagree with the infusion of STEM and race. As a faculty who teaches in STEM, every moment I have in class with students is spent on helping students learn the intricacies of that particular course and how that field is moving along in this century. Revisiting past atrocities is best served by history or IDEA courses, and presented by faculty with the appropriate background to do so. My focus is preparing my students to be proficient in the workplace.</p>

<p>10/21/21 9:49 AM</p>	<p>FTX01c</p>	<p>Faculty</p>	<p>This is a comment on this survey. Why was there no option to not report status on the previous screen? If staff, faculty, students, or the public identify as such, this may increase various biases that are highlighted in the report itself (feedback from non-faculty may be discounted). Also, why were no quantitative items included? Items such as overall perceptions, belief in fairness, feelings of inclusion, would have allowed for important feedback from those who do not have the time or care to write long-winded responses. If 500 surveys are given, maybe 100 responses will include meaningful written feedback. The triangulation of mixed methods research is very powerful, but the qualitative aspect also reflects on the humanities bias from this taskforce. This is just another place where the lack of expertise is painfully obvious.</p>	
<p>10/21/21 9:37 AM</p>	<p>FTX01b</p>		<p>Solution 1 & Challenge 1 I support Solution 1 and appreciate the Challenge 1 team’s diverse approach to diversity and inclusion. (Forgive me, but the pun is fully intended.) In implementing this solution and proposed recommendations I hope that UND:</p> <p>(1) collects the relevant data in valid ways (e.g. if we use a survey, please make sure a psychometrician is involved. To be blunt, many of the surveys that UND creates are not informed by relevant expertise regarding how to conduct a valid, effective survey, and much the resulting data isn’t even cleaned before distribution.)</p> <p>(2) creates concrete solutions that are data informed - even if it means right-sizing the university or adopting initiatives that don’t focus on or benefit the College of Arts & Sciences, and</p> <p>(3) utilizes the appropriate and existing offices in gathering, interpreting, and responding to such data. This means recognizing that faculty and TTADA aren’t really the best qualified individuals to do many aspects of this job. Analytics & Planning, Assessment and Accreditation, Enrollment/Admissions, Equal Opportunity & Title IX, Human Resources & Payroll Services, the Registrar’s Office, Student Diversity and Inclusion, and Student Rights and Responsibilities should be included from the onset - if not take a co-lead - in many of these sub-solutions. (Once a Chief Diversity Office is hired, the office of Diversity & Inclusion should be added as well.)</p> <p>In addition to the above suggestions, Solution 1 and Challenge 1 should also address student life. Every university has an official and unofficial curriculum. To really support inclusion and retention, we need to promote experiences outside of the classroom and outside of academic support services. UND should thus take a strong look at what it can do outside of academics (and arguably sports, but I am admittedly slightly biased against sports since I am not a sports fan). Why do students go to college, why do they pick one college over the other, and why do they stay at a college? Academics is part of it, but the lived college experience is also part of it. We need to focus on what makes UND fun and how we help our traditional and even nontraditional students to flourish in life.</p> <p>Lastly, Solution 1 and Challenge 1 focus largely on undergraduate students. This focus is not explicit, but I worry that this solution will inadvertently leave out our professional and graduate students.</p> <p>Challenge 2 Increasing the partnership with area and regional employees is a fantastic idea. I would encourage the scope to be broader, however. With the shift to remote work and the use of digital means of connecting, there is no reason why we should limit internship opportunities to a geographic region.</p> <p>Much of what I wish to say regarding the liberal arts education and budgeting models will be addressed in their corresponding solutions, and so I will limit my comments here to noting the importance of applying 1.e to 1.d and that I am disappointed by</p>	<p>I appreciate the administration’s focus on revising our strategic plan and the future of higher education. As someone who views the title of “educator” as one of their most important personal descriptors, I also applaud the focus on quality education. However, I would like to focus not on the positive elements of the study but instead to draw attention to its short comings and thereby better inform its use in future planning. Pats on the back feel nice, but if we focus on the effort the task members put forth instead of the limitations of the report, we do a disservice to UND. However, mere complaining is not helpful either. Thus, I have attempted to ensure that my comments, though critical at times, are always constructively so. Without constructive feedback, no project can succeed.</p> <p>The Charge: The charge of the task force was to “create a framework for developing short and long-term strategies to shape an academically and fiscally robust environment that satisfies the education needs of the next generation of UND students...”</p> <p>Given this charge, the lack of a feasibility study of the University, an evaluation of the economic solvency of colleges, departments, programs, and other divisions, and any discussion of right-sizing the University is a glaring omission from the report. Phrases like “economically viable” do appear later in the report, but not in a meaningful way the reflects a hard and realistic look at data. To take part one of their charge seriously, the task force needed to evaluate the current economic health of the University and - when needed - recommend ways of promoting the economic health of UND for the future generations in a realistic way. Stating that the proposed solutions will be roughly cost-neutral does not ensure economic viability if the current state of affairs is not viable. Given the lack of data presented in the report, I cannot say for certain if UND is currently viable or, if not, what these recommendations for right-sizing would be. However, I would be greatly surprised if a responsible way forward did not involve the consolidation or elimination of departments and programs which are an economic drain on UND and do not offer their graduates an economically feasible degree (“economically feasible” defined by comparing average debt of a graduating student with said degree versus expected increase in earning when compared to individuals without degrees). As someone from the Humanities, this does pain me to say. However, we cannot put individual pet projects and areas of specialization above the needs of the students and the overall well-being of the University. As harsh as it sounds, making</p>

		<p>the lack of support, resources, and evidence for these recommendations. Consulting the specific labor needs of North Dakota as well as national labor needs directly would have perhaps led to more robust and relevant recommendations. For example, according to data cited by the report, the career clusters with the highest employment projection percentage changes are health sciences, information literacy, and finance. (Job service North Dakota.) Promoting these degrees and supporting these programs (e.g. College of Nursing and Professional Disciplines, SMHS, and the College of Business & Public Administration) while also promoting the skills the liberal arts develops - regardless of whether those skills come from a class with a prefix from a traditional liberal arts discipline - would be a better way to future-proof our students and our University.</p> <p>Solution 2, Challenge 2, and Challenge 5 The report touts a liberal arts education as “central to a strong, future-proof education.” However, the report offers no evidence to support this claim and does not address the many ways in which the liberal arts can be promoted. (Ironically, it is the skills I developed in my much-loved liberal arts education that make this such a glaring error to me.) The report makes a bold conclusion, but where is the supporting argument? Absent a valid and sound argument, UND should not proceed with supporting a liberal arts education at the expense of supporting students and other programs. (I purposefully use “at the expense of” because we are operating with finite resources.) Specifically, UND should distinguish between the instrumental value of the liberal arts and their inherent value. By doing so, we can more clearly articulate how - if it all - liberal arts is valuable. This type of value and how strongly relevant stakeholders value it will then inform how we should promote and support the liberal arts.</p> <p>For example, I personally believe (without any solid evidence to support my belief other than anecdotal evidence) that liberal arts classes are key in developing students’ communication skills, critical thinking, intellectual curiosity, and a healthy ability to question. Some of these traits are intrinsically valuable, other traits are valuable in most career fields and/or life in general, and others are still, arguably, both. Looking at recent labor market data, having a degree in most liberal arts fields is not valuable for career purposes but having the skills that are developed by a class or a couple classes are. This nuance would support retaining many of our liberal arts departments as service departments, and perhaps even consolidating them, but offers no reason to retain degrees in these fields or offer classes that amount to little more than a professor’s advanced course on their nuanced, specialized field of study that few - if any students - wish to take at the opportunity cost of an interesting, more generalized course. I realize these words will be met with resistance and recall past, unsuccessful efforts. However, we must be guided by what is best for UND and what can be supported with evidence and reason - not what makes us happiest.</p> <p>I want to emphasize this point not because I am opposed to the liberal arts but because I love them and am the product of them. First, as alluded to above, I seriously doubt any of my liberal arts professors - undergraduate or graduate - would be pleased with the critical reasoning in this section. It makes a bold claim with no evidence or support.</p> <p>Second, the skills and materials covered in my liberal arts education inform my understanding of the value of equity and inclusion. If UND values equity and inclusion, it must take a long, hard look at the impact on underserved students of promoting certain liberal arts degrees. To increase diversity, we often increase the number of students who are taking on debt to obtain their degree. If we have an unrealistic view of the earning</p>	<p>sure UND has the resources to provide a quality education is more important than keeping faculty employed for programs and degrees which don’t form a meaningful part of the future of education.</p> <p>The composition of the task force and the scope of the report: The future of higher education involves more than just faculty (specifically, more than just tenured/tenure-track liberal arts faculty) and, often faculty lack the relevant expertise to provide realistic, meaningful insights into some the looming challenges. The fact that only two staff members were included in the task force means that much of the insight possessed by experts in non-teaching fields of higher education was lost and the focus was, arguably, too narrow. As a result, the report displayed a lack of broader institutional awareness and understanding of university systems as well.</p> <p>Furthermore, at times the result also seems to prioritize tenured/tenure-track faculty - particularly those in the College of Arts & Sciences - and TTADA over the rest of UND. I highly recommend that the report be strongly evaluated for elements of self-interest in light of the committee member’s institutional affiliation. This recommendation is not to say that the task was intentionally self-serving. I do not think this was the case and believe they conducted work with the best of intentions. My recommendation instead is merely to correct for the pervasive influence that implicit biases and biases towards our own specialties can play in our work. Being mindful of this will promote not only a better resulting product but also counter the hierarchy and privilege that often comes with tenured faculty status. In light of the DE&I focus of UND, this awareness is even more important such the hierarchy within higher education arguably compounds upon broader social hierarchies and injustices due to historical facts surrounding higher education and those who sought it.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>potential of a liberal arts degree or do not clearly communicate these earning potentials to students, then we are encouraging them to spend money on something which may not provide a worthwhile return in terms of foundational elements of their hierarchy of needs. Intellectual fulfillment means little if you can't find a job with good benefits or afford to start a family because of student loan debt. Every student should have the freedom to take a literature course or, to wax biographical, an astronomy course just because they are interested in it - just for the sake of knowledge. However, we must be mindful that gone are the days where merely any college degree would suffice for a career and, relatedly, gone are the days where mostly those who didn't have to worry about debt or wealth attended college.</p> <p>Above all else, we must focus on the wellbeing of our students. I sincerely hope this means retaining the liberal arts in some form. However, we cannot hide behind the "uncertainty" of the future job market to ignore current and likely labor market trends which indicate the lessening value of a liberal arts degree.</p> <p>Focusing on the specific aspects of Solution 2 and Challenge 5, I question why an essential studies task force must be led by full-time faculty. Why isn't an administrator from the College of Education & Human Development or a staff member with a doctorate in an Education field qualified to lead the task force? Once again, faculty do not know everything, and equating time spent teaching with an evidence and theory informed understanding of organizational psychology and educational theory and assessment is a grave error. For similar reasons, faculty should not have sole - or arguably even majority - control over ES assessment. Faculty are not experts on assessment and, absent additional training or qualifications, are often clueless about how to do assessment well and what federal assessment requirements are. (My graduate program at least didn't even touch on these topics, and I have yet to meet any other colleague in higher education - outside of some doctorates in education - that have actually been sufficiently trained on this in the same robust manner we would expect of someone who conducts research or instruction in any other field.) We require a graduate degree or similar experience in a relevant field before we let employees teach on a subject or conduct research on a subject. Why should creating an ES program or conducting educational assessment be any different? We have an Office of Assessment and Accreditation. If the University is not willing to allow that Office to do its job, at the very least it should consider hiring someone with appropriate education and training in higher education assessment to do assessment for ES.</p> <p>Solution 3 Once again, I support this solution. My main concern is (1) how such interdisciplinary collaboration is achieved.</p> <p>Any new interdisciplinary program, certificate, etc. should do a feasibility study prior to creation. Simply adding more lipstick on a pig doesn't solve the problem that we're dressing up a pig. We shouldn't simply toss more programs, certificates, etc. to the catalog without first making sure it will actually improve the situation. First, can the program be supported? The program must have sufficient faculty and staff to support our students and various programmatic needs itself (e.g. assessment, marketing, administrative support). It also must have sufficient student interest to support the program. How many programs, certificates, etc. do we have already that have no or very little student enrollment? Second, is the program meaningful? Does it add something substantive to our course of study, or is it just something new for newness's sake? If we cannot articulate the value of the program and what type of value it is, then we should not commit resources to it.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>As a suggestion, I highly recommend looking into the research on cohort, or cluster, hiring. While the existing research does have limitation (e.g. limited to a single institution or a small sample size), it can asset in retention, diversity, and interdepartmental collaboration if done correctly.</p> <p>Solution 4 Good pedagogy and andragogy are key to student success. I hope that the administration holds employees accountable to the goals set as part of this solution.</p> <p>Solution 5, Challenge 3, and Challenge 6 As with Solution 1 and Challenge 1, this is a solution that Offices mainly comprised of staff should be heavily involved in. In pursuing this solution, please include the Registrar’s Office and the Office of Assessment and Accreditation. Arguably, representatives from one or both of these offices should be a co-lead of any resulting team or task force to ensure both best practices and federal and state compliance.</p> <p>Solution 6 Faculty form a minority of UND’s employees. This solution ignores this fact and the key role that staff play in student recruitment, learning, retention, and overall success.</p> <p>Solution 7 To echo my comments from solution 1, UND needs to be mindful of how much learning occurs outside of the official curriculum and other official academic activities. We should promote opportunities for organic growth and learning in student life.</p> <p>Solution 8 and Challenges 4, 7, and 8 While I agree that UND needs to build institutional capacity, I am puzzled by many of the suggestions provided. For example, why are faculty qualified to contribute to fiscal decisions? Why must the office for ES be directed by a tenured or tenured-track faculty as opposed to the best suited employee with relevant education in the field, who may or may not happen to be on a tenure path? What evidence do we have that increasing TTADA will improve student retention and success? Moreover, how does increased faculty governance relate to the future of higher education? (Absent a clear link between increased faculty governance and better student success, this solution reads as little more than a faculty-heavy task force looking out for their own best interests.)</p> <p>I have two strong, additional concerns. First, where is the increased voice for the majority of UND employees (e.g. staff)? This solution in particular ignores the role that staff play in the future of higher education and is extremely faculty-focused. For example, the comments on recommendation 2 of Challenge 7 completely ignores the fact that it is the University Senate - which represents all UND employees and has student representation - that has the charge of consulting the President. The Senate is not a purely faculty body; yet based on the comments here one could reasonably make this mistaken assumption. Making progress requires an accurate representation of the current state of affairs. While there wouldn’t be a University without faculty, there also wouldn’t be a University without staff either. Any strategic plan should keep this point in mind and not leave out vital areas of the University and key members of its community.</p> <p>Second, many of the points of 8.3 reflect an ignorance of what UND should already be doing. For example, 8.3.b proposes assessment that should already be occurring. To prioritize this existing solution, the University should provide increased support for Assessment and Accreditation and hold faculty accountable for their required annual assessment. Re-examining the</p>	
--	--	--	--

			<p>relationship among Analytics and Planning, Assessment and Accreditation, and TTADA, as well as looking at how peer institutions address these issues, would be helpful moving forward.</p> <p>Challenge 9 UND is not a liberal arts institution. It is a space-grant institution. While the liberal arts are important, I (a Humanities-lover through and through) am very concerned by the fact that the report does not mention UND's purpose of outer space-related research. As a member of the Space Grant consortia, UND is expected "to develop innovative and integrated plans to advance aerospace knowledge and expand related activities." (418826main_Space Grant 2010 Solicitation Rev B[1].pdf (nasa.gov) pg 5) This area - and the not liberal arts - is a more rational starting point for partnership with institutions, industry, and government.</p> <p>Furthermore, this section ignores the specific areas of growth in medium, high, and advanced skill clusters for occupations. These skill clusters focus on medicine and technology; not all bachelor's degrees are created equal.</p>	
10/21/21 9:32 AM	S09	Student		<p>I am concerned about some of the wording within this document. I understand where the school is going/coming from regarding the Gender Inclusion policy statement. I believe, however, that the way in which the school is proposing enforcing compliance is heavy handed. By labeling misgendering as discrimination, you open the door for punitive action toward students/faculty who do not comply. This is against the standards of higher education and the foundation of classical liberalism. Ours is a school of educators, whos job is to educate students. Forcing compliance is not education. If the school believes this to be an important issue, then act like it. There are no shortcuts to moral behavior. When you silence dissenters, you stifle their opportunities for growth. What about supplementary educational resources? Or teaching about gender related issues in essential studies coursework? If students aren't provided a framework through which to understand a rapidly changing and very different concept, how are they supposed to come to terms with it?</p>
10/21/21 8:24 AM	T02	Staff	<p>It does not appear as though the task force met with support units across campus to learn about what is already occurring. Many of the recommendations are for things that are already happening and recommendations to "increase" support in certain areas do not include current practices or what the idea of "increase" means. In many support units, this is means additional staff.</p>	<p>The report does not reflect the entire campus. It seems to reflect tenured faculty in one college only. There is a lot of great work occurring across campus that was neglected in this report. Some of the suggestions were great and could have been more nuanced if they had taken the time to speak with units across campus.</p>
10/20/21 4:02 PM	F11a	Faculty	<p>There are some excellent suggestions in this report, especially involving the development and improvement of interdisciplinary learning and essential studies. I would say that the recommendations in the report (e.g. reinstating a faculty essential studies director, etc.) will not work if the same reporting structure that exists is left in place. Faculty who develop and direct academic programming need to report directly to the Provost or to someone who is qualified (academically and institutionally) -- not to someone like the current Vice Provost who is unqualified and does not have the support or trust of the faculty. During the past few years, unqualified and ineffective people have been placed in positions of authority. The institution has been weakened because of this and creating new initiatives</p>	<p>There are many excellent -- and essential -- ideas in this report. It provides some evidence that the institution might actually believe in its people (faculty and staff). It is also the first signs in a long time that we are trying to put students first.</p> <p>I hope that this -- like too many other things before it -- is not just "window dressing." And I hope that the administrative structures that have been put in place in the past 5 years or so are changed so that any initiatives that are developed can be successful.</p>

			<p>and re-empowering faculty who have the expertise to make programming effective will NOT be effective if the same problematic administrative structures are in place.</p> <p>I would also say that UND has many people who are experts in areas outlined here -- and who have previously led programs and initiatives that were moving the institution forward in some of the very directions indicated in this report. UND leadership should find these people and encourage them to resume their work - or at least to help inform the processes going forward. Use the great human resources you have already.</p> <p>Finally, I applaud the very necessary goals of improving academic assessment, particularly of essential studies. UND was doing very well in this regard -- and was nationally recognized for its efforts. Then these efforts were disregarded by administrators and very ineffective measures were used to replace what was working. It's good to see the desire to create effective and meaningful student-learning assessment once again. However, what I said previously stands: if the faculty leading these efforts are required to report to the people who have basically weakened essential studies, then nothing will be gained. I would also say, quite frankly, that the current person in charge of assessment at UND is very ineffective and should be replaced.</p>	
10/20/21 2:11 PM	S02b	Student	<p>I am concerned about the amount of emphasis the report places on the Essential Studies program. I am a graduate student at UND, but my undergraduate degree is from Towson University. TU overemphasized general education requirements to the point that undergraduate students had to take more gen ed classes than classes for their major; a system like this will leave students lacking in the skills and knowledge needed to enter a graduate degree program if they so desire. I would suggest ensuring that no more than 50% of an undergraduate student's classes are from the Essential Studies program.</p> <p>Additionally, the program itself should be tailored to students' majors. It would be a waste of credits and money for a student in, say, a STEM major, to be required to take classes on Shakespeare or art history. A STEM student does not need to know these topics to excel in their field. In essence, a student in an objective major has no need for subjective classes, and a student in a subjective major has no need for objective classes.</p> <p>However, students in the social sciences need to develop both objective and subjective thinking skills. These are the students that would benefit most from an expanded one-size-fits-all general education curriculum, at the expense of all other students.</p>	
10/20/21 11:45 AM	F07	Faculty	<p>-Solution 2: I like the emphasis on the Liberal Arts. One of the problems with Liberal Arts at UND in the previous Strategic plan was that no definition was ever made. The Oxford Dictionary defines Liberal Arts broadly as, "academic subjects such as literature, philosophy, mathematics, and social and physical sciences as distinct from professional and technical subjects." The Essential Studies program has allowed this definition to be broadened such that every department on campus has developed their own "Essential Studies" courses.</p> <p>-The development of specific "Essential Studies" courses is too constraining to the idea of liberal arts, and I do not support this. However, a University Studies class required for all students is OK.</p> <p>-C4 Development of a research arm for TTaDA seems to me to be a duplication of expertise that already exists in the College of Education. TTaDA has turned into the "tail that wags the dog" that has forced a set format for online teaching and learning, and classroom instruction. I recognize that some standardization of online courses is needed, but the very specific requirements of the current TTaDA down to the length of lecture videos is overreach, and limits diversity of teaching techniques.</p> <p>-Solution 8.2. Agree. The current budget model is now being focused at the department level in the College of Arts and Sciences. Courses and programs are being cut or trimmed based on student credit hour numbers versus a thoughtful approach to what our students need to get a good education, especially in the liberal arts. Monies for new hires are being routed to the STEM</p>	<p>I think that overall the report is well done, and the committee members should be commended for their work. The key is for the administration to take these recommendations and comments to heart, and not let them sit on a shelf awaiting the next charge to compile such a report.</p>

			<p>fields, with little for traditional areas of the liberal arts.</p> <p>C1-Recommendation 3 Attracting new and underserved students: agree with these. However, suggest that students not be "pigeonholed" into a degree program when they first come to campus. This constrains the students ability to explore new areas of understanding. Leads to overemphasis on subjects perceived to be higher income earning: e.g. medicine and engineering for incoming students.</p> <p>C7 Fiscal Structure. I agree that the administration at UND has continued to make many decisions without faculty involvement, or transparency.</p>	
10/20/21 11:27 AM	T17	Staff	<p>Solution 1: This is a great objective, but most universities start with increasing diversity through increasing diverse student access through recruitment. This only goes so far as it's not an embedded diversity strategy. To be fully embraced, we should increase diversity in stakeholders, strategic partnerships, vendors, clients, and absolutely staff and faculty. I cannot stress the importance of diverse faculty as leaders, role models, and change agents.</p> <p>Solutions 3 and 4: TTAaDA could lead this important work.</p> <p>Solution 5: I support this totally. I would like to see even more flexibility in courses such as no-limit courses that can be finished at any time by the student and more JIT training and credentialing. The more on-demand content and asynchronous courses that we have, we will have more of an edge on the competition. This is something that UND, UND Online, and SPEA already do well, and we need to invest further on this good work and build upon it while building our student enrollment.</p>	Thank you for your work on this!
10/20/21 9:33 AM	F10	Faculty	All the solutions look good, but we are not sure if the Administration would take them seriously and implement them at all. Based on what the top administrators did in recent years, I have no confidence in them.	Hope the new administration with a new Provost will not hurt liberal arts education any more. Many programs in humanities and social sciences have been killed or put on death penalty thanks to previous provosts and Dean of Arts & Sciences. UND cannot be a comprehensive university without strong liberal arts education.
10/20/21 8:35 AM	F01	Faculty	I am in agreement with providing program completion flexibility in attaining degrees and certificates. Innovative education strategies require changes that fits the needs of students. Faculty interprofprofessional collaboration is essential with providing a wider scope of learning and experiences.	The final report is excellent in recognizing student population needs, faculty recognition for contributions towards quality education and also recognizing there is also room for advancement and improvement in all educational programs.
10/19/21 5:21 PM	T04	Staff		<p>I have a few comments regarding the C1 Group Report:</p> <p>On page 20 (Recommendation 2.1), the report talks about disparities of financial aid and scholarship opportunities, particularly when it comes to nontraditional students. I believe this report uses a lot of generalization about the enrollment/recruitment process and strategies, without understanding the different student types that are recruited. There is no one-size-fits-all approach to this.</p> <p>When comparing students' financial aid and scholarship situations, you need to make sure you know deeper contexts. Not just relying on a few individuals' stories about people they know. While this feedback is very important, it's only helpful if used in addition to real data about how this funding is given to students. An incoming freshman who goes straight to UND from high</p>

				<p>school would typically have the most opportunities for scholarships and financial aid because these students do not have much (if any) work experience or personal income to fund college on their own without family assistance. Older, more non-traditional students typically may have a few years of work experience and some income that they have built up through money that might have been saved by not attending college initially or taking breaks between enrollment. Because of this, there are less opportunities for non-traditional students to find scholarships by default. This is the reality of college regardless of the institution. It doesn't mean that we can't improve this and create opportunities, but it is a very hard comparison between non-traditional students and traditional students in this context. One of the most important aspects of enrollment management is attracting students as early in their educational life as possible. That is one reason why universities place such a huge focus on incoming freshmen every year. We want to be the school that starts their college journey so that we can retain them and see them finish the entire college degree process. It would be more beneficial to find ways that UND can internally create scholarship/financial aid opportunities for non-traditional students, rather than attacking the opportunities that traditional students have.</p> <p>Also on page 20, it's especially odd to point out UND's efforts to purchase PSAT names and use that example as a disparity in scholarship opportunity. UND purchases names of these tests as a way to get ahead of the recruitment process and acquire prospect names for future recruitment terms. There are a number of other reasons for purchasing this data, but this is a crucial part of building a large funnel to then market UND to high school students from all types of backgrounds and demographics. As mentioned above, it is crucial for UND to acquire data of high school students to attract them as first-year students and hopefully retain them by providing an outstanding academic experience at UND. There are plenty of other ways that we collect data for prospective students of all types, whether traditional or non-traditional.</p> <p>The National Merit Scholarship Program is simply a program UND participates in like other universities. The program is highly competitive for all students in the country who participate, and those who qualify essentially have their choice of where they want to go and they get tuition and fees covered. According to their website, about 16,000 students nationwide are chosen as Semifinalists each year. It is a rare achievement for a student to have this distinction. But this report suggests that it's a much more common occurrence that UND students have as an option. I suggest the team does some more research to see just how many incoming UND students are National Merit Scholars.</p> <p>There are much more opportunities for traditional students because many of those opportunities are</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>either federally supported or provided by external organizations that UND participates under. I think it would be more beneficial to look at the opportunities that UND creates internally and see where growth can be found, rather than trying to dissect established opportunities that are standard across all universities. Taking away those opportunities or limiting participation severely impacts our competitiveness with other schools and the ability to attract any type of student. Taking away opportunities from traditional students will alter the foundation of recruitment efforts and success overall at UND.</p>
10/19/21 4:49 PM	F03b	Faculty	<p>I hope it's OK that I am making different submissions for different points...</p> <p>Recommendation 1.3 is excellent -- it is both doing the right thing and an important way to serve the needs of the state.</p>	<p>Perhaps with some exceptions (like 1.3), there's a strong feeling when reading through the report that we've done many of the things mentioned (at least in some form or fashion). That's not a critique, just an observation. If anything I see it in a glass-half-full way: there are multiple items that already have foundational work laid. My suggestion would be to ensure the people with knowledge of those past activities are consulted so that multiple reinventions of the wheel don't occur as work moves forward.</p>
10/19/21 4:45 PM	F03a	Faculty	<p>Essential Studies is mentioned in a number of places, which I think is great. For a number of years that program was very "out there" on campus -- you heard about things, there were discussions about matters of relevance to the program, faculty seemed to be pretty engaged in the work of gen ed. For the last few years it seems completely different. Aside from knowing that students take ES classes, I'd have assumed it was a casualty of recent budget cutting. If the TF report is an opportunity to bring back the vibrant program that once was, I'm all for it.</p>	
10/19/21 4:43 PM	CF01a	Community Member	<p>I like the emphasis on interdisciplinary learning and programs. But you know that UND had an exemplary interdisciplinary essential studies/general education program called Integrated Studies, right? I'm a product of that amazing program, and I can tell you that NO OTHER learning opportunity at UND was equal to what this program -- and these faculty teaching in it -- did for my education. If you really want quality interdisciplinary learning - especially an interdisciplinary general education experience, you need to bring back Integrated Studies. It was around for nearly 30 years, won awards, and impacted hundreds of students. Don't reinvent the wheel -- bring it back. Every ISP alum I've ever met says the same.</p>	<p>I'm glad UND is looking at these issues seriously. I'm an active alum and I really care about UND. Seems like there is some good leadership there now (about time!) and I hope to see good things. I'm encouraged.</p>
10/19/21 10:32 AM	T11	Staff	<p>The future of education at UND relies on finding additional students to join as freshman and then retaining the students. The key to this is marketing programs (not colleges and not solely UND) which are either unique, in demand, and/or available through various modalities. Without EFFECTIVE marketing the rest of our initiatives (referred to as solutions in the report) will be difficult to accomplish as we will not have the appropriate resources for implementation. UND must identify what could be cash cows and seize the opportunity.</p> <p>Career outcomes and placement are more important than ever in our post-covid world and unfortunately a review of the outcomes survey conducted by UND indicates the majority of colleges do not have great response rates. For example the 2020 report indicates aerospace at 6%, SMHS 7%, CEM 12%, etc. To review the report visit https://und.edu/analytics-and-planning/_files/docs/_files/outcomes-highlights-2020.pdf</p> <p>Prospective students and their parents cannot rely on such data sets. UND must change the process to ensure better tracking of graduates so placement results can be convincing in marketing efforts. We should not solely rely on what the US Bureau of Labor</p>	<p>The work the task force completed was no doubt a tremendous amount of effort; however, it seems to be narrowly focused results for the solutions and strategies. It appears to be heavily focused on faculty perspectives and less focused on what will matter to a wide audience of prospective students and their families.</p>

			<p>Stats provide as convincing reasons why students should pursue a degree.</p> <p>As we continue to explore interdisciplinary offerings we must also conduct a serious evaluation of underperforming programs and make difficult decisions of what to maintain and what to suspend. These are difficult decisions but it will be the best opportunity for long-term sustainability in our mega competitive higher education world.</p>	
10/19/21 9:40 AM	FS01a	Student	I like all of the proposed solutions, as a student who has taken a non-traditional path through college I believe that embracing flexibility is one of the best ideas in the report.	It is important to apply this report to all of UND's departments and facilities
10/18/21 7:40 PM	F23b	Faculty	I like 1.2.f about clarity in the definitions of "student success" and "retention" for different groups of students. I would add that "student success" recently has only seemed to mean make things easier rather than make things better. In other words, students will succeed after graduation if they are challenged.	It is clear the TF worked very hard, and for that they deserve to be commended!
10/18/21 4:41 PM	F23a	Faculty	<p>I commend the TF for developing strategies related to Essential Studies in various places in its report. And although I trust the TF knows it, perhaps our newest upper-level administrators do not, but we recently DID have a faculty member serving as ES Director. That recommendation will simply be a return to the past, a situation which arose from the recommendations of a previous task force, the General Education Task Force.</p> <p>Pertaining to this particular recommendation, I feel it important to draw attention to the substantial decline in the ES Program since Karyn Plumm was installed (no competitive process, and after the faculty were misled into thinking there would be no ES Director) in the position as ES Director. ES was an award-winning program with a nationally known process for program assessment. There were at least once-a-semester campus-wide discussions about the program, what students were learning in the program, etc. The assessment process involved loop-closing, and in fact led to the update to the "diversity" requirement. Since Ms. Plumm has taken over, none of these program-building activities has occurred. ES has become the epitome of a check-it-and-forget-it program -- both for students and faculty. Her legacy with ES has been to set UND back in terms of general education by many years. If the single TF recommendation that's adopted is the one pertaining to ES Program leadership, thereby removing Ms. Plumm from the post (and I'd trust any connection whatsoever with the program), the TF will have done a great service to the future of education at UND.</p>	
10/18/21 2:56 PM	FS02d	Faculty	A review of the enrollment strategy should be two-fold (1) internal to the state of ND, and (2) external to the state. We must seek and value diversity while at the same time, honoring ND natives who enroll and stay in the state. Many years ago, UND had a policy where ND high school students could apply to UND and the SAT was waived as a criterion for acceptance. This encouraged ND natives to stay and take their education at UND.	
10/18/21 12:49 PM	S06	Student	<p>I did not notice in my review of this report, any section that addresses microaggressions. This report is very goal oriented. A goal that seemed to be absent is the need to school current tenured faculty who have no grasp on pedagogies, or lack of knowledge about unconscious prejudices displayed as implicit biases.</p> <p>The level of denial by faculty who mistreat me while being expected to work in a hostile work environment is unbearable. Furthermore these microaggressions are a direct result of my identity.</p> <p>We need goals that provide a rehabilitation of faculty who mistreat students with hostility as a result of their unconscious prejudicial hostilities. Faculty who fail to take responsibility for their mistreatment of students among current faculty who have tenure needs some serious attention. These existing faculty need some serious intense training to 1) open their eyes and 2) correct their behavior so that they stop their prejudicial unconscious biases from driving their microaggressions against students. UND inclusion and equity has been amazing but implementing that successfully does not happen with faculty who continuously treat students with microaggressions of discrimination such as that which I am currently experiencing at UND.</p>	<p>This report is highly solutions focused and that's great. One component that seemed to be missing across all sections is procedures for successful policy implementation. This piece may be part of a different document, I am not sure.</p> <p>What I do know from experience is that no matter how good the policy is intended to be, the policy is only as good as the details in the procedures that are needed to implement each policy successfully.</p> <p>Far too often, the discrimination faced does not lay out the procedures and leaves it up to individuals to "figure it out" to implement a policy.</p> <p>Overall, at UND the left hand and the right hand actually communicate far more than most universities. However, for equity to be achieved, it is both procedures and policies that both need to be put in place. We cant rely on people reading the policy to just find ways to successfully implement said policy.</p>

<p>10/18/21 12:47 PM</p>	<p>FTX01a</p>	<p>Staff</p>		<p>Overall, this report was offensive, arrogant, and filled with incompetence. How about some big questions are addressed, such as, "what is the optimal number of programs for the number of students?" If you want to improve faculty, remove the archaic thing that is tenure. State and Federal protections will prevent unlawful firing. Teaching is so valuable, how much does it cost to run each college at UND when you factor in grants and research dollars. This was a write-up by faculty who are entitled and quite frankly backed with degrees/credentials that might get them a job at Starbucks. Look at the US Department of Labor for the projected job needs and see how those align to this document. Look at the jobs that need degrees, they are in engineering and healthcare primarily. Computer programming is focusing more on cheap, but productive boot camps that have no arts and science components. How do more programs, more academic bloat, and less valuable degrees help reduce student debt and increase internships? Where does all the extra money come from to support all these new initiatives without cutting many programs? If this report and others drive our leadership, then UND is going down and will lose what good folks we have outside of aviation. Oh, I also guess that A&S is the only college at UND.</p>
<p>10/18/21 12:11 PM</p>	<p>S05</p>	<p>Student</p>	<p>Solution 1.3--Thank you. The emphasis on supporting Indigenous communities is incredibly important. I have been told that Indigenous students on campus have regularly experienced racism and harassment. I encourage the University to include some kind of anti-racism experience/education to help break that cycle on campus and beyond.</p> <p>Solution 1.1.a Responses.</p> <p>-An important piece of supporting diverse communities is including awareness of work-restricted holidays in the University culture (perhaps a minimum may be including a link noting these dates at the top of the academic calendar page), and promoting faculty awareness of those upcoming dates in each semester. University of Louisville produced the following document for their faculty: https://louisville.edu/calendars/work-restricted-religious-holy-days-pdf. A hesitation with their recommendations is the practice of placing the burden on students to "out" their minority religion status to their professors and risk suffering discrimination (unconscious or otherwise). A better practice might include some use of an anonymous survey. If students are surveyed at the University-level (perhaps via text) prior to each Fall semester, the University can identify the communities present on-campus and customize recommendations to faculty. This would allow them to modify the course so exams and assignments are not given on those dates.</p> <p>-Reconsider standardized testing requirements in your recommendations</p> <p>The report emphasizes that UND seeks "Not just equal, but equitable access to education and the opportunity to succeed lie at the heart of the university's mission." Given that standardized testing has been known to negatively impact disenfranchised communities since the mid-1990's if not before (1), requires time, money, travel, learning how to test, and other resources, I would recommend that standardized testing at the undergraduate and graduate levels be made optional, if not eliminated. This would help build equitable access to education, especially in our rural state. Many other universities have taken this approach without</p>	<p>Regarding Solution 8.3. consider research around instituting a Fall Break, and what format may be the most beneficial to support student mental health.</p> <p>To support student mental health (1), I might suggest that the University consider researching the possibility of instituting a Fall break. It could be as simple as making Thanksgiving week-already short-a full week off. Alternatively, taking a Monday & Tuesday off mid-October to balance the Wednesday-Friday Thanksgiving break may be an option. Challenges implicated in the mixed-outcomes of Canadian fall breaks seem to center around whether or not professors assign additional work or exams during or just after the break; staggering days off may be more advantageous.</p> <p>1. Agnew, M., Poole, H., & Khan, A. (2019). Fall break fallout: Exploring student perceptions of the impact of an autumn break on stress. <i>Student Success</i>, 10(3), 45.</p>

			<p>negatively impacting their "prestige, size, or diversity of a program" (2).</p> <p>Experienced mid-career students without a GRE score were found to outperform high-scoring inexperienced students (2). In addition, GRE scores do not "prove useful in predicating who will graduate with a Ph.D., pass the qualifying exam, have a shorter time to defense, deliver more conference presentations, publish more first author papers, or obtain an individual grant or fellowship." (3) Rather they seem to merely moderately predict first semester grades.</p> <p>1. Lomax, R. G., West, M. M., Harmon, M. C., Viator, K. A., & Madaus, G. F. (1995). The impact of mandated standardized testing on minority students. <i>Journal of Negro Education</i>, 171-185.</p> <p>2. Cooper, C. A., & Knotts, H. G. (2019). Do I Have to Take the GRE? Standardized Testing in MPA Admissions. <i>PS: Political Science & Politics</i>, 52(3), 470-475.</p> <p>3. Moneta-Koehler, L., Brown, A. M., Petrie, K. A., Evans, B. J., & Chalkley, R. (2017). The limitations of the GRE in predicting success in biomedical graduate school. <i>PloS one</i>, 12(1), e0166742.</p> <p>Solution 3. I love the collaboration emphasis. I have often wondered why there isn't much between even similar programs such as Social Work, Counseling, and Clinical Psychology.</p> <p>Solution 4. Enhancing instruction is essential; I encourage the university to consider how teaching supervision may play a role as well. I have experienced situations where an instructor was exhibiting poor teaching or racist assignments or commentary. It is also important to ensure that students are educated about HOW and WHO to contact when instructors are problematic.</p>	
10/18/21 12:07 PM	FST01c	Faculty	<p>I notice there is the push for evaluating work experience and combined programs with other schools etc, as a solution to attract more students. But at what point does this cannibalize our lower level courses? At what point does having a significant portion of our students as transfer students from out of the region affect the motivation for the ND legislature to continue or increase funding for UND? I think this is a solution that must be monitored & limited as there are impacts to drastic changes to the student body.</p>	<p>Well done, a lot of quality solutions were posed, and I agree with all of the challenges being important. Most of the solutions that I have looked at look good.</p>
10/18/21 11:57 AM	F14	Faculty	<p>to be honest. This feel like we are spending time and resources to "un do" the work that was done by Provost DiLorenzo - which is long over due. I suspect there was some overlap and some programs could use a review, but he slashed a large majority of programs: Library, Conflict Res Center, American Indian Studies, Graduate School (we need a real academic dean and appropriate staff support) VPR office. So a look back to mid 2000s is probably a must and ES/Gen Eds before the Provost took over and reduced grad credits, double degrees and double credit counting is important. Some of the things we did as a campus in the past were fantastic... we should review those and this plan does that - Bravo!</p>	<p>One missing area is athletics. I believe that Athletics should be included in our "inclusive" community. We need to support athletics, and athletics needs to support academics - otherwise those students, staff and administrators are always at arms length. We learned during our athletic cuts that the athletics dept was not woven into the University very well.</p>
10/18/21 11:47 AM	FST01b	Faculty	<p>Solution 1.1d - My guess is that the UND faculty body is already more diverse compared to the student body. Maybe add in a part e; to recruit and retain faculty from the region to also maintain representation of North Dakota's actual demographics, instead of National trends.</p> <p>Solution 1.2d - faculty mentoring can be good but can also be a very poorly done. Faculty are not trained to be mentors and many could care less to do it well. If it is something good for students, staff will need to take over or departments will realize it on their own and already be doing so.</p> <p>1.3c - UND has been trying to do the indigenous population recruiting and retaining for a long time, and has a program that now "needs rebuilding" to show for it. I don't think UND should focus heavily on one under represented</p>	

			population. Put those resources into a broader Diversity type recruiting/supporting/retaining effort, so that those resources can be utilized and adjusted instead of being committed to a possible bridge to nowhere for one group.	
10/18/21 11:45 AM	T09	Staff	Meh.	Somehow the findings mirrored the general direction the university was already taking.
10/18/21 11:12 AM	FST01a	Faculty	Solution 2: Support liberal arts education and recognize its value in the workforce. Don't we already have enough Liberal Arts graduates who can't find a job now? How about more support for programs where there is employment demand?	A lot of idea that will require more faculty. Are we going to hire more?
10/18/21 10:58 AM	F31	Faculty	Item 1d: Attract and retain diverse faculty: The committee needs to provide specific examples of how to attract and retain diverse faculty such as UND Diversity grants or stipends to departments that will support 75 % or more of under - represented faculty salaries and their start up costs. Item 7d: Experiential learning needs to be coupled with an academy that "trains the trainers". A department of Interprofessional Education (such as at Duke University) would be ideal.	Item 2b: Employers and students should be stakeholders in curricular design Item 2c: Embedding liberal arts education across all degree programs is vital to leaders cultivated at UND Thematically, where is Student Centered Learning or Personalized Learning play a role in the strategic plan ?
10/18/21 10:53 AM	S07	Student	I am a distance education graduate student in the CEM faculty. As a delivery mechanism and important strategic growth option, distance education appears to be under-represented in the report - which implies it is also under-represented in business planning. In fact, the term "distance education" appears just once in the report. Distance-ed oriented opportunities: - Solution 1: recognize distance ed as an under-served market - Solution 4: current distance ed delivery works well, but enhancements are possible. This is a rapidly evolving delivery area (and revenue stream) - continuous innovation is essential. - Solution 8: Building on the above comment, the business plan should be explicit about ongoing innovation investments in distance education tools and delivery methods.	Great start.
10/18/21 10:42 AM	S08	Student	I strongly support the plan to design more flexible and individualized pathways toward a degree. As a mature student with a disability (which has impacted my ability to pursue a college education), I strongly feel that an expansion of the SPEA program is key to this! For students in my situation, semester-based online courses are often too great a challenge, but SPEA courses work very well. However, very few universities offer SPEA courses, so I think this is one way in which UND can set itself apart!	
10/18/21 10:36 AM	T10	Staff	1.1 Offer Academic Coaching sessions on the Monday before classes and throughout the first week, to help students to be better prepared to manage their course loads. Once the semester is underway, the students who most need this seem to be unable to find the time. Build capacity to provide this service. Offer technology getting started sessions for those uncomfortable with setting up their emails, accessing Blackboard and CampusConnection, etc. 1.3. INMED and RAIN (Nursing) are excellent programs already in place which are already in line with the goals and solutions stated - be sure to build on their work and assure that they have funding to continue/expand their work.	Lots of great recommendations, comprehensive.
10/18/21 10:30 AM	F29	Faculty	I am glad to see "Support liberal arts education and recognize its value in the workforce" listed as Solution 2. But sadly, this has not been the case at UND in recent years. Over the last 5-10 years, when candidates came to interview for an important administrative position (Dean of A&S, Provost and UND President), they all emphasized the importance of liberal arts education. When they were hired for the position, however, ALL of them (yes, including Provosts, Presidents, and even the Dean of A&S) targeted social sciences and humanities by cutting fundings available to those programs and not allowing those	I greatly appreciate the work of the Task Force, but I wonder if the Administration really cares at all. They may use the report only to show people another "nice" thing they have done.

			departments to fill vacant positions. How convenient! If UND wants to make itself a technical college, stop claiming to be the flagship university of the State.	
10/18/21 10:17 AM	FS02c	Faculty	Very good thought has gone into this important area. It is long overdue and I so appreciate the work that the committee has done.	Well-done!
10/18/21 10:08 AM	S10	Student	<p>From the report: "UND is justifiably proud of its historically strong AIS program, but the program and funding for it has diminished in recent years. Restoring and expanding the program would be a powerful signal to Indigenous communities that we consider the program valuable and our relationship with Indigenous peoples vital to our mission."</p> <p>With lack of funding for programs like RAIN and the the program suspension of Nursing PhD program (due to budget issues)- UND has to double down on it's commitment to educate the next generation of nursing scholars by reinstating the Nursing PhD program and re-commit to it's mission. Restructure the programs and commit more resources to recruitment and retention of Native nursing scholars. Make this a priority for the next CNPD Dean.</p>	
10/18/21 10:06 AM	T05	Staff	<p>Staff seem to be lost in these solutions.</p> <p>Solution 1 states "student populations" yet then 1.1 is students, faculty and staff. Why wouldn't the header include faculty and staff as well?</p> <p>Solution 6 only is an incentive for faculty. Again, what about staff? How can we incentivize and credit staff for innovation outside of the classroom?</p> <p>Solution 7 - there is a lot staff can also assist in supporting inclusive and diverse education experiences outside of the classroom.</p> <p>Solution 8 - Improve the role of Staff in governance as well. Right now University Senate is made up of 90%+ faculty members.</p>	it is faculty heavy, and barely acknowledges the very important role that staff play at UND. Disappointed since the university would not work without collaboration of faculty, staff and students.
10/18/21 9:57 AM	S02a	Student	Y'all sure as hell kinda suck at addressing the racism in the area but I'm not shocked lol	