Event/Date: North Campus Roundtable/21MAR16  
Led by: David Turpin/Steven Dew/Anne Bailey/Amy Dambrowitz  
Number of attendees: 10

Summary

| Big Picture | - Positive response to the document  
|            | - Questions and discussion about implementation and measuring success. |
| Specifics   | - In BUILD, add an objective focused on staff. |

Roundtable comments and questions—each person invited by president to speak:

- Found reading the document was very inspiring both as a staff member and alum
- Things that struck me were the emphasis on diversity, focus on innovation and economic diversification, and community development and engagement.
- Two questions: 1) Where are the areas where we’re stretching ourselves? 2) How will this fall through the organization?
- Like the plan—we now need to figure out the system underlying it all so that we can actually support excellence in teaching and learning.
- Emphasis on global and international pleases me. Like the signature programs although not sure how we’ll make that happen. The criteria are good but we should dive in a little deeper and see how they relate to one another.
- Would like to see more thinking on research and what kinds we are focusing on—basic OR applied?
- Where does Enterprise Square fit? What is it? Right now, it’s just an empty space.
- Is there a role of the Dept of History and Classics in developing the university’s story?
- Like the plan. How will it trickle down to units? How will units report out on it?
- How does this increase our organizational capacity and productivity? Liked that it encompasses all learning and learners, including staff. How might the leadership and mentorship programs also include staff?
- How will we measure success?
- Process is really open. The access to the material online has been really good as well as the emphasis on soliciting feedback.
- We still value the physical space—the bricks and mortar of this place. Not going to become an online university. Given this, how do things like collaboration manifest itself in the physical spaces? Universal design? Making physical spaces accessible. Can/does our physical spaces support the goals and strategies?

- The document reflects all the effort that has gone into drafting it. However, in BUILD, staff are missing. Could another objective be added? After “…educated by exceptional faculty....” should add “....supported by exceptional staff....” In this new objective, we would talk about equity, diversity not just for faculty but staff as well. Right now, we have nothing in place to make equity, diversity, and inclusion happen on the staff side.

- Also like the focus on health and wellness.

DHT response plus further discussion:

- DHT: Discussions have been moving quickly to implementation so I’d like your advice on this. The Board would like us to develop a set of metrics. One of the challenges is that some things lend themselves to measurement (ie. Recruitment) while others are much more difficult to capture.

- Response: Some numbers don’t make a lot of sense to use, such as Advancement dollars. Big donations are great but they also come with costs of implementation, so the numbers can be distracting. But is there an alternative? I can’t think of one. Same thing with grant dollars. We need to think a little bit beyond the numbers and focus on long-term impact.

- DHT: Trying to get the measurement right is the challenge. For instance, research dollars can give you a good comparative measure with other institutions.

- Numbers show big picture but don’t show depth. Tell the story of impact even when the numbers don’t show that.

- DHT: Stories really matter. I used to think that if you go in with the data, you can be persuasive, but you are more successful if you go in with the story and provide data to support it.

- Questions about InterD—how will we make it happen? I don’t envy you in having to make it happen. Too often we end up in competition and redundancy rather than interdisciplinary collaboration. We do have a few examples where we’ve done this well, but also many examples of where we haven’t.

- SKD addressed a question about the international file:

- We’ve been doing a lot lately on renovating our process of coordinating international activities. Thinking of setting up two committees:
  - 1. Presidential (PEC) level—which would set institutions priorities
  - 2. Faculty-level, plus UAI—which would focus on certain issues such as coordinating recruitment and engagement.

- In the past, we tried to do this with one committee and it’s too much for one to do it all and it’s struggled.
- DHT asked for opinions on the title:
- I really like it.
- Public good is really inclusive—important to remember that we touch many more people than the obvious ones you think of. The title captures all of the levels of interaction we have with the public. It’s not just about students and faculty.
- With Alberta there was a sense that the U of A was too international, leaving the province behind—the title is a reminder that the U of A is for them.
- DHT: we need to champion Alberta’s PSE system as a whole—that enables us to carve out our niche.