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Executive Summary

The Act as One University Task Force developed vision statements of One University and KU as the National Research University for Kansas City that were widely shared to assess merit in these concepts. There was a strong positive reaction to these statements but the sentiment was not unanimous. The cover page of this report which displays the diversity of business cards of the Task Force members is symbolic of the recommendations contained in this report that much is required to accomplish a unified focus.

Recommendations are organized into five sections: Culture/Climate, Academic Resources, Communication/Interactions, Public Image, and Research University for Kansas City. These themes emerged from Task Force brainstorming exercises and constituent input via focus groups conducted on each campus.

Task Force Charge from the Chancellor

Our goal is to operate as One University with well-coordinated internal operations and a clearly defined external image. Academic and research programs on each campus must be optimally served by the other campuses, faculty resources shared, and curricula coordinated. Equipment and materials must be compatible, administrative procedures complementary, etc.

Intercampus unity can only come from intracampus unity. We must not think of ourselves as departmental, campus, faculty, or staff representatives but as partners in a greater mission. Areas of critical concern are: research; intercampus academic programming, and new public service initiatives; KU as the National Research University for Kansas City; and how to achieve intracampus and intercampus “One University” attitudes (see Appendix I for complete charge).

Task Force Process

This report is the product of a dedicated and hardworking Task Force group. From the formation of the Task Force, the groups has held numerous meetings, primarily on Saturdays and Sundays at the Edwards, Kansas City, and Lawrence campuses and culminating in a six-hour report writing session at Wichita. In addition to formal meetings, Task Force members conducted over 30 focus group meetings with students, faculty, and staff groups on all campuses and with seventeen external constituents in the Kansas City area.

Overview of the Report

This report has three parts: 1) vision statements on One University and on KU as the National Research University for Kansas City; 2) a synopsis of our findings and recommendations; and 3) appendices. The synopsis and recommendations are organized into five sections: Culture/Climate, Academic Resources, Communication/Interactions, Public Image, and Research University for Kansas City. In each of these sections opportunities and barriers are indicated, followed by recommendations. These recommendations are prioritized by activities which are ongoing and need to be expedited, issues to be addressed in one year, in two years, and in three years.
Many of the Culture/Climate issues are high priority and the Task Force believes that these must be addressed prior to the implementation of substantive other changes. In meetings with various constituent groups, the overwhelming majority expressed belief that there is merit in the concept of One University. While this belief is not unanimous, the Task Force was heartened by the support for the concept. Much of the support was followed by thoughtful comments on what is needed to accomplish the goals. However, many who commented could see the benefits to KU for changing behavior patterns and focusing our future toward truly becoming One University. The cover page of this report symbolizes our central vision of One University and the display of the diversity of business cards of the members of this Task Force indicates that we have a great deal of work to accomplish a unified focus.

Vision Statements

Acting as One University

One University involves perception, presence, and participation. All of the KU community will share the perception of themselves as members of a single university independent of geography or assignment. We will understand and be supportive of each other. Each of the separate campuses will establish a presence at the other sites. Moving from one campus to another, members of KU will feel a sense of familiarity with systems, functions, and custom. Participation of students, staff, and faculty will be encouraged in the rich variety of activities at all sites. Sharing our resources will result in new opportunities in education, research, and service.

Why One University

While the separate campuses of the University of Kansas possess unique strengths, becoming One University offers opportunities greater than the sum of the individual parts. Learning to work together in a unified way, with shared systems and policies, should better equip us to work with others outside the University. Removing intercampus barriers will increase opportunities for collaborative and interdisciplinary programs and help us to move into multi-instructional collaborations, raising us to totally unanticipated new levels in research and in program development. To grow and prosper, great universities must constantly find new ways to generate and transmit knowledge; functioning as One University will allow us to cross traditional boundaries and explore new paradigms. We become more effective and more efficient as One University – improving the environment for students, faculty, and staff.

We must respect and honor the diversity of KU. Diversity makes us stronger and is important to the work we do. This diversity is an important component of One University. What we have now is not broken; neither is it as functional as we want. The following report and recommendations are built on these premises.

Perspectives on One University are included in Appendix II and reflect a faculty, a staff, and a student view contributed by members of the Task Force.
KU – The National Research University for Kansas City

Kansas City is a major metropolitan center with a recognized commitment to economic growth and quality of life. The region’s support and investment in high technology, manufacturing, biomedical science, health care, and service sectors is clear evidence of that commitment. Advancing economic and community development in these sectors will require access to first-rate research and graduate education programs. The University of Kansas, the only Association of American Universities member and Carnegie Research I University in the region, is truly the national research university for the Kansas City area.

Three University of Kansas campuses provide the region with outstanding programs and talented research faculty – the medical center at Kansas City, Kansas, the Edwards campus at Overland Park, and the nearby Lawrence campus. The University, through its strategic initiatives, intends to participate actively in the process of building the economy and community of the region through creative partnerships between programs and faculty on these campuses and the area’s business, government, educational, and nonprofit organizations. Those partnerships, as exemplified in other communities, will accelerate growth and improve the quality of life for the citizens of the greater Kansas City area.

Findings and Recommendations

Section I – Culture/Climate

Opportunities

• KU must be a community, not a feudal aristocracy; everyone has an essential role in KU’s success.
• There is a great deal of cross-campus goodwill at all campuses.
• Empowerment of all KU students, staff, faculty, and administration requires acknowledgment, recognition, fairness, and open channels of communication.
• The diversity of the University population enriches the educational and research environment greatly.
• Students benefit from educational experiences in diverse institutional cultures.

Barriers

• Cultural difference of individual campuses promotes isolation and inhibits openness and cross-site activities.
• A tradition of shared values and cooperation does not exist across all KU sites and units.
• Classified staff operate under very different and less flexible rules than unclassified staff.
• A fiefdom tradition/silo mentality (different campuses, schools, departments, centers, faculty/staff/students/administration) conserves separatism and works against openness and “Acting as One University.”
• Internal competition for limited resources impedes the goal of One University (between campuses, departments, faculty; e.g. for students, endowment money, space, overhead money, etc.)
• It is reported to us that “There is an aristocracy, almost-aristocracy, and the serfs.” This perception inhibits openness and cooperation.
The following recommendations have been prioritized according to the following scheme:

The numbers 0, 1, 2, and 3 precede each recommendation.
- 0 represents on-going programs which need to be accelerated and are important to do immediately
- 1 indicates implementation should begin in FY 1999
- 2 indicates implementation should begin in or before FY 2000
- 3 indicates implementation should begin in or before FY 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Develop the concepts of One University from the top, through the active leadership of the Chancellor and senior academic official on each campus. Promote a University-wide set of values that promotes sharing and collaboration while respecting the unique features of each campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Implement a unified human resources system with a visible presence on all campuses, with training and orientation for every staff member in the concepts of One University. Each staff member should understand that they represent the entire University in all public contacts. They should understand the missions of each campus, the resources available to visiting staff members at each campus, and the importance of building collegial relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eliminate the classified (civil service) employment system across the University. A system with two employee groups – faculty and staff – will allow more flexibility in equalizing benefits, in building career development programs, and in building the concept of a participatory One University community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communicate the importance of diversity to the culture and climate of One University. Expand University-wide diversity education and training initiatives to address the following (and other) aspects of our University community: disabilities (learning and physical), out-of-state/in-state students, urban/rural students, nontraditional students, international, religious, socio-economic, gender, sexual orientation, political orientation, ethnic employment category, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identify consistent symbols for One University and their presentation. Symbols should identify us as part of One University and yet permit identification of our diverse campuses and programs. A primary symbol with standardized secondary symbols for logos, stationary, signage, etc., should be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Include all campuses in planning for a capital campaign with campus priorities and specific expectations developed and acknowledged prospectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Host an annual University-wide social event along the lines of the KUMC carnival or the Lawrence MayFest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section II – Academic Resources

Opportunities

• Graduate and undergraduate students will benefit from the teaching and learning resources of all campuses
• Interdisciplinary research and teaching opportunities exist on multiple campuses
• Total access to library resources and easy exchange of educational materials on all campuses benefits learning and research
• Collaboration is a crucial necessity and not just a lofty goal
• KU lacks the resources to repeatedly replicate everything that faculty need
• The demand for additional academic programs in Kansas City is not saturated
• Intercampus collaboration is an inevitable conceptual and cultural shift
• Limited funding sources mandate intercampus, multidisciplinary collaboration

Barriers

• Transportation and communication between campuses is an issue (See Communication/Interactions)
• Currently there are different enrollment timetables among campuses and all enrollment must be done in person
• Student fees are based on total credit hours on a specific campus; therefore, full-time students who take classes on different campuses are penalized
• Scholarships and grant support are campus bound
• Health insurance/student health service fees are nontransferable between campuses
• Support services and recreational services are local
• Differing systems are in place at various libraries for check out, interlibrary loans, etc., and there is competition for limited library resources
• Reward processes (pay, promotion, recognition of success, tenure are inconsistent across campuses and traditional academic divisions. This is not conducive to developing creative new ways of partnering.
• Basic science and clinical science have differing expectations.
• Value placed on service varies from basic science disciplines to clinical science disciplines
• Definition of service is not universally the same across campuses
• Inadequate coordination between similar units on various campuses allows program duplication
• Appointments vary between nine and twelve months at different campuses
• Lack of respectful recognition of others’ worth
• Campus policy and procedural differences are disincentives for collaboration.
• The creation of collaborative centers which cross traditional departmental/school boundaries can lead to resistance from traditional administrative structures.
The following recommendations have been prioritized according to the following scheme:

The numbers 0, 1, 2, and 3 precede each recommendation.

0 represents on-going programs which need to be accelerated and are important to do immediately.
1 indicates implementation should begin in FY 1999
2 indicates implementation should begin in or before FY 2000
3 indicates implementation should begin in or before FY 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Revise student fee structure to recognize students as full-time within the University rather than on a specific campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Incorporate universal smart card technology to meet various access needs, e.g. library, parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establish similar operating procedures at each campus library and assure ability to obtain and drop-off materials at numerous points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Facilitate transferability of scholarships and grants to all components of the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Re-examine promotion and tenure policies and procedures and opportunities for staff advancement on all campuses for cross-campus relevance and equivalency where appropriate and to assure that reward processes are as equitable as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establish and standardize negotiated indirect cost return systems to academic units for intra- and inter-University grants and contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide online enrollment and academic record access option at all campuses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Involve faculty experienced with intercampus research and research grants in defining changes in policies and procedures to facilitate intercampus collaborative research and provide infrastructure to faculty to enable initiation of interdisciplinary and intercampus research programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Develop expectations for faculty about teaching on multiple campuses; recognize and reward multicampus instructional efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Enhance and publicize web-based learning systems and weekend course offerings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Develop freely accessible databases and other information sources to inform faculty, students, staff, and administration about common interests, resources, and expertise in research, teaching, and service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section III – Communication/Interactions

Opportunities

- The use of information technology as a key strategy to facilitate communications/interactions is generally accepted at all campuses.
- The absence of coordinated efforts and common capabilities most infrastructure elements affords unfettered opportunities.

Barriers

- There is substantial resistance at the Lawrence campus to standardizing e-mail.
- Using technology solutions is expensive. All investments in a technological infrastructure require additional investments in maintenance costs and replacement costs. Many require additional investments in the form of salaries for support and management personnel.
- Technological goals often must compete with school and department goals for funding. Schools and departments do not necessarily support the concept of a central, common technology infrastructure.
- Many policies have been developed with a view only towards issues related to the local campus. To standardize them in the One University context will require reengineering the support systems.

The following recommendations have been prioritized according to the following scheme:

The numbers 0, 1, 2, and 3 proceed each recommendation.
0 represents on-going programs which need to be accelerated and are important to do immediately
1 indicates implementation should begin in FY 1999
2 indicates implementation should begin in or before FY 2000
3 indicates implementation should begin in or before FY 2001

Priority Recommendation

0 Implement common electronic mail system for all campuses.

0 Develop the WWW as a primary communications environment across the University, creating WWW interfaces into all key information resources (administrative, research, educational). Implement routine student/staff training in all key institutional tools (e-mail, WWW, productivity systems such as spreadsheets, administrative systems, educational, and training resources).

1 Integrate policies across the University in the following areas: e-mail, Internet access, textbook and library access, student services (financial aid, counseling, transcripts, etc.), employee records, payroll, etc.
Create for the entire University community a University-wide newsletter to include information about new programs at each campus, University-wide policy issues, sections devoted to education and research, information about social and cultural programs, etc. Provide oversight responsibility for assessing and coordinating the output of information publications from the various units of KU.

Build a sense of responsibility in all offices for solving inquirer's problems; train all staff in good telephone practice in handling and referring calls to other units, regardless of campus; and, build a culture of routinely solving communication/information problems.

Implement a 5-digit dialing system throughout the University.

Simplify reimbursement processes for intercampus travel.

Provide 30 minute shuttle departures from 7:30 a.m. – 6:00 p.m. daily, with less frequent departures until 11:00 p.m., among the Kansas City, Lawrence, and Edwards campuses, with twice daily (or as needed) shuttles to and from Wichita. Alternatively, an on-call transport service to same sites should be considered.

Provide parking to guests involved in mission-related activities. Provide close-in parking on all campuses for KU members from other campuses. Devise a common parking tag (and/or a universal smart card) for use on all campuses.

Make continuing investments in large group conferencing facilities for teaching and group interactions. Develop infrastructure for wide-scale implementation desktop videoconferencing across the University.

Allocate office space and computer access at each campus for visiting KU faculty and staff. Reserve existing campus housing facilities, acquire facilities, and develop discount rates with local hotels for visiting faculty, students, and staff at each campus.

Develop campus information offices as central reference points for staff and students. Provide a "University operator" or information services office for directory information about people and services at all campuses.

Section IV – Public Image

Opportunities

- Increase academic programming at the graduate and undergraduate area in Kansas City and throughout the region.
- Improve the image of KU throughout Kansas, the nation, and the world.
- Strengthen relationships with the public and the state government.
- A more competitive and diverse student body.
- Facilitated competitiveness in faculty hiring and grant acquisition.
- Increase “perception of presence/involvement” in Kansas City, state, and region.
• Further enhance and coordinate image of KU through news conferences, advertising, press releases, and public service opportunities.
• Develop a “KU brand” for marketing the University.

Barriers

• Reluctance/availability of Lawrence faculty to teach in Kansas City.
• Space limitations at Edwards campus and Lawrence campus.
• Limited ability to deliver programs/courses via telecommunication to corporate sites and between campuses.
• Perceived competition with other academic institutions.
• Limited human and financial resources.
• Traditional educational delivery systems may be inadequate.
• Traditional class schedules are not supportive of working schedules.
• Multisite activities with no unified marketing/public relations approach.

The following recommendations have been prioritized according to the following scheme:

The numbers 0, 1, 2, and 3 precede each recommendation.
0 represents on-going programs which need to be accelerated and are important to do immediately
1 indicates implementation should begin in FY 1999
2 indicates implementation should begin in or before FY 2000
3 indicates implementation should begin in or before FY 2001

Priority Recommendation

0 Be proactive in addressing the real and perceived needs of KU’s constituencies.

1 Increase coordination among the various campus university relations offices to be more marketing oriented.

1 Utilize alumni to increase the presence of KU administrators and staff on for-profit and not-for-profit boards.

3 Develop coordinated marketing research effort to develop the “KU brand.”

3 Use KU facilities at Overland Park and Wichita for KU gatherings.

Section V – Research University for Kansas City

Opportunities

• Further develop technology transfer opportunities.
• Develop faculty fellowship program where appropriate.
• Expand graduate and undergraduate programs in engineering, technology, and education.
• Seek extensive research collaborations in Kansas City.
• Find opportunities for KU researchers to develop applications in Kansas City community.

Barriers

• Limited interest/incentive by personnel in some programs.
• Limited advocacy for research benefits and opportunities for Kansas City.
• Lack of visible mechanisms for linking research to practice.
• Absence of knowledge about the research needs and capabilities of Kansas City’s industries.

The following recommendations have been prioritized according to the following scheme:

The numbers 0, 1, 2, and 3 precede each recommendation.
0 represents on-going programs which need to be accelerated and are important to do immediately
1 indicates implementation should begin in FY 1999
2 indicates implementation should begin in or before FY 2000
3 indicates implementation should begin in or before FY 2001

Priority Recommendation

1 Develop appropriate corporate partnerships.

1 Increase the visibility of the Chancellor in the Kansas City community.

1 Inform industry in Kansas City about specific research opportunities at KU and make available University databases about research programs and scientists to customers in Kansas City.

1 Enhance communication between the University and the community through media and face-to-face interactions.

2 Revise faculty expectations regarding dissemination of research findings to include sharing of research results with community or corporate groups where appropriate.

2 Develop a possible KU-corporate University model and develop programmatic corporate instructional and research partnerships.
Appendix I – Task Force Charge from the Chancellor

The University of Kansas is a complex organization with physical resources in Lawrence, Overland Park, Kansas City, Wichita, and other towns and cities throughout the state. As each of these centers has developed, it has assumed an individual identity and level of independence, resulting in a variety of perceptions of the University by our constituents. Opportunity exists to unify KU’s image in the eyes of the public. For example, although our historical identification of place has been Lawrence, KU’s activities are geographically spread throughout Kansas City (Medical Center, Edwards Campus, Juniper Gardens Research Center, etc.). We have the human resources to enhance KU’s existing contributions and establish new partnerships within the metropolitan area through intercampus collaboration.

When faculty from Lawrence and Kansas City met at the Government University Industry Research Roundtable (GUIRR), they expressed a strong interest in lowering the barriers to joint research. Such changes could have a profound impact on the degree of integration across campuses. The establishment of a new research foundation in Lawrence provides an opportunity to review our University-wide policies in research and development with an eye toward fostering intercampus collaboration. Parallel opportunities exist in the teaching and service domains.

Our ultimate goal is to operate a single university with well-coordinated internal operations and a clearly defined external image. As part of that effort, we should work to ensure that academic and research programs on one campus are optimally served by the other campuses: faculty resources are shared, curricula are coordinated, equipment and materials are compatible, administrative procedures are complementary, etc. The exact form of this unified institution should be determined by our collective strengths and by the available opportunities; however, \textit{intercampus unity can only come from intracampus unity}. In these deliberations and in our other duties, we must not think of ourselves as “departmental representatives” or “campus representatives” or “faculty representatives” or “staff representatives.” Instead, we must see ourselves as partners in a greater mission.

Task Force I will consider the following as part of its deliberations:

- Strategies for facilitating intercampus participation and reducing existing barriers to intercampus research collaborations. Topics to consider include: university research policies, faculty incentives, research support programs, and national research funding trends. Special consideration should be given to the University’s role in the Kansas City region and the preferred roles of the Lawrence campus’ Center for Research Inc. and the Medical Center’s Research Institute;

- Strategies for facilitating intercampus academic programming, including regular interaction of disciplinary faculty across campuses, intercampus faculty appointments, combined degree programs, and new public service initiatives;

- Strategies for shaping and enhancing public perceptions of KU as the national research university of Kansas City, including the recognition that all members of the University share responsibility for this effort and that a key aspect is alumni relations; and

- Strategies for expanding the current spirit of cooperation within the University community with equal consideration of intracampus and intercampus attitudes.
Appendix II – One University Perspectives

A Faculty Perspective

• One of the underlying planning concepts for One University is that the University, each campus, each school, each department/center, and each faculty member develop their own clear mission, goals, and objectives. The planning process should emphasize maximizing overlap and complementary between the mission, goals, and objectives among the units.

• Substantial communication, perhaps even a campaign, would help bring faculty on board, to this end, when existing faculty are evaluated annually, and when new faculty are hired, the benefits and objectives of One University should be discussed in a practical way. In other words, teaching in more than one school or campus should be discussed if relevant. Collaborative research between faculty, departments, schools, and campuses should be discussed, if beneficial and collaborating on service activities across these entities should also be discussed if relevant. All of these activities should be promoted if they will further the goals and objectives of the faculty member, the department, the school, the campus, or the University.

• One University will produce the following benefits. Barriers for collaborating, communicating, and working across various units of the University will be minimized. High quality electronic and visual communication throughout the University will be maximized. When faculty teach or work on other campuses, they will have access to appropriate resources: a place to work, communicate, and carry out their varying objectives. Faculty will have easy access to an inventory of all teaching, research, and service activities in the entire University and hopefully, within the Kansas Regents System. Use of this resource will be marketed and faculty collaboration encouraged.

• The University's expertise and resources will be marketed to external funders and potential partners. To the extent that University, medical center, school, department, and faculty objectives are met, the University will engage itself in many research, teaching, and services efforts in many Kansas communities, at the state level, nationally, and internationally. All appropriate and interested University of Kansas faculty will be brought together for these efforts. Using all of the resources of the University to achieve the goals and objectives of its various components will become an obvious and deliberate strategy.

• The University is built upon the strength and individuality of its many components, but especially upon its diverse faculty. When acting as One University, we will always stress the mission, goals, and objectives of each faculty member, the department, campus, and school. It is, therefore, incumbent upon the University and its various components to improve its planning process to the point that mission, goals, and objectives at the top are compatible and complementary to mission, goals, and objectives at the level of the faculty.

A Staff Perspective

• The vision of One University for staff is a vision of a well trained team; the leader demonstrates his belief in the importance of One University for all team members.
• Progressive managerial values will be demonstrated by leadership and become the standard expectation for all supervisors.

• Each team member’s role is valued, and s/he is treated with respect regardless of location or unit affiliation.

• All members’ special contributions will be recognized the University-wide team.

• As the team is only as strong as its weakest link, training/continuous learning will become the norm and will include sharing the value and vision of One University.

• Intercampus cooperation will become a standard expectation of all team players.

• Communication systems will facilitate, not complicate, the exchanges of information and processing of work by staff.

• Systems across campuses will be seamless, so that staff may provide constituents with a satisfactory unified University experience, whether it be student admissions, contributions to KUEA, parking permits, library checkout, or any of many other activities.

A Student Perspective

• One University envisions its primary purpose as helping all students maximize their education. The University understands that its mission has many parts but its common goal is to pursue knowledge and provide an education of the highest quality.

• One University respects the uniqueness of its parts and provides avenues for recognizing the individual strengths and differences of its constituents. The University upholds those differences so that the uniqueness of all schools and campuses can not only be expressed, but can complement each other.

• One University sees itself as a single educational foundation. It exists as an organization where distance is not seen as a hindrance but as a strength. Distance allows the University’s constituents to maintain their uniqueness and to share teaching and learning experiences in different settings.

• One University maintains and encourages an openness of communication at all levels. It promotes understanding and knowledge of each member’s interests, activities, and goals. This openness provides a heightened awareness among both students and faculty that maximizes the University's resources. At One University, competition, separatism, and favoritism are kept in check. As a result, there is a greater sense of pride in the University community.

• One University implies a vast, diverse, yet cohesive family where individual differences can thrive, and where every member works toward the common goal of creating a robust learning community.