University of Missouri System Report

Submitted to:

The University of Missouri Board of Curators

Submitted by:

Terrence MacTaggart
Richard Novak
AGB Senior Fellows and Consultants

June 18-19, 2020

Table of Contents

Introduction

The University of Missouri System Board of Curators sought the assistance of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) to provide objective commentary for the Board's discussion of alternative organizational structures for the University of Missouri System. AGB consultants were asked to present alternative models, their advantages and disadvantages, the systems elsewhere in the country that exemplify the models and to facilitate virtually a board discussion of these issues on June 19th, 2020. It is worth noting that the Curators were seeking AGB's commentary on alternative models, not a specific recommendation for one or more over others.

This report addresses the following topics:

- Purposes of the report
- Consultant backgrounds
- The 'strong executive' paradigm
- Interview subjects and questions addressed
- Economic and other factors favoring restructuring
- Trends among higher education systems
- Six models to consider
- Six models—advantages and disadvantages
- Matrix of integrated systems and multi-campus universities
- What might academic consolidations mean
- Implementation issues
- Effective system/entrepreneurial universities

Purposes of the Report

The purpose of the report as defined in the May 12, 2020 proposal approved by the University of Missouri System and AGB reads, "the evaluation report is intended to support Curator deliberations on options for restructuring in order to:

- Strengthen academic and research quality, engagement and inclusion through greater collaboration and, in some cases, consolidation of academic programs; and
- Maintain and enhance administrative cost effectiveness in carrying out the University's mission."

Consultant Backgrounds

AGB Senior Fellows and consultants Dr. Terrence MacTaggart and Mr. Richard Novak conducted the organizational review. Dr. MacTaggart has served as a university chancellor, and on three occasions, head of university systems. He has published several books and articles on alternative system structures and consulted with many systems across the country including the University of Missouri System where he contributed to the 2018 University of Missouri System Task Force Report on Governance.

Mr. Novak is a nationally recognized expert on system organization and governance. Most recently, he has served as a team member on system reviews for the University of Puerto Rico System, the University System of Maryland, the North Dakota University System and the Louisiana State University System. Biographical information on both consultants is included in the appendix to this report.

The 'Strong Executive' Paradigm

The consultants reviewed a variety of internal system reports including efficiency studies, plans for budget reductions, and key governance documents such as bylaws and other policies. The following two reports have been highly relevant to this project: the Financial Status Update and Administrative Review and Other Cost Savings Initiatives, University of Missouri System, May 2020, and the 2018 University of Missouri System Task Force On Governance Report.

The latter—the 2018 Task Force on Governance Report—clarifies governance relationships among the Curators, the president and the chancellors. Pertinent parts of the Revised CRR 20.010 entitled General Organization and Revised CRR 20.030 entitled Executive Philosophy contained in the report are repeated here because they underpin the selection of models and the commentary in this report.

Revised CRR 20.010   General Organization

•   The University of Missouri Board of Curators ("Board') reaffirms the value and importance of the University's general organization as a university system and the basic concept that the University will be one university system.
•   This one university system concept requires a centrally directed and unified administration and operation and the Board reaffirms the authority already granted to the President to direct the implementation of this concept.
•   The Board expects full cooperation of all faculty and staff to carry out this general policy.

Revised CRR 20.030   Executive Philosophy

•   The University of Missouri System (U of M System) is organized as a system to achieve more collectively than its component parts could achieve individually and this principle will guide decision makers in managing the affairs of the U of M System, whether they be academic affairs or business affairs.
•   The President is the chief executive and academic officer of the U of M System and all faculty and staff shall be under his/her direction and authority, and he/she shall be in charge of all academic, public, business, financial and related affairs of the U of M System and all constituent part under the policies and general supervision of the Board.
•   The Chancellors of the U of M System are appointed by and report to the President.
•   The Chancellors are the chief academic and administrative officers charged with providing academic and administrative leadership and management on each of the four university campuses.
•   The Chancellors will also grow their university advancement programs through private fundraising and other activities that increase community support for the universities and the U of M System
•   The Chancellors serve as General Officers to advise the President on all matters affecting the U of M System

In sum, this Curators' Report and the revised CRRs incorporated within them reaffirm the University of Missouri *System* following a strong President model with all faculty and staff, and Chancellors, operating under his/her direction and authority. All of the model structures presented in this report illustrate options consistent with this strong executive paradigm.

OPEN – GB – INFO 7-4

Interview Subjects and Questions Addressed

The consultants conducted phone interviews with key leaders, including all of the Curators, the President, Chancellors and other System officials. Interviews of System senior staff included the Board's General Counsel, the System Chief Engagement Officer (who also serves and the Vice Chancellor for Extension and Engagement for the University of Missouri Columbia), the System Chief eLearning Officer, and the Vice President for Finance and Chief Financial Officer for the System. The interviews were confidential in that the consultants pledged to not link the names of individuals to their comments.

The interview template included in Appendix A formed the outline for these conversations, although some interviews focused on specific topics such as online education as well as the fiscal condition and outlook for the System. All those interviewed were asked to comment on whether or not the interim appointment of the President as also the Chancellor of the University of Missouri Columbia should be made permanent, and their views of the advantages and disadvantages of the dual appointment.

Economic and Other Factors Favoring Restructuring

The combination of slower growth in the pool of college-going Missourians, declining state support and the uncertainties associated with the COVID-19 pandemic indicate that the next decade will be especially challenging for the University of Missouri System. These trends support the case for dramatic change in the way in which the System organizes itself and does business.

• The growth rate in the college age (ages 18-24) and younger adult (24-44) populations over the next decade will be sharply lower than in earlier years—down to 13 percent and 5 percent from 37 percent and 44 percent respectively in these two cohorts. Competition for these potential students will be intense given the large number of competing colleges and universities in Missouri, and the presence of aggressive out-of-state online providers.

• State financial support for public higher education is reported to have dropped from roughly 70 percent of operational costs to 30 percent since 2000. This shifting of the burden from the state to students is compounded by the decline in individual and family incomes associated with the COVID-19 shutdowns. We note that the *State Higher Education Finance Report FY 2019*, recently issued by the State Higher Education Executive Officers, shows that of the 50 states, Missouri has the largest decline in total revenues (tuition dollars, appropriations, and other state support) per full time student over the past ten years, a 13.7 percent decline measured in constant adjusted dollars. These trends mean that absent substantial change in the System's business and organizational model, Missouri families will find it increasingly difficult to afford a University of Missouri education.

• Due to the decline in state revenues accentuated by the economic consequences of response to the COVID-19 pandemic, substantial cuts in state support for the current fiscal year have occurred and more are anticipated for FY 21. The precise impact of the pandemic on enrollment remains unclear. Many experts predict a 20 to 30 percent decline. Moody's Investors Services continues its negative outlook for higher education based on enrollment uncertainty.

There will be winners and losers in this environment. Most experts believe that highly branded and well financed institutions, agile and entrepreneurial ones and those with robust online offerings will weather this economic storm. Among public institutions, highly regarded research and land grant universities are

OPEN – GB – INFO 7-5

expected to do better than smaller, regional institutions, especially those in rural states with aging populations.

Less selective institutions, liberal arts colleges, humanities programs within comprehensive universities, and schools that have not developed effective online delivery will suffer greatly. The late Clay Christensen predicted well before the pandemic that the bottom 25 percent of every tier of institutions will go out of business.

Higher education systems that operate efficiently, maintain tuition affordability, have a substantial online presence and are composed of well-branded institutions in or near population centers are expected to be well positioned for the future.

Trends Among Higher Education Systems

The demographic and economic factors that affect Missouri are also exerting widespread influence on the strategic reorganizations of other systems across the country. The dominant trends are toward greater centralization of authority, consolidation of administrative services and 'back room' operations, campus mergers, rigorous program review and eliminations, and in some cases consolidations of academic programs.

- Institutional mergers and consolidations—The University System of Georgia has consolidated 18 of its institutions into 9. According to Georgia reports, the consolidations allowed funding to shift to academic support from administration and resulted in improved retention and graduation rates.

- System-driven program reductions and eliminations—The University of Wisconsin System recently announced a System-driven initiative to evaluate academic programs based on enrollment, to centralize services that support campus operations through the UW-Shared Services office, and to accelerate collaborative online degree offerings through UW-Extended Campus.

- Centralized services—a widespread initiative given greater impetus following the COVID-19 eruption. Virtually every system in the country is attempting to achieve some scale economies by concentrating services and reducing duplication.

- Academic consolidations—The University of Maine System (one research university of 11,500 students, a metropolitan university with about 7,000 students and four smaller institutions) is pursuing what it describes as a "One University" model with a single regional accreditation for the entire System. The regional accrediting body for the six New England states has expressed support for this consolidation. The Regents of the University of Alaska System considered but ultimately rejected a single accreditation model for its three separate institutions.

Six Models to Consider

"All models are wrong, but some are more useful than others"- George Box

Below are six options for the Board of Curators to consider for an administrative structure of the University of Missouri System. These options are based on existing models of university systems and multi-campus universities, as well as on the historic and current models of the U of M System. They are

based also on what the consultants see as logical and necessary responses to meet the challenges facing the U of M System.

A. The Existing Structure with System President to whom Chancellors report, with limited administrative or academic organizational change
B. The Existing Structure with System President to whom Chancellors report, but with substantial integration of administrative and academic functions
C. Combine the office and functions of the System President with that of Chancellor of the University of Missouri Columbia w/minimal additional organizational change
D. As in C above, combine the office and functions of the System President with those of the Chancellor of the University of Missouri Columbia, plus the substantial consolidation of System administrative functions with those of the University of Missouri Columbia into one integrated unit
E. As in C above, combine the office and functions of the System President with those of the Chancellor of the University of Missouri Columbia, plus substantial consolidation of administrative functions of all the constituent universities as a single integrated unit under the authority of the System/UMC executive
F. Consolidations as noted in E above (combining the offices of the System President with that of the Chancellor of the University of Missouri Columbia, plus substantial consolidations of administrative functions of all the constituent universities in a single integrated unit under the authority of the System/UMC executive), and with titles and responsibilities of the three Chancellors adjusted to "Chancellor and University of Missouri System Vice-President" to reflect their dual roles as campus leaders and System officers

Option A has been the historic Missouri model since the System's founding in 1963—four chancellors reporting to a system President and the model prior to combining the roles of system President and Chancellor of the University of Missouri Columbia on an interim basis. It envisions limited administrative or academic consolidations beyond those currently underway. Option B also sustains the historic Missouri model and maintains the separation of the President and Chancellor positions, but envisions a more aggressive program of administrative and academic consolidations. Option A presents the least change of all the options. Although Option B suggests substantial change in administrative operations and academic programs, it makes no change at the very top of administrative structure by keeping the system President and MU Chancellor positions separate. An administrative structure in which chancellors report to a system president, as in Options A and B, is the predominant model in the approximately 50 university systems around the country.

Options C and D would make permanent the combining of the President and Chancellor positions, with C including limited administrative and academic consolidations while D envisions substantial consolidations. Option D would effectively merge Columbia's administration with that of the current System office.

The models of Options C and D characterize the eight structures of Figure 1. Of the four systems, two of them, the University of Minnesota System and the University of South Carolina System, evolved such that the system president and chancellor of the main campus are one and the same. The University of Hawaii and University of Houston Systems have more recently combined these two positions. Other organizations that follow this pattern include Pennsylvania State University, the University of Michigan, Indiana University, and the University of Washington. These organizations prefer to be called "multi-campus universities" or "integrated research universities." Three of these, the Pennsylvania State

OPEN – GB – INFO 7-7

University and the Universities of Michigan and Washington have always had a single individual to lead the main campus, as well as all other campuses of the university. Indiana University came to this unified structure more recently. Options C and D represent a kind of middle ground of change-greater than option A and B, but less complex than E and F.

The final two options, Options E and F, offer the opportunity for more comprehensive change in that both would fully consolidate the administrations of all the universities under one unified system. Many of the national models that exemplify or come the closest to Options E and F are also characterized by some of the eight structures in Figure 1, particularly those four that are more appropriately called multi-campus universities or integrated research universities, and are highly integrated administratively, and some academically, as well.

Option F goes further than option E in centralizing system authority by changing the Chancellors' job descriptions, evaluation criteria and titles to become simultaneously Chancellors and System Vice Presidents. Campus heads in the University of Illinois System are titled both Chancellor and System Vice President. The Illinois system head is titled "President of the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign", the system's land grant university whose chief executive is titled "Chancellor." The Vice President title would set an explicit expectation that the Chancellors have a responsibility—individually and collectively—to advise and assist the President on system-wide collaboration and coordination and furtherance of a more integrated and cohesive U of M System.

Six Models—Advantages and Disadvantages

A. The Existing Structure with System President to whom Chancellors report, with limited administrative or academic organizational change;

Advantages:
- Familiar model dating from 1963
- Less interruption of integration in progress
- Continues historic 'balance of power'

Disadvantages:
- Perpetuates 'structural conflicts'
- Costs and uncertainties of chancellor search
- Costs of chancellor's salary & benefits
- Limits opportunity for greater integration of administrative services
- Limits opportunity for greater integration of academic programs
- Limits response to C-19 consequences

B. The Existing Structure with System President to whom Chancellors report, but with substantial integration of administrative and academic functions;

Advantages:
- Familiar model dating from 1963
- Continues historic 'balance of power'
- Supports acceleration of integration of services
- Frees chancellors from some administrative responsibility
- Modest cost savings relative to option A

OPEN – GB – INFO 7-8

Disadvantages:
- Less 'unity of command' to effect change
- 'Structural conflicts' hinder integration
- Strong chancellor at MU could result in conflicts with system president
- Weak chancellor could lose campus support
- May reduce campus independence

C. Combine the office and functions of the System President with that of Chancellor of the University of Missouri Columbia with minimal additional organizational change;

Advantages:
- Removes uncertainty of "interim" appointment
- Builds on confidence in current President
- Reduces costs of duplicate executives
- Enjoys system-wide support, with qualifications
- A common administrative structure among several systems and leading research universities
- More easily enables any required change agenda

Disadvantages:
- Less opportunity for greater integration of administrative services
- Less opportunity for greater integration of academic programs
- Limits response to C-19 consequences
- Too big a job for one executive?

D. As in C above, combine the office and functions of the System President with those of the Chancellor of the University of Missouri Columbia, plus the substantial consolidation of System administrative functions with those of the University of Missouri Columbia into one integrated unit;

Advantages:
- Removes uncertainty of "interim" appointment
- Builds on confidence in current President
- Creates greater 'unity of command' for change
- Reduces costs of duplicate executives
- Enjoys system-wide support, with qualifications
- A common administrative structure among several systems leading research universities
- More easily enables any required change agenda

Disadvantages:
- Perceptions of unfairness from other universities
- Perceptions of a greater 'Mizzou-centric' system
- May distract from academic excellence as top goal
- Shifts attention to management and administration
- What if crises hit Mizzou? Another university?
- Too big a job for one executive?

E. As in C above, combine the office and functions of the System President with those of the Chancellor of the University of Missouri Columbia, plus substantial consolidation of administrative functions of

OPEN – GB – INFO 7-9

all the constituent universities as a single integrated unit under the authority of the System/UMC executive;

Advantages:
- Potential for major change both administratively and academically
- Responds to Covid-19 fiscal realities
- Continues consolidations already in process
- Potential for accelerating administrative and academic consolidations
- Some cost reductions
- A common administrative structure among several leading research universities

Disadvantages:
- Too much change too soon?
- Better to pursue more manageable change packages first?
- Multi-year process to ensure continued functionality
- Shifts attention from academic excellence as top goal
- Transition costs substantial
- Expectations for saving may be exaggerated

F. Consolidations as noted in E above (combining the offices of the System President with that of the Chancellor of the University of Missouri Columbia, plus substantial consolidations of administrative functions of all the constituent universities in a single integrated unit under the authority of the System/UMC executive), and with titles and responsibilities of the three Chancellors adjusted to "Chancellor and University of Missouri System Vice-President" to reflect their dual roles as campus leaders and System officers.

Advantages:
- Greatest "unity of command"
- Emphasizes chancellors as 'system officers'
- Confirms campus alignment with system goals
- Builds on 2018 Curators' policy initiatives

Disadvantages:
- Deemphasizes university distinctiveness
- Reduces chancellors' executive authority on campus
- Requires new executive recruitment/assessment standards
- May reduce entrepreneurial initiative
- May incur community opposition
- May not be necessary in light of 2018 Curators' policy

Matrix of Integrated Systems and Integrated Multi-campus Universities

Figure 1: Four Integrated University Systems and Four Integrated Universities and that Have a Unified Executive—a CEO who leads the main institution or campus and the University System or entire University

Integrated University Systems	Governing Board	Title of CEO	Title of University Heads	Number of Universities	Enrollment*	Total Research of Main University**
University of South Carolina System	21 member Board of Trustees	President	Chancellor	Eight	48,715; 33,725 at USC Columbia	$183,478,000
University of Hawaii System	12 member Board of Regents	President	Chancellor	Ten	45,000; 17,700 at U of H Manoa	$300,864,000
University of Houston System	10 member Board of Regents	System Chancellor and University President	President	Four	71,000; 44,000 at U of H University Park	$142,081,000
University of Minnesota System	12 member Board of Regents	President	Chancellor	Five	63,000; 49,000 at UM Twin Cities	$872,514,000

Integrated Research Universities	Governing Board	Title of CEO	Title of Campus Heads	Number of Campuses	Enrollment*	Total Research of Main Campus**
Pennsylvania State University	36 member Board of Trustees	President	Chancellor	Twenty-three	77,225; 46,810 at PSU State College	$704,687,000
University of Michigan	8 member Board of Regents	President	Chancellor	Three	63,000; 46,700 at U of M Ann Arbor	$1,357,228,000
Indiana University	9 member Board of Trustees	President	Chancellor	Nine	111,000; 46,000 at IU Bloomington	$471,055,000
University of Washington	10 member Board of Regents	President	Chancellor	Three	58,725; 47,400 at UW Seattle	$1,197,773,000

* Enrollment data is from University and System websites or College Navigator, National Center for Education Statistics.

** Research expenditure data is from *The Top American Research Universities, 2018 Annual Report* published by The Center for Measuring University Performance at the University of Massachusetts Amherst and the University of Florida. Totals are for academic year 2016 and include research support from all federal government, state government and private sources.

What Might Academic Consolidations Mean

Examples of academic consolidations that have been considered, proposed and sometimes implemented in other systems and integrated research universities are listed below.

- A single system provost or vice president for academic affairs is the chief academic officer and oversees and coordinates all academic programs.
- A single regional accreditation for the entire system or university. Single regional accreditation exists for the Pennsylvania State University and its 23 campuses, and for Rutgers University and its three undergraduate institutions. It has been proposed but not yet adopted by the University of Maine System; it was proposed but rejected by the Regents of the University of Alaska System as noted earlier.
- A single, programmatic accreditation across the campuses and units of the system or multi-campus university depending on the extent of program integration at the upper division, graduate and professional levels for programs and disciplines such as law, medicine, nursing, engineering, business, and others that require such accreditation.
- A common undergraduate general education curriculum with common course numbering for all institutions of the system or campuses of the university.
- A single student application and application process for all campuses, with students indicating ranked preferences. Each campus retains its separate admissions requirements but students need not re-apply if transferring between campuses if they meet all academic requirements.
- Online education courses centralized through one system or university office offered on a common digital platform. In an integrated university system or integrated research university, on-line courses are offered under one brand and not ascribed to any campus or institution.

Implementation Issues

As the Curators consider alternative structures, they might reflect on the lessons from other states.

- It is best to persuade regional interest groups and their legislators that their institutions will no**t** be disadvantaged in the process, or that the advantages of the change outweigh its drawbacks. A recent, high profile restructuring process led by the Governor in North Dakota came to naught due to legislative opposition. A consolidation attempt in Connecticut initiated nearly ten years ago has yet to be accomplished due to lawsuits and objections from the regional accrediting agency.
- The more ambitious and complex the change, the more likely it is that a cumbersome process and complex new organizational structure will forestall positive results. The Connecticut example above illustrates this point. There are other examples of the new organization coming into being with little measurable improvement in student success rates, closing the minority/majority achievement gap, or increases in enrollment.
- Cost reductions through centralized services are often easier to imagine than achieve. New or upgraded systems, training costs, additional personnel even if temporary are all transition costs that cannot be ignored. With 70 percent or more costs associated with people, net reductions in force are necessary to achieve substantial savings over the longer term.

OPEN – GB – INFO 7-12

- • Learn from successful restructuring efforts elsewhere. The series of institutional mergers accomplished by the University System of Georgia represents a model of well-planned restructuring made by two successive and savvy but strategic thinking system chief executives and a powerful Board of Regents, featuring realistic goals, and enjoying measurable positive results.
- • "Able leaders can make any structure work" is a commonplace pearl of wisdom. Although an administrative structure with conflicting or overlapping responsibilities represent barriers to positive change, adroit leaders working in good faith for common purposes, with clear goals and clear accountability expectations, can be successful within any reasonable structure. The goal of course is to structure a system wherein able leaders can bring positive change more quickly than if they had to first overcome unnecessary barriers.
- • Transparency is essential. Plans that are sure to be controversial are best discussed openly and early in the process. A small group of trustees in a public university system in the northeast planned a forced merger of several smaller institutions without input from campus or community leaders. Once the plan became widely known, the legislature intervened to announce the proposal "dead on arrival" and went on to further restrict the system's authority to make any restructuring possible without explicit legislative endorsement.

Effective System/Entrepreneurial Universities

A famous dictum in the literature of complex organizations is "the iron law of oligarchy." Robert Michels, a German-Italian sociologist, argued that all organizations drift toward greater centralization, bureaucracy, and loss of responsiveness and agility. Michels' critics quibble with his research methodology, but it is hard to deny the frequent tendency of larger organizations toward bureaucratic regulations and processes.

Whatever structural changes the Curators endorse, striking the right balance between central control and institutional freedom to maneuver is important. Enhancing the capacity of the universities to compete in an increasingly challenging marketplace while capturing the advantages that a system can deliver is a worthy goal. The effective system/entrepreneurial universities model would display these features:

- • Strong System control combined with agile institutional leadership
- • Clear delineations of executive responsibility and authority at both the System and university level
- • Tuition flexibility to recognize both differential costs of academic programs and different levels of demand
- • Incentives for increasing universities net income
- • "Franchises" for programs granted by System to manage internal competition
- • Support for innovation, technical competitive advantage, global reach
- • Revised chancellor job descriptions, recruitment, evaluation and rewards

This balance between central control and university entrepreneurial spirit is achieved in different ways in the University of Illinois System and the University System of New Hampshire. The University of Illinois at Chicago is an aggressive, fast-developing urban university that exists in the same system with one of the highest ranked land grant universities in the country. The two regional institutions in New Hampshire and its nontraditional college are free to compete largely unfettered by the presence of a

system and the presence of the state's large (by comparison) and well-regarded land grant institution, the University of New Hampshire.

Conclusion

Whatever structural changes the Curators decide upon the goal of the changes and the test of their effectiveness will include these features:

- • The effective exercise of leadership in times of crisis, change, opportunity, especially in the post COVID-19 environment
- • Capturing the benefits of scale for greater functionality in administration and academic operations
- • Greater academic quality, research productivity, educational effectiveness, improved access and inclusiveness through collaboration and consolidation
- • Economic efficiency through shared services and the applications of technology, and
- • Strengthening regional and the state economic growth through focused research and innovation

The challenge for Curators, President Mun Choi and his team, the Chancellors and their teams will be to manage the criticism and pushback that accompanies change in order to realize the gains listed above through strong presidential and board leadership working with university leaders within an effective governance and organizational structure.

References

Blueprint for the University of Wisconsin System Beyond COVID-19, University of Wisconsin System, May 2020.

Financial Status Report, University of Missouri System, April 2020, report to the Board of Curators.

Financial Status Update and Administrative Review and Other Cost Savings Initiatives, University of Missouri System, May 2020, Report to Board of Curators.

Missouri Population Trends, Office of Administration, Department of Budget & Planning, https://oa.mo.gov.

Moody's-COVID-19 puts pressure on higher education finances, Moody's Research Announcement, April 7, 2020.

One University for all of Maine, University of Maine System Report, 2015.

Serving our Students and State, Campus Consolidations, University System of Georgia, Presentation to the Board of Regents, 2013 and subsequent reports.

State Higher Education Finance Report FY 2019, State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO), 2020.

The Top American Research Universities, Annual Report, the Center for Measuring University Performance, University of Massachusetts Amherst and the University of Florida, 2018.

Appendix A: Interview Protocol and Questions

Begin by thanking interviewees, introducing ourselves, and promising confidentiality in that no individual names will be linked to any comments or conclusions in the report.

The purpose of these interviews is to enable us to provide Curators with an evaluative report that will support their deliberations on different options for restructuring the University of Missouri System. The goals of restructuring would be to:

1.   Strengthen academic and research quality, engagement and inclusion through greater collaboration and, in some cases, consolidation of academic programs; and
2.   Maintain and enhance administrative cost effectiveness in carrying out the University's mission.

Missouri is in good company in reviewing its structure in order to achieve greater effectiveness. Many higher education systems across the country are reviewing and changing the way their systems are organized and governed. The economic impact of COVID-19 has accelerated interest in restructuring with the goals of improving functionality in general and reducing costs.

Just two years ago the Curators adopted a plan to clarify and strengthen the role of the President and the System in relation to the Chancellors and their institutions. Several other reports and studies over the past few years have served up recommendations for greater efficiency and effectiveness in system operations. This project builds on those earlier studies.

As you know, President Mun Choi currently also serves as interim Chancellor of the University of Missouri Columbia. In plain language, our study is intended to enable Curators to discuss and decide whether this combined administrative structure should be made permanent, or not, as well as present the Curators with other viable models for restructuring in the interests of better service and greater economy of operations.

Questions

1.   What are the top priorities for the University of Missouri System and its institutions at this point in time?
2.   What are the advantages and disadvantages of the current combination of President and Chancellor positions?
3.   How would you describe the University of Missouri System: Is it a well-integrated "system" or is it a collection of semi-independent universities?
4.   How well integrated is the system administratively and academically?
5.   What other changes in structure could result in a more cohesive and effective system?
6.   Is there another alternative to the president-chancellor combined model or the president-separate from chancellor model that the Curators should discuss and consider?
7.   What have we missed? Additional thoughts and comments would be appreciated. Would you like to schedule an additional conversation?

OPEN – GB – INFO 7-16

Appendix B: Illustrative Delineation of System-University Responsibilities

Virtually all of the specific responsibilities listed here require a collaborative working relationship between the System and individual universities, or more than one university. Depending on the specific issue, the university may report information to the system, provide the results of university decisions, describe university processes, offer advice and recommendations, act as a thought-partner with system leaders, discuss options and alternative scenarios, and adhere to system policies once they are enacted and if appropriate confirmed by the Board of Curators.

System is Primary

- Curator relations and support
- Financial management, planning, oversight
- Capital planning
- Relations and requests to legislature
- Human Resources
- Legal Affairs
- Information Technology
- Academic program review and approval
- Online platform and delivery
- Purchasing and procurement
- Research priorities and compliance
- System strategic planning

University is Primary

- Academic programs and departments
- Faculty and staff evaluation and development
- Research priorities and support
- University strategic plan
- Financial controls within approved budget
- Student success
- Student affairs
- Student recruitment
- Fundraising
- Athletics

OPEN – GB – INFO 7-17

Appendix C: Consultant Biographies

Terrence MacTaggart

tjm@maine.edu; 207-478-9487

Terrence MacTaggart is an experienced leader and scholar in higher education. His consulting and research work focuses on higher education leadership and policy, strategic planning, board development, issues of shared governance and leadership evaluation. He has served as a faculty member and administrator at several public and independent colleges and universities where he has led or participated in multiple institutional turnarounds. He has held the Chancellor's position at the Minnesota State University System and on two occasions at the University of Maine System.

He has served as a consultant and/or facilitator of board retreats for numerous colleges, universities and systems. His clients include major public research universities, urban and metropolitan universities, distinguished independent institutions, regional comprehensives as well as international colleges and universities in Europe, the Middle East, the Caribbean, Asia and the Pacific Rim, minority serving institutions, nontraditional colleges, community colleges and proprietary schools.

He has served as Chair of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC). He has led multiple visiting teams for several regional accrediting associations. He has served as a Fulbright Scholar to Thailand and to Vietnam as an expert on accreditation and quality assurance.

His research and publications focus on governance, improving relations between institutions and the public, and restoring institutional competitiveness. His forthcoming books are *Assessing and Developing College and University Presidents: An Enterprise Leadership Approach*, *and Crisis Leadership: A Guide for Boards and Presidents in an Era of Pandemic, Crisis and Disruption* (both to be published by AGB Press in 2020). In 2017 he published *The 21st Century Presidency: A Call to Enterprise Leadership* (AGB Press). His best-selling book is titled *Leading Change: How Boards and Presidents Work Together to Build Exceptional Institutions*, published by the Association of Governing Boards Press in 2011. In 2007, he published *Academic Turnarounds: Restoring Growth and Vitality to Challenged American Colleges and Universities*. He also produced *Seeking Excellence Through Independence*, which focuses on rebalancing campus autonomy and accountability in order to achieve better results. He has authored numerous articles on presidential and board evaluation, high performance standards for boards, presidential search and strategies for a highly competitive environment.

His academic credentials include a doctorate and master's degree in Literature from Saint Louis University, an MBA, and two honorary doctorates. He is a member of Phi Beta Kappa.

Richard Novak

Richard Novak is a senior fellow with the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, serving to help advance the association's interests and member needs in state and federal education policy and board education. During his 21-year career at AGB, he served as the senior vice president for programs and research and of the Ingram Center for Public Trusteeship and Governance. Mr. Novak has directed or codirected studies in several states, overseen special programs on board and presidential leadership, led several initiatives on the effectiveness of public college and university governing boards, advocated for the reform of public board member selection practices, overseen the association's

programs and research for both public and private members, and worked to incorporate environmental sustainability into governing board agendas.

At AGB, he also worked on governance and higher education projects for the Ministry of Higher Education in Egypt, the Ireland Higher Education Authority, and the Republic of the Marshall Islands. While at AGB and as a senior fellow and consultant, he has led or co-led more than 15 board workshops and helped plan or participate in more than two dozen statewide public board education programs, in addition to several longer-term consulting assignments related to public governance.