

Draft - Center Review Process

Created by Leadership and Talent Development Consultant Teri Spillers, 1.26.17

The purpose of this document is to outline the process that was used for the CDes Center Reviews, Minnesota Design Center (MDC) and Goldstein Museum of Design (GMD), in the fall of 2016.

1. The start of the process was a meeting with Becky Yust, Renee Cheng and Jan Batt to identify the need for center reviews.

Results: MDC would be first priority followed by GMD; an approach was decided based on the audience for whom the report would be written, in both cases an external review would be scheduled; identified who would attend the stakeholder analysis meeting.

2. Conduct a stakeholder analysis, attendees for this meeting included Renee, Marilyn, the director of the center, administrative and/or representative working in the center, and the meeting was facilitated by Teri Spillers from LTD. The process used for analysis was this [stakeholder analysis tool](#). The purpose of the analysis is to determine which stakeholders should be asked for input and how they should be asked, i.e., in person or online.

Results: Defined stakeholders that have power and/or interest regarding the center by categorizing all stakeholders within a 4-square flip chart (see above stakeholder analysis tool); decision was made on how many in person input sessions would be conducted and who the stakeholder groups are for those sessions; decision also made on who would be included in the online survey; agreed what questions that would be asked; identified who in the college would provide administrative survey assistance.

3. Create invitations to participate in an input session or take a survey. College leadership creates a short explanation as to why the center is being reviewed. Included with this invitation is the list of questions and ground rules for the input session provided by LTD. Separate invitations are sent for each input session and one invitation is sent after those sessions to complete the survey. Those who are not able to attend the input sessions can instead complete the survey or send a separate email to LTD.

Results: Following is an example of the GMD input session invitation:

GMD Input Session Facilitators: Teri Spillers, spill005@umn.edu, and Jennifer Engler, engle009@umn.edu from Leadership and Talent Development in the Office of Human Resources, UMN

Overview: Centers at the university and college are nexuses of entrepreneurial innovation, research, teaching and engagement. As a research-one institution, the University asks the College to support the centers while also ensuring they meet standards of scholarly rigor, effectively steward public dollars, have measurable positive impact and are financially stable. Three years ago, as part of a university-wide update, the college was asked to revise its constitution and by laws. These documents include the governance and review of the college centers such as MDC and GMD. While the centers had always been regularly reviewed, this round of reviews pilots a new format, including:

Stakeholder feedback, including affiliates, staff and external partners - done by OHR/college

Statement of mission, stakeholder value and operations - done by the Center director

360 review of director - also done by OHR

External reviewers - invited by the college

The goal of this review is to provide the college with a candid assessment of the current strengths and future opportunities for the center. It's important that the review be seen in the context of resources that need to be managed and grown from the centers own activities. Given that the college expects our recent budget reductions of \$.5M annually will continue, it would be wise for centers to plan any direct financial support of centers will not grow and could possibly shrink. It would be a disservice to the centers and college to use this opportunity to advocate for additional resources or request exemptions from core compliance policies or practices. We hope this review process will provide a better understanding the current and future strengths of our centers, so the college can strategically leverage everyone's time and energy to advance their impact.

GMD Input session: Below are the Input session ground rules:

We want you to do the talking. We would like everyone to participate, to share your honest and open thoughts. We may call on you ensure everyone has an opportunity to speak.

There are no right or wrong answers. Every person's experiences and opinions are important. Speak up and agree or disagree with what others are sharing. We want to hear your observations and opinions.

What is said in this room stays here. We need you to agree to share nothing about this input session outside this room. Even when discussing sensitive issues, we want everyone to feel comfortable sharing their thoughts.

The facilitator/s will be taking notes. We want to capture what you have to say, but will do so without including any names. We will not identify anyone by name as we theme this data. You will remain anonymous.

Specific data for each of these questions will be collected and only themed data will be shared.

- 1. What is working well for GMD?*
- 2. What strengths should be celebrated and maintained?*
- 3. What opportunities exist for the GMD? What are the opportunities for improvement?*
- 4. What are specific 'ideas for action' the GMD leadership and administration could consider?*
- Optional 5. What existing processes or activities are time intensive, what other activities could be done if less time were spent on those?*

4. Input sessions are conducted and detailed notes are taken to capture the lived realities of each particular stakeholder group and their relationship to the center in terms of the questions asked.

5. The administrator in the college coordinates the Qualtrics survey and allows approximately two weeks for the survey to be open. In some cases, those stakeholders who were not able to attend input sessions were sent surveys. Since several different stakeholders may be completing the online survey it is important that it is structured with a broad survey, e.g., what is your relationship with

GMD? in order to generalize results to a population/group of stakeholders and then capture the questions above.

Examples of specific survey questions were:

- *What is your relationship to the GMD? What resources do you use?*
- *What is working well for GMD? What strengths should be celebrated and maintained?*
- *What are the opportunities for improvement?*
- *What are the specific ideas for action that the GMD leadership and administration could consider?*
- *Optional: What existing processes are time intensive? What other activities could be done if less time was spent on those?*
- *Please rate your level of satisfaction in interacting with GMD.*
- *If you were recommending GMD to your peers, how would you describe GMD's goals and values and its ability to effectively support, execute, or partner with others?*

6. LTD facilitators write a report using the following process: (Adapted from Creswell 2009)

- a. Organize and prepare the data for analysis.
- b. Read through all the data. Gain a general sense of the information and reflect on the overall meaning.
- c. Conduct analysis based on the specific coding or organizing related portions of data into categories.
- d. Generate a description of each stakeholder group and identify themes from the coding and search for theme connections.
- e. Represent all the data within a report by each stakeholder group. The data gathered from input sessions are aggregated and summarized into *themes* that correspond to each of the specified questions. The data gathered from the online survey have been captured and presented by *individual ideas* and some verbatim data.
- f. Interpret the larger meaning of the data with overall themes, i.e., What is this saying? What does it represent? What is this an example of? What do I see is going on here? What is happening? What kind of events are at issue here? What is trying to be conveyed?

7. LTD creates report and provides recommendations. The following is the basic template for the report.

- Overview
- Process with stakeholder groups, method, participation numbers and questions asked
- Overall themes
- LTD recommendations
- Individual stakeholder group data

8. LTD holds a meeting with college leadership to review the report.

9. College prepares for external review process by sending college leadership letter, college documentation and the stakeholder report to external reviewers and depending on the review other documents. The external review is conducted and any further efforts are coordinated by the college.

External UMN resources that we recommend for Center reviews are:

Consultant name	Areas of expertise	Former or present clients
Goff Pejsa & Associates	1. Evaluation, Evaluation Capacity Building, 2. Planning and Organizational Development 3. Facilitation and Training Goff and Pejsa & Associates use their backgrounds in evaluation, teaching, and program development to ask the right questions and develop the approach that fits each client's organizational culture and context. Contact information: Emily Goff is via email elgoff@gmail.com www.goffpejsa.com There you will find work samples, descriptions of past projects, and testimonials.	UMN Libraries UMN CEHD UMN AHC
Sara Langworthy	• Professional and educational experiences have fostered a skilled consultant, evaluator, speaker and writer. • Passionate about communicating research accurately and clearly to public audiences. • Highly effective collaborative leader of diverse educational, community partnership, and research projects. • Adeptly and efficiently prioritizes and completes complex tasks, and eagerly seeks out new opportunities and responsibilities. Contact information: sara@drlangworthy.com, The Exchange Loop (www.theexchangeloop.com)	Streamlining data collection and maintenance processes and evaluating impact for the Minnesota Agricultural Education Leadership Council (MAELC). Evaluating barriers and informing marketing strategy for the Minnesota Council on Economic Education (MCEE). (Note: Case studies of

		these two efforts available on our website here: http://www.theexchange.com/testimonials)
--	--	---