

MANY VOICES, ONE FUTURE: CREATING NEW STANDARDS
THE GOLD LINE FUTURE at UMKC

M W. GILLILAND, CHANCELLOR
University of Missouri-Kansas City
December, 2002

John Cleek, Interim Dean, School of Education and Jennifer Hill, Graduate Student, School of Education were critical to the writing of this chapter. Thank you John and Jennifer

The Quantum Jump

We stand
At civilization's impasse
Groping for direction
Crossed to the word
Seeking unheard symbols
To consciousness

We stand
In relational constructs
Echoes of blinding pages
School-tool designed
Education – no education
Security seeking – insecurity
Fact – no fact
Calling for additive steps
A pathway to wisdom
While survival begs
A quantum jump
Toward wholeness

No longer
Can singular to multiple
Thinkwise
Or otherwise
Can multiple to singular
Survive us
Only a total commitment
Resonating integrity
In multiple to multiple relationships
Unified fields...within fields...within fields
Through a methodology of pattern
In metamorphical change
Can man-mankind
Continue emergence

Julius Stulman
Fields Within Fields...Within Fields
The World Institute Council
Vol. 5, No. 1, 1972

Introduction

In 2000, when I became Chancellor of the University of Missouri-Kansas City, I was convinced that public research universities had to conduct a serious self examination of the standards to which they held themselves accountable, that that self examination had to be inclusive, accessing the wisdom of faculty, staff, students, and constituents; that the pedagogy of self-examination had to be creative dialogue, not solely intellectual debate, and that the results had to be new ways of measuring ourselves, new standards. I have dialogue about possibilities, emerging accomplishments that are greater in a quantum way than in the past, and new standards, new measures, to which we are holding ourselves accountable. That future has been termed the gold line future, as opposed to the blue line future of incremental change. Our school colors are blue and gold and, of course, gold has the ring of “top of the line”.

In 2000, when I became Chancellor, the Public K-12 environment was also seeking quantum change. Kansas City's landmark desegregation case of long-standing had seriously eroded the effectiveness of the local K-12 schools. Our university – the city's public research and professional training university – was mired in traditional bureaucratic standards that inhibited response to a swiftly-changing economic marketplace and the corresponding educational demands of our students. As the newcomer in town, expectations of me were high to produce a radically different leadership outcome for higher education, and, hopefully, have some productive impact on our public K-12 counterparts.

The basic mission of a public research university is to educate mainstream America and enhance the economic and social well being of a region/state. In my role as Chancellor, it was clear to me that placing our university as a central resource for both economic development and the personal development of our citizens was a top priority – and an incredibly complex challenge.

My first duty was to listen. I met with leaders around the community, from both the public and private sectors, and listened to their concerns regarding educational opportunity in Kansas City, the purported failure of public school education, and wide ranging perceptions of their hometown university. These civic leaders were firm in their belief in education as necessary for social progress and for successful living. They were well-grounded in the advantages gained by a metropolitan area that offered access to high-quality educational systems and their naturally aligned by-products – thriving cultural organizations; intellectual capital to fuel new business development; a skilled workforce that can sustain growth and can lead through change. These same voices were quick to caution me, however, that UMKC – my new home and professional focus – was seen as a modest player at best, and ineffectual at worst, in both the civic arena and the public school debate.

The challenges were now clearly focused – and they were both exciting and daunting. Trained as an engineer and scientist, I spent the first 15 years of my career in a traditional teaching and research role. In retrospect, it was great preparation for my current position as chancellor. Teaching is, by its nature, a leadership position where conflicts and challenges are handled daily. In addition, as the leader of research projects covering public policy issues, I worked with policy-makers and social scientists and discovered the fine art

of shaping conversations in order to reframe problems and issues and define actions, a critical skill for any leader.

My experience as a Kellogg Fellow in the mid-1980s was pivotal in my transition from faculty to administration leadership. Through the Kellogg program, I was exposed to broader cultures, broader conceptual frameworks on “the truth,” formal leadership theories and opportunities to hone my personal leadership practices. Following the fellowship, I chose a deliberate focus on leadership for my career, a track that developed first through a position as the director of a research center, then as a dean, vice president, provost and – today – chancellor. My career took me to different universities, ranging from a large land grant university to a private research university, and now to a public urban university. This broad exposure to different academic cultures and practices is today a great strength; it feeds my passionate belief that leadership at its best is an opportunity to access the collective wisdom of others and move it to action for social progress.

Great Cities Have Great Universities

By 1999, my dream to serve a public research university was a powerful force in my personal goals. I was looking for a university that wanted who I was, a university interested in my vision. I was clearly focused on the shift of organizational management from predictable, incremental outcomes to the opportunities found in unpredictability – the more natural experience of our times. I believed that a successful organization – and especially a successful university – must celebrate ideas emerging in many places through the organization and bring them forward. I knew my deepest commitment as a leader was to produce a climate – a work environment – that supported bold actions and quantum change.

I knew this would have to happen in an urban university; I hoped for one that was already strong in its foundations, but one that recognized the ultimate advantage of shifting the culture to accommodate a quantum leap forward in its educational and service accomplishments. I came to the conclusion that an urban university was the best place for an educator looking to make a real difference for mainstream America.

Thus, the urban university that I sought would be located in a city that clearly understood the co-partnership of university to civic agenda, a community that valued the university's ideas, training and expertise to "fuel" its vision. Such a sustained co-partnership needed to include an active School of Education community serving the public schools at all levels with exemplary leadership.

Reform in public education has been both a battleground and battle cry for our country's major urban areas. Countless millions of dollars have been poured into these reform efforts, and Kansas City's schools are no exception. Although there are success stories in our city as well as other urban areas across the country, too often these attempts at K-12 reform have been dismal, transitory or non-existent. While I had not been in a faculty or a leadership role relative to a School of Education in my own career, I felt these schools had one of the most critical roles to play in our society. Like many scientists, I also felt that faculty in Schools of Education had abrogated that responsibility in favor of "ivory tower" studies about education. Until I moved into administrative roles in the 1980's, I had not considered that I, as a scientist, might be abrogating my responsibilities also. I have come to believe that the faculty in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences also carry responsibility for K-12 educational viability. At UMKC, it is gratifying to witness faculty in several academic

units across campus stepping forward to join the active deliberations about how we can foster a renaissance in our schools.

For me, UMKC was the right place, at the right time, in the right city. Kansas City knows it needs a great university to be a successful competitor in a 21st Century economy. While the “jury is still out,” both the city and the University have focused and are making remarkable progress together. We are ready to take a quantum leap forward. I feel quite blessed to be here.

That said, all is not rosy. Kansas City is geographically and racially divided. As I discovered in my early drives through the community, the metropolitan area is literally defined by State Line Road, a thoroughfare that delineates Kansas and Missouri. Johnson County, one of the wealthiest counties per capita in America, is situated on the Kansas side of State Line. Kansas City itself is divided further by Troost Avenue. Go east of Troost, and you are in the “black part” of town, often viewed as a landscape of compromised neighborhoods and expectations. Implications from this geographical divide range from the socio-economic to governmental services to educational opportunity.

Sitting right in the middle of this estranged urban landscape, two miles from State Line Road and bounded on its east side by Troost Avenue, is UMKC. To my mind, UMKC is in the perfect position for an urban university. Our campus vision of “a community of learners making the world a better place” opens the door for us to take the full complement of urban challenges – race; economic development through research and business growth; opportunities to build a quality public education system; social infrastructure needs focused in neighborhoods; and the cultural amenities to sustain our spirit – and create "new standards

in higher education.” What better or more fertile ground for the leadership principles I have studied and honed to be put into action.

Learning to Lead: Principles for Transformation

As I reflect over the past 15 years and the formal leadership roles in my experience,

Access the creativity, ideas and energy of the people toward actions for social progress.

ten principles emerge as essential to my own effectiveness and my ability to drive change. Each of these principles, in turn, share relationship with three organizational change goals: (i) access the collective wisdom of others; (ii) inspire others to “show up” and claim the vision; and (iii) produce an organization that is joyful, manifests a spirit of community and performs at a high level of accomplishment.

The following narrative outlines these ten leadership principles. Later in the case study, I will illustrate how the foundation formed by such leadership guidelines, and the actions prescribed, are changing the UMKC School of Education and the University’s capacity and desire to assist the public schools in Kansas City, Missouri.

1) **Lead the conversation about the University’s vision all the time.** Leading the development and implementation of a vision for our University means talking about it all the time and holding the Vice Chancellors, Deans and everyone in administrative roles accountable for talking about it all the time. It means making decisions from the perspective of the vision, including all personnel decisions. This, in my experience, is extraordinarily difficult and usually results in changes in leadership positions. However, if the Chancellor doesn’t hold the vision as context for the accountability of every administrator, including

him/herself, nothing ever happens. The vision sits on a piece of paper, becoming yet one more plan in the archives.

2) **Model the University's values.** Together with talking about the vision, nothing is more important for a leader than to model the values. UMKC's values were determined in a highly participatory process marked by open and candid communication. They are clear directives for my leadership. As Chancellor, I must openly communicate good news, bad news, ambiguities, mistakes and successes – and all other administrators must follow my lead. The pay-off for such candor, however, is rich. There is no access to the collective wisdom without trust, and trust requires openness even when it hurts. That openness must start at the top. I work hard to make all personnel decisions values-based, especially the hiring (and possible firing) of administrators. Many "ivory tower" decisions are made outside such values guidelines, and many ubiquitous university practices (e.g., the pay scale for part-time faculty) are inconsistent with the stated values. At UMKC, our principle calls for acknowledging those historical or habitual practices that are inconsistent with the values and supporting a plan to work toward clarity and consistency.

3) **Listen all the time.** I was once given the advice, "if you are dying to say something, it probably means you shouldn't say it." It is good advice. I've also learned that talking without listening – by all involved parties – is wasted energy. How do you get others to listen to you? Listen to them. People listen when they feel heard. Moreover, by listening, I normally find out my colleagues already know what I was going to say – and more. Again, there is no access to the collective wisdom without listening.

4) **Set the context for every issue.** I spend a great deal of time, as does my executive cabinet, reframing issues, constantly setting the context for growth, change and progress. In

every discussion, we consider: What is the real question? Why do we want to talk about or care about in this issue? The answer to those questions is the context for an issue. The issue will never be effectively addressed if the context is not agreed upon first.

5) **Work to impact the network of conversations.** Essentially everything in an organization happens in the context of conversations between people throughout the organization. People always have a choice in a conversation. Should I have this conversation in the context of blame, complaint, resignation, or cynicism (often the dominant context for conversations in universities) – or can I convert the framework into a conversation about possibilities and opportunities? Might I even have the discussion in the context of some small action that could offer the possibility of a solution? The culture of the organization exists in the context of our conversations. From the philosopher Heidegger (1,2), “language is the house of being.” Our language determines who we are. For further development of the role of background conversations in maintaining or changing an organization's culture, see Ford (3) and Ford, Ford, and McNamara (4).

6) **Make promises and keep them; be accountable.** Being accountable for results that have measurable outcomes and measurable timetables engenders trust as well as a high level of performance in an organization. Installing that principle as the norm for a leadership team is extraordinarily difficult. It is risky and requires constant vigilance. Missed deadlines happen, but when they are acknowledged as having been missed, trust emerges. Specific timetables for progress not only focus result outcomes; they also are foundations for building momentum and inspiring organizational achievement.

7) **Say out loud what is normally left unsaid.** Most meetings, in my experience, are inefficient because they leave the real issue unsaid. A context for the meeting exists which is

not dealt with openly – perhaps a turf battle, a performance problem, a personality conflict, a feeling of stress, loss of dignity, failure, or fear. Saying what is so out loud, without making it “wrong,” just what is so, takes all the power out of the perceived issue and allows everyone involved to deal with the real issue at hand.

8) **Do not operate out of fear.** In any leadership position, but especially during times of organizational change, “breakdowns” occur that are unexpected. Not knowing how they will be interpreted externally or how to handle them internally evokes fear in any leader. I have learned that when fear begins to take hold, I can recognize it by the myriad “what-if” questions that occupy my mind – especially in the middle of the night. That is a sure sign to simply stop and go to the vision and values for guidance. With that step, the stand that must be taken is clear. Declaring the stand nearly always clears out the morass of indecision and stalemate and a “breakthrough” occurs.

9) **Know myself and take time for reflection.** I have learned the meaning of the phrase “keep good company with yourself.” Whatever is the most effective way for you to stay centered and balanced, do it every day – exercise, journaling, whatever it is for a leader – the disciplined practice is essential. My own disciplines, when I adhere to them, free me from frustration and anxiety, creating room for creativity and humor.

10) **Acknowledge mistakes.** In any complex and fast moving organization, leaders make mistakes. In fact, most leaders, when they are judged 'great' by historians, indicate that their mistakes and successes are positively correlated. The leadership preamble, however, is: the success doesn't occur if the mistake is not acknowledged. For me, the admonition is clear – clean up my mistakes openly.

The University of Missouri-Kansas City

The University of Missouri-Kansas City is well positioned to take on the processes necessary for quantum change. We know as a university community that this city, our state and our constituents are seeking the leadership and opportunity historically fueled by institutions of higher education. We understand the current unsettled economic climate and forces demanding educational change can and will engulf the institution with or without our influence or planning. We are choosing to lead rather than only respond to this environment. In my view, UMKC and the emerging "new economy" based in ideas and a highly skilled, problem-solving workforce are perfect partners to meet the remarkable challenges ahead. Rather than settle for the more traditional and incremental improvement methodologies to keep pace with these challenges, we can deliberately link our progress as a university directly to the community and region we serve and respond quickly and effectively to both internal and external needs. This is a view of a "quantum future" that is invigorating the people of UMKC and our civic partners in Kansas City.

My own leadership to effect this alignment, however, must clearly confront and support both the unique areas of strength and possibility within UMKC and the historical fact of diminished returns and relationships that are indicative of the less successful areas of our campus. The School of Education and its influence with the deeply problematic K-12 issues of Kansas City, together with the corresponding lack of success in building strong bridges from our campus to local ethnic communities are two particular examples of challenges ahead that we examine in this case study.

To build a context for UMKC and its future, three special features of historical and current position must be noted. First, location and geography. UMKC is located in two of

the most vibrant areas of Kansas City and at the “divide” between the major white/black ethnic groups. The “main” Volker campus is on the Country Club Plaza, one of the premier tourist and shopping areas of the city. The health sciences campus is located on “Hospital Hill” near Crown Center, the Hallmark Corporation and the city's old "downtown." The Plaza area is home to a vibrant cultural-intellectual hub including the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, the Stowers Medical Research Institute, the Ewing M. Kauffman Foundation, and Midwest Research Institute. Hospital Hill is home base for Children’s Mercy Hospital, Truman Medical Center (our city's respected indigent care facility), Western Missouri Mental Health Center, and the Kansas City Public Health Department. Both the Plaza and Hospital Hill/Crown Center are areas of substantial urban energy and growth. However both campuses are also bounded on their east sides by Troost Avenue, the divide between black and white Kansas City.

Second, UMKC’s history provides an unusual context for monetary support from both the public and private sectors. The University began in 1929 as the University of Kansas City. This private institution, spawned and driven to fruition by the vision of the Kansas City Chamber of Commerce, recognized the city’s need for a university to serve its citizens. A board of trustees comprised of leading businessmen was established and a charter was granted. Raising a large endowment during the Great Depression seemed an impossible goal, but the Board persisted and on October 2, 1933, the first classes were held at the University of Kansas City.

Although the people and responsibilities have changed, the UKC Board of Trustees still exists today, tying the University to business and industry and providing the network for fund raising, legislative connections, and overall expertise. The Board’s impact is critical.

The work of the trustees, in combination with a special “state match program,” has led to the establishment of 47 endowed chairs and professorships at UMKC, and the professors who hold those positions play an essential role in the quantum changes now underway.

A major change in the University’s history occurred on July 25, 1963, when UKC joined the University of Missouri System with a corresponding name change to the University of Missouri-Kansas City. Today we are the University of Missouri System’s designated campus for the visual and performing arts, health sciences, and urban affairs.

Third, UMKC is uniquely dominated by professional schools. The University has 11 academic units, including a health sciences combination that few universities can match: schools of medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, nursing and biological sciences.

Existing institutions and dates of merger with UKC:

- Kansas City School of Law, 1938
- Kansas City-Western Dental College, 1941
- Kansas City College of Pharmacy, 1943
- Kansas City Conservatory of Music, 1959

Academic units established:

- College of Arts and Sciences, 1929 (the original UKC)
- School of Business Administration, 1953
- School of Education, 1954
- School of Graduate Studies, 1964
- School of Medicine, 1970
- School of Nursing, 1980
- School of Biological Sciences, 1985
- School of Interdisciplinary Computing and Engineering, 2001

Because some schools with separate and rich histories merged with UKC, much like a conglomerate, the University functions somewhat like a loose "federation." The Dental School and the Conservatory of Music in particular have their own reputations and identities, both stronger than UMKC’s identity nationally. This has positive impacts in some

domains and negative impacts in others. I sometimes feel the whole of UMKC is less than the sum of the parts.

In addition to the Dental School and the Conservatory of Music, other areas which attract quality faculty and students include the University's six-year program in the School of Medicine, the "brand" of the Bloch School of Business and Public Administration (endowed by Henry Bloch, co-founder of H&R Block), an interdisciplinary Ph.D. program, and fast-track and combined degree programs that allow students to obtain a degree at an accelerated pace.

Forty-three percent of UMKC's 13,800 students are graduate and professional students, pursuing post-baccalaureate degrees. This is a very high percentage for public research universities and gives us a powerful strength. The professional programs also place us in a wonderful position to provide a highly skilled work force for the city and to partner with the civic development agenda. UMKC is also a significant employer in Kansas City, with 2,300 full-time employees, including 557 tenured and tenure-track faculty, and 1,400 part-time employees.

Yet intermixed within this strong university profile is our School of Education, a program with almost 50 years of history, 43 tenured or tenure-track faculty and direct access to the urban and suburban public education microcosm. Though located in a community of national prominence with regards to desegregation and urban education conversations, I have not experienced it as a major force in K-12 issues or on campus. Of the total student body at UMKC, 22 percent report their ethnic origin as persons of color; half of this group is African-American. Yet our School of Education does not enjoy corresponding enrollment levels of African-Americans preparing to serve the educational needs of their community.

The School of Education offers all degree levels: bachelor's, master's, specialist, and doctoral. In FY 2002, 328 students obtained degrees from the UMKC School of Education.

Gayle Holliday, President of G & H Consulting LLC and a Kansas City community leader, is a participant in an informal advisory group to me designed to increase the University's performance and reputation with the African-American community. She has told me that African-American students specifically "do not think of UMKC as a first choice school for them, because the outreach has not been there."

During one of my initial meetings with my documenter for this project, it became clear to me that she had her own "already listening" viewpoints about Kansas City, race relations and UMKC. She is a Ph.D. student in the UMKC School of Education, a 53-year-old African-American female who is native to Kansas City. She tells me that she began her education in the Kansas City public schools, but was transferred to parochial schools by her parents after several racial incidents in largely all-white schools. Pressing her to be frank with me, I asked how people responded to her decision to begin doctoral studies at UMKC. In a matter-of-fact tone of voice, she replied, "Every black person I talked to told me to stay *away* from UMKC. The comments ranged from 'those folks will never let you get that piece of paper' to 'all that place does is suck the life out of black folks and they still don't get those initials behind their name.'" Having been raised east of Troost and to this day hesitant about venturing into Johnson County, she told me her initial supporters and contacts at UMKC were so different than her past experiences with the institution, that she "went with her gut" and began her doctoral studies in our interdisciplinary program. "It was the best decision I've made in a long time," she said. "My classes have been wonderful and my

committee has opened my mind to new ways of thinking I never dreamed possible. Without UMKC I doubt if I would have ever recognized my calling to teach.”

The Unspoken Conversation

This is a very polite town; one of the statements often made about the area is how nice the people are, how civil they are in conversations. This civility, however, is not without a cost.

As Sherry Lamb Schirmer observed in her book, *A City Divided: The Racial Landscape of Kansas City, 1900 – 1960*, “a desire for social distance from those deemed undesirable ... a desire to define racial harmony as an absence of conflict produces denial.” This is harsh, but no doubt real to many. It also points to the importance of one of my key leadership principles: Say out loud what is normally left unsaid.

Oddly enough, the differences in perceptions and conversations about race and class roughly parallel the two streets that bisect Kansas City North to South – Troost Avenue and State Line Road. UMKC is in the middle – geographically, politically, and demographically. It is an absolutely amazing spot from which to listen and shape a conversation. The conversations I had with people to the east of the campus were polite most of the time, but a wait-and-see attitude prevailed. I could sense I had to prove myself in some ways. Later, I would learn that these residents viewed UMKC in fairly negative terms. Many of the people I talked to felt as if they were not welcome on the campus. At best, they did not feel UMKC could bring any meaningful change to their lives or to students in their neighborhoods. Some were outright hostile and let me know it.

To the west, the landscape was certainly prettier – and definitely whiter. Many Kansas City civic and business leaders live in Kansas. My conversations with these people were often more comfortable on a personal level, however, I still came away feeling as though UMKC was somehow found wanting. Not until later would I realize that UMKC was not necessarily seen as “Kansas City’s University” by many of these people. Their attitude was not necessarily hostile; they simply didn’t view our campus as a catalyst for change, a site for innovation, and, a place where leadership for the City could emerge.

UMKC and the Public Schools

Considering this marked racial division, it is not surprising that Kansas City did not embrace the 1954 Brown vs. Topeka Board of Education decision with enthusiasm. Initial efforts had black and white students in the same school, but on different floors. After this was challenged, floors no longer segregated blacks and whites, but integration still did not flourish. White flight began with an exodus to the nearby suburbs in Missouri and Kansas. As more and more whites moved out, followed by middle-class minorities, the Kansas City Missouri Public School District faced new financial and other challenges.

The problems led to what I’ve heard described as “the most expensive desegregation experiment in public education.” UMKC was active in that experiment. Two professors at the University, Dan Levine and Eugene Eubanks, were profoundly involved in the school desegregation case in the 1970’s and early 80’s. With help from their colleagues, these UMKC leaders played a huge role in everything from the development of an educational improvement plan to designing the magnet school plan. Gene Eubanks, who became Dean

of the UMKC School of Education, led the desegregation monitoring committee for more than 10 years.

As part of the case, a court-ordered increase in property taxes produced a massive improvement program, bringing with it new or renovated facilities, state-of-the-art equipment, smaller class sizes and innovative magnet themes. Parents were allowed to have their children taken to and from school in private taxis.

Nevertheless, many white parents, especially those who had moved across State Line Road to Johnson County, Kansas, would not allow their children to be part of what they deemed a racial experiment. Black parents were also unhappy. Because a “40 percent white” racial quota was imposed by the judge, many seats sat empty in the more desirable magnets, while black students were forced to attend crowded neighborhood schools.

Today, only a few magnet schools remain. Most schools have reverted back to the neighborhood school concept, since the state of Missouri was removed from the case, which resulted in a massive loss of dollars for the district.

In the years since the desegregation lawsuit was filed in 1977, the Kansas City Missouri School District (KCMO) enrollment has dropped by over 13,000 students and minority student enrollment increased by 13 percent. More specifically, enrollment dropped from 45,700 in 1977 to 32,000 in 2000, while minority student enrollment increased from 68 to 82%. In 2000, the average ACT scores of those KCMO students who took the exam was 17.8, compared with a Missouri average of 21.5 and a national average of 21.0.

For perspective, today the population for the metropolitan Kansas City area (which includes suburbs in both Missouri and Kansas) is 1.8 million. Of that population, 11 percent are African-American. In contrast, of the 0.5 million people within the limits of Kansas City,

Missouri, 40% are minority and one-third are African American. Enrollment of African-Americans at UMKC is 11%, mirroring the metropolitan area. Within the School of Education, African-American enrollment is 20%, however only 8% of the undergraduates in the School of Education are African-American. Table 1 provides data on African-American enrollment within the public schools. The contrast between the inner city and the suburbs and between Missouri and Kansas is dramatic.

Table 1: Percent African-American Enrollment and African-American Staff: 1999¹

School Districts	Students	Staff
Missouri		
Kansas City Missouri School District ²	72%	43%
12 suburban School Districts		
Range	2 to 63%	0 to 16%
Average	18%	5%
Kansas		
Kansas City, Kansas School District	54%	22%
10 suburban School Districts ³		
Range	1 to 11%	0 to 2%
Average	4%	1%

¹ Source Kansas City Star, August 22, 1999, p.23

² Districts: Liberty, Missouri City, North Kansas City, Fort Osage, Independence, Blue Springs, Center, Raytown, Grandview, Lee's Summit Hickman Mills, Raymore Peculiar

³ Districts: Park Hill, Piper, Bonners Springs, Turner, De Soto, Shawnee Mission, Olathe, Blue Valley, Gardner, Spring Hill

Charter schools are now also emerging. In 1999, UMKC began to sponsor charter schools, and we now sponsor seven schools. According to a story in *The Kansas City Star* on October 10, 2002, one in five public school students within the Kansas City Missouri Public School District's boundaries was enrolled at a charter school in the fall of 2002. Since charters began enrolling students in 1999, the number of these schools has grown from 15 to 18; enrollment has passed 6,000. While the jury is still out on the overall effectiveness of charter schools, it is clear to me that these schools are extremely popular with African-American parents in the district, whose children make up close to 85 percent of the student population.

While much attention is paid to what goes on in the classroom, the Kansas City Missouri Public School District has also been challenged by what goes on "downtown" with

district and school board leaders. The district has had a seemingly never-ending succession of new superintendents; in 30 years, the district has had 20 superintendents.

When I arrived, the superintendent was Dr. Benjamin Demps (as this goes to press, the current superintendent is Dr. Bernard Taylor). I visited with Dr. Demps and asked him what UMKC could do to help him and the district. He had no immediate response, but clearly appreciated the question.

Later, I would realize why the question might have caught Dr. Demps off guard. Despite the intense involvement of some School of Education faculty, the University overall was not known for its involvement, in the community or the school district. Alan DuBois is the long-time Executive Director of Genesis School, a haven for “last-chance” students from the public schools. He says professors at the University continually turned away from his partnering requests: “Some of the professors were concerned about their status – and what working with kids who are poor and in trouble would do to that status. The rationale used to be, ‘We were never intended to solve urban issues.’ But, in my mind, if you are dependent on public dollars, it is not a separate thing. If you are an urban university, you have to address urban problems.”

My lack of previous experience with a School of Education provided me no “safe haven” when it came to accepting responsibility for our University’s less than stellar record in producing results for the children of our urban community. How to turn this around was clearly a new challenge for me – and one for which there appeared to be no simple solutions.

The UMKC School of Education

I began looking for the solutions by putting the third leadership principle into action. I listened all the time. And, what I discovered was that virtually no one was neutral when it came to the UMKC School of Education. The School suffered from low esteem within the community-at-large, especially within the minority community.

“We are comfortable blaming others; it is difficult to see oneself as the cause.”

Within the University community, the School was perceived to be at war with itself. Faculty and staff blamed central administration for imposing deans with little or no consultation – the prior Dean had suffered a short and unpleasant tenure marred by allegations of racism. Restructuring of the School’s academic programs had not gone well; nationally recruited chairs withdrew their applications in the face of the conflicts they encountered. School of Education faculty resented allegations of low morale and insisted they were involved in multiple urban-centered reform and educational initiatives. Finally, the current Dean felt she had not been given the institutional support needed to bring order to the chaos. I could go on, but the point is, it seemed obvious that solutions to the problems of the School of Education were not likely to come from within the School without significant changes being made.

The Interim Provost and I spent time with faculty, staff, and administrators seeking to redirect the energies of the School toward the urgent business of educational reform in Kansas City. We felt that our efforts were largely being ignored by the School of Education and our efforts to find a middle ground between the faculty and the Dean were not effective. I would have considered phasing out the School if not for my strong and unrelenting belief that an urban university in the 21st century cannot aspire to greatness without a great School of Education engaged in the reform of education in the region.

The incumbent dean, brilliant and energetic, but lacking in prior administrative experience, reached the point where she felt she could no longer be effective. I did not ask for her resignation, but neither was I completely surprised when it was offered in the Spring of 2001. Her frustration was obvious to all.

My frustration was eased in early Summer 2001, when new leadership emerged for the School of Education. Dr. John Cleek was one of those key leaders who “showed up” for the vision; in a clear demonstration of the leadership principles, John wanted to help lead the conversation about the vision and model the values. He had demonstrated this shortly after my arrival at UMKC, when he stopped by to see me and said: “I like what you are saying and doing; I think I see what you want to do. Your vision is one that higher education needs, and I want to help you Martha. What can I do?”

At the time, John was a faculty member in the Bloch School of Business and Public Administration with a doctorate in Foundations of Education. He had been President of two community colleges prior to coming to UMKC and had vast experience as a leader. I immediately asked him to develop UMKC’s first enrollment management plan and to develop it in collaboration with the academic deans and the admissions office. We both saw that the outcome of the development of the plan had to be: “Enrollment is Everyone’s Business.”

In the summer of 2001, as that project was winding down and was clearly on the path to success, I shocked John by asking him to consider being Interim Dean of the School of Education. He indicated that any affirmative answer from him would depend on faculty acceptance of him. I introduced John to the School of Education faculty and staff. I told them of my strong commitment to making our School of Education a centerpiece of the new

UMKC. I also told them I believed the School of Education deserved a chance to prove what was possible if the faculty and administration worked together to develop an intentional future worthy of the best all of us could contribute.

John told them he was ready to accept my challenge, but only if he was assured that they were willing to make a fresh start. He pledged to work with them in finding common ground and challenged them to share with him their personal commitment. His challenge to them was very direct, “Tell me what vision for the future would cause you to be willing to work harder than you have ever worked before.” The response from the faculty and staff was immediate and mostly positive.

The response from the community to changes within the School of Education has been more cautious – more in line with Missouri’s famous “Show Me” attitude. As Gwen Grant, President and CEO of the Urban League of Greater Kansas City says, “The quality of public education in Kansas City is in a horrible state. So, the outcome is indicative of the (University’s) involvement. However, you don’t just place the blame on UMKC; the whole community has accountability.”

John and I have had many long conversations about what it will take to focus the School of Education on the issues of teachers and principals in the schools. We both know it will not be easy. We also know we must engage faculty from other schools within the University. And, we know we have a moral obligation to future generations of children in Kansas City to give this effort our very best.

Again, Gwen Grant: “I know the Chancellor is trying to make changes. But dealing with faculty and resistance to change, the commitment has to be there, or they will just stay the course.” The commitment is here. What results we can produce remains to be seen.

Planning for the Future at UMKC

In May 2000, I launched a change process at UMKC – and I believe

it is a process that will bring value to the University and the entire community, including the public schools in Kansas City, Missouri. The process is grounded in theories about the role of language and conversations in changing cultures (1,2,3,4), living (see Wheatley, 5), quantum organizations, (see Kilmann, 6), and quantum human intelligence (see Zohar 7, 8 and Marshall, 9). I am of the opinion that traditional strategic planning processes lead to planning documents that find their way quickly into university archives, making only a modest difference, if any. Engaging in traditional strategic planning was, for me, tantamount to “doing the same thing and expecting a different result.”

Rather than do that, we began something quite different with a small group of UMKC leaders working together for three days

to discuss what was possible for UMKC. That led to additional faculty, staff, and student retreats throughout the summer of 2000, with each group contributing to the design of UMKC’s future. To date, roughly 2,000 people have been engaged in this process, several hundred intensively.

don’t establish the boundaries first the squares, triangles, boxes of preconceived possibility, and then pour life into them, trimming off left-over edges, ending potential let centers proliferate from self-justifying motions!

the box can’t bend without breaking: but the center-arising form adapts, tests the peripheries, draws in, finds a new factor utilizes a new method, gains a new foothold responds to inner & outer change.

R.Ammons

I refer to this as UMKC's transformation process, drawing from the substantial literature on higher education transformation. Many faculty, it turns out, find the term "transformation" highly distasteful. Nevertheless, for our purposes, transformation is defined in two domains: as outcomes and as a shift in the culture of the institution.

As outcomes, the transformation is intended to produce a **constituency that is highly engaged** in the vision and an **organization that is highly accomplished**, performing at levels previously unknown, qualitatively and quantitatively. I have a constituency in Kansas City and within UMKC which has accepted responsibility for specific accountabilities and actions. For example, I work formally and directly with an executive cabinet (6 people), a cabinet which includes the Deans and others (36 people), an extended cabinet which includes 150 faculty and staff as well as a few students and community leaders, and a set of Trustees which includes 60 people from the private sector in Kansas City. All together, we have 12 specific projects and four specific focus areas in which we are attempting to perform at new levels of accomplishment. These are aimed at demonstrating results and assuring that our time and resources are focused.

In the ACE series on institutional transformation, Madeleine Green writes: "A crucial step in implementing institution-wide change is expanding the group of supporters from the few (the president or administrative and faculty leaders) to the many (a critical mass of faculty, administrators, staff, students and other interested groups). Through the process of informed and energetic conversation, a change permeates a campus by getting others excited about and moving toward change."

As a shift in the culture of the institution, transformation refers to the process of moving from a cartesian to a quantum internal culture.

<u>Cartesian</u>		<u>Quantum</u>
a. determinate	moves to	unpredictable
b. atomistic	moves to	holistic
c. hierarchical	moves to	relational
d. reductionist	moves to	emergent

As we strive to become a quantum organization, we are designing policies and promoting a culture in which the institution accepts unpredictability as opportunity; celebrates the fact that great ideas can emerge in many places; encourages responses to be brought forward from the “bottom to the top” of the organization; embraces entangled relationships, putting them to work for the whole; and searches for the solutions that are “both/and” rather than singular. The process is deliberate in its design to access the creativity and imagination of participants, and it is by its very nature messy, unpredictable, and dynamic. In theory, it should be well suited to take advantage of the University’s tradition of shared governance, a tradition I view as valuable, important to our future and currently ineffective.

We remain in the early stages of this process. As Greene writes in the ACE series on institutional transformation: “(Transformation)... is not accomplished overnight; change that is sufficiently pervasive and deep to qualify as transformational change requires changing processes, values, rewards, and structures throughout an institution, all of which take time.”

The Transformation Process at UMKC

A key element of our process was a set of workshops open to people across the strata and hierarchy. The three-day workshops were designed with four intended outcomes: (i) to access the creativity, ideas and energy of people across the institution in shaping the vision; (ii) to produce a cadre of people at every level of the institution who saw themselves

individually as vital elements of making the vision real and saw actions they could take individually that would cause the vision to become real; (iii) to support the development of new relationships, projects, and solutions not available before; and (iv) to provide the support for these people to become leaders in conversations throughout the University aimed at transforming the culture.

Recall from my list of leadership principles that “culture exists in conversations.” The people who attended the workshops learned to recognize the conversations of cynicism and saw how to shift them. Participation was by choice, with workshops filled on a first-come, first-served basis. Seven hundred faculty, staff, students and community members participated in 10 workshops.

Equal in importance to the workshops was – and is – the extended cabinet created in January 2001. These 150 people, all of whom have taken the workshop, are charged to provide and model leadership, to create and model the UMKC core values, and to generate the new UMKC culture through their conversations. Again, participation on the extended cabinet is by choice.

By the summer of 2001, the School of Education was notable for its very limited, almost non-existent, participation in the retreats of the year 2000, in subsequent workshops and in the Extended Cabinet. Dr. John Cleek changed that. After taking the reins as Interim Dean in the late summer of 2001, John immediately introduced two of the three-day workshops, specifically for the School. While the workshops were again by choice, participation was high. Why? I believe most faculty were highly concerned about the future of the School of Education, given the turnover of Deans. I believe they had begun to see their own role in causing that destructive turnover and were willing to give this Interim Dean

and these workshops a chance. More than 65 percent of the faculty and staff in the School of Education participated in one of the workshops.

After this, the focus of the School began to shift to the UMKC vision and, more specifically, to UMKC's role with K-12 education in Kansas City. That role is clearly a part of the University's vision, values and goals. The "jury is still out" on the success of this shift in the School of Education.

UMKC 2006: Vision, Values and Goals

From the workshops and retreats emerged the UMKC vision, mission, values and goals. Our vision:

A Community of Learners Making the World a Better Place:

Creating new standards in higher education

- Academic excellence
- Campus without borders
- Unleashing human potential

is manifested through our mission:

- Lead in life and health sciences
- Deepen and expand strength in the visual and performing arts
- Develop a professional work force through collaboration in urban issues and education
- Create a vibrant learning and campus life experience

through processes that have us living our values

- Education first
- Discovery and innovation
- Integrity and accountability
- Diversity, inclusiveness and respect
- Energized collaborative communities

We have developed measures (10) for our five goals:

- In 2006, we are a national leader in scholarship in creative activity.
- In 2006, we attract, nurture and develop responsible community leaders.
- In 2006, we are an essential community partner and resources.
- In 2006, we are a workplace of choice.
- In 2006, we have the resources to fuel our vision.

Here and Now---Rising to the Challenge

A reading of some of the history of the public schools in Kansas City and conversations with participants in that history lead me to conclude that the origins of the problems with teacher education and with urban public schools ---that is the current problems with both of our products (teachers in the case of UMKC and educated young people in the case of the schools)--- are extraordinarily deep and complex. I also hear “blame” everywhere. My conclusions are undoubtedly the conclusions made by most chancellors of most urban universities in America today. The issues are embedded in the history of our nation, especially in the history of slavery and civil rights; in long struggles with bilingual education; in a long, frustrating and expensive effort by the courts to produce racial balance; and in the inability of UMKC and other Missouri and Kansas public universities to train and support teachers and principals successfully.

Today, Kansas City finds itself in the same situation as most cities in the country. We have a teacher shortage driven by high rates of attrition and migration, coupled with problems attracting people of color to the teaching profession. As in most cities, although many of UMKC’s graduating teachers stay in this area geographically, they do not necessarily start or remain teachers in urban schools. And, teachers, principals and counselors are provided little assistance in their career development and career support.

Gwen Grant of the Urban League, states: “Based on academic achievement, UMKC has not done a good job in terms of preparing teachers to teach in an urban environment. Their teachers don’t come out prepared to teach urban youth. Research shows that teacher quality is the number one indicator for either low or high student achievement. If the University has a role in preparing teachers, and if we have poor education outcomes in our district, that is obviously something we need to look at.”

I agree, but what to do now? I expect the next two and a half years to be challenging as the University and especially the UMKC School of Education work to be the educational reform partner in Kansas City that drives positive results. The challenges are both internal and external to the University. I summarize them in four categories, indicating where we stand in each, identifying next steps and delineating my role as Chancellor in each.

1) Establishing Partners: On April 29, 2002, I was pleased to convene an Educational Showcase on campus attended by some 200 area educational, business, and civic leaders. Interim Dean Cleek and the faculty of the School of Education challenged everyone in attendance to join us in a Partnership for the Educational Future of Kansas City. Partners were asked to commit to producing two accomplishments: By 2006, every child in our region would have access to a highly qualified, competent and caring teacher and every school would have a transformative educational leader in charge. UMKC will not proceed without key partners from the school districts of Kansas City; the teacher organizations in these schools; the private foundations of Kansas City; technology providers, and some representation from the business, civic, political, and religious leadership of Kansas City. Those that wished to partner signed an agreement and most participants did sign up. However, UMKC does not yet have in place the structure through which these partners can

implement their commitment. Thus, the partnership is today (December 2002) a loose confederation of cautiously positive conversations among and between the participants. “The ball is in our court” to convert that to a structure for action and results.

A proposal that would provide the structure, titled “A Partnership for the Educational Future of Kansas City”, has been developed and submitted to several foundations. The proposal requests money for the planning stage only. I intend to proceed with or without external funding, because the actions contained in that proposal are the right things for the university to be doing. However, progress will be much slower without external funding, especially given the withdrawal of state support for the university during the past 15 months and the shaky recovery of the national and state economy from recession. The state budget cuts have eliminated the marginal dollars through which chancellors and provosts can give important initiatives, such as this one, “a push”.

My role as Chancellor now is five-fold: (i) raise money from private foundations and individuals for the effort, (ii) find one or more technology providers interested in applications of broadband technology in training teachers and in the public schools, (iii) show my support internally for the UMKC leaders that are working to change the internal culture, procedures, policies, and curriculum, (iv) provide access to the UMKC leaders to civic, business and religious leaders where my role as Chancellor opens doors not available to them, and (v) talk about this effort all the time internally and externally as one of UMKC’s top priorities.

2) The Internal Culture and Actions of UMKC. As we proceed with or without external funding, I believe at least two problems with the internal culture of UMKC must be addressed for a successful effort. The work we have done over the last two years at the

University is a good start and is essential. First, teacher and principal preparation cannot be the responsibility of the School of Education alone. At UMKC, we must make this a serious issue for the College of Arts and Sciences and some professional schools. In the formal degree programs for both teachers and educational leaders, both content and methodology must be excellent and must be coordinated and that will involve numerous schools. Secondly, the faculty reward system must support faculty who engage in teacher education and in partnerships and it does not now do so.

Dealing with these internal issues which cross schools and colleges means that the Provost to whom these deans report must have the leadership role. My first priority, then as Chancellor, had to be to find a Provost who agreed with the commitment and held the value of “partnering”. I hired Provost Steve Ballard in the Spring of 2001; like John Cleek, I believe he was attracted to the emerging vision and values of UMKC. And, he is committed to partnerships. My role now is to give him my full support as he works to make this a university-wide priority internally. He is currently working on two fronts: (i) to develop the partnerships among the College of Arts and Sciences, some professional schools, the School of Biological Sciences, and the School of Education and (ii) to change the faculty reward system so that faculty will be rewarded for participation in this priority.

The Provost took the most important step when he hired Deans for the College Arts and Sciences and the School of Business and Public Administration, both of whom are committed to partnerships and hold a set of personal values that make UMKC’s engagement with K-12 issues a natural priority. Interestingly, since my arrival as Chancellor, new deans are present in all of the schools that will be involved in this effort. Any project of this level of importance and priority requires committed leaders at all levels. The Provost has made it

clear to these Deans that, even in these extremely difficult budgetary times, this priority will be supported. Changing the faculty reward system is proving to be more difficult, however, both the Provost and I are confident that many faculty are naturally interested and it is those with whom we will work. In addition to the partnerships across schools and the reward system changes, two additional actions are in planning under the leadership of the Provost and they are:

a. Change the general education, lower division, curriculum. Currently, the deans and faculty in the School of Education and College of Arts and Sciences are working on revisions in the lower-division curriculum to include one course in each of the first two years built around the theme of Cultures and Community. I am told this course will also include a service learning component aimed at having our pre-education students in the schools during their first two years.

b. Design joint appointment opportunities. The Provost is working with the deans to make attractive joint appointments for content area faculty, including those who teach content-specific pedagogy across Schools at UMKC.

3) The Internal Culture and Actions of the School of Education. Within the School of Education, Dean Cleek has numerous initiatives underway.

a. Install new leadership within the School. The new leadership the Dean has installed at the division level in the School of Education includes a new Chair of the Division of Curriculum and Instruction and a newly established position of Director of Teacher Education. Both of these leaders were drawn from the ranks of senior faculty within the School of Education, providing some validation that, given the leadership and

framework, our faculty would rise to the occasion. These leaders are now developing plans to expand the clinical dimension of our undergraduate teacher education program.

b. Change the admissions approach to the teacher education program. I am told that like most schools and colleges of education, our pre-education students are not admitted to the School of Education until their junior year. The Dean and the faculty are currently exploring the possibility of pre-admitting these students to the School of Education in order to give the faculty a head start on preparing them for successful entry into the teaching profession.

c. Align teacher preparation curriculum with competencies. Again, I am told that, like most schools of education, our teacher preparation curriculum has not been designed to produce the competencies needed to teach in the urban schools. Faculty are in charge of curriculum at universities, and a core group of faculty in the School of Education is redesigning the curriculum.

d. Develop a two-way exchange program. This exchange program would allow University faculty from the School of Education to spend a semester in residence in the schools – the intention being to expose the faculty to the environment in which their students will teach, thereby, altering the curriculum and pedagogy to fit the environment. A teacher, counselor, and administrator in residence program that parallels the faculty exchange program, but in reverse is under discussion.

e. Increase and diversity the pool of teachers. In the planning stages is a program to increase the quantity, quality, and diversity of the pool of teacher education candidates. The pools to be developed are from the ranks of existing professionals (retraining) and from

minority students now in middle school. Part of the fund raising effort will include support for these candidates.

f. Launch a turning point academy. A Turning Point Academy is in the planning stages to be focused on minority high school students to assist them in acquiring the college prep skills that will help them complete a successful college degree program.

g. Additional Actions in early stages of planning are: (i) a graduate degree program that will bring aspiring teacher leaders and aspiring principals together, also to be delivered clinically in the schools, (ii) a leadership support program for existing and emerging educational leaders, with a particular focus on the role of principals, (iii) an assessment program for student performance that is linked to the curriculum and the pedagogy for the preparation of teachers, counselors, and leaders, and (iv) a virtual network of support directed at all teachers in the districts.

4) The Proposal to Establish a Teacher Preparation Academy. As this goes to press planning grant money has been acquired from two private foundations for the proposal developed primarily by Interim Dean Cleek but more recently in partnership with the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The Dean of Arts and Sciences is now a full partner and a number of faculty from the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences are participating.

The proposal has three features which, in my view, are vital to its success.

a. A clinical approach to education. I am told that the Teacher Academy model that we are developing is similar to the way we educate health professionals at UMKC. UMKC has had substantial success in teaching its teaching model for physicians, dentists and nurses, and we can learn from that teaching approach as we develop this new academy. For

example, the clinical, on-site experience of prospective teachers will start early and be integrated with theory through practice in the schools. A network of local schools has verbally committed to partner with UMKC in this effort. In each school, UMKC will have clinical professors, master teachers, teaching fellows, and teaching interns working as teams. This is similar to the docent team approach we use in the School of Medicine that includes physicians, residents, interns, and medical students from each year of medical school training.

b. Technology. Our technology goal is to link the professional development schools, the academy site, and the homes of the students with broadband technology and develop a curriculum that fully utilizes the network in teaching teachers, leaders, and the students. The broadband providers nationally indicate that what is missing for “broadband to take off” in America is a “killer application”. The education of students in public schools is viewed widely as one of several potential killer applications.

c. An Advisory Board of our Partners. I will take the lead inviting external constituents to serve on an advisory board chaired by Provost Ballard. The board will include the Deans, several K-12 superintendents and representatives from teacher leadership organizations, religious organizations, the technology company, and funding sources. The advisory board will be expected to take overall responsibility for improving Kansas City schools as evidenced by the performance of the students in these schools. To join the Board, each partner will be asked to take personal accountability for a specific outcome. Again, the willingness of people to engage at that level of accountability remains to be seen.

We know what we must do. Is the political will to accomplish the needed changes present? I am not sure but I am optimistic. This is not only an educational issue. It is a

public policy issue that will require a powerful concentration of political will. I concur with the conclusion advanced by the Carnegie Corporation: The major barriers to successful change in the way we prepare teachers for our schools are “time, money, politics, public opinion, and bureaucratic inertia.”

These are very significant barriers. Success will require the commitment of all the partners. It will require that commitment be sustained both through the successes and through the breakdowns when outcomes do not proceed as planned. I now believe we have the right plan and people at UMKC. Some early successes and evidence of committed partners are the next steps in achieving the dream. And,

“Allow me to share a dream. What if schools and universities were not two places, occasionally intersecting, but instead one place where teaching, learning, research, and community service were occurring all the time? What if human beings from preschool to postgraduate school occupied the same geographical location and constituted an intergenerational community of inquiry? What if we refused to accept the given that there must be two distinct cultures and instead created anew one culture, a community of learners? What if every citizen of this ‘school’ were committed to the same goals: to be a lifelong learner, to discover new knowledge, to help design and construct the learning organization, to share in the decision making, and to live and work as colleagues? How much more likely would it be that young people would become lifelong learners if they could each day observe, experience, and work with adults who were lifelong learners? How much more would teachers and youngsters learn if they were part of a culture replete with role models of the reflective practitioner, scholar, and researcher? How much more would the older scholars learn from the persistent presence of the younger scholars? And how much more relevant would the scholarship be? Research would be everyone’s work. The ten-year old researching the inhabitants of pond water, the doctoral student researching the inhabitants of pond water, and the professor doing the same would become colleagues in researching pond water. The meaning of teacher and of student would never again be seen in the same way. Nor would the pond water.”

Learning By Heart (p.27)
Roland Barth
2001

References

1. Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time* (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), 174 pp
2. Martin Heidegger, *Basic Writings* (New York: Harper and Row 1977) p. 193
3. Ford, Jeffrey D. “Organizational Change as Shifting Conversations”, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 12, no. 6, 1999 pp. 480-500.

4. Ford, Jeffrey D, Laurie W. Ford, Randall T. McNamara, "Resistance and the background conversations of change" *Journal of Organizational change Management* Vol. 15, No. 2, 2002. pp. 105-121.
5. Wheatley, Margaret J., 1992, *Leadership and the New Science*, Barret-Koehler, San Francisco
6. Kilmann, Ralph H. 2001, *Quantum Organizations*, Davies-Black, Palo Alto
7. Zohar, Danah, 1997, *Rewiring the Corporate Brain*, Barret-Koehler, San Francisco
8. Zohar, Danah, 1996) "Consciousness and Bose-Einstein Condensates" p. 439-450, 738 in *Towards a Science of Consciousness, The First Tucson Discussions and Debates* edited by Stuart R. Hameroff, Alfred W. Kazniak and Alwin C. Scott, MIT Press
9. Marshall, I.N. 1996, "Three Kinds of Thinking" p. 729-738 in *Towards a Science of Consciousness, The First Tucson Discussions and Debates* edited by Stuart R. Hameroff, Alfred W. Kazniak and Alwin C. Scott, MIT Press

10. From the Strategic Plan for UMKC: UMKC Goals and Measures 2006:

In 2006, we are a national leader in Scholarship and creative activity

Our faculty and staff are widely known both locally and nationally for providing intellectual, scientific, artistic, and administrative management leadership and breakthrough results. We are the authors and creators of a community of learners committed to producing new scholarly and creative initiatives and outcomes.

- Sponsored program awards reach \$60million of which \$40 million is in federal support
- Ten academic programs are ranked by national standards in the top ten.
- Five academic support programs are ranked by national standards in the top ten.

In 2006, we attract, nurture and develop responsible community leaders.

Students enroll at UMKC because of the intellectually stimulating academic environment, the vibrant and diverse campus life, and the interaction with and in the community. Graduates leave able and committed to making a difference in their families, workplaces, communities, organizations and society at large. This is reflected most immediately in the greater Kansas City area as well as the state of Missouri, the primary beneficiaries of our citizen-leaders.

- Enrollment management and diversity-in-action project goals are achieved, which include ranking among the top universities in graduating students of color and first generation college students.
- 80% of students and recent alumni say they are satisfied with their UMKC experience.
- 85% of businesses/organizations who employ/engage UMKC alumni say UMKC graduates are citizen-leaders.

In 2006, we are an essential community partner and resource

UMKC is Kansas City's university and is essential to the success and quality of life in our metropolitan Kansas City region. Our faculty and staff help solve community problems and enrich community life with their research, expertise and talent: our students learn from and serve with the community; and our university community serves our broader community as leaders and volunteers.

- 90% of community leadership says UMKC is one of the top 5 community assets.
- 50% of UMKC faculty, students and staff, respectively, engage in public scholarship, community-based or service learning, or community service

In 2006, we are a workplace of choice

Faculty and staff see themselves and their work as valued, making a difference, and a source of their own growth, development and possibilities. A strong demand to join UMKC exists because of these opportunities.

- 80% of employees say they enjoy working at UMKC, as indicated by a rating of 4 or higher on a scale of 1 to 5 on the workplace survey.
- 50% of our applicants cite our vision and values as one of their primary reasons for applying.
- The goals of the diversity-in-action project are achieved.

In 2006, we have the resources to fuel our vision.

Our resources power transformational change: ensure sustainable excellence; foster creativity and innovation; and unleash human potential to realize UMKC's mission, vision, and goals.

- Our composite financial health index is 7.5 on a 10-point scale
- Our revenue growth and diversification goals for financial freedom are achieved.
- Our resources are allocated to priorities such that our core programs/

