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The Transformation Imperative: reframing the university explored disparate perspectives on the future of universities and some emerging frameworks for delivering education as we enter a phase of significant disruption in higher education.
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Some issues in higher education now are that students want more control, greater sense of agency, more flexibility, lower costs, and an assurance of the value of education.

This opening discussion is intended to identify the current critiques of higher education and invite you to share your perspectives for ways that we can productively challenge the university model and propose new frameworks.

Our goal is to develop several models for addressing the questions that emerge from this discussion that then become opportunities for change in higher education.
What challenges could the new model respond to?

The changing relationships between faculty and students.

The changing boundaries within the walls of the university.

The integration of problem-based learning.
  Interest to seek answers to unfamiliar problems.
  Need for diversity of resources to address problems.

The shift from an insulated to a more open model of the university.

A dissonance between needs of the individual and what the institution provides.
What are the new identities?
Mental model of oneself entering an institution
Goals, ambitions, driving interests of the student from the institution?
What a student wants today?

What is Peers Incorporated in the world of higher education?
How are universities responding to the “grand challenges” with design and design thinking?

What are the new forms of agency?
Who is responsible for education at an institution?
What are new capabilities we want our students to develop?

What is the value proposition for university education?
Who is the student?
What are new values?
Is education itself or a means to an end?
How do they create meaning?
NEW MODEL: KEY CHARACTERISTICS

Driving reason:
To develop a student who is empowered to act and has the resources, characteristics, and broader awareness to do so effectively and wisely.

• Supported by a **consortium** of academic and non-academic institutions focused on innovation.

• **Outcomes**-based, students advance as they achieve outcomes or stages of outcomes.

• **Modular** curriculum (lean core + problem framing + problem solutions)

• Distinctive Learning **Experiences**, assessed by impact.

• Set up systems that encourage **motivation** and the need to learn: “pull rather than push.”
What would the role of the institution be to create the ideal conditions for Nexus Learning?

What happens when we extend Nexus Learning beyond a pedagogy and make it a central principle for designing new programs and learning experiences?
Platform learning

- Asking the right questions
- Collaboration across networks
- Entrepreneurialism & initiative
- Accessing & evaluating information
- Agility & flexibility
- Communication
- Curiosity & Imagination

Tony Wagner, Core Competencies from “Play, passion, purpose,” TEDxNYED, 2012.
Ultimately the goal would be for the institution as a platform to allow students, faculty, staff to accomplish things beyond it.
Structure for working groups

OUTCOME:
• End up with a program that we could do here.

PROCESS:
• Design a real program make it as concrete as possible within the limited time frame.
• Position it within the institution and external environment.

DELIVERABLES:
• Create a scenario that describes the experience of an individual student moving through the program.
• Create an elevator pitch for the program (to sell the program and address what people need from higher education).

CONSIDERATIONS:
• Where are the levers for substantive change?
• How do you get from here to there?
• How do you make the end state real?
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