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Process and Purpose

Chancellor Miller presented his Invent the Future (ITF) design on 22 September 2014, the purpose of which was “to reflect deeply as an institution about the strategy, operation, creative potential and organization of the University for the purpose of developing and embracing a narrative and vision of a growing institution as a state-wide and national innovation leader in a time of great change in American public higher education.” The structure outlined by Chancellor Miller included a Steering Committee and four Working Groups: 1) Academic Portfolio, 2) Enrollment, 3) Innovation & Growth, and 4) Partnerships & External Affairs. The Steering Committee was formed, which included many members from the Chancellor Search and Screen Committee and two new members. The Steering Committee met first on 26 September 2014 and reviewed the charges and structure set forth in the ITF document. The Committee solicited nominations for Working Group Members from the University Committee, Academic Staff Committee, University Staff Advisory Council, and Student Government Association from which they developed memberships for the four Working Groups. Additionally, members of the Steering Committee served on Working Groups and during the early weeks of the process members of the campus community expressed interest in serving on a Working Group and were invited to join.

Chancellor Miller established a timeline for the 2014-2015 phase of the ITF process in which the Working Groups were to complete their tasks by 1 March 2015 and the Steering Committee was to complete its work by 1 April 2015. The Steering Committee was charged with populating the Working Groups, approving Working Group schedules, providing feedback on updates from the Working Groups and to summarize and draw conclusions from the ITF process. The Steering Committee met five times during the fall semester. Initial discussions focused on formulating the Working Groups and clarifying the roles and outcomes of both the Working Groups and Steering Committee. The Committee established a guiding structure for their tasks per the original time frame, discussed President Cross’ Talent Initiative in relation to the ITF process, and created a guide for the Working Groups. In early November, the Committee agreed on an approach to data collection to avoid repeated asks for the same information from campus entities, discussed the need for a way to efficiently share data, and provided feedback to the Working Groups based on their first Interim Reports. The remaining fall meetings included updates from the Working Group Chairs and discussion about interdisciplinarity at UWGB and a discussion about competency based learning. A few groups discussed the topic of interdisciplinarity as part of this process and it is clear that there are differing opinions about most every aspect of interdisciplinarity from its very definition, to its interpretation as a degree requirement, to its impact on funding and organizational structure. The Steering Committee did not meet during January.

In late January, as a result of the severe budget cuts proposed by the Governor, Chancellor Miller requested that this phase of the ITF process be concluded by mid-February to allow the elements explored and ideas developed to be submitted for consideration during the budget process. Thus, the Working Groups were charged with submitting their Final Reports by 9 February. The new timeline afforded the Steering Committee only one final meeting to distill the Working Group Reports. While the majority of people involved in the ITF process expected that their work be given consideration, the shortened timeline did not allow the Steering Committee and Working Groups to complete their tasks as planned. Important research, data collection, and discussions did not take place that would have allowed the Groups and Committee to present more fully formed catalogs of
ideas and recommendations. Most notably, the following elements were not studied or are incomplete: 1) evaluation of overall program array, 2) approach to interdisciplinary education, 3) competency-based assessment, 4) the region’s perception of UWGB as a leader in the area of partnerships, 5) research and evaluation of potential partnerships, 6) evaluation of current resources as they pertain to partnerships, and 7) discussion to sufficiently distill the ideas and recommendations presented to the Steering committee by the Working Groups.

The final meeting of the Steering Committee focused on the most effective way to present the findings of the ITF process. Given the lack of time for all parties to fully complete their work, the Committee determined to present the connections that emerged from the findings, recommendations, and ideas of the four Working Groups. What follows is a summary of the key themes, including examples. The examples are not intended to indicate priorities nor are they exhaustive. The Committee has developed two versions of this report. The first includes this report in its entirety and the Executive Summaries from the four Working Group Final Reports. The second version includes this report in its entirety and the complete Final Reports of the Working Groups: 1) Academic Portfolio, 2) Enrollment, 3) Innovation & Growth, and 4) Partnerships & External Affairs. The Committee highly recommends reading the Working Group Final Reports for details related to the themes presented below.

**Vision**

The Committee believes it is imperative that we create an internal culture of mutual responsibility and engagement for the wellbeing of the University. This culture must be built into the structure of the University to have widespread and lasting impact. Existing structures should be examined to determine where inefficient and ineffective systems hinder opportunities for advancements and growth. Operative structures are needed to improve efforts aimed at recruiting and retaining students, advising students, developing partnerships, promoting the University, establishing collaborations, and supporting faculty and staff.

**Themes**

**Academic Portfolio**

UWGB should offer a balance and array of programs to fulfill the liberal arts mission of our institution and preserve interdisciplinarity. Flexibility in program array is increasingly important to be vital in today’s higher education marketplace. The program array must prepare students to meet changing and emerging employment opportunities and for global citizenship in a dynamic world.

Academic offerings must extend the reach of the institution to maintain financial health and be an economic force in the region. We must utilize current resources and strengths in determining program expansions. Instructional formats must be able to serve local and global populations. A campus-wide discussion along with research should be instigated to develop a strategic plan to expand online offerings. The administration and support of expanded online offerings will be critical components to succeed.
Interdisciplinarity was the idea around which academic Units were formed when UW Green Bay was founded. Today, there is not a clear conceptualization and application of the interdisciplinary idea across all academic units and degree requirements. However, interdisciplinarity remains a strong and positive force in shaping approaches to teaching, research and service. In addition to interdisciplinarity, a UWGB degree offers depth and breadth. To this, the identification and assessing of specific skills is worth consideration as an educational component. While the topic of interdisciplinarity was not fully discussed due to time constraints, it is suggested that the next phase of the ITF process include an examination of new ways to approach achieving this important component of a UWGB education.

As the ITF process continues, the Committee hopes that the Graduate Studies Council will be included in the process given that the instructions set forth in this stage of the process did not include examination of graduate studies opportunities. The Graduate Studies Council has been active in developing and researching graduate programs and the Committee acknowledges the importance of graduate programs to the future of the UW Green Bay.

The appendices of the Final Report from the Academic Portfolio Working Group contain the entire list of programs, emphases, and certificates submitted during this process. Time did not permit exploring the viability of all of these programs and therefore we submit them for consideration during the next phase of the process.

**Partnerships & Community Connections**

The University is a valuable resource to the region and has the potential to become an even greater resource. We have strong outreach programs and activities connected with community programming and academic programs. In addition, the faculty has passion for building partnerships and employees have strong personal connections in the community. While continuing the many valuable relationships we have established with schools, community organizations, businesses, and industry, developing new partnerships that are mutually beneficial for faculty, students, and external partners will contribute to the University’s mission to serve the region. We can utilize current human resources to further explore the needs of the region and extend the reach and visibility of the University. We suggest establishing a structure and processes that are user friendly to internal and external parties in an effort to become a central constituent in the development and continuance of partnerships, collaborations, and entrepreneurial activities in collaboration with businesses, industry, public entities, and community organizations. The proper infrastructure will provide organization, streamline efforts, and facilitate efficiency and growth in this facet of the University’s activities and relations with external units.

Partnerships exist in many forms, including academic partnerships. In an effort to increase enrollments, meet students’ interests, and prepare students for employment and global citizenship, the Committee recommends exploring more links between technical and community colleges and high schools. The skills and content offered at two-year institutions may be combined with our academic offerings, experiences, and activities in new ways adding valuable degree components that will prepare students to succeed in a rapidly changing work environment and for lifelong learning.
**Enrollment**

Enrollment is and will continue to be a challenge. As stated previously, responsibility for recruiting and retaining students must become part of UWGB’s culture. A system and infrastructure that support enrollment initiatives and connect activities and opportunities for recruiting is essential to achieving widespread participation by university departments and personnel in order to address this challenge. Additional research, data collection, and discussion must occur to develop a structure that encompasses the many areas of campus that impact recruitment and retention. While there may be a multitude of ways in which recruiting and retention efforts can be enhanced, the Committee offers the following ideas to support this critical aspect of the University’s wellbeing: 1) develop a web site that offers easy access to information expected and required to compete in any market, 2) increase partnerships, 3) increase high impact practices, and 4) embrace the principles and practices of undergraduate research, scholarship, and creative activities (URSCA). Engaging students in high impact practices and campus life are suggested ways in which to improve recruitment and retention. The web site must serve as a valuable resource for students offering them information about opportunities and services that will further connect them with the people and activities of the University. Adopting data platform tools that track students and their activities from application through life as alumni will assist in developing allegiances to the University.

**Processes & Methods**

The research and discussions carried out by the Working Groups indicate that there are processes and practices in place that restrict our ability to be flexible and responsive to student needs and economic needs of the region. There are processes that can be streamlined to allow for greater responsiveness, such as those associated with new programs, emphases, individual major, and certificates.

The Committee suggests that decision making must be evidence-based with clear metrics and goals in order to promote innovation, growth, and determine future directions in all aspects of the enterprise, such as academic offerings, partnerships, growth agendas, and collaborations—both academic and business/community oriented. Pliant and transparent administrative and decision-making processes are needed to create and market new and existing programs and partnerships. The Committee acknowledges that not all faculty, staff, and administrators are trained in evidence-based processes and a structure may be needed to assist with the implementation of such processes to effectively utilize data.

**Marketing, Promotion, & Reputation**

A culture of mutual responsibility that includes all university personnel promoting and highlighting the innovative, high quality, and expansive range of research and creative activities, experiential learning, and high impact practices conducted by faculty, staff, and students will contribute to the University’s positive reputation. All supporters of the University should take and make every opportunity to promote the University; any and every interaction can contribute to this mission.

We suggest exploring opportunities, academic and otherwise, that encourages entrepreneurial endeavors and adds to students’ credentials. The proposed **badge system** offers attractive
advantages for our students and would highlight many of the skills and experiences afforded to students as part of their education at UWGB but not apparent in our current credentialing system.

External messaging about academic offerings and the advantages of an interdisciplinary education must be clear and relatable to potential students, their families, and employers. Feedback from various constituents indicates this will likely enhance recruitment and retention efforts. The demand for online instruction is on the rise for both on-campus and off-campus students. Online courses must increase student engagement to make our offerings desirable to the local, national, and global markets and improve the perception of academics at UWGB. The University’s web site and promotional activities should showcase the impressive examples of student, faculty, and staff projects that have utilized an interdisciplinary approach, demonstrate high impact practices, and draw attention to partnerships.

Conclusion
The Committee believes the Working Group Final Reports provide a solid starting place for exploring future directions for UW Green Bay. We expect that these documents will serve well the next phase of the Invent the Future process. It is the hope of the Steering Committee that both established and new groups will discuss and study the ideas and recommendations in the Final Reports. There has been widespread campus participation in the ITF process to date and many ideas have been generated during the past four months. The Steering Committee encourages reading the Working Group Final Reports in their entirety.

- Academic Portfolio Working Group Final Report
- Enrollment Working Group Final Report
- Innovation & Growth Working Group Final Report
- Partnerships & External Affairs Working Group Final Report
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Invent the Future Design Document

Invent the Future

University of Wisconsin – Green Bay

Design

September 22, 2014

“The purpose of Invent the Future of the University of Wisconsin—Green Bay is to reflect deeply as an institution about the strategy, operation, creative potential and organization of the University for the purpose of developing and embracing a narrative and vision of a growing institution as a state-wide and national innovation leader in a time of great change in American public higher education.”

Gary L. Miller, Chancellor

Introduction

The transition of a new Chancellor is a unique opportunity for an institution to reflect on its values, mission and future. The opportunity for this reflection is particularly important at this time of great change in American public higher education and in response to the changing demographic and economic environment in Wisconsin. The Invent the Future initiative is a coordinated, institution-wide process designed to accomplish this institutional self-reflection over the eight month period between October 2014 and May 2015. The initiative will be accomplished even as the operations of the university continue and, thus, will require enormous energy and commitment from everyone on campus. The goal is the development of a clear and compelling vision of the future of the University of Wisconsin – Green Bay along with strong recommendations about how to achieve that vision.

Goals of Invent the Future

The activities of the Invent the Future initiative are designed to accomplish the following specific goals:

- Review current approach in critical operational areas.
- Review articulation and efficacy of the interdisciplinary approach.
- Review university organizational structure in relationship to dynamic environment in higher education.
- Review institutional approach to community partnerships.

In addition to these goals, a new more transparent process for university planning and innovation is being implemented (see University Planning Design attached).

Invent the Future Structure
The structure for Invent the Future is depicted in Figure 1. Separate working groups will consider the University’s approach in four important areas: Innovation and growth, enrollment, academic portfolio and partnerships and external affairs. The activities of these groups will be organized and supported by a Steering Committee.

Working with university governance and senior leadership, the Steering Committee will develop the membership for the working groups. Members will be appointed by the Chancellor. Some overlap in working group membership is desirable in order to encourage the broadest discussions possible.

![Invent the Future Design](image)

**Figure 1. Invent the Future Design.**

### Group Charges and Goals

Following are the initial charges and goals for the Steering Committee and each of the working groups. While each group has a specific charge, there are elements for consideration that transcend all groups. For example, as they discuss their topic, each working group should consider broad university structure such as organization, leadership and external factors. Moreover, it is essential that each working group provide insights and recommendations about how President Cross’ system-wide talent initiative will operate at UWGB.

An important goal of this process is to create an environment for innovative thinking about the future of the university. Thus, the charges of the various working groups are designed as starting points for the group. It is hoped innovative directions will emerge from the work of each group.

### Steering Committee

The Chancellor’s Search and Screen Committee has been re-tasked to serve as the Steering Committee for the Invent the Future initiative. Through its extended work together in the Chancellor search process that group developed a unique perspective about the University’s challenges and opportunities and its leadership position in Wisconsin and the nation. The group has also developed a highly collaborative and collegial working relationship that will help it work efficiently.

The goal of the steering committee is to help initiate, monitor, organize and summarize Invent the Future initiative. Specifically the Steering Committee will:

- Populate the working group membership.
- Approve working group schedules.
- Hear updates and final reports from working groups.
- Summarize and draw conclusions from Invent the Future process.
The Steering Committee will also take on the issue of reevaluating our approach to interdisciplinarity and efficacy of the 360 degrees of learning branding program.

**Innovation & Growth**

In order for the university to prosper, it must position itself for innovation, develop a philosophy of growth and create and deploy well-constructed and impactful strategies for the integration of technology into learning, faculty research and operations. Among the activities of this group are:

- Recommend a university growth philosophy and suggest process and targets for such growth.
- Provide the key elements for a university-wide eLearning strategy and suggest a process for achieving the strategy.
- Investigate university capacity for evidence-based decision making at all levels and suggest approach to increase this capacity.
- Suggest approaches for the university to take advantage of growing opportunities and markets in areas such as health care, smart manufacturing, resource recovery and data analytics.

**Enrollment**

The University faces both proximate and long-term challenges in enrollment. The goal of this group is to carefully examine the assumptions and processes of our current enrollment strategy and recommend an enrollment approach that meets current and future challenges.

- Critique the current enrollment strategy.
- Suggest ways in which to develop a culture of institutional responsibility for enrollment.
- Suggest investments that will place the university in a competitive advantage in enrollment.

It is important this group be composed of members of the university community not involved in the current enrollment approach.

**Academic Portfolio**

The proposition that the University’s interdisciplinary approach and academic portfolio is consistent with contemporary demands of career and the modern imperative of public higher education to directly support talent creation and economic development must be carefully considered and affirmed or adjusted. This is the goal of this working group. Specific activities may include:

- Review academic program portfolio.
- Suggest ways to directly link interdisciplinarity with career success.
- Suggest how program efficacy can be included in the program review process.
- Suggest strategies for expanding graduate programs.

**Partnerships and External Affairs**

The University currently supports a large number of community outreach programs. These programs have created a strong base of support in the community. However, there is a growing expectation in the community that the university will take a leadership role in creating partnerships directly related to regional economic growth and prosperity. The Engineering Technology program is a good example of such expectations. Others are emerging in the areas of entrepreneurship and health care. Meeting this expectation will give the university important new opportunities for faculty and students and expand the
level of advocacy for the university in Wisconsin. An important goal of this working group is to examine our capacity to meet this leadership opportunity.

In addition to the opportunity for community leadership, the university must present a clear and passionate message about itself in the community. This includes all aspects of our external presentation including the web page, social media as well as traditional marketing approaches. Another goal of this group is to examine our current marketing and external communications strategies.

Among the possible activities of this group are:

- Suggest how the university might better organize for external partnerships.
- Analyze and make recommendations regarding the University marketing and communications strategy.
- Analyze and make recommendations regarding the university web page.

**Schedule and Milestones**

The *Invent the Future* initiative will begin October 1 and conclude at the end of the Spring 2015 semester. The vision narrative for the coming decade will emerge from the exercise with the first elements to be part of the Chancellor’s installation remarks in November 2014. Following is the proposed schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Achieved by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Populate working groups</td>
<td>October 1, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish <em>Invent the Future</em> we page</td>
<td>October 1, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working groups first interim reports to Steering Committee</td>
<td>October 31, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor’s Installation Remarks</td>
<td>November 14, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working groups second interim reports to Steering Committee</td>
<td>February 1, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final recommendations and reports to Steering Committee</td>
<td>March 1, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report from Steering Committee</td>
<td>April 1, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision rollout</td>
<td>End of Spring Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect with 50th year celebration</td>
<td>End of Spring Semester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Portfolio Working Group Final Report

Invent the Future- Academic Portfolio Working Group
Final Report to the Invent the Future-Steering Committee

Executive Summary

The Academic Portfolio Working Group was charged with exploring the university’s academic offerings and suggesting ways to link to interdisciplinarity to academic success. To meet these goals, we discussed four main areas:

1. Identifying possible new majors/certificates/emphases the university could offer.
2. Developing a portfolio/badge system to showcase the skills students develop and the works they create.
3. Discussing the university’s approach to interdisciplinarity and the strengths and limitations of that approach.
4. Identifying ways to increase student involvement in undergraduate research, scholarship, and creative activities

Three subgroups were created to meet these goals: New Majors/Certificates/Emphases, Portfolio/Badge System, and Potential Policy Changes.

With regard to New Majors, Certificates, and Emphases, the subgroup compiled data from faculty and staff across campus to generate a list of possible ideas. The list was extensive and, due to the compressed timeline, we were unable to develop specific recommendations for short-term, intermediate, and long-term program development, we made the following recommendations:

1. Distribute the list of new programs/certificates to all UWGB faculty and staff and encourage deans and departments to further develop the ideas.
2. Develop a working group to explore a potential “certificate initiative” (e.g. demand for certificates, audience interest in certificates, marketing certificates, etc.).
3. Identify a different mechanism to propose and start new programs.

Regarding the Portfolio/Badge System, the subgroup developed a preliminary vision of a model whereby student portfolios and/or badges could be used to make the interesting projects students complete more visible and demonstrate the obtainment of particular skills (e.g., research, data analysis, coding, critical thinking). We recommend the following:

1. Move to the system of “Skills, Breadth, Depth” where breadth is achieved through general education, depth is achieved through the chosen major, and the skills students develop are made outward facing through a badge system.

Regarding Interdisciplinarity, the working group focused mostly on our budgetary structure and the requirement that students obtain an interdisciplinary major or minor to graduate. The consensus of the working group was that the interdisciplinary mission is valuable and worth preserving but there was little consensus as to whether or not we are meeting our mission in the best way. We also explored different mechanisms by which we can meet our mission. We recommend the following:
1. Explore the effectiveness of the requirement that students have an interdisciplinary major or minor in meeting our problem-focused, interdisciplinary mission.
2. Explore a new process for setting up an individualized major that is less taxing on the faculty members and students involved and make the option of an individualized major more visible to students.
3. Implement a university policy that allows for increased opportunities to team teach as a way of fostering a culture of interdisciplinarity.
4. Explore how we communicate our mission to the public as well as how we market our majors. Consider questions like whether or not the names of our majors best describe them, whether or not our website and other recruitment materials best describe the mission and programs, and whether or not the pathways to particular careers are visible via our marketing materials.

Finally, regarding finding ways to increase student involvement in undergraduate research, scholarship, and creative activities we recognized that these high impact experiences are important elements of student learning, and are central to our mission of providing a problem-focused, interdisciplinary education. Such experiences also provide us with opportunities to showcase the outcomes of our interdisciplinary approach. Given the transformative nature of such experiences, we recommend the following:

1. Support initiatives by the Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning and elsewhere on campus intended to increase student participation in such activities and reward faculty who work with students on such activities.

Invent the Future- Academic Portfolio Working Group
Final Report to the Invent the Future-Steering Committee

Committee Membership

Andrew Austin, Sue Bodilly, Sarah Busko, Caroline Boswell, Matt Dornbush, Mike Draney, Susan Gallagher-Lepak, Cheryl Grosso, Doreen Higgins, Amanda Hruska, Jen Lanter, Ryan Martin (chair), Nicole Miller, Amanda Nelson, Chuck Rybak, Mary Simonsen, Christine Style, Brian Sutton, Lisa Tetzloff, Erin Van Daalwyk, Steve Vandensavond, and Bryan Vescio.

I would like to first express my deep gratitude to rest of the committee for their hard work, thoughtful discussion, and willingness to offer and consider big ideas. Special thanks, in particular, go to the three subgroup chairs (Amanda Nelson, Chuck Rybak, and Jen Lanter). I would also like to express that, while I understand the need for the accelerated timeline, a consequence of that acceleration was that our work feels unfinished to many of us. There are ideas in this report that are not as fully formed as we would have liked or had originally planned.
The Academic Portfolio Working Group Charge

Below is the specific charge Chancellor Miller provided to the Academic Portfolio Working Group. It comes from the Invent the Future-Design document he sent out to all Faculty and Staff on September 26th.

The proposition that the University’s interdisciplinary approach and academic portfolio is consistent with contemporary demands of career and the modern imperative of public higher education to directly support talent creation and economic development must be carefully considered and affirmed or adjusted. This is the goal of this working group. Specific activities may include:

- Review academic program portfolio.
- Suggest ways to directly link interdisciplinarity with career success.
- Suggest how program efficacy can be included in the program review process.
- Suggest strategies for expanding graduate programs.

That charge was clarified for us after a lengthy discussion with Chancellor Miller at our second meeting (October 21st) where he clarified his goals for the group. He stated that he was looking for an inventory of creative ideas to help the university “rekindle and recapture the innovative spirit” UW-Green Bay was founded on. He recognized that many of these ideas would require governance actions and that our purpose was not to implement changes but to engage in a “frank and lively discussion” about what we offer and how to communicate what we offer to the community. He discussed concerns about enrollment relevant to the work of the APW stating that feedback he receives from the community suggests that some of our enrollment difficulty is due to not offering the programs potential students are looking for. He also expressed concerns about our ability to grow within our interdisciplinary model stating that we’re not big enough and that UW-System doesn’t look to us for possible programs (e.g., engineering) because our model doesn’t allow for them. We were also instructed not to worry about graduate programs because sufficient work had already begun with regard to our graduate offerings.

Meetings and Subgroups

The Academic Portfolio Working (APW) Group met seven times to discuss a wide range of topics including possible new majors and certificates, a badge and portfolio system, our approach to interdisciplinary, support for undergraduate research, scholarship, and creative activities, and other topics. To accomplish this work, we set up three subgroups charged as follows:

1. **New Majors/Certificates/Emphases:** This subgroup, chaired by Amanda Nelson, will explore new programs that would meet community needs (students and employers) and be consistent with the University’s mission. The subgroup will gather information and data to develop ideas for immediate, short-term, and long-term program development. The subgroup was encouraged not to become bogged down by concerns of resources. Membership included Andrew Austin, Sue Bodilly, Sarah Busko, Caroline Boswell, Susan Gallagher-Lepak, Doreen Higgins, Amanda Hruska, Amanda Nelson (chair), Christine Style, and Steve Vandenaavond.

2. **Portfolio/Badge System:** This subgroup, chaired by Chuck Rybak, will explore the possible development of a student portfolio system that integrates badge achievement. Badges would
mark the achievement of particular skills (e.g., critical thinking, creative writing, data analysis) and students could earn them by completely projects in or out of class. Membership included Mike Draney, Cheryl Grosso, Nicole Miller, Chuck Rybak (chair), Lisa Tetzloff, and Bryan Vescio.

3. Potential Policy Changes: This subgroup, chaired by Jen Lanter, will explore particular policies that may require amending to make for greater progress or expand potential for student success. Examples of policies under exploration are policies regarding team teaching, the process of setting up an individualized major, the requirement of an interdisciplinary major or minor. Membership included Matt Dornbush, Jennifer Lanter (chair), Ryan Martin, Brian Sutton, Erin Van Daalwyk.

What follows is a description of the 4 areas on which we focused our attention: New Majors/Certificates/Emphases, Portfolio/Badge System, Interdisciplinarity, and Undergraduate Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities.

New Majors/Certificates/Emphases

The bulk of our work on exploring new majors, certificates, and emphases was completed by the New Majors/Certificates/Emphases Subgroup. The subgroup gathered information from department chairs, faculty and staff in LAS and the College of Professional Studies (p. 11-12). Additionally, information was collected from Linda Peacock-Landrum and colleagues in the Career Center asking for areas of study that enrolled students often indicate to the Career Center they wish UW-Green Bay had or areas of study that cause students to leave UW-Green Bay and seek out another educational institution (p. 13). A fairly high number of options for certificates was identified by chairs and faculty. In contrast, Linda Peacock-Landrum provided most majors (e.g. architecture, speech pathology, etc.) rather than certificates or emphases.

After compiling a list of suggested new programs, certificates, and emphases in all disciplines across campus, the subgroup had a lively discussion to outline specific criteria that would provide justification for implementing proposed programs or certificates (p. 14). Although 19 factors were originally identified as potential criteria, the subgroup narrowed the conversation to two focal points: resources and demand. It was agreed that additional information was needed from the contact person of each new suggested program to construct a more thorough, informative report. Each contact person was asked to provide the following:

- brief summary of the proposed program
- discussion of the resources available to develop/run the program (i.e. interactions with current programs, potential for growth across disciplines, community partnerships, 2+2 programs, faculty passion to move the proposal forward, etc.)
- discussion regarding the demand for the program (i.e. student demand, market demand, regional need, etc.)
- barriers that prevented this proposal from moving forward in the past

After compiling information and data from each contact person (p. 15-51), the committee reconvened for discussion. Despite the steering committee’s request that the subgroup develop ideas for short-term, intermediate, and long-term program development, the subgroup came to the conclusion that they were not in a position to prioritize the suggested new programs/certificates.
The submitted proposals provided various levels of development and detail and the subgroup lacked expertise in each proposal’s field.

**Portfolio/ Badge System**

The working group explored the use of student portfolios and/or badges as ways of making the interesting projects students complete more visible and demonstrating the obtainment of particular skills (e.g., research, data analysis, coding, critical thinking). A portfolio/badge system would delineate the skills and experiences students acquire in their course work, individualized learning experiences like research assistantships, internships, independent studies, etc. and, as well as work done under the supervision of staff, and make these skills and experiences more visible to both the students and potential employers.

The subgroup dedicated to exploring a portfolio/badge system arrived at a consensus about one significant point: a badge system of some form is worth pursuing and we feel it would be fairly easy to propose different systems and develop nimble pilot efforts. Our hope would be not to mimic other systems, but develop something that is unique to us, in both composition and result. Furthermore, given the immediate budget situation, this is a proposal that largely relies on existing resources, especially in the early stages.

The group saw a badge system at UW-Green Bay as something that works in concert with our existing credentialing mechanisms: grades, transcripts, certificates, etc., rather than replacing anything. Therefore, the system should not duplicate existing credentialing and governance structures, but instead serve as an opportunity for innovation and experimentation. In addition, a more adaptive, organic system will encourage participation from various areas of campus who might benefit: faculty, staff, students, and maybe even local partnerships/employers.

There are a number of potential avenues as to how to proceed:

First, producing a proposal draft that includes permutations of what a system might look like. Primary issues to address include:

- Developing authority
- Issuing authority
- Badge content
- Tracking earned badges
- Fluidly connecting our system to employers
- Horizontal and Vertical application (i.e. using both across and within curricular structures)

Preliminary research done by the subgroup identified different options for starting the badge system. First, Mozilla, which offers “Open Badges” rather than “Digital Badges.” The distinction between the two is that “Open Badges” have safer/firmer metadata standards that confirm their authenticity.

GB could become a badge issuer, have our own badge insignia, and maybe even our own “GB Backpack,” which is simply what people use to “carry” their badges. Interestingly, Mozilla is supported by The Macarthur Foundation and HASTAC (among others), and these institutions
prioritize learning over profit (see here: http://openbadges.org/). The site also lists other issuing systems for reference.

From a resource perspective, it is important to note that a badge and portfolio system would require a need for campus IT involvement. The Mozilla site provides some information on this, which is helpful regardless of which path we were to choose: https://wiki.mozilla.org/Badges/Onboarding-Issuer.

Advantages of a portfolio/badge system are as follows:

1. They are flexible and can be used to accomplish what we want them to accomplish. The more unique it is to us, the more creative, the more purchase it might have when drawing students, and the eyes of potential employers, to our campus. Badge systems currently exist in contexts like Code Academy, Khan Academy, Mozilla, and other online education venues (like Competency-based education), specifically as a way to document the completion of lessons. There is no reason to be limited by a narrow conception of use.
2. A badge system could be attached to our General Education program, but also be included in all areas of our curriculum. UWGB does “breadth” and “depth” very well right now, with those being the gen eds and majors, respectively. A badge system would add “skills” to that equation in a marketable way: “At UWGB we guarantee skills, breadth, and depth.”
3. The system should also be overdetermined, meaning that at any given time, there are multiple classes across the university where students could earn badges, say in “Basic HTML,” “translation,” “Social Media,” “Copy Editing,” “Applied Research,” “Interviewing,” “Collaboration,” etc. If such a horizontal system were in place, there is no reason why departments and units could not strategize to vertically align courses in a way that helps build a “stackable” sequence of badges that best suit them and speak to both specialized and general audiences about what their graduates can do.
4. Finally, we could have a database of accumulated badges (and maybe other information/documents from other initiatives) that was student portable and immediately accessible to potential employers for free. There would also be an interface where employers could communicate things/skills they are looking for, as it would help us develop badges to meet those needs. This aligns perfectly with the concept of the student portfolio, digital or otherwise, which is something we have also talked about exploring.

**Interdisciplinarity**

Our work on the topic of interdisciplinarity was completed largely through discussions amongst the full working group and much of it focused on the importance of our budgetary structure and the requirement that students obtain an interdisciplinary major or minor to graduate. In addition to the discussions of the full working group, the subgroup on university policy was charged, in part, with exploring particular policies associated with how effectively we meet our interdisciplinary mission. The efforts of that subgroup are described here as well.

The consensus of the working group is that our interdisciplinary mission is valuable and worth preserving. It was argued by many that our budgetary structure allows for a culture of
interdisciplinarity that informs our teaching and scholarship in positive ways that are consistent with the university mission.

There was not consensus, however, as to whether or not we are meeting our mission in the most efficient way. Several members of the working group identified the following problems with our approach: a lack of student understanding of interdisciplinarity, the limitations our policy places on what students can choose to major and/or minor in, the ways our approach may weaken the disciplines on campus, and some felt that obtaining any two majors should count as meeting the interdisciplinarity major/minor requirement. Simultaneously, though, concerns were identified regarding how to maintain the culture of interdisciplinarity without our current policies in place. Several members expressed concern that removing the requirement that students have an interdisciplinary major or minor would lead to the eventual breakdown of the budgetary structure that so many members value.

To explore student perspectives of interdisciplinarity, the subgroup on policy obtained data from the Academic Advising Department. It should be noted that this information is based on personal accounts from staff in the Academic Advising Department and not formal data collected from students. Their perspective was that students find the interdisciplinary major/minor requirement problematic for the following reasons:

- Students do not understand how two different majors/minors do not satisfy the interdisciplinary requirement (i.e., English and Art; Political Science and Psychology).
- Advisors themselves demonstrate the ambiguity in the term interdisciplinary as each tends to explain it very differently depending on his or her background and experience.
- Many majors share support core curriculum that are similar but one is disciplinary and the other interdisciplinary (i.e., Biology and Human Biology) – how is interdisciplinary explained in this instance?
- Questions are raised as to what impact the interdisciplinary requirement has on degree completion time given that students with a disciplinary major must add an interdisciplinary minor.
- Student sometimes declare majors or minor they have no intent on completing in order to get a declaration hold removed so they can register.

The policy subgroup also explored university policy regarding other mechanisms that may enhance our approach to interdisciplinarity. Specifically, they looked at university policy regarding the individualized major and team-teaching of courses, as these were identified by members of the working group as powerful approaches to meeting our interdisciplinary mission.

Regarding the Individualized Major, after eliciting comments from Donna Ritch, it was determined there are only five to six students who take advantage of this opportunity in any given year. It is worth exploring the reasons why so few students utilize this option. Specific concerns the working group identified were that Individualized Major may not be as visible to students as it needs to be and the process of setting up an individualized major may be unnecessarily onerous.
Regarding team teaching, the subgroup found that there was no formal policy on how it happens across departments at UW-Green Bay. They surveyed team teaching policies at a wide variety of colleges and universities and found the following approaches in use:

- Full credit for teaching a course can be shared by two instructors
- Both instructors must actively participate in all phases of the course (i.e., the course is not simply taught via a “tagteam” model)
- Courses need to have higher enrollment (i.e., at least 24 students or 50 students depending on size of University)
  - Northwestern, for example, has a formula for this: anticipated enrollment for the course is at least n times greater than the minimum enrollment number for courses at that level [where n = the # of proposed faculty teachers and n > 2 will almost never be permitted].
- Team teaching assignments cannot infringe on a department’s ability to staff to staff the courses it needs to offer – an adequate number of courses must be offered to meet the demands of the students

Finally, the working group also discussed the idea that we should make a shift in our rhetorical emphasis away from philosophical discussions of the value of interdisciplinarity to more of a focus on problem-solving and the projects/work our interdisciplinary approach actually produces. In other words, rather than focus on interdisciplinarity as an abstract idea that we think is valuable, we should showcase the many impressive examples of student, faculty, and staff projects that have utilized an interdisciplinary approach.

**Undergraduate Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities**

Finally, the policy subgroup recognized that high impact experiences such as undergraduate research, scholarship, and creative activities (URSCA) are important elements of student learning, and are central to our mission of providing a problem-focused, interdisciplinary education. Such experiences also provide us with opportunities to showcase the outcomes of our interdisciplinary approach.

The policy subgroup on university policy explored URSCA, as well as other High Impact Experiences for students, and found that they support the following efforts by allowing students opportunities to develop qualities employers look for in high-quality job candidates, such as enhanced problem solving skills, enhanced oral communication skills, increased creativity and critical thinking, enhanced ability to work collaboratively with others, stimulation of curiosity, enhanced ability to learn independently (Osborn & Karukstis, 2009).

There are numerous benefits to the students, faculty and community – higher enrollment (recruitment & retention), improved student outcomes, increased faculty job satisfaction...

Data from the 2012 high impact experiences survey show that out of 112 instructors (41.6% response rate) who completed online questionnaire related to high impact experiences:

- 53.1% of instructors who responded to the survey reported involving undergraduate students in their research
• Of those who do not involve students in their research, 34.9% report some interest in doing so (N = 15)
• When asked what might be helpful for instructors interested in involving students in their research, the most common responses involved:
  o funding for research materials, to pay students
  o assistance in figuring out ways to involve students in research projects
  o more support from unit for conducting research with undergraduates
• The most commonly reported reasons for why an instructor is not interested in including students in their research include:
  o instructor is not currently conducting research
  o type of research is a solitary endeavor
  o too much work involved
  o students cannot do the types of work required
  o it would not be useful to students’ learning or is not relevant to teaching in their field
• Instructors report students complete research projects in 45% of classes; mostly in upper-level courses

Working Group Recommendations: Our “Catalog of Ideas”

What follows is a list of ideas we generated over the course of our work. Some come directly out of the subgroups while others were discussed by the full working group.

1. Based on the work of the subgroup for New Majors/Certificates/Emphases, we recommend the following:
   a. Distribute the list of new programs/certificates (starting on page 11) to all UWGB faculty and staff. Deans and departments should be encouraged to further develop the ideas, including campus-wide sessions led by the administration. Encourage units to continue to progress with ideas for new programs with existing resources (e.g. Academic Incubator). The subgroup stresses the need for transparency in this process and emphasizes that a suggested new program should not be excluded due to a lack of a direct advocate for the idea.
   b. Develop a working group to explore a potential “certificate initiative” (e.g. demand for certificates, audience interest in certificates, marketing certificates, etc.). The subgroup recognized a difference between “certificates” and “being certified”, which should be addressed by this working group due to the difference in audience.
   c. Identify a different mechanism to propose and start new programs. In addition to having faculty/staff and units suggest new programs, create a process where the administration facilitates program development. Through working group discussions, we identified multiple barriers to starting new academic programs, certificates, and/or areas of emphases. Specifically, resources (primarily not having enough faculty), ownership of subject matter, layers of approval, unit inflexibility, low administrative support, low faculty support, and an inadequate understanding of how to get started.

2. Move to the system of “Skills, Breadth, Depth” described by the Portfolio/Badges subgroup where breadth is achieved through general education, depth is achieved through the chosen major, and the skills students develop are made outward facing through a badge system. Additionally, make student projects more visible to the community through the use of student portfolios
3. Explore the effectiveness of the requirement that students have an interdisciplinary major or minor in meeting our problem-focused, interdisciplinary mission. Likewise, explore the formal data behind the concerns identified, anecdotally, by the Academic Advising Department.

4. Explore a new process for setting up an individualized major that is less taxing on the faculty members and students involved. Likewise, make that option more visible to students and advisor as a way of increasing usage of this potentially valuable opportunity.

5. Implement a university policy that allows for increased opportunities to team teach as a way of fostering a culture of interdisciplinarity and allowing more students to experience what is often a powerful learning opportunity.

6. Given the transformative nature of student involvement in undergraduate research, scholarship, and creative activities, support initiatives by the Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning and elsewhere on campus intended to increase student participation in such activities and reward faculty who work with students on such activities. Increasing student involvement here will also serve as a recruiting aid since potential students will likely be drawn to projects and concrete examples of the work being done on campus.

7. Explore how we communicate our mission to the public as well as how we market our majors. Consider questions like whether or not the names of our majors best describe them, whether or not our website and other recruitment materials best describe the mission and programs, and whether or not the pathways to particular careers are visible via our marketing materials (e.g., does a student who wishes to be a doctor, lawyer, computer programmer, etc. understand how to achieve those career goals at UW-Green Bay).
Appendices

New majors, minors, and emphases proposed by UWGB faculty/staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Aging/Gerontology</td>
<td>Doreen Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>Animation</td>
<td>Jeff Benzow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>B.F.A. In Writing and Applied Arts</td>
<td>Rebecca Meacham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Biology</td>
<td>Biomedical/biomolecular engineering</td>
<td>Craig Hanke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>Community Arts</td>
<td>Jeff Benzow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre/Dance</td>
<td>Dance Pedagogy and Dance Studies Minor</td>
<td>Laura Riddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre/Dance</td>
<td>Dance Pedagogy/Dance Studio Management Major</td>
<td>Laura Riddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Dance Studio Management</td>
<td>Riddle/Carlson-Garner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>Data Science (data analytics, statistics, business intelligence)</td>
<td>Gaurav Bansal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>Design in the Community</td>
<td>Jeff Benzow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUS</td>
<td>Digital and Public Humanities</td>
<td>Caroline Boswell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Entertainment Technology</td>
<td>Laura Riddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUS/Theatre/Design Arts</td>
<td>Film and Digital Media</td>
<td>Coury/Riddle/Benzow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Game Studies (emphasis w/in Information Science major)</td>
<td>Ben Geisler (US News)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>Information Graphics</td>
<td>Jeff Benzow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Latin American Studies</td>
<td>Hernan Fernandez-Meardi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>MSW/MBA or MSW/MPH joint programs</td>
<td>Joan Groessl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music/HUD</td>
<td>Music Therapy</td>
<td>Cheryl Grosso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>Problem Solving and Design Thinking</td>
<td>Jeff Benzow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Public History</td>
<td>Clif Ganyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Stage Management</td>
<td>Laura Riddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>Technology Platform</td>
<td>Jeff Benzow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**New certificates proposed by UWGB faculty/staff:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Proposed Certificate</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Accelerated Certification Tracks for Practicing Teachers</td>
<td>Cheryl Grosso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Aging/Gerontology Certificate</td>
<td>Doreen Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach &amp; Adult Access</td>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>Adolfo Garcia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URS</td>
<td>Environmental Planning and Design Certificate</td>
<td>Marcelo Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS/URS</td>
<td>Geographic Information Systems (GIS)/Problem-focused certificate</td>
<td>John Luczaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Gerontology Certificate</td>
<td>Joan Groessl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Graduate courses for Practicing Teachers</td>
<td>Cheryl Grosso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Hospital administration or entrepreneurship certificates</td>
<td>Susan Gallagher-Lepak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS</td>
<td>Industrial Hygiene Certificate</td>
<td>John Luczaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>International post-docs in nursing diagnosis</td>
<td>Susan Gallagher-Lepak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Legal Studies</td>
<td>Chris Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Music Pedagogy Certificate</td>
<td>Cheryl Grosso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS</td>
<td>OSHA HAZWOPER Certificate</td>
<td>John Luczaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Performer’s Certificate or graduate performance course work</td>
<td>Cheryl Grosso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJS</td>
<td>Pre-Law Certificate</td>
<td>Andrew Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Stage Makeup</td>
<td>Laura Riddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW Partnership</td>
<td>Substance Abuse Counselor Licensure</td>
<td>Sharon Locklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work/Outreach</td>
<td>Supervisor Certificate (or MSW credit course)</td>
<td>Joan Groessl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS</td>
<td>Water Resource Certificate</td>
<td>John Luczaj</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Program ideas without detail and without a faculty/staff proposal:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Student Demand</th>
<th>Market Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actuarial Science</td>
<td>student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biometrics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Analytics</td>
<td></td>
<td>US News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Lab Sciences or Medical Technology</td>
<td>student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer programmers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Job Trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE-W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology/Forensic Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>US News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber Security</td>
<td></td>
<td>US News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Marketing/Social Media Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE-W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>NE-W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness and Wellness Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE-W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Science</td>
<td>student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetic counselors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fastest Growing/BLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Physical Education</td>
<td>student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Promotion and Wellness</td>
<td>student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Specialties Teaches (post-secondary)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fastest Growing/BLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/organizational psychologists</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fastest Growing/BLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT/technology experts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Job Trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS/Management Information Systems</td>
<td>student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking specialists</td>
<td></td>
<td>Job Trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralegal Studies</td>
<td>student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal care aides/home health aides</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fastest Growing/BLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical therapists</td>
<td></td>
<td>Job Trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td></td>
<td>US News, NE-W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiology/Radiological Science/Sonography</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>Fastest Growing/BLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robotics</td>
<td></td>
<td>US News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Pathology/Communicate Disorders</td>
<td>student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports and Athletic Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE-W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports and Athletic Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE-W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Chain/Logistics</td>
<td>student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE-W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specific criteria that provide justification for implementing proposed programs and/or certificates.

Complete list of criteria suggested by the group:

Resources
  • Faculty expertise
  • Physical space
Market demand
Clusters
Community partnerships
Cost to develop program
Builds on existing programs/departments
Connections to mission
Wow factor of new
Revenue generating
Faculty passion
Limited in UW-System portfolio
Regional need/cultural need
Economic development
Faculty intellectual development and growth
Potential for multiple platforms
Graduate level potential
Attainable
Improve academic reputation
Adaptable

Final criteria deemed as the two focal points:

Resources
  • Builds on current programs
  • Growth – crosses disciplines, Units, etc.
  • Partnerships
  • 2 + 2
  • Passion for the idea
Demand
  • Student/market/regional
BFA in Writing and Applied Arts

Proposed by: Rebecca Meacham

Summary:
The BFA in Writing and Applied Arts is a 45-credit program of study of multiple forms of creative writing in an interdisciplinary context. Designed for students seeking professional experience in writing, editing, and literary production, this program would offer service learning opportunities in editing, community events, digital and public humanities, young writers’ mentorship, translation, and the book arts.

Resources:
UW-GB currently offers a B.A. in English with a Creative Writing emphasis. As of January, 2015, we have 73 declared English with Creative Writing emphases. This is approximately half of all English majors at UWGB, and the highest enrollment the CW program has seen in at least 12 years. Enrollment is consistently high (beyond capacity) for UW-GB creative writing and literary publishing courses.

Two professors (Chuck Rybak and Rebecca Meacham) teach the bulk of editing and writing courses, and have won various honors and awards for the multiple books they’ve published. Two additional professors (Brian Sutton and Rebecca Nesvet) offer the potential to teach courses in the program— as do two instructors (Tara DaPra and Carl Battaglia). The English and HUS faculty have been supportive of this initial plan, as is the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Scott Furlong.

UWGB’s Spanish Program hosts a SCHOLAR IN RESIDENCE who often teaches creative writing workshops in Spanish. In addition, we are in preliminary talks about offering students opportunities for translation, writing, and storytelling in the greater Green Bay community.

UWGB’s Art, Theater, and English departments will be hosting a one-semester ARTIST IN RESIDENCE from the University of Florida. In 2017, UW-GB’s creative writing program will host the UF Scholar—who will guest edit Sheepshead Review, teach courses, and build community connections.

Existing Connections between UWGB Creative Writing and University, Community:
- Unity Hospice, Green Bay, WI
- UWGB Archives, UW-GB
- The Hamilton Woodtype Museum in Two Rivers, WI
- Reader’s Loft Bookstore, DePere, WI

Demand:
Rarity: Only 30 colleges in the U.S. offer a BFA in Creative Writing.
- No colleges in the UW-system offer a BFA in Writing
- No colleges in Wisconsin offer a BFA in Writing

Focus: Traditional BFA in Writing programs usually require students to focus on a single genre (poetry or fiction) and complete a thesis through lots of studio and thesis hours.

VERSUS OUR UWGB BFA IN WRITING AND APPLIED ARTS, which:
- Increases students’ marketability and potential publication as writers
- Connects student writers to the larger profession of editing, publishing, copywriting, teaching, fundraising, budgeting, and project management
- Connects students to people’s stories, research opportunities, local history and potential employers in Northeastern Wisconsin
- Creates enrollment by engaging high school and middle school writers through student mentorship, outreach, and on-campus workshops
- Increases UW-GB’s visibility and service to the people of NE Wisconsin
- Capitalizes upon existing resources and interdisciplinary connections—and makes use of upcoming opportunities

Barriers:

*Faculty resources; new hire in English, Rebecca Nesvet, alleviates some of this; still would need 1-2 hires in English to run and development the program at a high level; course reassignment for head of Creative Writing to assist with design and community outreach to help create internships, find funding, etc.*

*Equipment (for example):*
- letterpress for on-site classes in coordination w/Hamilton Wood Type and visiting book arts artists
- A UWGB-housed micropress with potential for limited print-runs of distinctive booklets, broadsides, chapbooks, and Unity hospice materials (see above)
  - Ecotone model, Chico State model
  - Staffed by UWGB students (developmental editors, copyeditors) for Internship credit
  - With outreach to Unity hospice, Hamilton Woodtype, other UWGB departments

**Community Arts (minor or certificate)**

Proposed by: Jeff Benzow

Community Arts in this iteration would be a combination of studio arts core courses, art history and upper-level studio courses with a grouping of courses drawn from areas of campus with expertise in cultural and community issues. The intention of this area of study would be to provide students with a working understanding of the role the arts play in the community setting and to promote or enable forms of personal expression and activism among community members. The program would be centered on service learning with a view towards empowering communities and individuals to pursue creative activities as a means of social and cultural enrichment and as an instrument of change. A Community Arts program probably would be best suited as a minor or certificate program that could be combined with majors in studio art, theatre and possibly music. An interdisciplinary major could also be established with a structure similar to the concept provided with this proposal. If the service and community program elements could be developed as a module of courses, a major in Community Arts could be applied to the areas of Theatre, Dance, Art and possibly Music. Program development would require the creation of at least two courses specific to community arts/service learning with an introductory course and an upper level capstone course.

Study in community arts would use existing courses from Anthro, Arts Management, DJS, FNS and URS that focus on cultural and community issues to provide students with a background understanding of the complexities of the community domain. With careful structuring the Culture and Community element would also likely serve to fulfill general education requirements as well.

Resource needs would be minimal, as most of the course work would be drawn from existing programs. Student demand would likely not require additional sections of existing course work. Market demand is unknown, but likely not significant. A certificate or minor program would be beneficial in extending the student cultural and community service experience and by increasing collaboration between faculty in the social sciences, the arts and other areas.
Depending on the form that the Community Arts program would take it could potentially increase student interest in the use of social media, web development and digital storytelling as tools of activism and community discourse. This would require a technology tools component as part of the curriculum.

Conflict Resolution (certificate)

Proposed by: Adolfo Garcia
Division of Outreach and Adult Access
Instructors: Laura Smythe, Adolfo Garcia
Currently Scheduled for March, 2015

Purpose
The goal of the certificate course is to help students realize their potential to engage in constructive communication through conflict resolution practice and reflection.

Course Format
The certificate course combines in-class lecture and practice with at-home reflection and preparation. The course meets on four consecutive Fridays in March 2015 from 8:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m. Students are asked to read and respond in writing outside of class at three different times during the course.

Learning Outcomes
- Identify your primary approach to handling conflict, practice other approaches, and learn in what contexts each approach makes sense.
- Identify your own most strongly-held values and learn how to utilize the strengths of everybody’s values to craft a more constructive conversation.
- Understand what you are listening for and how that impacts what you hear.
- Learn negotiation and mediation techniques and gain confidence using these techniques through role play.

Student Time Commitment:
In-Person, 16 hours; At-home reflection and preparation, 4-5 hours.
Approximate TOTAL: 20 hours

Instructors Time Commitment:
In-Person, 16 hours; setup new course, prep time before class, homework grading and after-class integration, 25-35 hours per instructor.
Approximate TOTAL: 41-51 hours per instructor

Curriculum Structure
Class Period 1. Approaches to Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>Read Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Styles booklet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day of Class</td>
<td>Approaches to Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class Period 2. Ethical Communication and Listening Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day of Class</td>
<td>Ethical Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Listening Styles

After
Ask students to generate scenarios for capstone day

Class Period 3. Negotiation and Bargaining

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>Read from <em>Principled Negotiation</em>, Chapter 1-?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day of Class</td>
<td>Each student practices Principled Negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class Period 4. Capstone Experience, Third Party Facilitation and Mediation Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>Read from <em>Alternative Dispute Resolution: A Conflict Diagnosis Approach</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day of Class</td>
<td>Each student practices mediating a dispute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>Certificates are distributed based on satisfactory completion of all components of the course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criminal Justice (certificate)

Proposed by: Andrew Austin

12 credits of upper division courses
DJS 303 Criminal Justice Process
DJS 325 Law and Society OR DJS 320 Constitutional Law
SOCIOL 315 Street Gangs in America
SOCIOL 404 Criminology

After a review of Criminal Justice certificate programs around the country, an appropriate-level certificate program was designed using already existing and routinely offered class courses.

Because the program is based around already existing and regularly offered classes, there is no anticipation of extra costs to run the program in terms of personnel at the outset. If the certificate program experiences growth, then additional instructional dollars will be requested to offer multiple sections of overpopulated courses. Also, if the certificate program is moved online additional instructional dollars will be requested.

No assessment of demand, student, market, regional need or otherwise, has been conducted. However, we anticipate that the program will appeal to graduates who are seeking certification in this area, and well as enrollees from area technical schools.

There have been no barriers preventing such a proposal from moving forward save a general noninterest in certificate programs on campus. Now that is changed, it seemed obvious to move this idea forward.

Dance Pedagogy/ Dance Studio Management (major)
Dance Pedagogy and Dance Studies (minor)

Proposed by: Laura Riddle
Dance Studio Management - Theatre and Dance Lecturer Denise Carlson-Garner, has mentored a number of students through Individual Majors in Dance Studio Management, teaching Dance pedagogy and arranging for student teaching opportunities through local dance schools, most of which employ or are run by graduates of UWGB. In the last 20 years every dance studio, YMCA, and Park and Recreation program in Brown County and surrounding counties have employed UWGB graduates as teachers of dance. Local high schools have employed UWGB dance students as Dance Team Coaches and choreographer of musicals. Currently, five local dance studios in the area are owned and operated by UWGB graduates who completed the Dance Minor:

- Northern Dance Academy - Rana Altman
- New Fusion Dance and Performing Arts Center - Rana Poley
- Fancy Dancer - Laura Bronk
- Danaille's Dance Academy - Danialle Brouchoud
- Karlyn Schneider - (new studio opening in 2015)

Studios in which UWGB dance students have been employed as teachers:

- Barb's Center For Dance
- Northern Dance Academy
- Green Bay School of Dance
- All That Dance
- New Fusion Dance and Performing Arts
- Fancy Dancer
- 5,6,7,8 Dance
- Danaille's Dance Academy
- Encore Dance
- Sarah's Dance Academy

Parks and Recreation Programs that have hired UWGB dance students as teachers:

- Bellevue
- Ashwaubenon
- DePere

Howard YMCA
Downtown YMCA
East Green Bay YMCA
Allouez YMCA

Most area high schools have a dance team and also stage an annual Musical Theatre production. Graduates of UWGB have been employed by the following:

- Preble High School Dance Team - coach
- DePere High School Dance Team - coach
- Denmark High School Dance Team - coach
- Bay Port High School Dance Team - coach
- East High School Dance Team - coach
- West High School Dance Team - coach
- Southern Door High School - coach
- DePere High School - Musical Choreographer

Denise Carlson Gardner has mentored students who have sought to complete an Individual Major in Dance Studio Management (curriculum attached) and has overseen numerous Independent Studies in
Dance Pedagogy and supervised internships with area dance schools. We believe that there is strong interest in Dance Pedagogy as a minor and Dance Studio Management as an interdisciplinary major. Denise has been employed by UWGB for 20 years and was hired as a full-time Lecturer in Theatre/Dance teaching studio dance classes, Choreography, and Dance History. She is the Choreographer for the annual Performing Arts musical and the Artistic Director of DanceWorks, an annual dance concert choreographed by students and faculty. Ballet classes are currently taught by Timothy Josephs who owns a private studio and is a driving force in NEWDO—Northeastern Wisconsin Dance Organization. NEWDO has produced an annual community-wide production of The Nutcracker at the downtown Meyer Theatre with technical support by paid faculty and students from the UWGB Theatre program. This collaborative enterprise has expanded to include a Spring Dance concert that has been staged in the University Theatre and also supported by UWGB Theatre faculty and staff.

The Theatre/Dance Lecturer position was cut by 20% to an 80% Lecturer position that primarily meets the needs of Theatre’s required curriculum for majors and minors. Denise is qualified and experienced in teaching Dance pedagogy but has no room in her teaching load for additional courses. She and has developed numerous contacts regionally in the public schools and dance studios. She has developed and administered curriculum for the following:

- Dance Studio Management as an Individual Major
- Dance/Dance Pedagogy as an Individual Major
- Applied Dance and Dance Pedagogy as a 2nd major to the Arts Management Major
- Dance/Dance Pedagogy as a 2nd major to the Education Major
- Dance/Dance Pedagogy as a 2nd major to the Human Development Major

**Design Arts Minor/Certificate Programs in Web Design and Animation**

Proposed by: Jeff Benzow

**Demand**

Two areas of design that prospective students frequently inquire about are web design and animation. Design Arts has offered one course in web design since 1999, but this is no longer adequate for instruction as the complexity of contemporary web sites now requires the use of more complex mark-up and dynamic programming languages than first generation websites. Animation is an area of keen interest as it is the foundation of gaming and opportunities in web and video postproduction possibilities. Both of the minor/certificate proposals are the bare minimum for providing students with a web or animation experience as part of their undergraduate experience. Both areas of study have obvious interdisciplinary reach. A richer and more elaborated program in web design could be developed in collaboration with and to the benefit of the computer science department with animation having potential connections to sciences and engineering.

- **Web Publishing Minor/Certificate (22 credits)**

The certificate would expand current course offerings in web design within the Design Arts program and be structured in a way to allow non-majors to gain web design experience without encountering significant prerequisites. The course would serve traditional students who want to augment their major and improve their employability by adding web skills, as well as professionals interested in the essentials of webpage design. Individuals may enter the program at any point, depending on background and experience.
Required Courses (22 credits)

Supporting Courses
Comp Sci 201, Intro to Computing and Internet Technologies, 4 credits
Art 106, Design Methods, 3 credits
Art 107, Two Dimensional Design, 3 credits

Upper Level Studio
Design 331, Graphic Design Studio I, 3 credits
Design 332, Graphic Design Studio II, 3 credits
or
Design 433, E-Publications
Design 433, Web I (existing), 3 credits
Design 400, Web II (proposed), 3 credits

- **Animation Minor/Certificate (21 credits)**

The minor serve would expand current course offerings in the Design Arts program and also allow non-majors interested in animation to gain experience in the use of digital tools with a view towards developing animated programming.

Required Courses (21 credits)

Supporting Courses
Art 105, Intro to Drawing, 3 credits
Art 106, Design Methods, 3 credits
Art 107, Two Dimensional Design, 3 credits

Upper Level Studio
Design 331, Graphic Design Studio I, 3 credits
Art 302, Intermediate Drawing, 3 credits
Design 433, Animation I, 3 credits
Design 400, Animation II, 3 credits
Design Thinking/Problem Solving

Proposed by: Jeff Benzow

Design is a problem solving process that results in a variety of products depending on client need. Design Thinking is a relatively new moniker for part of that process that examines client need based on user experience and equally important, examines the broader opportunities that are often hidden in client-based requests. These opportunities are analogous to important peripheral discoveries that frequently occur during research in the sciences. The goal of an expanded curriculum in design thinking/problem solving would be to formalize processes used in design with a view towards creating a curriculum available and applicable to a range of campus majors.

This proposal acknowledges that other programs have traditionally used similar processes in the form of research methods, experiment design and a range of creative activities. Recent interest in an Innovation major drew support campus-wide.

This concept would support a campus wide dialogue and participation in identifying existing areas of activity and strength in problem solving and look for opportunities to create a base-line interdisciplinary of curricular involvement that would be a direct expression of our campus charter. This effort could take the form of a center, exchange or curriculum development with campus-wide reach in the form of course development in general education or workshop scenarios.

In 2012 the Design Program had the opportunity to mount an experimental course in Design Thinking that took the form of a workshop and enrolled a diverse group of students including design, computer science and art majors. The projects that the course centered on were Oneida language learning tools with outcomes largely undefined. The student products varied from interactive board games, a coloring book with potential web/interactive extension and an animated video featuring a rap song composed and produced by students in the class. The animation is probably less viable as a teaching/learning tool than an expression of the class’s investigation of the problem, but is very successful in that the students drew on a range of skills beyond their formal studies and did so in a very innovative way.

Curricular areas of development could include:

• Design methods (beyond the focus on 3-dimensional forms in Art 106)
• Research methods
• Prototyping methods: Traditional methods such as mind-maps, sketching and model building with a bias towards "low-fidelity" processes during initial concepts development. The low fidelity approach (using paper, pencil, post-a-notes, or any cheap, down and dirty material) minimizes the initial investment in time, emotion and money during the development process and has proven to reduce costs and improve the final product.
• Presentation methods: Developing key skills in presenting the problem definition and final concepts and producing effective media materials to support proposals.

Many of these elements are included in some form in the Graphic Design, Environmental Design and Design Arts media courses.
Proposed by: Caroline Boswell

1. Brief summary of your proposed program (a single paragraph):
Recently, the National Endowment of the Humanities announced it is beginning to shift funding from traditional academic research toward projects designed for public audiences. Such grants compliment their growing support for projects in the Digital Humanities, which, while distinct from the Public Humanities, shares important methodologies as well as a dedication to collaborative research and user-generated data rather than singular academic research. The Digital and Public Humanities are rapidly redefining the landscape of academic work, inquiry, study, publication, pedagogy, and participation. With this evolution in mind, an interdisciplinary collective of faculty and staff members propose creating a new major, and, in the future, a new graduate program in the Digital and Public Humanities at the University of Wisconsin–Green Bay.

Given the program’s proposed name, a few definitions are in order. The Digital Humanities (DH), previously known as Humanities Computing, and broadly defined, is a rapidly expanding field that specifically uses computing and digital tools to perform humanistic, scientific, and artistic inquiry in ways not previously, or as easily, possible; one example is the advent of increased processing power, “big data,” and text mining. The Public Humanities, broadly defined, is an older field that takes the questions, controversies, and research associated with disciplines such as history, literary studies, culture, art, and philosophy and then designs methods for engaging the public in each. More recently, the digital revolution has brought the two fields closer together as Public Humanists such as museum curators, conservators, and archivists are expected to understand how digital tools and DH methodologies can be harnessed to interact and engage with the public. This program would fulfill our commitment to service learning and undergraduate research, where student work and projects are conceived and implemented with direct public benefit and access as the primary outcome.

Furthermore, it would encapsulate the “maker movement” and skill-building approach, where curriculum and projects prioritize making, building, and creation rather than focusing entirely on analysis or writing for publication.

2. Discussion of the resources available to develop/run the program (i.e. interactions with current programs, potential for growth across disciplines, community partnerships, 2+2 programs, faculty passion to move the proposal forward, etc.)
Efforts originating out of the Humanistic Studies department have already resulted in the crafting of a Digital Scholarship Center Proposal, which includes faculty from Units across campus and Colleges (Info & Comp Sci, Communication, History, English, DJS, HUS, PEA, Geography, Nursing, Business, and Social Work all expressed interest, as well as ATS and the Library). While no Unit alone has the faculty required to mount an undergraduate or graduate level program in the Digital and Public Humanities, a new inter-and-cross disciplinary program that breaks down Unit barriers and Faculty/Staff barriers could be created in a relatively short time frame as many current courses offered across campus could be integrated and realigned to suit such a program’s objectives with very little transformation. The program could easily overlap with the newly proposed program in Public History as well.

Future growth: The Humanistic Studies department has recently hired a new faculty member who has a secondary expertise in the fields of Digital and Public Humanities. Units who express an interest in the program could similarly include familiarity or expertise with these fields as secondary requirements of future faculty positions without even changing the primary area of expertise, especially given that a lot of digital humanities work incorporates primary skills of other fields, such as computer programming. Finally, because of the growing “faculty passion” for the Digital Humanities, the Deans of CLAS and CPS have agreed to fund 8 faculty who wish to attend a week-long Institute on the
Digital Humanities this summer to integrate new directions in this field two the classroom and/or their research. Two faculty members in HUS have already attended in the past. We simply need to harness this momentum and turn it into a program that perfectly reflects our dedication to interdisciplinarity.

Graduate Program: A graduate degree in the Digital and Public Humanities would require a longer time frame to complete, but could be done with gradual support (institutionally and financially) from the University over a series of years. Further, as noted at the beginning of this document, there is grant funding in both fields that could assist with this transformation. We envision creating a 4+1 Master’s Program that would draw students from across the state at the undergraduate level; whereas the Master’s Program would draw students from within and beyond the state, as it would be relatively unique for the region.

Community partnerships: Such a program would enhance and increase the number of partnerships we have with non-profit organizations and corporations in the region, such as the Neville Public Museum, the History Museum at the Castle, the National Railroad Museum, Aver Technologies (who donated data for mining), Unity Hospice, the Hamilton Woodtype Museum, Breakthrough Fuel, and more. Students would become qualified to complete internships that would fill a large void in the non-profit sector, which lacks the funding—or, in the case of business, time--to either keep up with the most recent digital initiatives or exploit the potential of big data.

3. Discussion regarding the demand for the program (i.e. student demand, market demand, regional need, etc.) Please identify where this information was obtained from. If you do not feel confident in assessing the demand of a program, please indicate this.

Degrees in the Humanities do not allow for a one-to-one correlation with jobs in the region, and, thus, statistical market data is not available to us. What we do have is evidence of student demand for these courses, and increasing number of students taking internships in organizations that require the skills these courses offer, and a belief that the basic methodologies and competencies gained in a Digital and Public Humanities program are relevant to the 21st century job market. Just recently, two undergraduates from our English and Humanistic Studies programs who completed coursework infused with the digital and/or public humanities received work in ATS as instructional technologists because of the skills and methods offered in this coursework. This program would provide students the analytic and creative skills of original thinkers as well as a strong technological literacy – skills employers’ value.

Another important factor in weighing demand: currently there is no program in the digital and public humanities at any UW-System institution at either the undergraduate or graduate level. UW-Stout is the only System institution we know of that offers a digital humanities degree; UW Madison only offers courses in the field. UW-Milwaukee has a MA program in History with an emphasis in Public History, but it has no Public Humanities MA and their program is extremely specialized. UW-Madison has recently begun to offer its PhD candidates coursework in Public Humanities, but it does not offer a joint digital and public humanities emphasis. As an interdisciplinary institution, we are ideally suited to be the first to offer such a program in the System. In our program, students would follow a track that emphasized their interests, but all students would gain knowledge of the methods, tools, and skills of digital and public humanists.

4. Barriers that prevented you from moving forward with this proposal in the past

Several faculty members in Humanistic Studies, and even the former Vice Provost, Andy Kersten, have been in the process of designing an undergraduate and, possibly, a graduate program in the Digital and Public Humanities over the past 2.5 years, but we have faced roadblocks. Most often these arise from the competing demands placed on faculty of various Units. For example, in our original design we integrated courses from Design Arts, Communication, Geography/PEA, Arts Management, as well as Humanistic Studies and its disciplines. Almost immediately we ran into the problem of a large number of prerequisites that would be debilitating to any student attempting to complete this
program. Many majors have up to 4 prerequisites for their upper division courses. Secondly, some of the necessary skills our students would need to learn are only offered in intensive introductory computer science courses, which are not well suited for students who do not intend to become programmers or coders. We would need to create introductory courses – such as an Intro to Humanities Computing Course -- that could be used across curricula that would serve as proper introductory level courses without burdening them with too many supporting courses. Jeff Benzow of Design Arts has supported this idea, as well as some faculty who teach GIS. The real issue is the rigidity of the current interdisciplinary structure as it exists with Units housing majors, and stand-alone programs being forced to integrate courses that exist primarily to serve a different program. Many of those interested in teaching for this program are untenured faculty who are unable to negotiate these departmental and Unit level politics, and, thus, we would need approval from Chairs and perhaps the Deans to help us move forward. Thus, we require a basic commitment of current resources, and the potential of more resources after the program has proven successful through enrollment numbers and/or grants received.

Conclusion
The skills and areas of knowledge described above are not far from being a permanent fixture in humanities programs and departments across the world. It is vital that we align and enhance our resources to meet the curricular needs of the students, and the community, who will require, and will benefit from, this program of study.

Entrepreneurship (certificate)
Proposed by: Susan Gallagher-Lepak
Description: A 12 credit certificate with courses in: Introduction to Entrepreneurship, Innovation, Entrepreneur Finance, New Product Management, and Intra-preneurship. The program will appeal to Individuals from various disciplines (e.g., business, technology, healthcare). A determination will need to be made about the delivery format for this program (online? Hybrid? Evenings?).
Resources: Revenue-based certificate program, will build off current resources (faculty expertise) used with MSN Leadership program (nursing), possibly Business program, and Small Business Development Center on campus.
Demand of the program: This information is needed and the Small Business Development Center could assist in collecting demand data.
Barriers: Need to build in some reassignment time for a faculty member to take on this initiative. Need support to look at what other similar programs are in the UW and at other universities in the region. Further work on delivery format.

Environmental Design Program
Proposed by: Jeff Benzow
As per our conversations at the end of fall semester 2013, and spring semester of 2014 with Dr. Adam Parrillo, Mr. Charles Lucht, Dr. Marcelo Cruz and Prof. Jeff Benzow concerning the cognitive and skill levels of our Environmental Design Students at UW Green Bay, it became apparent that our students are ill equipped at performing the minimum acceptable professional level in environmental design. We believe there are many reasons for these failings one of which is structural.
The rational for this proposal in curriculum change is to identify and address what faculty and ad hocs working with students in this field of work see as serious gaps in the professional formation of our environmental design students. We feel that critical analysis and problem solving are weak due to a weak foundation in cognitive, methodological, and application courses.

We have identified courses currently being taught that will directly strengthen the cognitive, methodological and application skills of critical analysis and problem solving of our students in Environmental Design. There are 37 to 48 general education credits for graduation. We are recommending 36 REQUIRED lower division general education credits:

- Complete 7-page proposal was not included in this document.

**Environmental Sciences (certificates)**

Proposed by: John Luczaj

1. **Industrial hygiene** certificate. Our meetings with people at Foth (local company) in recent years made it clear that they saw a strong need for people to monitor air, soil, water quality for a variety of reasons. Coupling this with either environmental science, environmental engineering tech, geoscience, or ES&P would make candidates’ resumes much stronger.

2. I think our graduate ES & P program OR our undergraduate environmental science students might benefit from a "water resources certificate". I think we have most of the courses necessary to accomplish such a certificate, but we might need to include aqueous geochemistry. It's something we're weak on at this university anyway, and it would benefit other disciplines. I was thinking about several courses in science and policy that would be necessary, including hydrology, hydrogeology, groundwater resources & regulations, GIS, and some policy courses that already exist. Coupling with an aqueous geochemistry and a stable isotopes course, this might be a viable certificate option. I'm offering a 1 credit stable isotopes course in the spring that might be a good introduction to this topic. There are also possibilities of having students complete off campus courses, such as OSHA 40-hour HAZWOPER, and even a hydrogeology field camp to supplement what we offer. Here is an example: [http://wmich.edu/geology/academics/hydrogeology-field-course](http://wmich.edu/geology/academics/hydrogeology-field-course)

Another example is for a Hydrologist (surface water) certificate: [http://aihydrology.org/hydro-certification.html](http://aihydrology.org/hydro-certification.html)

Here is an example of a hydrogeology (groundwater) certificate: [http://www.geosc.uh.edu/graduate/hydrogeology-certification/](http://www.geosc.uh.edu/graduate/hydrogeology-certification/). This would require a second course in hydrogeology, along with "hydrochemistry" or "aqueous geochemistry". We don't have those two courses, but I have the expertise for this. Unfortunately, we don't have enough staff in geosciences to allow for this.

3. One course that is taught in industry typically, but is sometimes taught at universities is the 40-hour OSHA HAZWOPER certificate. It is required for all personnel sampling soil or water at any uncontrolled hazardous waste site, which includes gas stations, dry cleaners, landfills, or other industrial sites for which pollution is or is expected to be present. A model for this would be the first week (of 6 weeks) at Western Michigan University's Hydrogeology Field Camp, to which I've recommended several students. Some of my students have taken this course and a couple of others that follow. While WMU's HAZWOPER is offered by an industry rep, this could potentially be developed at UWGB in the future.
4. One major area in which UWGB is sorely lacking is a broad foundation in GIS. Most universities that are serious about spatial sciences (especially environmental science and other spatially related disciplines) have extensive access to GIS personnel and offer certificates or emphases on their campuses. Our campus has relied upon just a few individuals to barely squeak by with the necessary expertise. It is truly one of the standard modern links in an "interdisciplinary" curriculum, and I feel that this is an area where we could tremendously improve. It would allow several other 'certificates' to be offered/supported, and it would improve our potential to attract more students to our programs.

Film and Digital Media (minor)

Proposed by: David Coury (HUS), Jeff Benzow (AVD), and Laura Riddle (Theater)

- brief summary of your proposed program (a single paragraph)
  The rationale of this minor is to develop a program in film and digital media that combines a diverse array of courses currently offered across the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, in order to give students an understanding of film and digital media as a visual art as well as the impacts on communities. This course of study will combine a theoretical understanding of the visual aesthetics, as well as analytical approaches focusing on the cultural contexts of cinema and the digital arts, as well as thematically oriented courses and aesthetic analysis. In addition, students will have the opportunity to engage in the practical components of filmmaking by taking courses in screen writing, digital filmmaking and editing and television production. Finally students will finish with an internship with local non-profits organizations to learn about film festivals and film programming or engage in hands-on training with area production teams.

- discussion of the resources available to develop/run the program (i.e. interactions with current programs, potential for growth across disciplines, community partnerships, 2+2 programs, faculty passion to move the proposal forward, etc.)
  Participating faculty will include: Carl Battaglia, Jeff Benzow, David Coury, J P Leary, Cristina Ortiz, Adam Parrillo, Laura Riddle, Ellen Rosewall, Gabriel Saxton-Ruiz, Mike Schmitt, Bryan Vescio. Therefore the program will be both inter-and cross-disciplinary to include Humanistic Studies, Art and Visual Design, Arts Management, Urban and Regional Studies and Theater.

- discussion regarding the demand for the program (i.e. student demand, market demand, regional need, etc.) Please identify where this information was obtained from. If you do not feel confident in assessing the demand of a program, please indicate this.
  While it’s always difficult to fully ascertain “demand” for a program that does not yet exist, it is clear that the cinema and digital media courses that we current offer almost always fill to capacity. Moreover, there have been a variety of student film and cinema clubs over the years and at least one student who did Film Studies as an individual major. Moreover, there are community groups and businesses that support this. Both Film Green Bay and the Green Bay Film Society (two 501c3 non-profit community groups) support the creation of this minor as do two local film and media companies, NorthCoast Productions and Launch Film and Photography.

- barriers that prevented you from moving forward with this proposal in the past
  None, really, other than finding the time and the commitment from enough faculty to make it sustainable.
Game Studies (emphasis)

Proposed by: Ben Geisler

My partner in crime on this endeavor is Dr. Carr, who is a faculty member in the Communication department. The two of us are proposing a “Game Studies” emphasis to exist inside of the Information Science(IS) major. This would be a blend of Computer Science and Communication courses but would also include a few brand new games courses, and some Psychology courses. Game Development is an incredibly interdisciplinary field, and thankfully most the courses which are needed are already offered at UWGB in some capacity. With very little work, we can create an emphasis. Target professions include game development, game critique and game journalism. All of these are growingly popular areas not only for potential jobs but also in terms of student interest. We’ve both experienced potential students asking us about Video Game related majors and since we don’t have anything (yet), these students usually end up going to UW-Stout. We want to create something here, at UWGB, for students to sink their teeth into. Our emphasis inside of the IS major will be a bit different than traditional Game Development related majors. It will be much more interdisciplinary than typical offerings at other schools, which are usually Computer Science based. Ours will even offer students the potential to take courses in Art, Music, Women Studies and other fields that are related to Video Games in various ways.

Gerontology Certificate (offered in Social Work)

Proposed by: Doreen Higgins & Gail Trimberger, Social Work

The changing demographics of the older population in the United States and beyond call for increased attention to the preparation of social workers and community professionals for involvement in an aging-diverse workforce. It is estimated that by the year 2030, one in five people will be 65 years of age or older. By 2050, this population is expected to more than double, increasing from 35 million in 2000 to over 86 million. Predominant in this demographic shift is the explosion of older minority groups. Given these demographic imperatives, the Gerontology Certificate offered in Social Work at UW Green Bay will provide practical and theoretical preparation of students on the fundamentals of gerontology through critical examination of a variety of interdisciplinary topics and issues that affect older people and their families, communities, and professionals in the field of aging.

The Gerontology Certificate encompasses an interdisciplinary orientation which prepares students to approach aging from a variety of perspectives, across a variety of settings and a wide range of social problem areas. It is designed to prepare students via the application of practical knowledge and skills to enhance their workforce readiness in serving older adults and their families. As a supplement to the undergraduate degree or to professional credentials already attained, the certificate will provide practical knowledge and preparation for work in human service and other community agencies, long-term care and assisted living facilities, hospitals, home health care, and business and retail sectors that serve or work with older people. For those already employed in the aging field and/or human services areas, the certificate will offer the opportunity to enhance knowledge and expertise across a wide variety of aging-related topics and issues.

The following are provided as examples of courses that will meet the four-course requirement to attainment of the Gerontology Certificate:

Two interdisciplinary courses such as:

1. Human Development 343: Adulthood and Aging (3 credits)
2. Human Development 344: Death and Dying (3 credits)
Two social work practice courses:
Social Work 250: You and Your Future/Living and Working in an Aging Society
(3 credits/Also a General Education Course)

1. Social Work XXX: Social Work Practice with Older Adults (3 credits)

All courses will be offered as supporting courses for the Social Work major.

**Healthcare Administration (online certificate)**

Proposed by: Susan Gallagher-Lepak
Description: A 12 credit certificate with an emphasis on the areas of leadership, financial management, healthcare policy, and quality measurement in healthcare settings. Healthcare is a growing industry and there is a need for leaders/managers in all areas of healthcare. Individuals from numerous disciplines will be interested in a program of this nature (e.g., business, nursing, social work, laboratory science).

Resources: Revenue-based certificate program, will build off current resources (faculty expertise) used with Master of Science in Nursing Leadership program. Faculty have high interest in this programmatic area.

Demand of the program: This information is needed and could be obtained via survey or focus groups with healthcare professionals. Nursing has done this before in sending out a large survey to Chief Nursing Officers in planning for the MSN Leadership program.

Barriers: Need to build in some reassignment time for a faculty member to take on this initiative. Need support to look at what other similar programs are in the UW or in the region.

**Legal Studies (certificate)**

Proposed by: Chris Martin

1. I am proposing a Legal Studies Certificate that would help students interested in Law School or Legal Studies to best acquire the skills and understanding that will best prepare them for a career in this area.

2. I have selected courses only from those that are already on the books. (Most if not all of them are also currently regularly offered.) My aim, as this is in-progress, is to first identify what we can offer at present. Once the team of faculty has a chance to meet we can then consider whether we may want to develop a new course or two. I know that Philosophy is interested in revising existing courses and possibly creating new ones to better suit the certificate.

3. I do not have hard data on the demand for such a program. However, I have helped 3-5 Philosophy students apply to graduate school, and understand that DJS has a number of interested students as well. Also, given the ubiquity of legal issues, a need for people with training in the nature and practice of law is always of use.

4. The current curriculum may be Philosophy heavy. This is in part because I am a philosopher and in part because Philosophy students have historically been the best prepared for Law School (per the LSAT). It is also due in part to not yet having met with other contributing faculty members to improve the plan. Also, it would be best if we could conjoin the DJS and Philosophy proposals. That being said, because my proposal draws only from existing faculty
and courses, I do not foresee significant curricular hurdles in the creation of such a program.

Legal Studies Certificate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Courses</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choose 2 of the following Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PHILOS 103 Logic and Reasoning (Logic for Lawyers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PHILOS 105 Justice and Citizenship in the Modern World</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PHILOS 213 Ancient Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PHILOS 214 Early Modern Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HISTORY 207 Introduction to African-American History.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper-Level Courses</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choose 1 of the following Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PHILOS 326 Philosophy, Politics, and Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PHILOS 420 Metaphysics: Free Will</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PHILOS 403 Topics in Philosophy: Torture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PHILOS 403: Topics in Philosophy: Punishment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ENG 324: Sheepshead Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose 1 of the following Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HISTORY 309 United States Immigration History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HISTORY 312 The Early American Republic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HISTORY 322 Economic and Business History of the U.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HUS ????: 4 Court Cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose 1 of the following Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DJS 303 Criminal Justice Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DJS 320 Constitutional Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DJS 325 Law and Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DJS 348 Gender and the Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose 1 of the following Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PEA 301 Environmental Politics and Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PEA 314 Administrative Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PEA 378 Environmental Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PEA 379 Natural Resources Policy, Law, and Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• POLSCI 301 Environmental Politics and Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• POLSCI 305 Urban Politics and Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• POLSCI 314 Administrative Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• POLSCI 320 Constitutional Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• POLSCI 340 Political Theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• POLSCI 349 American Political Thought</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select 2 additional courses from the above listings
Music Therapy Program (joint program with HUD): Undergraduate
Proposed by: Cheryl Grosso
1. Summary: There are currently only 2 undergraduate programs in Music Therapy in Wisconsin. This field is having a bit of a re-birth and prospective students increasingly ask for this program. Currently, we advise students to major in music in one of the B.A. emphases and minor in Human Development. We encourage them to take as many psychology courses as possible but, given the University’s requirement that all students must have an interdisciplinary degree component, we are forced to advise them to first earn a minor in HUD.
2. Resources: Current coursework in music and psychology is sufficient for the majority of this program. However, in order to offer an accredited program, a position for a certified music therapist would be necessary.
3. Demand: I think there is a demand for this degree and UWGB could become the public university in the state to offer a program at the undergraduate level.
4. Barriers: not previously put forward.

Music Pedagogy Certificate
Proposed by: Cheryl Grosso
1. Summary: Certificate for individuals that teach or want to teach music lessons privately or through a music store. Flexibility in requirements will be necessary to accommodate candidate’s demonstrated competencies. Content will focus on pedagogical techniques and approaches, developing musicianship, long range lesson planning, and individual lessons.
2. Resources: the program will likely need to be self-sustaining but, individual lessons could be offered by current full-time faculty, and some pedagogy course work overlap with a curricular expansion that is being discussed in the B.A. music degree (not the B.M.).
3. Demand: Not confident to assess
4. Barriers: not previously put forward.

Music: Accelerated Certification Tracks for Practicing Teachers
Proposed by: Cheryl Grosso
1. Summary: Certification would meet DPI requirements. Program is for certified music teachers looking for additional music certifications. The course work necessary for all music certifications is already in our curriculum. However, in this accelerated track students will work at independent rates for the majority of course work. Competencies will be evaluated for candidates to determine how work experience may apply to certification requirements.
2. Resources: Resources would be necessary to compensate faculty for developing course work that could be offered digitally on an individual basis. It is not realistic to expect there would be cohorts of students needing the same course work at the same time. This program would need to be self sustaining. We are assuming there are other fields that may have this same need given the changes in K-12 education in Wisconsin. UW Oskosh does have this type of program for all teaching certifications.
3. Demand: As music programs get cut from schools, more and more teachers need additional certification. I believe there is a reasonable demand for this. We have always had inquiries from teachers needing additional certification and it has not been easy to accommodate their requests.
while they continue teaching full-time. However, now the technology is in place to offer quality and effective course work to the working teacher.

4. Barriers: not previously put forward.

**Music: Graduate courses for Licensure Renewal for Practicing Teachers**

Proposed by: Cheryl Grosso

1. Summary: There are many courses our faculty could offer through Outreach. This would not be a specific curriculum but rather individual courses designed to enhance music teaching for the experienced teacher.

2. Resources: There must be support for the development of course work. Program needs to be self-sustaining and could likely be offered through Outreach with approval from the Education program.

3. Demand: Area teachers have asked for years if UWGB offers any graduate music courses for the purpose of licensure renewal.

4. Barriers: not previously put forward.

**Music: Performer’s Certificate or Graduate Performance Course Work**

Proposed by: Cheryl Grosso

1. Summary: Current faculty expertise is sufficient. The central curricular focus would be individual applied study. Other performance requirements could be fulfilled in a variety of ways, such as participation in community groups.

2. Resources: For applied lesson study there would be little drain on faculty loads.

3. Demand: Not confident to assess.

4. Barriers: not previously put forward.

**Public History (minor or 4+1 BA-MA)**

Proposed by: Clif Ganyard

The program originally proposed by the History department was a Certificate in Public History. After further discussion within the department, it was decided that a certificate was inappropriate for our goals. Instead, two ideas did emerge as possibilities: 1) a minor in public history, and 2) a 4+1 BA-MA in public history. We would like to suggest these programs be taken into consideration.

Public History is the field of history that studies both history as such and the presentation of that history to the public, and practitioners of public history find work in archives, museums, libraries, historical societies, state and national parks, as reenactors, in journalism, in documentary film, or as preparation for graduate school. In the past few years, the History department as noticed a growing interest in these fields. Students are attracted both to hands-on approaches to learning history represented by the field of public history (e.g. working with artifacts, designing exhibits, developing digital projects) and sharing that knowledge with a broader audience. In addition, students feel that such work provides them with practical skills to complement their passion for historical knowledge. We have noticed a growing interest in student participation in internships (another area we are developing with an eye toward providing more internship opportunities to students), and we have
had some success placing students in public history positions (Sheboygan County Historical Museum, Manitowoc County Historical Society, Heritage Hill). Historical knowledge is valuable in its own right, but the passion and ability to share that knowledge with the public is worth nurturing. These programs (a minor and/or a BA-MA) would allow our students to develop the specialized knowledge and skills to succeed in the public history field. While a History degree in itself is a good beginning for such work, it is necessarily limited. A program that imparts both historical knowledge and the specialized skills necessary to work in the field of public history would improve our students’ ability to find jobs in a field that evidently is of growing interest to them. Development of an MA in Public History would require some further thought, but the department has given some thought to a minor, which might look something like this:

**Supporting Courses (6 credits):**

American History (choose one course):

- HISTORY 205. American History to 1865. 3 Credits.
- HISTORY 206. History of the United States from 1865 to the Present. 3 Credits.
- HISTORY 207. Introduction to African-American History. 3 Credits.
- HISTORY 220. American Environmental History. 3 Credits.

**Historical Methods:**

- HISTORY 290 Historical Methods. 3 credits.

**Required Courses (12 credits):**

Public History:

- HISTORY 339 Introduction to Public History. 3 credits. [new course]
- HISTORY 439 Topics in Public History. 3 credits. [new course]
- HISTORY 497 Internship

American History:

Choose one course from Category I, American History, of the History major.

18 credits total

Such a minor should be a particularly useful complement for those students studying History, the Humanities, Democracy and Justice Studies, Arts Management, Public and Environmental Affairs, or students seeking additional expertise in public service. This may be just a starting point, however, as it may be possible to expand this initial program into a BA program in its own right. This could be done in collaboration with several other programs across the campus, including English, Art and Art Management, Geography, Public and Environmental Policy, and other programs.

Currently, within the UW-System, La Crosse offers a minor, Eau Claire and Whitewater offer BA degrees, and Eau Claire and Milwaukee offer MA degrees in public history. However, it is worth noting that Stevens Point recently advertised for a public historian (2013) and has just started offering a course in public history (2015). As interest in public history expands across the state and within the system, it will become increasingly important that UWGB offer education in public history.
Our biggest obstacle in pursuing these programs is resources. Unfortunately, none of the current faculty have experience in public history, though we all do value it. To properly mount a program in public history, we would need to hire a specialist in public history. This person could develop, initially, new courses in public history, such as those listed above. In the future, a faculty member in public history could help us develop a BA or BA-MA program in public history as well. Unfortunately, despite the enthusiasm for a program in public history exhibited among our students, our colleagues, and administrators, the History department does not have the expertise to launch any such programs at present.

MSW/MBA or MSW/MPH (major)

Proposed by: Joan Groessl
Social workers interest in upper management would benefit from a dual master’s degree for marketability to employers. The growing emphasis on interprofessional care, particularly in health care would provide a potential market niche for graduates of UWGB. As administrators of social service agencies, the dual MSW/MBA would be an asset for our graduates. No studies or actions on the idea have been investigated. UW-Oshkosh does have a master’s of public administration degree and a study would need to be completed as to the viability of such an option (MSW/MPH) for UWGB. The dissolution of the Collaborative MSW Program would limit any possibility of partnering with UWO on this area of study.
It is possible that there could be a linkage created between UWGB MSW Program and UWGB Masters of Management program with some cross-listed programs. Currently, students interested in the administration concentration of the Collaborative MSW Program do have the option of several courses in business.
For the past two years, we have been working toward the development of our solo MSW program and this time constraint has been the biggest obstacle in moving forward with any additional development discussions or actions. We would need to work with the Council on Social Work Education regarding accreditation requirements since this would then likely be considered a concentration in addition to our generalist practice concentration; curricular components would then have to go through the same scrutiny.

Social Work Supervisor (certificate)

Proposed by: Joan Groessl
The State of Wisconsin’s Department of Safety and Professional Services has discussed the possibility of requiring any social worker, professional counselor or marriage and family therapist who provides supervision to demonstrate continuing education or potentially certification as a qualified supervisor. (This standard is already required for Substance Abuse Provider Supervisors.) While these standards have yet to be developed, a course or sequence of trainings could be created that would address the components articulated by the Association of Social Work Boards as essential competencies for supervisors.
The Collaborative MSW Program had a course titled supervision but it was focused on management and human resources. This course was an elective for many but required for those who had chosen the administration emphasis. In the new UWGB MSW Program, plans are to develop the course syllabus to add to a rotation of potential electives.
The Administration concentration was not of interest to the majority of MSW students however, it is frequently the case that MSW-level practitioners are placed in supervisory roles. If the Department of Safety and Professional Services makes this a requirement, demand for proof of training would be high so I would anticipate a need for continuing education events that would address the topic. I have talked in the past with the Office of Outreach, Joy Ruzek, about the potential of partnering for this purpose. She does work with another entity in a similar certificate program although it does not address human services supervision, which would be the focus of this certificate program. I am in the process of developing the syllabus for an MSW elective on supervision and it could potentially be taken for MSW credit or for certificate status, or simply continuing education hours. For the past two years, we have been working toward the development of our solo MSW program and this time constraint has been the biggest obstacle in moving forward with any certificate endeavor.

Substance Abuse Certification

Proposed by: Sharon Locklin

According to the Addiction Technology Transfer Center Network, in a report prepared for the US Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, the current workforce in substance abuse treatment programs are predominantly white, female and over the age of 45. Due to the Affordable Care Act, there will be a significant need for professionals who are able to care for individuals with substance use disorders in a variety of healthcare settings. According to clinical directors they surveyed, almost half of facilities have difficulty filling open positions due to an insufficient number of qualified applicants. They emphasized the need to develop relationships with colleges and universities in order to recruit qualified professionals. County directors in northeast Wisconsin have reported similar difficulties in recruiting qualified professionals as well.

Currently, substance abuse certification classes are offered at Northeast Wisconsin Technical College (NWTC), but are not part of a 4-year degree program. A 4-year degree is now required in order to obtain licensure in social work and certification for substance abuse counseling. Consequently, NWTC students who have completed the core curriculum for substance abuse counseling often transfer to a 4-year college to complete their degree and many of their credits don’t currently transfer. Additionally, providers are looking to hire staff who are dually licensed in both social work and substance abuse counseling. At this time, there is no coursework at UW-Green Bay specific to substance abuse counseling. The social work students at UW-Green Bay could benefit greatly from having access to substance abuse coursework. In discussions with the Department Chair for Social Work, she feels strongly that there should be substance abuse coursework available to social work students.

I am currently in the process of doing a feasibility study about whether a partnership can be formed to bring that Substance Abuse Counselor In Training (SAC-IT) core curriculum and Substance Abuse Counselor Education to UW-Green Bay students and to professionals within the community. The requirements for this training are laid out by the Wisconsin Department of Safety and Professional Services (SPS 166, attached). NWTC has received endorsement from the Department of Safety and Professional Services (DSPS). Neither our department (the NEW Partnership) nor the Social Work Department have the resources or the time to develop the curriculum or provide the coursework at this time. My proposal involves continued study of the feasibility of partnering with NWTC and the Social
Work Department at UW-Green Bay in order to provide access to this coursework for current students and for professionals in the community seeking their substance abuse certification.

The biggest barrier to this proposal is that I don’t have a budget and my time is already committed to current projects. Also, I have spoken only briefly with both NWTC and the Social Work Department at UW-Green Bay. I have set up meetings with both entities to discuss the idea further, and to see what potential there might be to establish a partnership for providing substance abuse certification classes. I also propose to meet with UW-Green Bay, Outreach Department to study their interest in being involved in this partnership. At this time, I cannot ensure buy-in of the parties. Until that happens, it is hard to determine exactly what the partnership would look like, what type of investment would be required, etc. That being said, I believe in this program and I believe this is the type of program that would match community needs and would better prepare our social work students and our professional social workers for the current workforce demands.

**Technology Platform**

Proposed by: Jeff Benzow
The need to provide students with skills in technology use is an issue that affects a number of programs on campus and especially when considering new programs such as a Digital Humanities. There are a number of emerging opportunities including access to free online tutorials such as Code Academy and free software use offers from significant developers including Autodesk that might provide technical instruction outside of our limited course offerings on campus.

Using these resources the approach might be a requirement to enroll in online technology teaching modules with on campus testing and evaluation mechanisms integrated into the process. For programs interested in having students develop technology skills that are outside of the purview of their curricular area, having tutorial modules in "web development for the rest of us" for example, would help extend our abilities to prepare students for course work within a major and provide a level of technical proficiency.

This might require the development of a tech learning center, analogous in some ways to the writing center, with a group of skilled teachers and tutors providing support and testing in addition to facilitating student online self-study.

In the Design program, we have been experimenting with tutorial subscriptions where students pay $10.00 per month for access to tutorials for five of Adobe's design software packages. An advanced student was hired to review and score the work. This approach helped move the software instruction component from the Studio/classroom so more time could be dedicated to design theory, development, problem solving, etc.

If this approach could be somehow implemented on a campus level, it could be the basis of creating a campus technology platform requirement, with students fulfilling technical requirements specific to their area of study.
Enrollment Working Group Final Report

Final Report of the Enrollment Working Group
  Invent the Future Steering Committee

Executive Summary

Committee members: Denise Bartell (chair of EWG), Brent Blahnik, Kevin Collins, Diana Delbecchi, Kim Desotell, Heidi Fenc, Sharon Gajeski, Adolfo Garcia, Ray Hutchison, Jen Jones (chair – Recruitment subgroup), Olyvia Kuchta (student), Vince Lowery, Justin Mallett, Steve Meyer, Cris Nelson, Mark Olkowski (chair – Data Platforms subgroup), Adam Parrillo, Darrel Renier (chair – Clear Path subgroup), Heidi Sherman (chair – Campus Experience subgroup), Sierra Spaulding (student), Alison Staudinger, Tina Tackmier, Gail Trimberger, Alex Wilson (student)

The EWG was asked to carefully examine the assumptions and processes of our current enrollment strategy and recommend an enrollment approach that meets current and future challenges. Over the last three months our group has examined available data, identified what we feel are the most pressing needs to place UWGB in a competitive advantage in enrollment, and worked to generate suggestions for how to achieve our enrollment goals.

The EWG developed a vision statement to guide our process, and that we believe should guide UWGB’s enrollment efforts.
Vision statement: UWGB seeks to be the destination for regional college students and all students seeking a high impact educational experience. We will:
1) Recruit students that better reflect the demographic composition of the region, and work actively to recruit a diversity of students from the region, the US, and the global community
2) Retain students by:
   a) Supporting student success, with a focus on knowing and respecting students as individuals and providing individualized support (before, during, and after college)
   b) Providing high impact, transformational educational experiences that promote successful careers and fulfilling lives
3) Recruit and retain students through persistent, wide-ranging and targeted marketing and promotion, to internal and external constituents, of UW Green Bay's high impact, transformational educational experiences and individualized student support.

Below we provide a basic overview of the specific issues/problems we explored and highlight the most promising strategies to address each. These are listed in order of priority. In the next section we present more detailed information about each issue, including summaries of relevant data, critiques of current strategies, and details about how to accomplish our recommended strategies.
Overview of Issues

1. **We currently lack a culture of institutional responsibility for enrollment.** We lack long term goals and benchmarks for recruitment and retention, as well as the institutional structures needed to support enrollment work. We do not put adequate resources (either financial or human capital) into enrollment efforts, given the critical role of this work in the financial stability of our institution. And our current budget decision-making model impairs the effectiveness of enrollment efforts by not allowing initiatives that demonstrate a positive impact on recruitment and retention to utilize the funds they generate.

   **Recommendations:**
   a) Create strategic organizational structures for the work (“put someone in charge“)
   b) Allocate resources in ways that are consistent with our enrollment priorities
   c) Build enrollment work into administration, faculty, and staff workload responsibilities; professional development; tenure and promotion guidelines; merit review criteria; and awards and recognition

2. **We do not effectively utilize the data platform tools we have purchased and currently use.** We need to better harness available data to more effectively communicate with prospective and newly admitted students and more effectively support the retention of existing students. We possess platforms that have the potential to share information about admitted students with departments, provide early academic progress data or allow advisors to keep sharable records of contact with students (d2l, SIS, the CRM), but we have not yet harnessed them to do so, due mainly to insufficient staff.

   **Recommendations:**
   a) Create a group to oversee decision-making in the area of data platforms, comprised of IT staff, other staff who utilize the platforms, faculty, and students
   b) Provide the resources necessary to develop data tools and provide maintenance and support for their use
   c) Create data tools necessary to assist in recruitment and retention: a campus wide early alert system, a more productive CRM, an electronic storage method for advising records

3. **We underutilize the power of high impact experiences as retention and recruitment tools.** There is a significant causal link between student participation in high impact experiences (HIE) and retention. UWGB has the potential to improve retention enough to generate significant additional revenue, when comparing our retention rates to those of peer institutions in the UW System. Participation in HIE exerts a particularly strong impact for underrepresented students, which will be critically important as we seek to boost enrollment of diverse students. Finally, more effectively marketing HIE opportunities to prospective students and their families is an effective recruitment tool, showcasing our efforts to help students develop career skills and be more competitive on the job market once they graduate.
Recommendations:
  a) Grow the number and quality of HIE available to students, especially internships and undergraduate research
  b) Create a central office and position that oversees the development of HIE
  c) Utilize HIE as a marketing tool for prospective students and to build visibility in the community

4. **Our university website currently does not provide easy access to the information that students and parents want.** A significant redesign of both the actual website and the philosophy behind its uses needs to occur. Easy access to information is expected and required to compete in any market—prospective students become impatient when information is not available and will reject campuses based on their websites alone. Families and students need to see evidence that a UW-Green Bay education is affordable and relevant to their goals. And current students need to be able to easily access the information they need in order to maximize retention.

Recommendations:
  a) Employ an in-house design and support team so the website can be maintained and be innovative
  b) Conduct focus groups of prospective students to discover the information that they want to see on our website
  c) Design pages for prospective students (first year and transfer) that provide immediate access to financial information, campus life information, transfer credits and application processes
  d) Highlight student employability, graduate school, and other markers of student success

5. **We recruit fewer regional students than most of our peer UW institutions.** There is significant potential to boost enrollment of regional students, when looking at the demographics of the NEW region and comparing our regional enrollments to those of similarly situated UW institutions. But in order to do so Admissions must have the resources to more effectively harness data on prospective students and target the needs of different student populations (e.g., traditional, transfer, diverse). We also need to find ways to identify and attract potential transfer students in the region.

Recommendations:
  a) Enhance our visibility to local high school students and their families
  b) Improve recruitment of transfer students from NWTC and other technical and two-year colleges

6. **The population of UWGB does not adequately reflect the diversity of our community.** As a comprehensive regional campus, we have an ethical obligation to serve all local students, and we are currently under-serving local students of color. Better reflecting our regional demographic is also vital to the future survival of our campus.

Recommendations:
  a) Increase outreach and contact with underrepresented students and their families
b) Increase and publicize support and opportunities for underrepresented students

7. **We must enhance transition support for new students, particularly transfer and underrepresented students.** Although we provide a set of effective transition experiences for traditional first year students (i.e., FOCUS, first year seminars), we provide very little for transfer students beyond a 3 hour orientation program. In addition, we have few institutionalized programs targeted towards the underrepresented students who are most at risk of not being retained, and for whom our existing programs are less effective.

   **Recommendations:**
   a) Connect more quickly, more personally and more intentionally with admitted students
   b) Create more effective orientation experiences for transfer students
   c) Utilize peer leaders more in transition efforts
   d) Ease the process of transfer credit evaluation for new transfer students
   e) Utilize the AIC and Office of International Education more in transition support for diverse students

8. **We must better support students’ path to graduation.** The support we provide for students in helping them to progress through their college education smoothly, successfully, and in a timely manner is critically important for retention. We currently face challenges in our advising system, in the effective utilization of resources such as career services, and in our ability to harness data to identify students requiring assistance.

   **Recommendations:**
   a) Improve students’ advising experience
   b) Enhance collaboration between Career Services and other offices and programs that work to support students’ path to graduation
   c) Create an early alert system that allows us to identify barriers to students’ path to graduation and intervene effectively
   d) Develop a data platform that allows advisors to keep track of contact with students and share information across advisors
   e) Effectively communicate our resources supporting success to current and prospective students and their families

9. **We must create the perception of a more vibrant campus community with easy access to the city of Green Bay.** Despite a diverse array of well-attended activities on campus, a common student criticism of UWGB is a lack of things to do on campus. Some of this is likely due to the lack of walking proximity to restaurants, shopping and entertainment venues, coupled with a lack of viable transportation options for our residential students without cars. This issue also negatively impacts the capacity of students without cars to take advantage of internship or community service opportunities. Students are also concerned about the quality and cost of campus dining options.

   **Recommendations:**
a) Create a campus shuttle that provides students with transportation to business districts in the city.
b) Reinstitute the practice that all FYS courses include a mandatory requirement of all students to attend three co-curricular events during the semester
c) Explore ways to improve the quality and affordability of campus dining

Detailed Critique of Current Strategies and Recommendations

Issue 1: Creating a culture of institutional responsibility for enrollment

Critique of current strategies:
• We currently lack a cross-campus culture of institutional responsibility for enrollment. An array of factors contribute to, and are evidence of, this problem.
• First, we lack long-term goals and benchmarks. There are currently no such goals or benchmarks in place for campus retention. Recruitment planning occurs on a yearly basis (no long-term planning), and historically Admissions has not received guidance in terms of specific enrollment goals or targets. Most schools provide such goals and benchmarks, and have both shorter and longer-range enrollment plans.
• Second, we lack key institutional structures to support enrollment work. One of the foundational principles of effective institutional change is the need to “put someone in charge”. Although we have campus programs and initiatives across campus working on issues of enrollment, with the exception of Admissions there is little to no structural oversight of this work, which means that no one is truly accountable for reaching enrollment benchmarks. For example, we have no centralized “home” for retention-related work at UWGB. Instead, the programs and initiatives that enhance student retention at UWGB are housed in centers or offices across campus (e.g., FOCUS, the Phoenix GPS Program), or have no organizational structure at all (e.g., undergraduate research, internships). There is no institutional structure supporting collaboration or even communication between these entities, which creates inefficiencies such as duplications of effort and increased faculty and staff workload. This lack of institutional structure also means we have not established retention benchmarks, and no one is accountable for achieving retention outcomes. Many of our peer institutions have created positions that oversee and support transition and retention initiatives across campus. For example, UW Oshkosh has an Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Engagement & Success, overseen by a Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs. It is not a coincidence that these institutions consistently outperform UWGB on retention and graduation rates.
• Third, our current budget decision-making model impairs the development of enrollment initiatives. Specifically, it does not allow initiatives that demonstrate a positive impact on recruitment and retention to utilize the funds they generate, nor does it utilize existing data on the effectiveness of campus initiatives in making resource allocation decisions.
• The current structure of University Marketing & Communications poses challenges for our recruitment and retention efforts. Right now UM&C reports to Advancement, and so spends significant time on print magazines and press releases, speech-writing, etc. This makes it difficult to provide sufficient time for recruitment needs. UM&C also does not currently work on web-based marketing, and currently does not have sufficient resources to cover and promote campus events, the visibility of which is important to recruitment and retention efforts. Peer institutions have integrated marketing teams within Admissions (e.g., UW Oshkosh, Winona State University), and the Adult Degree program at UWGB is able to staff their own marketing team due to their funding sources.

**Recommendations:**
In order to truly create a campus culture where enrollment is everybody’s job, we must do three things:

1. **Create strategic organizational structures** for the work (“put someone in charge”)
   a) We must develop long-term recruitment and retention targets, with links to specific initiatives and benchmarks for each to meet towards these targets. Targets should be created for general enrollment, but also for specific populations of interest (e.g., low income students, students of color, transfer students).
   b) We must develop institutional structures that effectively support enrollment initiatives and that track benchmarks and progress towards targets.

   i. Specifically, we believe the university should create a position focused on retention-related initiatives - an **Associate Provost for Student Engagement & Success** (or alternatively a Dean or Special Assistant to the Provost). This position would be staffed by an existing faculty member, using a model similar to CATL or the Associate Deans. The primary responsibilities of the position would be to oversee retention-related initiatives on campus, to set and track benchmarks, and to assist in the development and maintenance of activities that promote student engagement and success, and therefore retention. They would need to be able to foster strong, collaborative relationships between faculty and academic staff. Ideally, this person would have experience in the student affairs and academic affairs aspects of student engagement and success, experience with program development and management in retention-related areas, and expertise in the institutional assessment of retention, engagement and academic success. Ideally we could realign existing offices and programs that work directly on student retention and success under this position, potentially including: the Office of Academic Advising, Career Services, the Tutoring Center, the Counseling and Health Center, the AIC, FOCUS, and the GPS Program.

   ii. The university should also create a **Committee on Student Engagement & Success**, which works with the Associate Provost to create and track benchmarks, and which provides a mechanism for communication and collaboration on enrollment-related initiatives. This committee should be comprised of faculty, staff and students from across campus, and should include directors of offices and programs working directly or indirectly on issues
effecting student retention (e.g., Academic Advising, the AIC, Student Life, Career Services, FOCUS, GPS Program, Admissions)

iii. Although focused on retention, these structures would also positively impact recruitment because it would expand and strengthen programs that are highly effective marketing tools for prospective students and their families and will provide an institutionalized mechanism for communication and collaboration between recruitment and retention initiatives.

iv. These organizational structures should work with the administration and relevant parties to set goals and track benchmarks, and to evaluate the progress of campus initiatives in meeting our goals. In short, the structures should hold us accountable as an institution for meeting our long-term targets.

2. **Allocate resources in ways that are consistent with our enrollment priorities.** We must make a significant shift in budget decision-making, to a model where initiatives that demonstrate a positive impact on recruitment and retention are able to utilize the funds they generate and where demonstrable impact is a primary determinant of resource allocation. In addition, we need to increase the financial resources available to enrollment efforts, such that these initiatives have resources adequate to accomplish the goals with which they are charged.

3. **Build enrollment work into administration, faculty, and staff workload responsibilities; professional development; tenure and promotion guidelines; merit review criteria; and awards and recognition.** If it is truly expected that everyone attend to issues of enrollment, then this should be clearly identified and evaluated in all faculty and academic staff positions, faculty and staff should be provided with the time in their workload to contribute to this work in meaningful ways and opportunities for professional development around enrollment-related issues, and the work should be appropriately acknowledged and rewarded.

**Issue 2: Better utilizing the data platform tools we have purchased and currently use, so that we can better harness available data to support our enrollment goals**

**Critique of current strategies:**

- We currently have a variety of data platform tools that we are underutilizing, but which have the potential to be more effectively utilized to support enrollment efforts. SIS is seen as the anchor for many other systems and has proven to be very solid and stable. D2L has been good to work with for most, but has a contract ending in early 2016. Pilots have been started using other products similar to D2L to determine if the UW system should change vendors. The use of a CRM (client relationship management) system as a general operational practice is necessary if we are to be competitive in our markets. But the current program needs attention, and potentially more human resources assigned to support it. If we are to have methods to reach out and communicate with students, or potential students, these software programs can assist us, if leveraged properly.
• We currently have no institutionalized early alert system at UWGB. The goal of such systems is to identify students who need assistance early, and provide the support and resources necessary to help them succeed. Without such a system, it is easy for students early in the semester, either new freshman or new transfer students, to fall short of the minimum academic requirements, which puts them at greater risk of not being retained. Our early alert efforts currently on campus are sparse and reach only small pockets of our students in transition. Athletics conducts a manual mid-semester grade check on student athletes by asking instructors to respond to an email requesting students’ grades and any comments about their academic progress. The AIC has just begun trying to collect such data for multicultural students on campus. And the GPS program conducts week 6 academic progress checks for all students enrolled in the program via online surveys sent to instructors and students. In all of these efforts faculty response rates hover around 50% or less, since the reports are completely voluntary. We currently have no policy requiring that students receive a grade or feedback on their performance in a class until the end of the semester. Many other campuses require instructors to input mid-semester grades into their course management system, or utilize other more systematic forms of early alert, including purchased products from data analytic companies.

• We currently have a CRM system, but are not maximizing its utility. A productive CRM has the capability to get the attention of, educate, and motivate audiences of all sizes. CRM’s are often used to assist with recruitment of new students, inform or reach out to current students and to help stay in touch with alumni or donors. UWGB is in the fifth year of a five year contract with our current CRM vendor. The same CRM is used by Adult Degree, Admissions, and Nursing to assist in keeping track of applicants and where they are in the pipeline. Advancement uses its own CRM, and is currently happy with this product’s abilities. Data can be used to identify target audiences, but this is mostly done outside of the program by IT staff, or manually by CRM users. The vendor has promised updates to the software to better automate this process, but this has not been delivered yet. Although many other campuses are doing so, our CRM is not used for texting students or applicants at this time because UWGB has not purchased the CRM module which performs this function. The majority of CRM users do not have the tech skills to write/create anything beyond very basic events or campaigns within CRM, even after several sessions of vendor training. This is due to the limitations of the software, which requires some knowledge of software programming languages in order to function as designed. The number of users is also limited to the number of shared licenses purchased from vendor and installation of necessary software on users’ computers, which makes the costs associated with expanding use on campus of concern. Many of the key staff who have been responsible for supervision of the CRM project have left or are leaving UWGB shortly.

• Many schools also utilize a CRM to create a “lifespan” system that can provide data from first contact through alumni relations. This system is used to track students’ advising experiences, their academic progress, their campus involvements, etc. In short, it houses all information to support recruitment and retention efforts in one location. The advantage of this option is the “lifespan” capability and integration of data. The primary disadvantage is the cost to create and
maintain this functionality, especially when the system requires site licenses for each user (i.e., we would need licenses for every faculty advisor who uses the system).

- To provide consistent and effective advising, advisors need the ability to document their work with each student and to see students’ records of contact with other advisors. Such records need to be able to follow a student through their college career and from advisor to advisor to assist in keeping a student on track to graduation. We do not currently have the capacity to do these things at UWGB. Academic Advising and Adult Degree Advisors started using CRM during the 2013-14 academic year to keep notes on their advisees. Prior to this, notes were kept by individual advisors and not shared with others. Currently Faculty Advisors have no shared or centralized location for keeping notes on advisees. As stated above, the CRM is restricted by number of user licenses, so allowing all faculty advisors to use CRM for maintaining advising notes would have a notable cost for licenses and support. Although the Registrar’s Office keeps records of student petitions or appeals, but these are not available to all advisors for viewing.

- Many schools have an analyst who helps Admissions monitor data for trends and assists in better utilizing CRM systems to track and facilitate contact with prospective and newly admitted students. We do not have such a position.

- Better utilizing our data platforms has clear value in our recruitment efforts, as it will allow more effective communication with prospective students. It also has clear value for retention efforts, as creating early alert functions and ways for advisors to keep better track of their contact with students and communicate more effectively with them will both act to boost retention on campus. More effectively utilizing our data for retention efforts can also serve as a powerful recruitment tool, as we can market our use of these strategies to demonstrate to prospective students and their parents that we are proactive about their success.

**Recommendations:**

1. **Create a group to oversee decision-making** in the area of data platforms, comprised of IT staff, other staff who utilize the platforms, faculty, and students

2. **Provide the resources necessary** to develop data tools and provide maintenance and support for their use

3. **Create a campus wide early alert system**
   a) Activate the Mid-Term Grade field in SIS to hold the grade so it is viewable for students and available to be queried.
   b) Develop SIS query to identify students doing poorly in more than one course and alert their advisors of performance concern.
   c) Make advisors responsible for reaching out to these students and meeting with them to discuss what is happening and talk about options with the student.

4. **Create a more productive CRM**
   a) Establish a small (3-4) CRM oversight group to be responsible for overseeing the contract, implementation of the product, developing policies, such as user access levels, protocols/procedures for users to follow, and the prioritization of work for IT support staff.
b) Work with current vendor to get product working at the level promised by original contract, or search for new vendor with similar services already operational.

c) Hire either a permanent position, or at minimum an 18-24 month LTE tech position to extract quality data, develop events and write campaigns. This position should also be responsible for documenting these processes and provide training to other users to enable more robust use of the software.

d) Purchase and develop uses for texting module to assist in communication with students and applicants.

e) Explore the feasibility of a “lifespan” CRM product for campus.

5. **Create an electronic storage method for advising records**

   a) Test and launch a newly introduced feature in SIS which has the capability to keep and maintain advising notes which would be connected to a student’s SIS account.

   b) Create an expectation that all advisors are using a centralized notes system, either in SIS or CRM, to provide history and continuity of service to students.

   c) Create policy to keep records of all advising sessions to assist as supporting documentation for student appeals, outreach efforts and reminders for students of their past advising sessions.

---

**Issue 3: Increasing student participation in high impact experiences and more effectively marketing these experiences to prospective students and their families**

**Critique of current strategies:**

- High impact experiences are a powerful way to boost student retention and success, especially for the diverse student population that we are seeking to serve more effectively at UWGB. High impact experiences (or HIE) are defined as highly engaging learning experiences that involve practice in real-world environments, significant time on task and effort, frequent and constructive feedback, and substantive engagement with faculty and diverse others. They include activities such as service learning, internships, research with faculty, study abroad, and first year seminars.

  A growing volume of research suggests that participation in high impact experiences exerts a significant positive impact on retention, graduation, and GPA, and these effects are particularly strong for historically underserved students. For example, higher HIE participation in the first year of college for UWGB’s 2013-14 cohort is associated with significantly higher retention, GPA, and number of credits earned in students’ second year. Data from the 2014 NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement) indicate that UWGB students participate in fewer high impact experiences than their peers at other UW institutions (e.g., by their senior year 57% of UWGB students report participating in service learning and 17% in research with faculty, as compared to 67% and 26% of students in peer UW institutions, respectively). However, results from a 2012 survey of faculty and departments at UWGB suggest that many do offer such opportunities to students and would like to expand their offerings. Therefore, growing student engagement in high impact experiences would be feasible to implement and highly effective in boosting retention rates at UWGB, especially for diverse and/or low income students. And marketing these opportunities to
prospective students and their families would be an effective recruitment tool, showcasing our efforts to help students develop career skills and be more competitive on the job market once they graduate.

• Our peer institutions are moving to institutionalize HIE in their curriculum. For example, Recently, UW-Oshkosh reformed its General Education program to include internships with local non-profits and businesses. Although we now have First Year Seminars as a required part of our General Education curriculum for first year students, and study abroad fulfills a General Education requirement, we are behind many of our peers when it comes to other HIE. A few departments do require student internships, and others allow internships to count towards upper level requirements. However many of the HIE opportunities we provide do not count towards major or general education requirements (e.g., undergraduate research, peer mentoring).

• There is greater student demand for many HIE than we can provide given existing curricular pressures and workload and compensation policies. For example, Human Development typically has 2-3 applicants for every Research Assistantship position they offer. The Peer Mentor program for First Year Seminars typically receives 50% more applications than they have positions available. Although many faculty and departments would like to provide more HIE to their students, there are significant institutional barriers to doing so. In the 2012 HIE survey UWGB faculty reported the primary barrier was not having the time given their course load (i.e., that these experiences were not typically counted as part of their teaching responsibilities and that they had other more pressing responsibilities for courses that must be “covered” in their curriculum), and that providing HIE were not considered adequately in tenure and promotion or merit review guidelines (and so they felt pressure to spend less time on HIE and more time on the activities that “count”).

• UWGB currently has an exciting opportunity to significantly expand RSCA experiences for students on campus. As a result of the great work our campus team has done with CUR (Council on Undergraduate Research) as part of their program on Institutionalizing Undergraduate research within Systems and Consortia over the last three years, UWGB has been invited by CUR to participate as “exemplar” institutions in the next phase of CUR work, a 4 year NSF-funded project to transform college curriculum to engage students in research. UWGB is one of only 4 campuses from across the country that have been invited to participate by CUR, and this work will allow us the resources and developmental support to dramatically expand research-related HIE on campus. In addition, in fall 2014 our campus created a grant in aid of research for student researchers, allowing them up to $500 in funding to support student travel to present their research at professional conference.

• It is currently quite difficult for most students to access information about HIE’s on campus. For example, we lack a comprehensive, centralized, easily searchable database of internship opportunities, a system which many of our peer institutions possess. Instead, much internship information at UWGB is located on individual department websites (if available at all), with no link to a centralized database. We also lack a centralized database of opportunities to participate in undergraduate research, scholarship and creative activities (RSCA) with faculty. Currently students access information on RSCA opportunities from departmental websites (when available),
or through conversations with individual faculty. Supported by grant funding from the UW System, we are in the process of developing a database that will allow us to post RSCA opportunities from across campus in a centralized, easily searchable way.

- We also need to find ways to help students understand the value of HIE’s and make intentional decisions about participation. Currently students in the GPS program complete a HIE plan that involves discussion of the value of HIE, student guest speakers who discuss the impact of the HIE they’ve participated in, and then asks students to research a variety of opportunities and develop a plan for participation in 8 activities over the course of their college career. This work has been highly successful, as by the end of the first year GPS students report participating in over twice as many HIE’s as non-GPS first year students. As a next step, it is important that we help students to effectively explain the value of the HIE they’ve participated in to prospective employers.

- We provide many programs and resources that should be very appealing to prospective students (e.g., First Year Seminars, undergraduate research opportunities, the Phoenix GPS Program, a problem-focused education), however we are not effectively conveying information about these programs and resources to prospective students and their families. Peer institutions do a better job sharing information about these experiences in local media outlets, through more outward focused web-sites, during community events, etc.

- An underutilized HIE on campus is student employment. Research indicates a direct link between campus employment, retention and GPA. As an example, for the 2011 cohort, 71% of new first year and 74% of new transfer students who worked on campus have either graduated or were still enrolled at UW-Green Bay in fall 2013, as compared to 55% and 59% of cohort members without campus employment, respectively. However a smaller percentage of our first year students work on campus, as compared to our peer UW institutions (13% v. 20%, for 2011).

**Recommendations:**

1. **Grow the number and quality of HIE available to students.**
   a) Set a **campus-wide goal of participation in four high impact experiences** by graduation.
   b) **Provide faculty reassignments and adequate compensation** so that faculty can participate in HIE. Build this work into guidelines for tenure and promotion as well as merit.
   c) **Aggressively pursue funding opportunities** to expand our offering of HIE, such as participation in the NSF grant with CUR (the Council on Undergraduate Research).
   d) Utilize data platforms to **create a system that records student participation in HIE** and places this information on student transcripts. The badge system being proposed by the Academic Portfolio working group would be an effective way to do so.
   e) Provide **professional development opportunities** on HIE’s for faculty and staff.
   f) **Increase student support for participation** in HIE (monetary [e.g., new Grant in Aid of Research for students], logistical [e.g., transportation])

2. **Create a central office and position that oversees the development of HIE** activities on campus as well as promotion of these activities (i.e., an Associate Provost for Student Success or a Director of High Impact Experiences). This position will coordinate and centralize information,
publicity, and requirements for high impact experiences through a central office and give this office an accessible web presence.

a) This position could oversee the development and maintenance of centralized databases for internship, RSCA, and perhaps other HIE opportunities.

3. **Utilize HIE as a marketing tool for prospective students and to build visibility in the community**

   a) Profile student research, student interns, products of capstone courses, service trips, study abroad, etc. on the website in a visible and celebratory way.
      
      i. E.g., Link to videos in which students talk about their high impact experiences

   b) Use internships, service learning, and other high impact experiences to gain visibility in the community.

4. **Increase student opportunities to participate in internships.**

   a) Reach out to the Green Bay community to create more internship opportunities for students.
   
   b) Extend internship opportunities to first and second year students.
   
   c) Create a central location that disseminates information about all internships.
   
   d) Use a campus shuttle or other transportation options to help students access internship locations.

5. **Increase student opportunities to participate in RSCA** (research, scholarship and creative activities).

   a) Support campus participation in the NSF-grant-funded CUR program.

6. **Boost student employment opportunities on campus**

   a) Create more paid employment opportunities for our students, such as paid peer mentor and peer advisor positions. Increase opportunities for first year students to access campus employment.
   
   b) Improve the structure and support for student employment by offering a campus wide orientation program, job fairs and continued training/professional development opportunities.
   
   c) Effectively promote campus employment opportunities, and the value of on campus employment, to prospective students and their families

7. **Provide more opportunities for our students to become stakeholders in their education** at UWGB (e.g., increase student committee participation)

**Issue 4: Redesigning the university website to provide more easy access to the information that students and parents want**

**Critique of current strategies:**

- Chancellor Miller has identified the internal focus (“intranet”) of the campus website as a top priority. A significant redesign of both the actual website and the philosophy behind its uses needs to occur. Easy access to information is expected and required to compete in any market—prospective students become impatient when information is not available and will reject
campuses based on their websites alone. Families and students need to see evidence that a UW-Green Bay education is affordable and relevant to their goals.

- Given the time requirements for a complete redesign, a temporary partial fix is in place. A temporary homepage fix with a focus on enrollment went live January 16. CMS will be phased-in starting in the next few months. Once the move is made and training takes place, departments will be able to manage more of the content for their areas. A total website redesign will take place once a CIO is hired and web-development resources are addressed. Website redesign is generally an 18 month process even if done externally. There is a proposal for a web/marketing team on the Chancellor’s desk.

**Recommendations:**

1. **Purposefully and intentionally redesign the campus website** to focus on recruitment and retention and to make resources clearly accessible.
2. **Design pages for prospective students** (first year and transfer) that provide immediate access to financial information, campus life information, transfer credits and application processes.
3. **Use focus groups representing prospective student populations to discover the information that they want to see.** The design of the website should give immediate access to the information that prospective students want to know rather than to focus on the information that we think they should have.
4. Highlight student employability, graduate school, and other markers of student success.
5. **Employ an in house design and support team** so the website can be maintained and innovative.
6. **Make the website more interactive,** for example, with chat features for financial aid and admissions. Provide check lists for admissions processes.
7. **Develop a search engine optimization strategy tied to our brand.**

**Issue 5: Recruiting more regional students**

**Critique of current strategies:**

- The Provost, Chancellor and Enrollment team have developed a temporary recruitment plan for the immediate year that seeks to significantly increase our yield. The Admissions Office implements a comprehensive recruitment plan including: travel, on campus events, a large communication plan (both paper and electronic) which is focused on all traditional undergraduate students. The Admissions budget for recruitment has been static for many years. Due to increasing costs and development of new recruitment efforts, in recent years, the chancellor’s budget has helped fund additional marketing and recruitment activities.

- A new grant that covers application fees for students in Green Bay and regional high schools currently has had a positive impact on local applications.

- Current recruitment efforts are hampered by the need for a data analyst. Admissions implemented a CRM (customer relationship management) tool two years ago. This is a powerful tool, but requires staff resources to harness the data and use it to aid in recruitment. Right now,
two members of the Admissions team have been assigned to spend a good amount of their time creating content that will be shared, building and testing queries, cleaning up data, developing new functionality. These are very time consuming tasks and it has been slow going due to increased demands on the Admissions Office. The Director of Admissions has created a position description for a proposed position to be responsible for the duties above, thereby freeing up the recruitment staff to focus on external recruitment activities.

- It is very difficult to identify potential transfer students outside of the population at 2 year schools, and it’s a very competitive environment for prospective transfer students at these schools (i.e., all local 4-years are competing for these students, and internally we even “compete” with Adult Degree). There has been some attempt to address issues of transferability of credits through participation in the NEW ERA Faculty Dialog Group. Although there was some agreement that individual course transfer agreements are very confusing for students and global agreements would be easier to navigate, no data was collected to examine these perceptions.

- At this point in time, and given the fact that approximately 50% of your graduates begin at UWGB as transfer students, very few resources are devoted to transfer students. The list of things that Admissions would like to do and has identified as important includes: (a) a timely process for determining transfer credits; (b) a centralized location for articulation agreements, (c) marketing materials directly intended for transfer students/cohesive recruitment efforts, and (d) program-specific transfer guides.

- There is a 3 hour orientation program for new transfer students, but it is nothing like the scale of FOCUS.

- Anecdotally, transfer students slip through the cracks in terms of course transfers and orientation and this causes a “public relations” problem for other potential students.

- We currently have much less information on prospective out-of-state students, enrollment targets, etc than we do for international students, even though out-of-state students also generate significant revenue.

- Overall, existing strategies are more limited by resource constraints than by will or knowledge. Resources need to be dedicated so that recruitment can be effective, not as a one approach fits all mechanism, but targeted to the needs of traditional students, transfer students, diverse students, veteran students, etc.

Recommendations:
1. **Enhance our visibility to local high school students and their families.** From billboards to tables at events, other UW System schools (most notably, but not exclusively, UW-Oshkosh) have a large visible presence in the region. The university needs to take advantage of the popularity and visibility of UWGB events to share the value of a UWGB education with receptive audiences and community partners. This efficient strategy leverages existing popular programs and sports and builds image and credibility.
   a) Support externally-focused entities on campus (e.g. Athletics, Weidner Center, Summer Camps, Music, Theatre) to include recruitment materials, Social Media, and/or staffed tables at events.
b) Expand UW-Green Bay presence (e.g. billboard or poster advertisement, recruitment materials, staffed table) at community events such as UWGB Athletics at Resch and Kress Centers, on Campus Concerts, regional Musical Ensemble Tours, History Day, Academic Decathlon, State Solo Ensemble, AP Exams, WSMA State Honors Camps, UWGB Summer Camps, and UWGB Hosted Athletic events.

c) Host an annual Academic Fair for high school students and their families. Financial Aid, Admissions, all student support services, and all academic areas should be represented.
d) Hire a bilingual recruiter in the Admissions Office.
e) Provide grants for application fees for students in Green Bay and regional high schools.
f) Utilize CCiHS courses as recruitment opportunities.
g) Better utilize Phuture Phoenix as a recruitment tool.
h) Utilize students, especially alumni of local high schools, more in recruiting events in community.
i) Hire a business analyst to help Admissions monitor data for trends and to assist in better utilizing CRM system to track and facilitate contact with prospective students.
j) Utilize scholarship competitions, perhaps with an on-campus component, to recruit high achievers/Segment recruitment approach to specifically target high achievers.
k) Automatically offer scholarships upon admission to National Merit semi-finalists and all students with a designated ACT/GPA combination. (For example, a 3.8 or greater GPA and a 26 or higher ACT.)
l) Provide funding to staff the Admissions Office during off-hours (e.g. during on-campus weekend events, after traditional working hours).
m) Provide funding for increased outreach activities.
n) Improve and market campus amenities, events and transportation.

2. **Improve recruitment of transfer students from NWTC and other technical and two-year colleges.** The UW-Colleges are intended in part as transfer schools within the UW System. Students are able to meet general education requirements at a lower cost than at the four year campuses. NWTC and other technical colleges market the value of their education effectively. In both cases, many students (often first generation college students) from northeastern Wisconsin begin their path to college at one of these types of institutions. Increasing practices, efficiencies and relationships with transfer students builds and sustains the enrollment pipeline for our future.
a) Increase the efficiency of the course/credit transfer process (and accepted credits), especially with NWTC, including developing a comprehensive list of how courses and programs from NWTC transfer in to UWGB.
b) Market that transferability, including a transfer-student-specific link on the campus web site.
c) Put a recruiter at NWTC weekly.
d) Increase use of transfer fairs at UWS Colleges and other transfer-oriented schools.
e) Increase number of scholarships for transfer students.
f) Boost marketing support, including development of integrated marketing teams.
g) Make UWGB available for select/targeted NWTC evening courses, such as those leading to a transfer into the Engineering Technology Major. This would increase NWTCs availability to East Side residents, and acclimate potential transfer students to our university.

3. **Improve and publicize resources for students with dependents.** Students with dependents are a growing population in the region. Nearly all other UW-campuses have on campus childcare, and NWTC offered childcare vouchers. Currently, we have little or no directed recruitment of parents and many of our policies assume all students will be free of care responsibilities.
   a) Offer innovative, efficient and convenient on campus childcare.
   b) Provide targeted support during Admissions, perhaps using a network of existing students who are parents
   c) Advertise and enhance our support for parents, including assistance with accessing government resources
   d) Consider how our scheduling and in-class policies impact those with care responsibilities

**Issue 6: Increasing the diversity of UWGB to better reflect the diversity of our community**

*Critique of current strategies:*

- Application, enrollment and graduation data all show that diverse students are not represented at UW-Green Bay in the numbers that should be present based on the demographics of the region. As a comprehensive regional campus, we have an ethical obligation to serve all local students. Better reflecting our regional demographic is also vital to the future survival of our campus. Students need to see that others like them are represented and successful on campus. Families need to see that their students will be supported on campus. But we are currently not adequately serving local students of color. As of December 2014, 44% of Green Bay School District juniors and seniors are non-white, as compared to just over 9% of UWGB students. The vast discrepancy between these numbers clearly indicates that local non-white students are choosing not to attend UWGB, a fact born out in UW system data on the number of students enrolling in UW schools by county. But these data also point to a significant opportunity – we must find ways to better connect to local diverse students and their families and provide the type of educational experience they are seeking.

- We engage in less contact with parents of prospective traditional-aged students than many of our peer institutions, and seem to rely too heavily on email communication during the admissions process, which may come across as “uncaring” to prospective students and their families and negatively impact our ability to communicate with those who do not have regular access to the internet. Although the utilization of email is understandable given the significant resource constraints the Office of Admissions face, it is especially problematic for the recruitment of diverse students, as direct contact is especially influential in their recruitment. For example, peer UW schools have Admissions counselors hired specifically to work with multicultural admissions (e.g., UW Steven’s Point) and do home visits with prospective diverse students (e.g., UW Oshkosh). UWGB has only one recruiter for students of color, who works in the Admissions Office. Other schools also advertise directly in outlets utilized by different cultural groups, such as the
statewide Hmong magazine or bi-weekly Hispanic newspaper or on downtown billboards (e.g., UW Oshkosh). Other schools also target diverse students early, with programs and events that bring them to campus, such as UW Steven Point’s multicultural leadership program for local high school students.

- The energy and enthusiasm of the Admissions and AIC staffs is a significant strength in our work to boost diverse enrollment. But there are resource issues that limit the effectiveness of both recruitment and retention of a diverse student population. Finally, support of diverse students is largely relegated to the AIC, and while many faculty members do care about the success of all students in their classes and the overall demographics of the campus, efforts to address recruitment and the achievement gap are individual and fragmented. There is not a unified campus effort in these areas.

Recommendations:

1. Increase **outreach and contact** with underrepresented students and their families
   a) Hire additional recruiters specifically to recruit diverse students using recruiting practices that are known to be effective, including home visits to prospective diverse students and their families.
   b) Diversify recruiters, support staff, and recruitment/support approaches to recognize and address the varying needs of different diverse populations and individuals. One approach does not fit all!
   c) Utilize multiple media for reaching out to under-represented families. Not all have in-home access to electronic resources. Personalized direct mailings, advertisement in media such as ethnic newspapers, and presence with ethnic organizations should be part of the recruitment process. Suggested points of contact include the newsletter for Catholic/Hispanic parishes, Hmong Community Church, and African American churches.
   d) Use diverse student representatives to recruit at local high schools.
   e) Develop and moderate a Spanish Language Facebook group, and family support group “Familia de un ave fénix”
   f) Enhance transferability with two year tribal colleges and place recruiters on site at those colleges on a regular schedule.
   g) Develop bi-lingual recruitment materials.
   h) Develop 3 year, 5 year, and 10 year plans with specific goals for diverse populations.
   i) Develop under-represented group-specific materials for high school recruitment highlighting recent graduates from that group and published bilingually.

2. **Increase and publicize support and opportunities** for underrepresented students
   a) Provide on-campus day care and support students with family/care responsibilities.
   b) Increase funding and staffing for the AIC.
   c) Hire bilingual counselors and advisors.
   d) Develop summer bridge programs to increase student success.
   e) Hire more diverse staff (teaching and other) across all areas of the university.
f) Highlight opportunities for under-represented students at UW-Green Bay (e.g. research opportunities in the Hmong Studies Center)

g) Increase course content in multicultural subjects.

h) Develop and maintain Spanish Language Facebook groups for study support.

**Issue 7: Boost transition support for new students, particularly transfer and underrepresented students**

**Critique of current strategies:**

- Our FOCUS program is quite effective in supporting students’ initial transition to UWGB. We successfully register over 90% of our incoming students during June R&R, and a high percentage of incoming first year students participate in, and find valuable, our Orientation program. However we currently provide very little support for transfer student transition to UWGB, with a brief 3 hour orientation and no support programs such as FOCUS Orientation or First Year Seminars. Developing these types of transition support services could significantly enhance retention of transfer students and also serve as an effective recruitment tool for prospective transfer students.

- We have recently added First Year Seminars to the general education curriculum for all first year students at UWGB. Past data has found a significant positive impact of seminar participation on student retention and engagement in the first year.

- The Phoenix GPS program, started in 2013-14, is exerting a significant positive impact on retention and engagement of underrepresented students. Over 81% of the students who participated in 2013-14 are still enrolled at UWGB in Spring 2015, as compared to 68% of underrepresented students who did not participate. GPS students also have higher cumulative GPA’s, are significantly more likely to have declared a major and have participated in a significantly higher number of high impact experiences, as compared to non-GPS underrepresented students.

- The first year is a critical point for student retention. We lose almost 24% of our students before the start of the third semester. This means our transition resources may be an important tool in our retention toolkit.

**Recommendations:**

1. **Connect more quickly, more personally and more intentionally with admitted students.**
   Admissions should provide lists of admitted students to be distributed at designated times to key players in the semester. Department chairs, faculty, student advocates and general advisors should reach out to students upon admission to discuss interest in a potential major or to answer questions.

   a) Professional advisors could call transfer students that have been admitted but have not enrolled as of a certain date.

   b) An Ambassador with a hometown in a certain area could reach out to newly admitted students from that same location.
c) Peer advisors can take part in Admitted Student Days to assist Admissions with student/parent questions.

2. **Create more effective orientation experiences for transfer students.**
   a) Move responsibility for transfer student and international student orientations to FOCUS, and increase resources for programming. One option would be to charge incoming transfer and international students the FOCUS fee we currently charge new first year students.

3. **Utilize peer leaders more in transition efforts.** We need to better utilize our student ambassadors, peer mentors and peer advisors as contacts for newly admitted freshmen and transfer students. Moreover, we need to develop these programs, preferably for pay, in a way that creates a pipeline so we are not drawing from the same students. This will also allow us to run “lean” by doing more without creating additional professional positions. Ambassadors, peer mentors and peer advisors already exist. We must strengthen, diversify and grow these groups.

4. **Ease the process of transfer credit evaluation for new transfer students.** We must examine transferability of courses and expedite the decision on what courses transfer. Moreover, we must allow our transfer students to interact with faculty advisors much more quickly upon admission.

5. **Utilize the AIC and Office of International Education more in transition support for diverse students.**

**Issue 8: Better support students’ path to graduation**

**Critique of current strategies:**

- There is significant room for improvement in students’ advising experiences. One very significant factor here is the student to advisor ratio at UWGB. We currently have 5.2 full-time advisors to serve our entire population of students (excluding Adult Degree). Surveys of student advising experiences consistently indicate that students perceive problems with both the structure of the advising experience and the content of the advising. Currently at UWGB many declared students are still utilizing general Advisors (from the Office of Academic Advising) as their primary advising source. For example, during 2013-14 almost 30% of the students Academic Advising met with were juniors and seniors with declared majors. This means that many of our declared students are not utilizing the faculty advisors in their majors, who should provide better advising on major requirements and career options. This also minimizes the time General Advisors can spend working with undeclared and new transfer students, the population their office is designed to focus on. The lack of clarity about advising responsibilities also impairs the quality of advising that students receive from faculty advisors in their majors and can impair timely progress to degree. These problems with our advising process have a significant impact on retention, as students seek out other campuses with a more clear and effective advising process. They also exert an impact on recruitment efforts, as students share their frustrations about advising and their academic progress with others in the community. There is currently an Advising Task Force, created and led by our Director of Academic Advising, and made up of faculty, staff and students from across campus, working to tackle many of these issues. But there must be support from administration
to make a significant positive change in students’ advising experience. Academic Advising has also created a Peer Advising program this year, which trains undergraduate student to provide basic advising support about how to register for courses and understand the general education requirements. These peer advisors have been utilized to provide information sessions in residence halls and first year seminar classes, and provide additional support in the office of Academic Advising during the walk-in periods before course registration.

- The AIC is established to be a point of support and liaison in connecting students to resources, and provides critically important support for our multicultural students. Dr. Mallett is putting an increasing focus on connecting to students, personally meeting with 300 of the 650 minority students during the fall 2014 semester. As a result, the AIC has seen a significant increase in student traffic in the center. However, a recent survey conducted by the AIC makes clear that there is still work to be done to increase student accessing of the center resources. For example, 81% of the minority students who responded to the survey reported not utilizing the AIC, and 68% were not aware of the services that the AIC offers. The AIC is working to improve student knowledge and accessing of the center in many ways, for example hosting Welcome Back Gatherings that showcase their different student organizations in the fall semester, beginning study table nights at the AIC, and sponsoring a Celebration of Success event in the spring. Supporting our diverse students’ paths to graduation is an ethical imperative as we seek to grow our enrollment of diverse students. We must provide the support students need, especially if we are recruiting them with the promise of these supports.

- A significant limitation in our capacity to effectively support students’ path to graduation is the limitations of our data platforms. As stated in section B above, creating early alert systems as well as tools to keep track of advising interactions and share information across advisors would significantly enhance our ability to support students’ path to graduation.

- Scholarship opportunities assist with our recruitment efforts but also help to ensure continued academic success. Per statistics released by University Advancement, 85% of students who receive a scholarship of at least $1,000 were retained from freshmen to sophomore year, yet only 6% of our students receive an institutional scholarship.

- We need to work to boost the impact of Career Services. Assistance in career exploration, resume development, and job searching is a vital part of our work to support students’ path to graduation. Although students who do use the services find them useful, many students are not utilizing the services, due both to a lack of visibility to students and structural barriers to using the services.

- Many campuses have created “one-stop shops” for the services that students’ need most to support their path to graduation – often including academic advising, career services, tutoring, and even the counseling and health center.

**Recommendations:**

1. **Improve students’ advising experience.** We must continue the work of the Advising Task Force and implement the changes they recommend.
a) We must enforce our split-model of advising so academic departments are talking with students in majors about careers, internships and research. This allows general advisors to focus on assisting new freshmen, transfer and undecided students. Participation for general advisors in first year seminars is vital.

b) Since general advisor workloads are so high, the newly created peer advisor programs should be broadened to support and the student to advisee ratios reduced.

c) Excellent faculty advisors must be rewarded for exceptional advising. Advising duties must be included in merit.

d) Academic departments should identify lead advisors for each program, provide office hours and curriculum guides for students.

e) We must create an advising webpage for students and advisors, accessible from our homepage, that explains the importance of utilizing advising, serves as a resource for students, and explains our complete university advising model.

2. **Enhance collaboration between Career Services** and other offices and programs that work to support students’ path to graduation. Career Services must be improved and collaboration increased across campus. The involvement of this office is so important in path to degree yet it’s difficult to get collaborative involvement on student retention issues. There are many ways we can enhance career success.

a) We need to market our graduation statistics more openly on our website and webpages and continue to collect and assess our graduate survey information.

b) We must improve and centralize the internship experience. We may want to consider an internship coordinator or area on campus in which these experiences are housed.

c) We must be a resource for our students by providing effective career counseling with an open-door policy.

3. **Create an early alert system** that allows us to identify barriers to students’ path to graduation and intervene effectively.

a) Grade reports should be administered or grades provided for advisors attempting to track students.

b) GPA reports should be routinely provided to department chairs for follow-up by faculty advisors.

c) We need to consider an “in house” or early alert tracking software system that helps us in the areas above.

4. **Develop a data platform that allows advisors to keep track of contact with students and share information across advisors.** There seems to exist a lack of trust in access to important functions in SIS or otherwise. We must begin trusting our advisors and staff that work closely with students on an “academic need to know” basis.

5. **Effectively communicate our resources supporting success to current and prospective students and their families.** With the cost of higher education, students and families need to know that support services are available to ensure student success. Students and families, especially first generation and diverse students, do not always know how to find resources when they need them. UWGB has resources to serve specific populations of students but the visibility of those
resources (availability and value) must be increased. Centralized, user-friendly, targeted communications regarding resources should be available to support student success to all audiences who might benefit, internally and externally.

a) Highlight support services for academic success in appealing and visible ways during campus tours. They should also be accessible together electronically on the campus website (and perhaps physically as well)

b) Create a Spanish Language Facebook group for student support

c) Identify access points for specific populations (e.g., transfer students, veterans, first generation students, under-represented populations, etc.) and communicate them clearly and in multiple formats including, but not limited to, the campus website.

d) Enhance the following support services and increase their visibility on the campus website:
   i. Student physical and mental health services.
   ii. Tutoring opportunities.
   iii. Student/peer advisors.

e) Use application materials to create email database of parents/guardians for regular communications (e.g., about how to support their students, issues commonly faced at different points during the first year, etc.)

6. **Improve scholarship opportunities for students.** We should centralize scholarship application processes across campus to increase the visibility of scholarships available and assist parents and students in finding opportunities. This could be done by purchasing software or developing a system for our campus. Simplifying the scholarship process for students would break down the barriers that exist within the administration of our current program.

Issue 9: Creating the perception of a more vibrant campus community with easy access to the city of Green Bay

**Critique of current strategies:**

- Students often complain that there is nothing to do in the evening and on the weekends on campus. These complaints create the perception that UWGB is unfriendly and lacks a total “Campus Experience”. According to recent prospective studies of UWGB students’ transfer intentions, the most common reasons why students who eventually leave UWGB report considering leaving are: (1) not enough to do on campus (60.9% report), (2) campus isolation from rest of city (58.7% report), major not offered (32.6% report), difficulty making friends (23.9%), wanting to move closer to friends or romantic partner (19.6% report), and not feeling comfortable on campus (17.4% report). Academic and financial issues were less commonly reported (8.7% and 13.0%, respectively). These data suggest that retention initiatives focusing on the interpersonal aspects of the college transition and sense of belongingness on campus may be effective in boosting retention.

- The Office of Student Life and its Director Lisa Tetzloff have made significant advances in improving a sense of campus community during the past decade. In the last decade, the number
of weekend campus events has jumped from 60 to 265 (last year’s figure). Student Life programming is both engaging and well attended by students. Nonetheless, students continue to report that there is nothing going on campus. This suggests a problem with student perception, as opposed to actual lack of opportunities.

- A common concern voiced by our residential students is the distance of campus from the city of Green Bay, and the lack of viable transportation options for those without cars. Currently students can use the Green Bay Metro bus system for free with a campus ID, and there are fleet vehicles available to students for a minimal fee. But in many ways we assume that our students have their own vehicles for transportation, and students who do not are at a significant disadvantage in terms of internship opportunities as well as access to basic needs such as grocery stores. Though an environmentally sustainable and economical choice, the public transit system is slow (2 hours one way to Bay Park Mall) and does not provide service in the evenings, which is prime time for students, and no service at all on Sundays. Many students choosing to live on campus do so because they do not own cars or wish to drive in the city.

- Students are also fairly dissatisfied with on-campus dining options, particularly the price and quality of food choices. Union Director Rick Warpinski is aware of these issues and consistently strives to make improvements, such as creating a salad bar to increase healthier food choices. UWGB contracts with A’viands and the vendor contract will expire next year. A handful of UW campuses self-operate their campus dining (Platteville, Stevens Point), but those campuses have many more students enrolled in campus dining. Platteville, which is of similar size to UWGB, has four times the number of students enrolled in a campus-dining program. This means more money for self-operation. Becoming a self-operated dining campus may not be possible for UWGB because it requires enormous cash investment for food stock - money up front that we no longer have. Another student complaint that could be addressed is the retail ticket prices students pay each meal.

**Recommendations:**

1. **Create a campus shuttle** that provides students with transportation to business districts in the city.
   a) Campuses that use a shuttle service (e.g., UW Platteville, UW Stevens Point) tend to have more than one route operating at various intervals depending on that route. For example, University of Wisconsin Platteville and its Pioneer Transit utilize three different routes: a campus route that runs from 7:00AM until 8:00PM every half hour, a dinner route that runs from 4:30PM until 7:30PM every 20 minutes, and a shopping route that runs from 1:00PM until 11:00PM every one hour.
   b) Bringing a shuttle to campus would reassure parents of first-year students that there is a system with trained drivers that provides safe and reliable transportation year round. Students could get to the things they needed without taking several hours to get to the pharmacy or mall using the city transit system. It is also environmentally friendly. By bringing shuttles to campus, we could potentially cut down on the number of vehicles that travel to and from town.
c) Seek out the business of a local dealership to supply us with a two 15-passenger vans and one 7-passenger minivan. Recognizing that three vehicles is ambitious, we decided on such for two reasons: we could have overlapping route times between the two 15-passenger vans, and should one van break down, we could still operate.

d) Once we have the vehicles (and hired trained drivers), we propose two routes and possibly a third, if open to the community. The first shuttle would run on Saturdays and Sundays from 8:00AM until 6:30PM, and it would run in a loop that incorporated a grocery store, a pharmacy, the mall, and other businesses that fit into such a loop. Moreover, if possible, we would like to include many of the businesses that accept pass points. Currently, these businesses are two BP Gas Stations, a CVS Pharmacy, Festival Foods, Green Bay Pizza Company, Mackinaw’s, Noodles and Co., Toppers, the Bluff Pub and Grille, and Subway. The purpose of this route is to get students around on the weekends if they do not have a car on campus. The second shuttle would run on Fridays and Saturdays in the evening and late night from 6:00pm until 2:00am through downtown Green Bay. The purpose of this route is for students (21+) to get to and from campus on the weekends without the need to drive. A third possible option is to have a shuttle that runs complementary to the Green Bay City Transit system. This option is less developed, but the idea is to have it run on Monday through Friday from 2:00PM until 10:00PM to offset the early closing of the city transit. This option would be available to the community, and would foster community support for our university shuttle system.

e) In order to pay for the shuttle, we propose asking the businesses along the routes, and especially those that already accept pass points, to invest for the first two years of its operation. We believe this shuttle will bring students to these places of business, and thus a rise in their sales and customer base. We decided on this form of raising the money because it is not likely to raise student segregated fees in the coming years for a campus shuttle.

2. Reinstute the practice that all FYS courses include a mandatory requirement of all students to attend three Common Theme events during the semester. Students often do not know of the exciting things happening on campus and requiring attendance at these events will help shake up the misperception of flat campus life.

3. Create a buzz about campus events by making videos showing active and engaged students talking about these events. Ideally, UWGB should hire a media specialist to document our campus culture and work with student interns in Communications to learn how to make their own videos, etc. By spreading the word that things ARE happening on campus, students will feel less disconnected and a greater sense of commitment to enhancing their own campus experience.

4. Explore ways to **improve the quality and affordability of campus dining**
   
   a) At more traditional UW campuses, meal-plan students have $1,000 automatically deducted from their account at the beginning of the semester - and pay much smaller amounts for each individual meal ($2 - $4) throughout the term. Our campus does something different. Instead, we leave the overhead cost as part of the total payment of each meal. For example, other campuses charge less than $2.00 for a meal, whereas our campus may charge somewhere close to $8.00 for a meal. Though students end up paying roughly the same for each system,
the latter has the negative effect of reminding the student with each meal how much their food actually costs. The daily “sticker shock” effect experienced by UWGB students could be alleviated by adopting the first option. Because the contract with A’viands is almost up, we will have the chance to switch to another system next year. Thus, Student Government proposed switching to a self-operation, which could increase the quality of food on campus. We could also switch to a multi-vendor option. Rick Warpinski suggests the possibility of bringing in other companies; Festival could potentially take the place of the Corner Store. Kavarna could take the place of Common Grounds. This would mean closer ties with the community businesses, and Festival already has a system that takes student pass points.
Appendix A: Overview of Process

The EWG was asked to carefully examine the assumptions and processes of our current enrollment strategy and recommend an enrollment approach that meets current and future challenges. This includes (1) critiquing the current enrollment strategy, (2) suggesting ways in which to develop a culture of institutional responsibility for enrollment, and (3) suggesting investments that will place the university in a competitive advantage in enrollment.

In our initial work we explored five populations of students: (1) new/first year, (2) transfer, (3) returning adult, (4) international, and (5) historically underserved students. Data on current retention rates show that our year 1-year 2 retention rates for first year students are lower than most of our peer institutions (e.g., 71.9% for 2012 cohort as compared to 75.2% for UW Oshkosh, 78.9% for UW Steven’s Point and 82.3% for UW Eau Claire). Potential factors influencing this trend include our relatively high rates of first generation and low income students (60% and 38%, respectively), the fact that other schools have more selective admission requirements (e.g., UW La Crosse), and our campus environment compared to peer institutions (i.e., lack of downtown area within walking distance, larger percentage of commuter students). UWGB first year students also have relatively low 6 year graduation rates from any UW institution (e.g., 54.3% for 2007 cohort as compared to 61.2% for UWO, 67.5% for UWSP and 73.9% for UWEC. UWGB also performs more poorly than most of our peer institutions for low income students (e.g., 69.3% year 1-year 2 retention for 2012 cohort Pell grant recipients as compared to 71.2% for UWO, 74.9% for UWSP and 80.4% for UWEC). However year 1-year 2 retention of underrepresented minority students is about on par with peer institutions (71.7% for 2012 cohort as compared to 66.2% for UWO, 72.0% for UWSP and 74.6% for UWEC). There is clearly room for improvement in our retention rates, both overall and for historically underserved groups. And boosting retention rates will provide significant added revenue for campus, which could ease demands on enrollment for revenue generation. We need to develop and boost support for programs and structures on campus that have a demonstrable positive impact on retention and boost our retention rates to be more in line with, or ideally exceed, that of peer institutions. Growing these programs should also serve as an effective recruitment tool, as transition support is very appealing for prospective students and their families.

We do a better job of retaining new transfer students, although there is room for improvement with this population as well (e.g., 76.0% for 2012 cohort as compared to 80.2% for UWO, 77.2% for UWSP and 71.0% for UWEC). UWGB transfer students also have lower 6 year graduation rates from any UW institution (e.g., 60.2% for 2007 cohort as compared to 66.9% for UWO, 63.6% for UWSP and 63.2% for UWEC). Currently we provide very little support for transfer student transition to UWGB, with a brief 3 hour orientation and no support programs such as FOCUS Orientation or First Year Seminars. Developing these types of transition support services could significantly enhance retention of transfer students and also serve as an effective recruitment tool for prospective transfer students.

After a review of the data, including regional and national demographic trends, the group concluded that UWGB needs to focus more on better serving the regional population, especially underserved and transfer students. Specifically, we feel UWGB should be the place for regional students, and we should strive to provide the support regional students need to be successful in college and the experiences that will allow them to excel professionally and personally. This is not to say that we shouldn’t continue to grow our national and international enrollments, but that we are a regional
public university, and there is significant potential for growth in regional enrollments. We want to be known as a place where students will receive a student-focused, high quality education that will allow them to excel in their careers and in their lives; a place where students will be supported, and known and respected as a person. We should capitalize on who we are (a regional institution serving largely first generation students), and more effectively highlight our strengths, including: the quality and dedication of our faculty and staff; the quality of the problem-focused, interdisciplinary education we provide; the breadth and depth of high impact experiences that our students participate in, and the value of those experiences; and our student focus, the fact that we are a place where every student will receive personalized attention and support that maximizes success. These characteristics will appeal to a broad range of students - regional, national, and international.

We started by developing a vision statement that should drive all enrollment efforts at UWGB. **Vision statement:** UWGB seeks to be the destination for regional college students and all students seeking a high impact educational experience. We will:

4) Recruit students that better reflect the demographic composition of the region, and work actively to recruit a diversity of students from the region, the US, and the global community

5) Retain students by:
   a) Supporting student success, with a focus on knowing and respecting students as individuals and providing individualized support (before, during, and after college)
   b) Providing high impact, transformational educational experiences that promote successful careers and fulfilling lives

6) Recruit and retain students through persistent, wide-ranging and targeted marketing and promotion, to internal and external constituents, of UW Green Bay’s high impact, transformational educational experiences and individualized student support.

The EWG then began examining, as a large group, data on student enrollment trends and current campus policies and practices regarding recruitment and retention. We also explored trends, policies, and practices at other comparable campuses, focusing primarily on our peer institutions in the UW System. (See Supporting Documentation section for detailed list of data examined.)

In this initial examination, the EWG concluded very quickly that our recruitment and retention efforts are, and must be, inextricably linked. First, most retention-related initiatives are highly appealing to prospective students and their families, and we can boost recruitment by developing and more effectively publicizing these initiatives. Second, it is cheaper and easier to retain existing students than to recruit new ones. In addition, every additional student we retain each year generates significant revenue for our campus. The data suggest, when comparing our retention rates to those of peer institutions and when looking at the effectiveness of retention-related initiatives on campus, that we can realistically improve our yearly retention rates by 5-7% with heightened focus and support for these initiatives.

We then created four subgroups to examine in greater detail specific areas we determined were of greatest need:

1) **Clear Path to Degree** – focused on ways to promote academic progress and timely completion of degree (especially for historically underserved students) as well as participation in the high impact experiences that lead to retention, graduation and career success;
(2) **Recruitment** – focused on ways to enhance the recruitment planning and implementation processes and recruitment of diverse, local and transfer students;

(3) **Data Platforms and Tools** – focused on the development of tools to assist in recruitment and retention efforts, including early alert and data analytics platforms to enhance early intervention efforts with students at risk of not being retained, and more effective tools to provide early and consistent communication with new admitted and current students; and

(4) **Campus Experience** – focused on finding ways to enhance students’ experiences on campus and improve the perception of our campus as a vibrant student community.

**Subgroup Work Guidelines**

A. Each group should identify the scope of their work, the “problems” or issues they will focus on.

B. Each group should examine existing campus strategies and philosophies, and explore what other campuses are doing.

C. Each group should generate a list of recommendations and ideas for the future that includes existing strategies and new recommendations, and provide rationales for why each is important for UWGB.

For each recommendation/idea generated, consider:

- How it might be funded (so costs associated) and staffed? What institutional structures will the idea need to move through?
- What specific recruitment or retention issue does it address (with priority on those that address more pressing needs, and have the potential to exert more significant positive effects)? What’s the goal of the idea?

D. Each group should consider these groups in their work and review existing strategies, develop ideas/strategies that address the needs of each population:

- First year students (i.e., students who begin at UWGB as new first year students)
- Transfer students
- Historically underrepresented students (i.e., students of color, low income students, first generation college students)
- Other non-traditional student populations (e.g., older college students, international students)

Each subgroup worked over a period of two months to gather as much information as possible and identify strategies to meet our current and future enrollment challenges. The summary above reflects an integration of the work of these subgroups, with the individual subgroup final reports available in an appendix at the end of this document.
Appendix B: Supporting Documentation

**Part I: Data Exploration**

_The following questions guided our data gathering phase:_

**Recruitment:**
1. What are our current recruitment practices and strategies and the guiding philosophy (if any)?
   a. Who holds responsibility for recruitment efforts?
2. What are the current enrollment trends at UWGB and in WI?
   a. Who comes and why? Why do students not come?
3. Above for new freshmen, transfer, adult students, international students
4. What can/should we do? (generating priorities, ideas)

**Retention:**
5. What are our current retention practices and strategies and the guiding philosophy (if any)?
   a. Who holds responsibility for retention efforts?
6. What are the current retention trends at UWGB and in WI?
   a. Who stays and why? Why do students not stay?
7. What are our graduation rates, and how do they compare to the rest of WI?
   a. Who graduates from UWGB and why? Why do students not graduate?
8. Above for new freshmen, transfer, adult students, international students
9. What can/should we do? (generating priorities, ideas)

_We examined the following data:_

1. UW System data on enrollment, retention and graduation
2. NSSE data on student engagement and high impact experiences– most recent 2-3 cohorts
   b. Data: UWGB institutional inventory of high impact practices (2012)
3. National-level recruitment and retention trends (STAMATS reports and national publications)
4. Factors impacting recruitment and retention at UWGB: Institutional data on (1) participation in programs and initiatives such as First Year Seminars, the GPS Program, Learning Communities, (2) demographic variables such as race/ethnicity, SES, first generation status, residential vs. commuter status, declaration of major (3) challenges such as physical or mental health issues, financial constraints
5. Current enrollment targets and goals for future - from Enrollment Services (first year and transfer), Adult Degree, International Education
6. Breakdown of enrollments (FTE’s and other) – number of full and part time, degree seeking and not, average number of credits
7. Association between online courses and retention rates
8. Current techniques for recruitment contacts – from Admissions
9. Information on diversity of local high schools vs. UWGB population and perceptions about UWGB
   - Stamats 2011 and summer 2014 surveys
10. Current enrollment capacity – simple: how many open seats; optimal
11. Utilization of ACT names in recruitment – Admissions data on major interests of local students from our ACT lists
12. Number of students in CCiHS, where, how staffed
13. Non-academic reasons students don’t choose or don’t want to remain at UWGB - Data: Transfer intentions surveys 2011 and 2012, with follow up from fall 2013
14. Reasons why transfer students choose or do not choose UWGB - Stamats surveys
15. Needs of students choosing alternatives like Lakeland College - Numbers of students enrolled in any college (including for-profit) in Brown County. Demographics of the population of all potential students in Brown County (e.g., adult, transfer, h.s. grad)
16. The “academic slide” of sophomores (i.e., students who reach sophomore or higher status and then start a slow descent into academic suspension). Identifying patterns of credits earned, Cum GPA, Term GPA’s for students who end up suspended after 2nd year
17. When students leave UWGB (year 2, 3,4). The predictors of attrition at each point (e.g., failure in gateway courses, enrollment in major).

Part II: Findings of Data Review

Recruitment-related information:
• Recruitment planning currently occurs on a yearly basis (no long-term planning), and historically Admissions has not received guidance in terms of specific enrollment goals or targets. Most schools provide yearly goals and have longer-range plans.
• Many schools have an analyst who helps Admissions monitor data for trends and assists in better utilizing CRM systems to track and facilitate contact with prospective and newly admitted students. We do not have such a position.
• It is very difficult to identify potential transfer students outside of the population at 2 year schools, and it’s a very competitive environment for prospective transfer students at these schools (i.e., all local 4-years are competing for these students, and internally we even “compete” with Adult Degree)
• We currently have much less information on prospective out-of-state students, enrollment targets, etc than we do for international students, even though out-of-state students also generate significant revenue.
• We provide many programs and resources that should be very appealing to prospective students (e.g., First Year Seminars, undergraduate research opportunities, the Phoenix GPS Program, a problem-focused education), however we are not effectively conveying information about these programs and resources to prospective students and their families. Peer institutions to a better job sharing information about these experiences in local media outlets, through more outward focused web-sites, during community events, etc.
• We engage in less contact with parents of prospective traditional-aged students than many of our peer institutions. This contact is especially influential in the recruitment of multicultural students. For example, peer UW schools have Admissions counselors hired specifically to work with multicultural admissions (e.g., UW Steven’s Point) and do home visits with prospective diverse
students (e.g., UW Oshkosh). Other schools also advertise directly in outlets utilized by different cultural groups, such as the statewide Hmong magazine or bi-weekly Hispanic newspaper or on downtown billboards (e.g., UW Oshkosh). Other schools also target diverse students early, with programs and events that bring them to campus, such as UW Steven Point’s multicultural leadership program for local high school students.

- The Admissions department does not currently work at all with graduate admissions. If we intend to grow our graduate programs we will need to develop a structure that effectively markets our programs and recruits prospective students.
- The current structure of University Marketing & Communications poses challenges for recruitment efforts. Right now UM&C reports to Advancement, and so spends significant time on print magazines and press releases, speech-writing, etc. This makes it difficult to provide sufficient time for recruitment needs. UM&C also does not currently work on web-based marketing, and currently does not have sufficient resources to cover and promote campus events, the visibility of which is important to recruitment and retention efforts. Peer institutions have integrated marketing teams within Admissions (e.g., UW Oshkosh, Winona State University), and the Adult Degree program at UWGB is able to staff their own marketing team due to their funding sources.
- A shift in budget decision-making, to a model where initiatives that demonstrate a positive impact on recruitment and retention are able to utilize the funds they generate, would significantly assist in recruitment efforts. Enhancing recruitment efforts is going to require an increase in resources.

Retention-related information:
- Currently our year 1-year 2 retention rates for first year students are lower than most of our peer institutions (e.g., 71.9% for 2012 cohort as compared to 75.2% for UW Oshkosh, 78.9% for UW Steven’s Point and 82.3% for UW Eau Claire). Potential factors influencing this trend include our relatively high rates of first generation and low income students (60% and 38%, respectively), the fact that other schools have more selective admission requirements (e.g., UW La Crosse), and our campus environment compared to peer institutions (i.e., lack of downtown area within walking distance, larger percentage of commuter students). UWGB first year students also have relatively low 6 year graduation rates from any UW institution (e.g., 54.3% for 2007 cohort as compared to 61.2% for UWO, 67.5% for UWSP and 73.9% for UWEC. UWGB also performs more poorly than most of our peer institutions for low income students (e.g., 69.3% year 1-year 2 retention for 2012 cohort Pell grant recipients as compared to 71.2% for UWO, 74.9% for UWSP and 80.4% for UWEC). However year 1-year 2 retention of underrepresented minority students is about on par with peer institutions (71.7% for 2012 cohort as compared to 66.2% for UWO, 72.0% for UWSP and 74.6% for UWEC). There is clearly room for improvement in our retention rates, both overall and for historically underserved groups. And boosting retention rates will provide significant added revenue for campus, which could ease demands on enrollment for revenue generation. We need to develop and boost support for programs and structures on campus that have a demonstrable positive impact on retention and boost our retention rates to be more in line with, or ideally exceed, that of peer institutions. Growing these programs should also serve as an
effective recruitment tool, as transition support is very appealing for prospective students and their families.

- We do a better job of retaining new transfer students, although there is room for improvement with this population as well (e.g., 76.0% for 2012 cohort as compared to 80.2% for UWO, 77.2% for UWSP and 71.0% for UWEC). UWGB transfer students also have lower 6 year graduation rates from any UW institution (e.g., 60.2% for 2007 cohort as compared to 66.9% for UWO, 63.6% for UWSP and 63.2% for UWEC). Currently we provide very little support for transfer student transition to UWGB, with a brief 3 hour orientation and no support programs such as FOCUS Orientation or First Year Seminars. Developing these types of transition support services could significantly enhance retention of transfer students and also serve as an effective recruitment tool for prospective transfer students.

- According to recent prospective studies of UWGB students’ transfer intentions, the most common reasons why students who eventually leave UWGB report considering leaving are: (1) not enough to do on campus (60.9% report), (2) campus isolation from rest of city (58.7% report), major not offered (32.6% report), difficulty making friends (23.9%), wanting to move closer to friends or romantic partner (19.6% report), and not feeling comfortable on campus (17.4% report). Academic and financial issues were less commonly reported (8.7% and 13.0%, respectively). These data suggest that retention initiatives focusing on the interpersonal aspects of the college transition and sense of belongingness on campus may be particularly effective, as may a reevaluation of academic majors offered in order to be more competitive with our peer institutions.

- UWGB is relatively inexpensive as compared to other 4-year UW schools, partly because we haven’t utilized differential tuition.

- Our FTE numbers are significantly influenced by CCiHS (college credit in high school) enrollments. One FTE = 15 credits, and this fall we had 980 enrollments in CCiHS courses in our region (the equivalent of 196 FTE). So this is boosting our FTE numbers considerably, and growth in the CCiHS program has helped our enrollment numbers significantly over the last three years as our number of full time students has decreased significantly.

- There is significant room for improvement in students’ advising experiences. Surveys of student advising experiences consistently indicate that students perceive problems with both the structure of the advising experience and the content of the advising. Currently at UWGB many declared students are still utilizing general Advisors (from the Office of Academic Advising) as their primary advising source, and are not utilizing the faculty advisors in their majors, who can provide better advising on major requirements and career options. This also minimizes the time General Advisors can spend working with undeclared and new transfer students, the populations their office is designed to focus on. The lack of clarity about advising responsibilities also impairs the quality of advising that students receive from faculty advisors in their majors and can impair timely progress to degree. These problems with our advising process have a significant impact on retention, as students seek out other campuses with a more clear and effective advising process.
They also exert an impact on recruitment efforts, as students share their frustrations with advising and their academic progress with others in the community.

- One very promising avenue to boost retention is providing high impact experiences to students, defined as highly engaging learning experiences that involve practice in real-world environments, significant time on task and effort, frequent and constructive feedback, and substantive engagement with faculty and diverse others. High impact experiences include activities such as service learning, internships, research with faculty, study abroad, and first year seminars. A growing volume of research suggests that participation in high impact experiences exerts a significant positive impact on retention, graduation, and GPA, and these effects are particularly strong for historically underserved students. Data from the 2014 NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement) indicate that UWGB students participate in fewer high impact experiences than their peers at other UW institutions (e.g., by their senior year 57% of UWGB students report participating in service learning and 17% in research with faculty, as compared to 67% and 26% of students in peer UW institutions, respectively). However, results from a 2012 survey of faculty and departments at UWGB suggest that many do offer such opportunities to students and would like to expand their offerings. Therefore, growing student engagement in high impact experiences may be a practical and effective way to improve retention rates at UWGB, especially for diverse and/or low income students. And marketing these opportunities to prospective students and their families would be an effective recruitment tool.

- Currently, the programs and initiatives that enhance student retention at UWGB are housed in centers or offices across campus (e.g., FOCUS, the Phoenix GPS Program), or have no organizational structure at all (e.g., undergraduate research, internships). There is no institutional structure supporting collaboration or even communication between these entities, which significantly impairs our capacity to improve retention rates. Many other campuses have created positions that support and coordinate transition and retention initiatives across campus (e.g., Dean of Student Success and High Impact Experiences). Creating such a position at UWGB, as well as a governance group that brings together constituents working on these initiatives from across campus, would significantly enhance retention at UWGB.

In this initial work we explored five different populations of students: (1) new/first year, (2) transfer, (3) returning adult, (4) international, and (5) historically underserved students. After a review of the data, including regional and national demographic trends, the group concluded that UWGB needs to focus more on better serving the regional population, especially underserved and transfer students. Specifically, we feel UWGB should be the place for regional students, and we should strive to provide the support regional students need to be successful in college and the experiences that will allow them to excel professionally and personally. This is not to say that we shouldn’t continue to grow our national and international enrollments, but that we are a regional public university, and there is significant potential for growth in regional enrollments. We want to be known as a place where students will receive a student-focused, high quality education that will allow them to excel in their careers and in their lives; a place where students will be supported, and known and respected as a person. We should capitalize on who we are (a regional institution serving largely first generation students), and highlight our strengths, including: our student focus, the fact that we have higher
retention rates for low income students than any other UW school, that we are a place where those unsure of their major and career interests can receive the support they need to figure it out, and that we are a place where every student will participate in high impact experiences and will receive personalized attention and support that maximizes success. These characteristics will appeal to a broad range of students - regional, national, and international.
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Final Report: Enrollment Working Group (EWG) Clear Path to Success Subgroup
Date: February 4th 2015

Members:

The Clear Path to Success Subgroup was convened to recommend strategies to improve retention as a basis of improving recruitment. Recruitment allows institutions to create new programs, hire faculty and staff, maintain optimum course availability and increase morale through promotion and merit. Yet, often we don’t purposefully connect recruitment with its sibling; retention. It would be a mistake not to invest in retention efforts at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay. It’s time for a cultural shift in the way we view the enrollment/retention link. We must not lose sight of the power of retention as a recruitment tool. Below are some of our recommendations. These recommendations are based upon data we reviewed, interviews we’ve conducted and experiences we’ve had from the student, academic staff and faculty perspectives.

A Critical Note on the Structure of Student Affairs
We believe there needs to be a restructuring of Student Affairs with a focus on collaboration. We suggest the creation of a Associate Dean or Dean of Student Success position. Additionally, we suggest consideration be given to the creation of an Retention Director. Both of these positions will unite various Student Affairs offices such as Advising, Tutoring, American Intercultural Center, Counseling and Health etc., be highly involved in the day to day operations of student affairs and have a collaborative relationship with Academic Affairs. Other UW Schools have positions in place that serve this purpose (below). Let’s be clear, we’re not necessarily advocating for new positions, though funding opportunities may come from grants in either Title 3 or First in the World Grants. It may be more advantageous and practical to appoint someone internal to coordinate retention efforts. Someone that understands the personnel issues, historical roadblocks and campus challenges might have the most impact. The structure of Student Affairs may be the most critical piece of any significant change we face in the coming year. We need to take action immediately in the regard.

Schools that have an administrator tasked with overseeing some sort of student success/retention and/or first year experience area:

- **UW Oshkosh**: has a Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs which oversees an Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Engagement & Success/Dean of Students.
- **UW Lacrosse**: has a Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, that oversees a Director of Student Life where student orientation, pre-orientation and new student success are held.
- **UW Milwaukee**: has a Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs that oversees a Student Success Center where the First Year Program, Transfer/Adult services, Orientation programs, mentorship and advising take place.

- **UW Parkside**: has a Provost Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs that oversees an Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management, which includes below them a Director of College Readiness, Access and Transition

### A Critical Note About the Diversity

We are on the precipice of missing a major opportunity of increased diversity on our campus. As a comprehensive regional campus, we have an obligation to serve all local students. A demographic shift in the City of Green Bay should be reflected by a shift at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay. Our data indicates the need to begin preparing to support our Green Bay Public School graduates and provide support that focus on academic preparation. Diversity is a critical point in our report because support networks must be in place for authentic growth. To promise diverse students support on the recruitment side and not deliver on the retention side is the worst thing we could do. This is a social justice issue and it needs to be addressed to increase diversity.

Source: GBAPS Office of the District Equity Coordinator

As of December 2014, Green Bay Area Public Schools (GBAPS) students are 48% non-white and this number will only increase. In comparison, during Fall 2013 (latest numbers) UW-Green Bay undergraduates had 9% non-white enrollment. There are, of course, many reasons why these percentages aren’t more balanced, like preparation level for college, but the stark contrast is a reason to start asking questions. So I did. I requested data from the District Equity Coordinator at GBAPS about the number of potential area students that could come to UWGB. “Potential” equates to students who are currently juniors and seniors in high school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Total # of Juniors and Seniors</th>
<th>Hispanic Juniors and Seniors</th>
<th>African-American Juniors and Seniors</th>
<th>Other Non-White Juniors and Seniors</th>
<th>White Juniors and Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,783</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>1562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These numbers of potential UW-Green Bay freshman are telling in several ways. First, enrolling even a fraction of the diverse students coming from our public schools drastically changes the landscape at our institution in two years. If we were able to enroll half the non-white juniors and seniors (610
students) this would double the student diversity on our campus. Second, we can see that diversity is even higher at the lower public school grades (48% total diversity versus 44% juniors and seniors), so we will have the potential to grow our enrollment even more as time goes on.

A Cultural Shift in Three Key Areas
We identified three focus areas to improve that will positively change the retention landscape and culture at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay. The three areas, described below, break down silos and force a supportive campus environment. Most importantly, they’ll provide all students the authentic experience that our admissions counselors will be promoting on the recruitment side. Our recommended strategies and some examples are provided as well.

Key Area 1: Transition
The moment a student is admitted we need to begin to acclimate him/her to campus. We struggle in our efforts on transition. Why transition? The simple answer is that transition increases yield. Admissions reports our 2014-2015 yield, total number of students admitted that actually enroll, is 41%. Last year, at this time, it was 43%. Just as important, improvement in transition strengthens a student's decision to attend the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay and prepares him/her for the academic journey they are about to take.

Recommended Strategies to Improve Transition

1. **Connect with Admitted Students**
   Admissions should provide lists of admitted students to be distributed at designated times to key players in the semester. Department chairs, faculty, student advocates and general advisors should reach out to students upon admission to discuss interest in a potential major or to answer questions.
   - **Example:** Professional advisors could call transfer students that have been admitted but have not enrolled as of a certain date.
   - **Example:** An Ambassador with a hometown in a certain area could reach out to newly admitted students from that same location.
   - **Example:** Peer advisors can take part in Admitted Student Days to assist Admissions with student/parent questions.

2. **Utilize Students as College Guides**
   We need to better utilize our student ambassadors, peer mentors and peer advisors as contacts for newly admitted freshmen and transfer students. Moreover, we need to develop these programs, preferably for pay, in a way that creates a pipeline so we are not drawing from the same students. This will also allow us to run “lean” by doing more without creating additional professional positions. Ambassadors, peer mentors and peer advisors already exist. We must strengthen, diversify and grow these groups.
3. **Enhance Transition for Identified Populations**

We need to examine and modify our approaches and policies in ways that assist student transition without compromising academic integrity.

a. **Example:** For transfer students, we must examine transferability of courses and expedite the decision on what courses transfer. Moreover, we must allow our transfer students to interact with faculty advisors much more quickly upon admission.

b. **Example:** For diverse students, we must assist the American Intercultural Center and International Education to support newly admitted diverse students.

c. **Example:** For commuter students, we must make the campus more friendly to students that do not live on campus. Offer various events or course options that suit our commuter student population.

d. **Example:** For parents, we must offer a personal connection via social streams, modify the website to demonstrate the effectiveness of our retention efforts, connect majors to jobs and incorporate them, as much as possible, as a member of the support network.

**Key Area 2: Boosting Engaging Experiences**

Students with high impact experiences are less likely to transfer and tend to be more successful. We must strengthen and enhance our experiences with orientation, first year seminars, extra-curricular events, service learning, capstone experiences and others. Engaged students are successful students.

**Recommended Strategies to Boost Engagement**

1. **Enhance Orientation Programs**

As a campus we must unify our orientation programs and connect them to the First Year Experience. We suggest one individual or group of connected individuals to oversee them.

a. **Example:** Transfer Student Orientation, International Orientation and New Freshmen Orientation should be under the same roof. Special attention must be given to Transfer Student Orientation. Lack of funding and resources has weakened this program for such an important group of students.

2. **Scholarships and Student Employment**

We need these opportunities to be easily accessible and equally available for all students. We need to build upon both programs to create more visibility among prospective and current student populations.

a. **Example:** Create more paid employment opportunities for our students, such as paid peer mentor and peer advisor positions. Improve the structure and support for student employment by offering a campus wide orientation program, job fairs and continued training/professional development opportunities.

b. **Example:** Centralize scholarship application processes across campus to increase the visibility of scholarships available and assist parents and students in finding opportunities. This could
be done by purchasing software or developing a system for our campus. Simplifying the scholarship process for students would break down the barriers that exist within the administration of our current program.

Scholarship opportunities assist with our recruitment efforts but also help to ensure continued academic success. Per statistics released by University Advancement, 85% of students who receive a scholarship of at least $1,000 were retained from freshmen to sophomore year, yet only 6% of our students receive an institutional scholarship.

Percent of Students Working for Pay (NSSE 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>On Campus</th>
<th>Off Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen UWGB</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other UW Comprehensives</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1,100 students were employed in 1,569 positions across campus in 2013-14. UWGB falls behind other UW schools in on campus student employment opportunities.

Students who have campus employment during their first year have higher retention rates at UW-Green Bay than members of their cohort who do not have campus employment. For the 2011 cohort, 71% of New Freshmen and 74% of New Transfers who worked on campus have either graduated or are still enrolled at UW-Green Bay in fall 2013. These percentages are 16% and 15% higher than cohort members without campus employment, respectively. For the 2012 cohorts, the difference in outcomes is 17% for the freshmen and 11% for the transfers. 

Source: Impact of Student Employment on Academic Outcomes (2013)
3. High Impact Experiences
We need to encourage and strengthen high impact experiences on our campus. First Year Seminars should have consistent components such as professional advisors, study skills training and extra-curricular activities. We should not limit the freedom of faculty to teach topics, but we should require components that will increase engagement.

Key Area 3: Better Support for Path to Graduation
Whether we want to believe it or not, we are competing with other colleges on time to graduation and career opportunities. We must move past challenges that have plagued this campus for far too long.

Recommended Strategies to Improve Path to Graduation

7. Campus Advising
Advising on our campus exists in pockets. Some departmental advising is very good and some is not. There is currently an Advising Task Force tackling many of these issues. Administration must support their efforts to make campus advising more consistent and effective.

f) **Example:** General advisor workloads are very high. Peer advisor programs must be broadened to support and the student to advisee ratios reduced.

g) **Example:** Excellent faculty advisors must be rewarded for exceptional advising. Advising duties must be included in merit.

h) **Example:** We must enforce our split-model of advising so academic departments are talking with students in majors about careers, internships and research. This allows general advisors to focus on assisting new freshmen, transfer and undecided students. Participation for general advisors in first year seminars is vital.

i) **Example:** Academic departments should identify lead advisors for each program, provide office hours and curriculum guides for students.

j) **Example:** We must create an advising webpage for students and advisors, accessible from our homepage, that demonstrates the importance, serves as a resource and explains our complete university advising model.
2. Career Success

Career Services must be improved and collaboration increased across campus. The involvement of this office is so important in path to degree yet it’s difficult to get collaborative involvement on student retention issues. There are many ways we can enhance career success.

a. Example: Utilize alumni to attract more students. We must more effectively connect successful alumni in the community to current students.

b. Example: We need to market our graduation statistics more openly on our website and webpages and continue to collect and assess our graduate survey information.

c. Example: We must improve and centralize the internship experience. We may want to consider an internship coordinator or area on campus in which these experiences are housed.

d. Example: We must be a resource for our students by providing effective career counseling with an open-door policy.
3. Early Alert
We need to better identify and track academic and personal challenges through a systematic and routine approach.

a. Example: Grade reports should be administered or grades provided for advisors attempting to track students.

b. Example: GPA reports should be routinely provided to department chairs for follow-up by faculty advisors.

c. Example: We need to consider an “in house” or early alert tracking software system that helps us in the areas above.

4. Campus Technology
We need to examine our current systems and improve or discontinue them. There seems to exist a lack of trust in access to important functions in SIS or otherwise. We must begin trusting our advisors and staff that work closely with students on an “academic need to know” basis.

a) Example: PeopleSoft (SIS) has many inaccuracies confusing to advisors and students.
Improving SIS is vital to clear path to graduation.

b) Example: Our Constituent Relationship Management Software (CRM) has existed for five years and is still not working to capacity. The option for faculty involvement with this system is still unknown and unlikely. It currently exists in only Admissions, Adult Degree and very few Student Services Offices. We must examine whether to invest further or explore other options.

c) Example: We need to implement a way to get accurate queries from the Registrar’s Office. We request queries often, but frequently get inaccurate information. It is undetermined whether the inaccuracies are user error or whether all tools are being utilized for accuracy purposes. We must improve the accuracy of this information.

A Final Note
We cannot emphasize enough the importance of not overlooking the power of retention. There’s one undeniable truth. It is cheaper to retain a student than it is to recruit one. With a position/person that coordinates and organizes our efforts, his/her decisions that break down barriers and his/her courage to make decisions, we can make large strides very quickly. Make no mistake, we have numerous cultural challenges to overcome. From lack of trust on SIS access to territoriality for certain departments, there is much to do. We can strengthen retention at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay. In doing so, we can and will impact recruitment.

Respectfully submitted on February 4th, 2015 by Darrel Renier (Chair), Adolfo Garcia, Justin Mallet, Diana Debecchi, Alex Wilson, Steve Meyer, Denise Bartell
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Chair: Jen Jones  
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**Recruitment Subcommittee Report to the Enrollment Committee**

*Jennifer Jones (chair), Kevin Collins, Kimberly Desotell, Heidi Fenc, Ray Hutchison, Olyvia Kuchta, Alison Staudinger*

**Opportunity 1**

*The UW-Green Bay website can be improved to provide more easy access to the information that students and parents want.*

Chancellor Miller has identified the internal focus (“intranet”) of the campus website as a top priority. Easy access to information is expected and required to compete in any market—prospective students become impatient when information is not available and will reject campuses based on their websites alone. Families and students need to see evidence that a UW-Green Bay education is affordable and relevant to their goals.

**Existing Strategies:**

- A temporary homepage fix with a focus on enrollment went live January 16.
- CMS will be phased-in starting in the next few months. Once the move is made and training takes place, departments will be able to manage more of the content for their areas.
- Total website redesign will take place when a CIO is hired and web-development resources are addressed. There is a proposal for a web/marketing team on the Chancellor’s desk.
- Website redesign is generally an 18 month process even if done externally.

Strengths and Limitations: The existing strategies recognize that a significant redesign of both the actual website and the philosophy behind its uses needs to occur. Given the time requirements for a complete redesign, a temporary partial fix is in place. Strategies below include the elements that the Recruitment Subcommittee finds to be important in the re-conceptualization of the website.

**Suggested Strategy 1: Purposefully and intentionally redesign the campus website to focus on recruitment and to make resources clearly accessible**

- Design pages for prospective students (first year and transfer) that provide immediate access to financial information, campus life information, transfer credits and application processes.
- Use focus groups representing prospective student populations to discover the information that they want to see. The design of the website should give immediate access to the information that prospective students want to know rather than to focus on the information that we think they should have.
- Highlight student employability, graduate school, and other markers of student success.
- Employ an in house design and support team so the website can be maintained and innovative.
• Make the website more interactive, for example, with chat features for financial aid and admissions. Provide check lists for admissions processes.
• Develop a Search Engine Optimization Strategy tied to our brand.

**Suggested Strategy 2: Strengthen and publicize High Impact Practices**

There is strong evidence that high impact experiences attract and retain students. These include, but are not limited to, student/faculty research partnerships, internships, study-abroad and capstone experiences. A more coordinated approach to these activities would help us tell these stories for recruitment, measure their impact and allow more students to engage in high impact experiences.

B. Profile student research, student interns, products of capstone courses, service trips, study abroad, etc. on the website in a visible and celebratory way.
C. Coordinate and centralize information, publicity, and requirements for internships (and perhaps other high impact experiences) through a central office and give this office an accessible web presence.
D. Use internships to gain visibility in the community.
E. Link to videos in which students talk about their high impact experiences.
F. In order for these experiences to be strong:
   G. Create standards for high impact experiences.
   H. Provide faculty reassignments and workload adjustments for those involved in significant high impact practices.
• Aim for every student at UWGB to complete at least two high impact experiences in their time here.
• Build on CATL grants (such as the new $50,000 undergraduate research grant) to increase support (monetary, pedagogical and logistical) for undergraduate research.
I. Provide more opportunities for our students to become stakeholders in their education at UWGB (e.g., increase student committee participation)

**Suggested Strategy 3: Enhance and effectively communicate resources for success (especially for freshmen and sophomores)**

With the cost of higher education, students and families need to know that support services are available to ensure student success. Students and families, especially first generation and diverse students, do not always know how to find resources when they need them. UWGB has resources to serve specific populations of students but the visibility of those resources (availability and value) must be increased. Our civic mission includes reflecting the diversity of our region and world, which requires coordinated and robust support. Centralized, user-friendly, targeted communications regarding resources should be available to support student success to all audiences who might benefit, internally and externally.

• Implement suggestions from the Pathways to Success subcommittee. Pathways should be highly visible on the campus website, in printed recruitment materials, and in presentations. Pathways to Success should be framed as success and not treated in any way as remedial.
• Place all support services for academic success in beautiful and visible environments and highlighted in a positive light on campus tours. They should be accessible together electronically on the campus website (and perhaps physically as well.)
• Create a Spanish Language Facebook group for student support.
• Create efficient Connection Points/Access Points that are communicated clearly and in multiple formats including, but not limited to, the campus website.
• Identify Access Points or people unique to specific populations (transfer students, veterans, first generation students, under-represented populations, etc.) and communicate them clearly and in multiple formats including, but not limited to, the campus website.
• Enhance the following support services and increase their visibility on the campus website:
  o Student physical and mental health services.
  o Tutoring opportunities.
  o Student/peer advisors.
• Use application materials to create email database of parents/guardians for regular communications (e.g., about how to support their students, issues commonly faced at different points during the first year, etc.)

Opportunity 2

UW-Green Bay can recruit more students from the local region, and at a minimum close the local market share gap between UWGB and other UW System campuses from our region.

The problem was identified based on the recruitment/enrollment data for UW System schools. Relevant to this data, this region of the state does not have the same tradition of higher education (as given by Bachelor’s Degrees per capita) than much of Wisconsin. NWTC is in our immediate region and has both a strong reputation in the community and markets its value well.

Existing Strategies:
• The Provost, Chancellor and Enrollment team have developed a temporary recruitment plan for the immediate year.
  o Grants for application fees for students in Green Bay and regional high schools currently have a positive impact on local applications.
• The Admissions Office implements a comprehensive recruitment plan including: travel, on campus events, a large communication plan (both paper and electronic) which is focused on all traditional undergraduate students. The Admissions budget for recruitment has been static for many years. Due to increasing costs and development of new recruitment efforts, in recent years, the chancellor’s budget has helped fund additional marketing and recruitment activities.
• Current recruitment efforts are hampered by the need for a data analyst. Admissions implemented a CRM (customer relationship management) tool two years ago. This is a powerful tool, but requires staff resources to harness the data and use it to aid in recruitment. Right now, two members of the Admissions team have been assigned to spend a good amount of their time creating content that will be shared, building and testing queries, cleaning up data, developing new functionality. These are very time consuming tasks and it has been slow going due to increased demands on the Admissions Office. The Director of Admissions has
created a position description for a proposed position to be responsible for the duties above, thereby freeing up the recruitment staff to focus on external recruitment activities.

- Existing strategies relating to recruitment of transfer students:
  o NEW ERA Faculty Dialog Group was intended to address the perception that students lose credits when they transfer because faculty members are reluctant to accept courses from other institutions as meeting their requirements. There was some agreement that individual course transfer agreements are very confusing for students and global agreements would be easier to navigate, although no data was collected.
  o At this point in time, very few resources are devoted to transfer students. The list of things that Admissions would like to do and has identified as important includes:
    ▪ A timely process for determining transfer credits
    ▪ A centralized location for articulation agreements
    ▪ Marketing materials directly intended for transfer students/cohesive recruitment efforts
    ▪ Program transfer guides
  o There is an orientation for transfer students, but nothing like the scale of Focus.
  o Anecdotally, transfer students slip through the cracks in terms of course transfers and orientation and this causes a “public relations” problem for other potential students.

Strengths and Limitations: Existing strategies are more limited by resource constraints than by will or knowledge. In other words, a main weakness in the existing strategies is that there is not enough of them. Resources need to be dedicated so that recruitment can be effective, not as a one approach fits all mechanism, but targeted to the needs of traditional students, transfer students, diverse students, veteran students, etc.

**Suggested Strategy 1: Enhance visibility to local high school students and their families**
From billboards to tables at events, other UW System schools (most notably, but not exclusively, UW-Oshkosh) have a large visible presence in the region. The university needs to take advantage of the popularity and visibility of UWGB events to share the value of a UWGB education with receptive audiences and community partners. This efficient strategy leverages existing popular programs and sports and builds image and credibility.

- Support externally-focused entities on campus (e.g. Athletics, Weidner Center, Summer Camps, Music, Theatre) to include recruitment materials, Social Media, and/or staffed tables at events.
- Expand UW-Green Bay presence (e.g. billboard or poster advertisement, recruitment materials, staffed table) at community events such as UWGB Athletics at Resch and Kress Centers, on Campus Concerts, regional Musical Ensemble Tours, History Day, Academic Decathlon, State Solo Ensemble, AP Exams, WSMA State Honors Camps, UWGB Summer Camps, and UWGB Hosted Athletic events.
- Host an annual Academic Fair for high school students and their families. Financial Aid, Admissions, all student support services, and all academic areas should be represented.
- Hire a bilingual recruiter in the Admissions Office.
- Provide grants for application fees for students in Green Bay and regional high schools.
• Utilize CCiHS courses as recruitment opportunities.
• Better utilize Phuture Phoenix as recruitment tool.
• Utilize students, especially alumni of local high schools) more in recruiting events in community.
• Hire a business analyst to help Admissions monitor data for trends and to assist in better utilizing CRM system to track and facilitate contact with prospective students.
• Utilize scholarship competitions, perhaps with an on-campus component, to recruit high achievers/Segment recruitment approach to specifically target high achievers.
• Automatically offer scholarships upon admission to National Merit semi-finalists and all students with a designated ACT/GPA combination. (For example, a 3.8 or greater GPA and a 26 or higher ACT.)
• Provide funding to staff the Admissions Office during off-hours (e.g. during on-campus weekend events, after traditional working hours).
• Provide funding for increased outreach activities.
• Improve and market campus amenities, events and transportation.

**Suggested Strategy 2: Improve recruitment of transfer students from NWTC and other technical and two-year colleges**

The UW-Colleges are intended in part as transfer schools within the UW System. Students are able to meet general education requirements at a lower cost than at the four year campuses. NWTC and other technical colleges market the value of their education effectively. In both cases, many students (often first generation college students) from northeastern Wisconsin begin their path to college at one of these types of institutions. Increasing practices, efficiencies and relationships with transfer students builds and sustains the enrollment pipeline for our future.

a. Increase the efficiency of the course/credit transfer process (and accepted credits), especially with NWTC, including developing a comprehensive list of how courses and programs from NWTC transfer in to UWGB.

b. Market that transferability, including a transfer-student-specific link on the campus web site.

c. Put a recruiter at NWTC weekly.

d. Increase use of transfer fairs at UWS Colleges and other transfer-oriented schools.

e. Increase number of scholarships for transfer students.

f. Boost marketing support, including development of integrated marketing teams.

g. Make UWGB available for select/targeted NWTC evening courses, such as those leading to a transfer into the Engineering Technology Major. This would increase NWTCs availability to East Side residents, and acclimate potential transfer students to our university.

**Suggested Strategy 3: Improve and publicize resources for students with dependents**

Students with dependents are a growing population in the region. Nearly all other UW-campus have on campus childcare, and NWTC offered childcare vouchers. Currently, we have little or no directed recruitment of parents and many of our policies assume all students will be free of care responsibilities.

J. Offer innovative, efficient and convenient on campus childcare.
• Provided targeted support during Admissions, perhaps using a network of existing students who are parents
• Advertise and enhance our support for parents, including assistance with accessing government resources
• Consider how our scheduling and in-class policies impact those with care responsibilities

Opportunity 3

We can attract a diverse student population that reflects the demographics of our community.

Application, enrollment and graduation data all show that diverse students are not represented at UW-Green Bay in the numbers that should be present based on the demographics of the region (approximately 30% of Green Bay public school students.) Our campus should better reflect our regional demographic and serve the local region. This is healthy for our campus and vital to the survival of our campus in the future. Students need to see that others like them are represented and successful on campus. Families need to see that their students will be supported on campus. We have very little tradition of reaching out to underrepresented students and their families.

Existing Strategies:
• Existing strategies (see below) largely relate to retention of diverse students by work of the AIC. There is a great need for resources for minority recruiters. There is currently only one recruiter for students of color in the Admissions Office.
• Diverse students are told about resources to support them during FOCUS-Registration and Resource, and FOCUS-Orientation. Transfer students are told during Transfer Orientation. Students do not like to be singled out for their ethnicity during these events and not a single student or family member spoke with advisors about these resources during the three Preview Days. AIC is a better point of access. Family members are not made aware of resources unless they talk to AIC staff during Orientation.
• AIC is established to be point of support and liaison in connecting students to resources. Dr. Mallett is putting an increasing focus on connecting to students. He personally met with 300 of the 650 minority students during the fall semester alone, and is seeing more traffic in the AIC as a result.
• From a recent survey, “81% of our minority students (220 respondents out of 650 total minority students) do not utilize the American Intercultural Center and another 68% are not even aware of the services that we offer within the AIC.” (Justin)
• AIC hosts Welcome Back Gathering/Fall Showcase.
• Resources or centers include:
  o First Nations Studies
  o BSU (Black Student Union)
  o WOC (Women of Color)
  o ISC (Intertribal Student Council)
  o SASU (Southeast Asian Student Union)
  o OLA (Organization Latino Americana)
• New things coming up include:
- Academic Progress Report program
- Study table nights in AIC
- Cooperation with Tutoring Learning Center
- Celebration of Success in the spring

Relevant findings from Equity Scorecard (quoted from their report)
- Students/Applicants have financial concerns.
- UWGB has multiple communication issues, including a perhaps too heavy reliance on email during the admissions process, and the presence of on-campus "silos" (initiatives and projects not widely shared among faculty and staff alike) which affect public perception, and hence, access.
- UWGB needs to build stronger community and support structures for underrepresented minority students on our campus.
- While reviewing UW-Green Bay’s website, a few areas for potential confusion and frustration were identified. For example, the first piece of information requested from students is their intended major. (The ‘not specify’ button is buried at the bottom of the page); little explanation is provided regarding ‘special circumstances’ and how a student would know if he or she had special circumstances that could be considered along with their application; also, information for financial aid was hard to locate.
- Recruitment officers shared that, due to current low enrollment of African Americans, “They don’t see others like themselves.” Also, a reliance on online and electronic communication may come across as ‘uncaring’ and affect those who do not have regular access to the internet.

Strengths and Limitations: The greatest strength in this area is the energy and enthusiasm of the Admissions and AIC staffs, but again there is a resource issue which limits effective recruitment of a diverse student population. There is also a resource need for support of under-represented students when they arrive on campus. Finally, support of diverse students is largely relegated to the AIC, and while many faculty members do care about the success of all students in their classes and the overall demographics of the campus, efforts to address recruitment and the achievement gap are individual and fragmented. There is not a unified campus effort in these areas. As stated above, there is a great need for resources to hire minority recruiters.

**Suggested Strategy 1:** *Increase outreach and contact with underrepresented students and their families*

Unlike some other UW System schools, UW-Green Bay does not have the recruiting staff to make personal connections with families and under-represented communities.

- Hire additional recruiters specifically to recruit diverse students using recruiting practices that are known to be effective, including home visits to prospective diverse students and their families.
- Diversify recruiters, support staff, and recruitment/support approaches to recognize and address the varying needs of different diverse populations and individuals. One approach does not fit all!
- Utilize multiple media for reaching out to under-represented families. Not all have in-home access to electronic resources. Personalized direct mailings, advertisement in media such as
ethnic newspapers, and presence with ethnic organizations should be part of the recruitment process. Suggested points of contact include the newsletter for Catholic/Hispanic parishes, Hmong Community Church, and African American churches.

- Use diverse student representatives to recruit at local high schools.
- Develop and moderate a Spanish Language Facebook group, and family support group “Familia de un ave fénix”
- Enhance transferability with two year tribal colleges and place recruiters on site at those colleges on a regular schedule.
- Develop bi-lingual recruitment materials.
- Develop 3 year, 5 year, and 10 year plans with specific goals for diverse populations.
- Develop under-represented group-specific materials for high school recruitment highlighting recent graduates from that group and published bilingually.

**Suggested Strategy 2:** *Increase and publicize support and opportunities for underrepresented students*

- Provide on-campus day care and support students with family/care responsibilities.
- Increase funding and staffing for the AIC.
- Hire bilingual counselors and advisors.
- Develop summer bridge programs to increase student success.
- Hire more diverse staff (teaching and other) across all areas of the university.
- Highlight opportunities for under-represented students at UW-Green Bay (e.g. research opportunities in the Hmong Studies Center)
- Increase course content in multicultural subjects.
- Develop and maintain Spanish Language Facebook groups for study support.

**Opportunity 4**

*UWGB can create a campus-wide culture of recruitment.*

**Existing Strategies:**
- None

**Strengths and Limitations:** Many opportunities to connect with prospective students are missed.

**Suggested Strategy:** *Create a campus culture for recruitment as everyone’s job*

Faculty, staff and students are all active in the community and have relationships with community members and interest organizations. Recruitment training opportunities for general campus members offer a means to increase recruitment success across campus.

- Offer training opportunities for general campus members as a means to increase recruitment success across campus.
- Regularly share outcomes of recruitment/enrollment strategy.
- Identify and recognize excellence in recruiting of both departments and individuals.
- Support and publicize Undergraduate Research Experiences and Student/Faculty Research Partnerships.
• Examine resource allocation for Admissions and Academic programs affected by recruitment and re-allocate or provide additional resources as needed.

Subgroup 3: Data Platforms and Tools
Chair: Mark Olkowski
Members: Brent Blahnik, Sharon Gajeski, Cris Nelson, Adam Parrillo, Gail Trimberger

Data Platforms Final Report
The Data Platforms Subcommittee of the Enrollment Working Group was charged with looking at the current software systems used today and look for ways to leverage them in order to assist with recruitment and retention. We focused on three functions, an early alert system for students underperforming academically, Constituent Relationship Management (CRM) uses and abilities to further our recruitment and retention goals, and a central location for advising notes.

Opportunity #1: Create an Early Alert System
Early alert systems are used by campuses across the country, and to a limited extent, have been used at UWGB. The goal is to identify students who need assistance early, and provide the support and resources necessary to help them succeed. Without such a system, it is easy for students early in the semester, either new freshman, or new transfer students, to fall short of the minimum academic requirements, which hurts both the student and the university.

Existing Strategies
• Currently Athletics has the best and most recognized early alert system on our campus, but participation by faculty is about 50%.
• American Intercultural Center and the GPS program use similar methods, but they are labor intensive, and faculty responses are not required.
• There is no current policy requiring students receive a grade/feedback until the end of the semester.

Suggested Strategy: Create a campus wide early alert system.
• Begin a pilot program for an early alert system with a targeted or high risk group of students.
• Start with 100 level general education courses, requiring those faculty to post in SIS an early grade by the end of the fourth week of the semester.
• Activate Mid-Term Grade field in SIS to hold the grade so it is viewable for students and available to be queried.

• Develop SIS query to identify students doing poorly in more than one course and alert their advisors of performance concern.

• Make advisors responsible for reaching out to these students and meeting with them to discuss what is happening and talk about options with the student.

Opportunity #2: Create a more productive CRM

The committee looked at the Constituent Relationship Management (CRM) program to determine what was the original plan for this software product, where is it today, and how will it help us in the future. A productive CRM has the capability to get the attention of, educate, and motivate audiences of all sizes. CRM’s are often used to assist with recruitment of new students, inform or reach out to current students and to help stay in touch with alumni or donors.

Existing Strategies:

• UWGB is in the fifth year of a five year contract with our current CRM vendor.

• The same CRM is used by Adult Degree, Admissions, and Nursing to assist in keeping track of applicants and where they are in the pipeline.

• Data can be used to identify target audiences, but this is mostly done outside of the program by IT staff, or manually by CRM users. The vendor has promised updates to the software to better automate this process, but this has not been delivered yet.

• Not used for texting students or applicants at this time because UWGB has not purchased the CRM module that performs this function.

• The majority of users do not have the tech skills to write/create anything beyond very basic events or campaigns within CRM, even after several sessions of vendor training. This is due to the limitations of the software which requires some knowledge of software programming languages in order to function as designed.

• Number of users is limited to the number of shared licenses purchased from vendor and installation of necessary software on users’ computers.

• Key staff responsible for supervision of CRM project have left or are leaving UWGB shortly.

• Advancement uses its own CRM, and is currently happy with this products abilities.
Suggested Strategies:

- Establish a small (3-4) CRM oversight group to be responsible for overseeing the contract, implementation of the product, developing policies, such as user access levels, protocols/procedures for users to follow, and the prioritization of work for IT support staff.
- Work with current vendor to get product working at the level promised by original contract, or search for new vendor with similar services already operational.
- Hire either a permanent position, or at minimum an 18-24 month LTE tech position to extract quality data, develop events and write campaigns. This position should also be responsible for documenting these processes and provide training to other users to enable more robust use of the software.
- Purchase and develop uses for texting module to assist in communication with students and applicants.

Opportunity #3: Electronic Storage of Advising Record

To provide a consistent and comprehensive advising model, advisors need the ability to document their work with each student. Such records need to be able to follow a student through their college career and from advisor to advisor to assist in keeping a student on track to graduation.

Existing Strategies:

- Academic Advising and Adult Degree Advisors started using CRM during the 2013-14 academic year to keep notes on their advisees. Prior to this, notes were kept by individual advisors and not shared with others.
- Currently Faculty Advisors have no shared or centralized location for keeping notes on advisees.
- CRM is restricted by number of user licenses, so allowing all faculty advisors to use CRM for maintaining advising notes would have a notable cost for licenses and support.
- Registrar’s Office keeps records of petitions or appeals, but these are not available to all advisors for viewing.

Suggested Strategies:
• Test and launch a newly introduced feature in SIS which has the capability to keep and maintain advising notes which would be connected to a student’s SIS account.
• Create an expectation that all advisors are using a centralized notes system, either in SIS or CRM, to provide history and continuity of service to students.
• Create policy to keep records of all advising sessions to assist as supporting documentation for student appeals, outreach efforts and reminders for students of their past advising sessions.

Overall, the data platforms UWGB uses are either strong or showing great potential. SIS is seen as the anchor for many other systems and has proven to be very solid and stable. D2L has been good to work with for most, but has a contract ending in early 2016. Pilots have been started using other products similar to D2L to determine if the UW system should change vendors. The use of a CRM as a general operational practice is necessary if we are to be competitive in our markets. But the current program needs attention, and potentially more human resources assigned to support it. If we are to have methods to reach out and communicate with students, or potential students, these software programs can assist us, if leveraged properly. We believe our recommendations would do this, and help move UWGB forward in reaching its enrollment goals.

Subgroup 4: Campus Experience
Chair: Heidi Sherman
Members: Vince Lowery, Sierra Spaulding (student), Tina Tackmier
Note: Jacob Immel (student) recused himself from the committee in November 2014 due to other time commitments.

Sub-Committee on Campus Enhancement
Final Report
February 4, 2015

Heidi Sherman (Chair), Vince Lowery, Sierra Spaulding, Tina Tackmier

Problem 1:

The more than 2,000 students who live on campus feel isolated from the city of Green Bay due to the distance from campus to business districts. We do not attract those students to UWGB who are seeking connection with an urban community even though Green Bay is the third largest city in Wisconsin.

Existing Strategies:
Stevens Point that provides students with transportation to business districts in the city.

**Suggested Strategy:** Create a campus shuttle such as those adopted at UW Platteville and UW Stevens Point that provides students with transportation to business districts in the city.

- Free use with a campus ID of the Green Bay Metro bus system.
- Making fleet vehicles available to students for a minimal rental fee.
- Expecting students to use their own vehicles for transportation.

**Strengths and Limitations:** Though an environmentally sustainable and economical choice, the public transit system is slow (2 hours one way to Bay Park Mall) and does not provide service in the evenings, which is prime time for students, and no service at all on Sundays. Many students choosing to live on campus do so because they do not own cars or wish to drive in the city.

To begin, we decided on a set of guiding questions. These include, who is going to fund the shuttle and how, if the shuttle will be open for community use as well, for what purpose will the shuttle be used, what the hours of operation would look like as well as how the routes would map out, what the environmental impact would be of using a shuttle, how this could be used as a recruitment and retention tool, how it is possible to accommodate people with specific needs or disabilities.

Once we determined this set of questions, we began to research what other campuses are doing. We found that campuses that use a shuttle service tend to have more than one route operating at various intervals depending on that route. For example, University of Wisconsin Platteville and its Pioneer Transit utilize three different routes: a campus route that runs from 7:00AM until 8:00PM every half hour, a dinner route that runs from 4:30PM until 7:30PM every 20 minutes, and a shopping route that runs from 1:00PM until 11:00PM every one hour. This helped us determine the types of routes we made need for our campus.

Seek out the business of a local dealership to supply us with a two 15-passenger vans and one 7-passenger minivan. Recognizing that three vehicles is ambitious, we decided on such for two reasons: we could have overlapping route times between the two 15-passenger vans, and should one van break down, we could still operate.

Once we have the vehicles (and hired trained drivers), we propose two routes and possibly a third, if open to the community. The first shuttle would run on Saturdays and Sundays from 8:00AM until 6:30PM, and it would run in a loop that incorporated a grocery store, a pharmacy, the mall, and other businesses that fit into such a loop. Moreover, if possible, we would like to include many of the businesses that accept pass points. Currently, these businesses are two BP Gas Stations, a CVS Pharmacy, Festival Foods, Green Bay Pizza Company, Mackinaw’s, Noodles and Co., Toppers, the Bluff Pub and Grille, and Subway. The purpose of this route is to get students around on the weekends if they do not have a car on campus. The second shuttle would run on Fridays and Saturdays in the evening and late night from 6:00pm until 2:00am through downtown Green Bay. The purpose of this route is for students (21+) to get to and from campus on the weekends without the need to drive. A third possible option is to have a shuttle that runs complementary to the Green Bay City Transit system. This option is less developed, but the idea is to have it run on Monday through Friday from 2:00PM until 10:00PM to offset the early closing of the city transit. This option would be available to the community, and would foster community support for our university shuttle system.
- We have found there to be several positive outcomes to bringing a shuttle to campus. First, it would reassure parents of first-year students that there is a system with trained drivers that provides safe and reliable transportation year round. Students could get to the things they needed without taking several hours to get to the pharmacy or mall using the city transit system. Second, it is environmentally friendly. By bringing shuttles to campus, we could potentially cut down on the number of vehicles that travel to and from town. Third, there is potential to use the shuttle to bring nursing students to and from Bellin Health, which could contribute to retention in that it saves money.

- In order to pay for the shuttle, we propose asking the businesses along the routes, and especially those that already accept pass points, to invest for the first two years of its operation. We believe this shuttle will bring students to these places of business, and thus a rise in their sales and customer base. We decided on this form of raising the money because it is not likely to raise student segregated fees in the coming years for a campus shuttle.

**Problem 2:**
Students are lacking in the hands-on professional experience due to the low numbers of internships available in the city of Green Bay. Recently, UW-Oshkosh reformed its General Education program to include internships with local non-profits and businesses. Green Bay is a larger community than Oshkosh, offering more opportunity for connection building, but our campus has done little to seek out these contacts and make them available to students.

**Existing Strategies:** Several budgetary units and disciplines offer internships for their students and these have proven successful for student professional development.

**Strengths and Limitations:** Students do not know how to find information on internships. Also, most internships are restricted to juniors and seniors, who have heavy academic demands. Finally, there simply aren’t enough internships for all students who desire them.

**Suggested Strategy:**
- Like UW Oshkosh, reach out to the Green Bay community to create more internship opportunities for students.
- Extend these internships opportunities first and second year students, not only juniors and seniors.
- Create a central location that disseminates information about all internships.
- Use a campus shuttle to help students get to their internships.

**Problem 3:**
Students complain that there is nothing to do in the evening and on the weekends on campus. These complaints create the perception that UWGB is unfriendly and lacks a total “Campus Experience”.

**Existing Strategies:** The Office of Student Life and its Director Lisa Tetzloff have made significant advances in improving a sense of campus community during the past decade.
Strengths and Limitations: In the last decade, the number of weekend campus events has jumped from 60 to 265 (last year’s figure). Student Life programming is both engaging and well attended by students. Nonetheless, despite fantastic efforts to get students involved, there is anecdotal evidence that students continue to believe there is nothing going on campus. This suggests a problem with student perception, which could be mitigated by the following:

Suggested Strategies:
- Reinstitute the practice that all FYS courses include a mandatory requirement of all students to attend three Common Theme events during the semester. Students often do not know of the exciting things happening on campus and requiring attendance at these events will help shake up the misperception of flat campus life.
- Create a buzz about campus events by making videos showing active and engaged students talking about these events. Ideally, UWGB should hire a media specialist to document our campus culture and work with student interns in Communications to learn how to make their own videos, etc. By spreading the word that things ARE happening on campus, students will feel less disconnected and a greater sense of commitment to enhancing their own campus experience.
- Finally, the Office of Student Life recommends that if someone complains about campus programming, recommend they take their complaint to Student Life to suggest a programming idea.

Problem 4:
Students complain about facilities and rules/restrictions in the Residence Halls. Anecdotal evidence suggests students have transferred to other UW campuses more freedom in residential living.

Existing Strategies: Residence Life staff is always on call and responsive to student concerns. In response to student requests to limit quiet hours, they were modified: quiet hours now end at 9:00am instead of the previous 11:00am and pushing back quiet hours on the weekends from 11pm to midnight. The Director also reported plans for a major exterior makeover of the traditional apartments planned for this coming summer, with new siding and windows, which should downplay the perception that the halls are drab, outdated, and drafty.

Strengths and Limitations: Residence Life success in creating a positive campus living experience is evinced by recent EBI results (a customer satisfaction survey given each year with a 60% response yield) and an impressive 67% retention rate (compared to the 41% norm for most campuses). Nonetheless, UWGB’s campus distance from the city of Green Bay makes on-campus housing the only choice for students who wish to walk to class.

Suggested Strategies:
- Create a campus shuttle from the residence halls to business districts in town that would give students more options to socialize and connect with the city.
- As we recruit more students, invest in housing facilities for these students to avoid imminent overcrowding issues. The residence halls are filled to capacity and cannot house more students without additional capital investment in facilities.
Problem 5:
Students are dissatisfied with on-campus dining options, particularly the price and quality of food choices.

Existing Strategy: Union Director Rick Warpiniski is aware of these issues and consistently strives to make improvements, such as creating a salad bar to increase healthier food choices.

Strengths and Limitations: UWGB contracts with A’viands and the vendor contract will expire next year. A handful of UW campuses self-operate their campus dining (Platteville, Stevens Point), but those campuses have many more students enrolled in campus dining. Platteville, which is of similar size to UWGB, has four times the number of students enrolled in a campus-dining program. This means more money for self-operation. Becoming a self-operated dining campus may not be possible for UWGB because it requires enormous cash investment for food stock - money up front that we no longer have. Another student complaint that could be addressed is the retail ticket prices students pay each meal.

Suggested Strategy:

K. At more traditional UW campuses, meal-plan students have $1,000 automatically deducted from their account at the beginning of the semester - and pay much smaller amounts for each individual meal ($2 - $4) throughout the term. Our campus does something different. Instead, we leave the overhead cost as part of the total payment of each meal. For example, other campuses charge less than $2.00 for a meal, whereas our campus may charge somewhere close to $8.00 for a meal. Though students end up paying roughly the same for each system, the latter has the negative effect of reminding the student with each meal how much their food actually costs. The daily “sticker shock” effect experienced by UWGB students could be alleviated by adopting the first option.

L. Because the contract with A’viands is almost up, we will have the chance to switch to another system next year. Thus, Student Government proposed switching to a self-operation, which could increase the quality of food on campus.

M. Switch to a multi-vendor option: Rick Warpinski suggests the possibility of bringing in other companies; Festival could potentially take the place of the Corner Store. Kavarna could take the place of Common Grounds. This would mean closer ties with the community businesses, and Festival already has a system that takes student pass points.
The Final Report from the Innovation and Growth Working Group

The charges of I & G Working Group are:

- Recommend a university growth philosophy and suggest process and targets for such growth.
- Provide the key elements for a university-wide eLearning strategy and suggest a process for achieving the strategy.
- Investigate university capacity for evidence-based decision making at all levels and suggest approach to increase this capacity.
- Suggest approaches for the university to take advantage of growing opportunities and markets in areas such as health care, smart manufacturing, resource recovery, and data analytics.

**Philosophy of Growth**

Statement: The key values of our proposed philosophy of growth are effectiveness and economy. We propose growth—the recruitment of students, the greater utilization of existing resources, the development of new programs, forging stronger ties with the community, and the development of university programs—within fiscal, demographic, and competitive parameters.

Background and Rationale. The University of Wisconsin—Green Bay has a number of strengths and is uniquely situated, both geographically and academically. However, we face a number of challenges. These challenges can be grouped under three broad headings: (1) competition from a number quarters, including for-profit universities, other nonprofit universities, and sectors of career training not associated with higher education; (2) rapidly changing needs of students and the society, including environmental needs, a high demand for expertise in health care, electronic and information-related technology, racial, ethnic, and gender diversity, and the requirement to educate students to be able to re-educate themselves in rapidly and unpredictably changing social and circumstances; (3) the parameters of a limited and not-likely-to-expand resources, monetary and otherwise. Sustaining and growing as a university must take into account our strengths and the three areas of concern just mentioned. Our aims, as always, are the intellectual growth, career preparation, and social responsibility and good citizenship of our students.

In accord with this, needed are:

(a) Much increased efforts for the recruitment of more students, traditional, non-traditional, online, and international. Aggressive recruitment is a vital step in growth, and should be pursued in as efficient a way as possible, preferably through electronic media, word of mouth, and in-person recruitment as much as possible.

(b) The expansion of online programs. There is a strong need for online programs, regionally, nationally, and globally. Our school online programs are affordable, accessible, and of high quality. To attract more online students, we must establish better online services by centralizing all necessary student services, respond to existing educational demand with both already-existing programs and new on-line programs, and improve student engagement by setting up
interactive and engaged platforms for all online courses. More highly ranked online programs will further attract students, regionally, nationally, and globally. Going global is necessary. All sustainable universities, no matter what their orientation, have gone global. To survive and grow, we must as well. But we need to first establish a strong infrastructure and expand online programs, while actively differentiating our online programs, in terms of content, approach, and quality, from those of other universities, and especially from those of for-profit universities and corporations.

(c) The development of programs that utilize existing resources and strengths, programs that fill in gaps or make up for weaknesses in other educational settings. In this regard we think of such innovations as a College of Health Sciences, a Master’s program in Applied Leadership for Teaching and Learning, and an increased emphasis on First Nations Education and other programs listed in this report.

(d) More extensive involvement in and coordinated activity with the Wisconsin business community, including the industrial, financial, and service communities. Many more student internships is a vital first step in this direction. The desirability of UWGB as a community institution is inherently connected to its economic role in the community. Strengthening connections, becoming an integral and vital player in the expanding economic life of the community, is vital to UWGB’s growth and health as well.

(e) Creation of a culture that inspires people to generate novel solutions with measurable value for UWGB and other stakeholders. We need a process to encourage experimentation with new ways to solve work problems and seize opportunities that result in unique and differentiated solutions. This involves: inspiring curiosity by having people talk together across the campus and community, challenging people to think differently about problems, encouraging people to experiment with new ideas, removing barriers by providing resources, and having leadership personally advocate for viable ideas to push them forward.

a. Modeled after the popular TEDx Talks series, UWGB hosted a series of Phoenix Talks 2014. We need to expand the series as an annual event to drive innovative ideas and draw people from the community onto campus, utilizing UWGB faculty and staff and community leaders to.

b. Regional problem solving competition modeled on Hult Prize Competition: Have campus common themes focused on solving a regional problem and have awards and a modest grant for the department team and/or student team that comes up with the best idea or innovation.

c. Student employment as a learning activity and resources for student-led innovation: there are lots of opportunities on campus where we could utilize the activities that student workers are performing at work as learning tools and resources for innovative ideas generated by students.
(f) Flexibility and Nimbleness in administrative and academic decision-making. Needed is the creation of a standardized template for creating new academic programs and marketing academic programs.

(g) The creation of a standing committee/office to take the pulse of present and future industries’ need, of future societal needs, student internship opportunities, emerging career prospects, and student career objectives. This committee/office should contact and travel to regional and state-wide industries to collect data for student career preparation, and inform students, faculty and academic programs of their findings and recommendations. Students and faculty can then keep pace with the present while inventing the future.

**On eLearning**

Re: The charge of “Provide the key elements for a university-wide eLearning strategy and suggest a process for achieving the strategy”:

The I & G Working Group eLearning subcommittee focused on online programs and Adult Degree Programs, examining the key elements for ADP and online programs needed to grow and stay more competitive. On overall eLearning on campus, the I & G Working Group suggests that we need to find a way to accommodate our course offering by utilizing more hybrid/flipped classes or any other modes of classes.

I & G Working Group finds that the ADP and online programs at UWGB will recruit more students, and increase its national ranking and prestige, by

1) Providing better student services,
2) Increasing student satisfaction in engagement, and
3) Offering more new programs in demand.

I & G Working Group recommends the following strategies.

1) Centralize online services for students on a web portal. Student eServices which are needed for online program students are as follows.
   a) Library
   b) Advising
   c) Bursar/Financial
   d) Tutoring
   e) Mental/Physical Health
   f) Disability Services
   g) Writing Center
   h) Career Services
   i) Tech Support
   j) Registrar
2) Establish a universal platform for online courses with National Quality Standard. Cutting edge delivery is necessary. In addition to eService for students, online student engagement is crucial. It reflects student satisfaction and is a factor in determining the national ranking of online programs. In order to increase online student engagement, students should feel connected to the classroom environment and to the instructor. Instructors’ quick responses and frequent feedback to students will increase online student engagement. Also, online student engagement is enhanced by hearing their instructors’ voices and lectures, and through engagement in “fun activities” related to the content knowledge and its application. There should also be more faculty tech training and workshops on engagement enhancing programs and methods of delivery. Current QM certification for online courses, which improves the design of on-line courses, is going well, but we also need focus on delivery of on-line courses.

3) Create an Online Course Development Committee in conjunction with interested or invited academic program chairs/representatives and the Academic Incubator, identify promising on-line programs, and create new programs. The identification of the needed online programs should be determined by market research and through a decision-making committee involving all key players. New programs in demand can be divided into three categories as follows.

   i) More baccalaureate programs (e.g., Criminal Justice)
   ii) More master programs (e.g., Professional Science Master’s)
   iii) More baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate stackable online certificate programs.

Creating new online programs needs an ongoing collaboration between academic programs and ADP. Traditional programs should provide a roadmap for a new online program, and help staffing. Close collaboration and good will for the common good are essential for the flourishing of the on-line programs and our university as a whole.

4) In order for growth in the online environment, we must first secure a base of solid student support services (advising, tutoring, help desk, library, etc.) to be available off-hours (e.g., in the evening and on weekends). Whether we accomplish this by centralizing our online student support and staffing from a central office on campus, or we hire an outside agency to handle matters for us off-hours, we must accommodate in order to grow our online student body while maintaining quality. We need to establish a long term and overarching vision of UWGB online education and develop a strategic plan to implement the vision. The I & G Working Group recommends a campus wide discussion for setting up a clear online education vision/strategic plan to decide:

   (1) How can we provide eServices?
   (2) What kind of universal platform our online courses should have?
   (3) Should we be 24/7 and go global?
   (4) What infrastructure do we need?
   (5) How should we budget?
   (6) How much growth should we aim at?
   (7) Through what processes a new online program can be created?
   (8) How should ADP and academic programs cooperate to create new programs and new courses?
5) For creating the vision and strategic plan for online programs, we should create an **Online Collaborative Committee** that brings together key players to make decisions and set the vision and direction for online growth. The committee should comprise the following membership:

1. Chair (or another representative) from each of the 8 fully online majors
2. Chairs (or another representatives) from academic programs which are interested in creating online programs
3. Director of Access and Adult Degree
4. Library
5. Tech
6. ATS
7. Course Design
8. Tutoring Services
9. Academic Advising
10. Career Services
11. Enrollment
12. Admissions
13. Budgeting
14. Advertising/Marketing
15. Web Design

6) The I & G Working Group recommends re-examining the cost-recovery model of the ADP and online programs to forge a reasonable and consistent budget model for their growth. The online programs can grow to meet the demand from students, industry, region, and the world. And the growth will surely generate revenue for our school. If our school aims at such growth, we should invest in creating a better infrastructure for student services and engagement, increasing the quality of online programs, and creating new programs.

**I&G Decision-Making**

Re: The charge of investigating “university capacity for evidence-based decision making at all levels” and suggesting approach to increase this capacity”:

The following is the report for the Steering Committee, with our recommendations and recommended strategies to develop and increase university capacity for evidence-based decision-making. These recommendations resulted from several meetings and research on behalf of the Decision-Making subcommittee, which the I & G Working Group discussed and agreed to put forward to the Steering Committee.

While decision-making processes exist on campus, the processes do not appear to have campus-wide integration, nor does there appear to be a strategic or universal use of evidence in making decisions. As such, it is difficult to determine if the decisions are made within the context of university strategies, goals or priorities. The working group believes that this stems from having no clarity on institutional goals or strategic direction. Without measurable, communicated,
understandable goals, it is difficult to determine a process or processes that can integrate and align these goals for the entire campus community. To create processes to support evidence-based decision making, the campus must first start with long-term strategic goals that can be incorporated into the goals and strategies of the Colleges and Departments at UW-Green Bay.

a) The University relies on several databases that capture on time and relevant data, including the Student Information System, Talisma, WISDM, and surveys/data from Institutional Research.

b) Pockets of expertise in using these databases exist; nonetheless, the campus community may not know what information is already captured, which reports are easily accessible, and how the information is shared.

2) Explore decision-making models that accommodate innovation and growth.

a) Several universities are moving to evidenced-based decision making processes and with the help of a subcommittee member, the following universities are shown to be at the forefront. The university may continue to investigate these models.
   (1) Morgan State University
   (2) University of Texas-El Paso
   (3) Metro State University-Denver

b) The subcommittee also learned of an evidence-based decision making rubric that is being developed by the Association of Institutional Research and National Association of System Heads. Opportunities to participate, perhaps as a pilot campus, should be explored.

c) The Academic Incubator developed by the Office of Outreach and Adult Access should be supported as a process for developing new programs and innovation. While in its infancy, the Academic Incubator has already shown progress by determining a process for reviewing ideas and by the beginning stages of two new programs such as Fermentation Science and Data Analysis for the University.

d) It is important to the long-term viability of the institution that more evidence-based decisions be made. The first step in the successful implementation is to increase the University’s capacity in this area by training faculty and staff on how to make evidence-based decisions.

i) Key campus members should be identified to oversee the capture of data and its dissemination. This will be an important group because they will determine the priority of what data is collected and why as well as determine how the data and reports are best utilized to support long-term strategies.

ii) Additional questions to be answered will help develop the process(es):
   1. How do we collect data?
   2. What is already being collected?
   3. What queries/reports should be canceled or deleted?
   4. What is the timeline for collection and publishing?
   5. Who needs the data?
iii) Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) must be determined and defined within specific categories/areas to develop both a baseline and a comparison to help with decision-making. For example, specific KPIs can be measured each semester to measure the size, effectiveness, and efficiency of operations in such areas as retention, recruitment, and admissions.

3) Connect decision-making processes to Innovation, and Growth recommendations.

a) The decision making process should employ an established process or the AIR/NASH rubric. Also, any new committees or groups should start discussion in relation to previous and relevant reports and decisions. This way, we can build our decision on previous findings and decisions. Also established process such as the Academic Incubator process should be clearly open to the campus and a relevant committee in relation to the Academic Incubator process should formulate the correct priorities and processes for their recommendations.

b) Materializing innovative ideas requires flexibility, nimbleness and consistency in decision-making process. They can be institutionalized by establishing standardized templets for decision-making processes for innovation and growth such as for creation of new academic program and for marketing academic programs.

c) Develop a clearinghouse or web portal where reports and queries are published that can be utilized by departments and groups for evidenced-based decision-making. Currently, data and reports are published in several areas, such as the graduation survey on the Career website or national data on the Provost’s website. By one access point to data and reports, new findings and continuing reports are easily found and communicated.

4) The subcommittee has also identified a challenge to increasing the use of evidence-based decision making. Currently, staff for providing data from our databases is limited. Requests for data usually go to IR or key pockets of expertise are developed within a department.

a) Add trained staff to institutional research and/or statistical analysis capacities.

b) Develop experts that can be used by the entire campus for specific databases, such as SIS, Hyperion, surveys, etc. and/or identify campus members who can help with statistical analysis and report writing.

On Markets and Opportunities
Re: The Charge of “Suggest approaches for the university to take advantage of growing opportunities and markets in areas such as health care, smart manufacturing, resource recovery, and data analytics”:
The I & G Working Group thinks that our university should make an effort to create new programs in health care, smart manufacturing, resource recovery, and data analytics in strong collaboration with industries and other colleges in region. For the creation of successful new programs:

1) Our school should establish a clear decision-making process for creating new programs in these areas. One suggestion is to have a team of market researcher/Academic incubator/faculty which collects the necessary data for market research, builds a close partnership with industries in the region, and helps students with internship opportunities. As a way to build a close partnership with industries, the team runs a citizen advisory board of 10 – 12 people in various fields around the region. The market research officer can collect information on what needs they have and how we can facilitate existing programs or start new programs with their assistance.

1) The team needs to work with industries, and for-profit and not-for-profit organizations, in the region to find and create internship opportunities for students. Students and the faculty do not have a clear idea of where to go to find internship opportunities. It is a near necessity for a college student, regardless of her major and minor, to have an internship while she is in school. If our school provides students with ample opportunities for internships, we would recruit more students, and more qualified students, and serve our region better. Finding large or small industries or organizations for student internships is not easy without an ‘Internship officer.’ To give an example of what is needed: there is a small organization, Bridge-Between Retreat Center, in Denmark, which shares our values of sustainability and education. It is a 501(c)3 organization that needs support in health education programming (curriculum design, working with students grades 3-8 on activities/programming), and also needs business/marketing support, sustainability support, permaculture/organic gardening, etc. A partner such as this, though it cannot offer us paid internships, could serve as an “incubator” or “test site” for many potential disciplines. If we have an internship finder or internship officer in our school, and find student internship opportunities, our university will be benefited.

Ideas for high demand programs that the I & G Working Group and Markets and Opportunities subcommittee thought UWGB worth pursuing, either because they extend existing programs or can be pursued in collaboration with other schools, industries, or organizations, include:

1) A College of Health Sciences (CHS) – to function alongside the current Liberal Arts & Sciences and Professional Studies colleges. This college would provide students with an array of academic majors, from traditional nursing, social work, laboratory sciences and nutrition programs to interdisciplinary programs such as public health, gerontology, and integrative health, addressing current and future needs in health sciences that include high tech, high touch and high growth areas. Health care continues to expand in terms of new knowledge, new fields of practice, and jobs. The CHS will open up opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students in these new areas of growth, including work with our aging population, the use of technology in rural communities, new roles in health care, and other exciting growth trends.
a. List of possible undergraduate degree programs in Human biology and Nursing, and Health Sciences. These programs are expected to be in very high demand. There are existing programs at Marquette, MSOE, Madison, Concordia, which need collaboration with Engineering and Human Biology, and Nursing.

i. Biomolecular engineering - existing program at Milwaukee school of engineering, developing program at Medical College of Wisconsin (possible collaboration)

ii. Medical Laboratory Scientist – expected high demand, existing programs at UW Milwaukee, UWO, UWSP.

iii. Food safety specialist – existing programs at UW Madison, UW Stout, most curriculum already in place – require internships

iv. Building health specialist - existing expertise in environmental microbiology

v. Bachelor of Science in Nursing – “Traditional” nursing program – either in conjunction with Bellin (would be strong benefit to this model) or competing against it; RNs are the #1 in-demand healthcare professionals (HRSA)

vi. Bachelor’s and Master’s in Integrative Health – expected high demand, includes nutrition science, psychology, nursing, human biology, physical education

vii. Bachelor of Science in Health and Wellness (there is already a group working on this with UW Extension)

viii. Bachelor’s in Public Health - existing programs at Eau Claire, La Crosse, Madison

ix. RN to MSN -- “benefit of this program is that it moves the student more seamlessly from an associate’s degree to a master’s degree, and can be delivered in a completely online or face-to-face format.

x. Food sciences – existing programs at UW Madison, UW Stout already in place – will require affiliation with internship sites

b. List of Graduate degree programs

i. MS Occupational & Environmental health specialist (nursing) - existing expertise

ii. Masters Athletic Training – existing programs - none in state, has been proposed as new master degree

iii. Masters Pathologists Assistant - expected high demand- existing programs – none in state, 10 in country

iv. Masters Anesthesiology Assistant - expected high demand- existing programs – none in state

v. Masters Certified Registered nurse anesthetist - existing program at UW Madison
vi. Masters Physician’s Assistant – could be in affiliation with Madison – no new program accreditations will be allowed in near future

vii. Master’s Nurse Practitioner – strong demand, existing programs at Madison, Eau Claire, Milwaukee, Oshkosh - recommend Gerontology focus, high demand with only one program (Madison) concentrating on gerontology (again, either in conjunction with Bellin that currently offers a Family NP program, or competing against it)

viii. Graduate Gerontology Health Care Certificate Program (18 credits) – existing programs at Madison, Parkside, Milwaukee – this is an educational goal of the Institute on Aging, designed to provide students with a broad, multidisciplinary overview of the field of aging for majors in various departments, including, but not limited to, nursing, occupational therapy, social work, interior design, psychology, sociology, public policy, economics, population health, human development and family studies, urban planning, environment, textiles and design, dietetics, and physical therapy

ix. Master’s in Public Health – existing programs at Eau Claire, La Crosse, Madison; again, strong demand

x. Physical therapy – exiting programs in Marquette, Milwaukee, Madison, La-Crosse - projected job growth of 27% over next two years, strong need

2. Non degree Programs

i. Certified nursing assistant training - commonly completed by premed Human Biology majors, nursing students generally required to take this

ii. Home Health Aide – very high demand (considered the #2 in-demand healthcare occupation)

iii. Pharmacy Technician – currently no formal training requirements, but things seem to be moving in this direction

iv. Massage Therapy -- requires national certification, courses in anatomy, physiology and hands on courses. Often an “add on” course for health promotion, nursing, physical therapy, and physical education majors….strong market potential
3. **Entrepreneurial Certificate Programs:** A review of potential stackable certificate programs should be undertaken in those fields that meet the needs of students and the workplace. A list of some potential stackable certificates are provided below, although it should be emphasized that these are simply examples. A more detailed undertaking should be to consider the possibility of such programs across the campus, and then select those with the most demand and with university leaders committed to moving them forward. These entrepreneurial certificate programs could attract more nontraditional students with interest in specific topic areas to lead to small business creation. These certificate programs also have a potential to “add on” additional certificates that would enable them to expand their businesses and create a unique undergraduate or master’s program in entrepreneurial studies, and to include business, marketing and other skills essential to today’s small business entrepreneurs.

i. Coffee roasting – perhaps partner with a local roaster such as Luna in De Pere, bring a roasting facility here with the folks from Luna having an on-campus location to sell coffee that would be roasted by those in the program.

ii. Craft brewing – again, partner with a local brewer such as Hinterland or Titletown, bring a facility on campus to provide internship opportunities for those interested in becoming brewmasters. Maybe the beer would be for sale at the golf course on campus, etc.

iii. Fermentation science – this is huge right now in terms of nutrition, natural health, etc.! Offer a program to help people understand how to properly ferment foods, use of/selection/maintenance of equipment needed for fermentation, and learn the science behind the healthy properties of these foods/beverages

4. **Recommendation for a creation of Master’s program in other area.**

a. **Master’s program in Applied Leadership for Teaching and Learning – emphasis in First Nations Education:** Our First Nation Studies has a unique place in the UW system. We have dedicated faculty members who have established a center for the teacher education of First Nation teachers on Wisconsin Act 31. UWGB can gain national recognition and can become a center for the First Nation Studies that collaborates with students in the Master’s program in Applied Leadership for Teaching and Learning. The Education and First Nations Studies faculty involved in this partnership are currently planning an Ed.D. in First Nations Education. We must act fast. Other universities both in and outside of the UW System are interested in our faculty expertise and seek to draw our faculty resources away with the aim of establishing premiere First Nations education programs on their campuses. UWGB needs First Nations graduate education to serve and forge partnerships with school districts and First Nations communities. Doing so elevates our reputation a state, national and international institution of education.

b. **Masters of Public Administration** – with the only undergraduate program in this area within the state, it seems a natural extension to offer a graduated MPA and to seek accreditation in this area. Wisconsin has an MPA program at UW-Milwaukee and another at UW-Oshkosh. UW-Madison has a related program in Public Policy. We lag behind
other states in having programs and graduates in this area. UW-Green Bay has a long history in this area at the undergraduate level and also is the state’s primary source of Outreach programming for governmental affairs at the local and county level.
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Why do partnerships matter?
Why are they important for the university? For its faculty, staff, and students? Why are they important for the community?

The simple answer is this:
Partnerships enable all of us to benefit from the highest possible QUALITY OF LIFE in the region we all call home.
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Executive Summary

The Partnerships & External Affairs Team (PEA Team) was charged with examining the university’s capacity to meet the “growing expectation in the community that the university will take a leadership role in creating partnerships directly related to regional economic growth and prosperity.”¹ As described in Appendix A, three tasks were identified:

1. **Partnerships.** Describe, analyze, evaluate, and make recommendations for enhancing our institutional approach to formal partnerships.

2. **External Messaging.** Describe, analyze, evaluate, and make recommendations for enhancing our marketing and external communications strategies.

3. **Leadership.** Describe, analyze, evaluate, and make recommendations for “taking a leadership role in creating partnerships.”

Two subgroups were created to address the first two tasks. The third task was to be completed by the full PEA Team, after it reviewed and approved the subgroups’ recommendations for the first two tasks. Unfortunately, the third task was not completed due to the Team’s timeline being shortened by three weeks². The Team was exceptionally disappointed to have its momentum disrupted and its efforts prematurely terminated.

With respect to **Partnerships**, the Team recommends the following actions.

1. Create a “One Stop Shop” called the **Office of Community Engagement.** Do this by renaming and (slightly) repurposing the current Outreach operation. Change the title of the head of this operation to Vice Chancellor (or Dean) for Community Engagement, and have this individual report directly to the Chancellor and serve as a Cabinet member.

2. Create processes within the Office of Community Engagement that will enable it to:
   a. **Respond** – by visibly serving as the point of initial contact for external stakeholders seeking partnership opportunities
   b. **Support** – by continually facilitating ongoing collaborative relationships
   c. **Promote** – by proactively cultivating collaborative relationships between external stakeholders and university members and units/programs/projects

3. Develop and disseminate a strategically focused Community Engagement **plan.**

4. Create and sustain a Community Engagement **culture.** Identify the means for rewarding and recognizing community engagement activities for faculty, staff, and students.

5. Create a Community Engagement **Advisory Board** of external and internal advisors.

6. Extend the university’s **physical presence** beyond its current borders to include downtown Green Bay and locations throughout the region.

² “Urgent Change in timeline of ITF Work,” Email communication from Cheryl Grosso, Chair, Inventing the Future Steering Committee, January 29, 2015.
With respect to **External Messaging**, the Team recommends the following actions.

1. Develop and disseminate a strategically focused marketing and university communications **plan**.

2. Conduct an evaluation of marketing and university communications **talent** throughout the university.

3. Identify **signature** activities/behaviors/programs/people/statements that exemplify the desired outcomes delineated in the strategic marketing plan. Emphasize these!

4. Create a Strategic Marketing **Advisory Board** of external and internal advisors.

5. Identify **messaging conflicts** between organizational aspirations and marketing and university communications activities. Develop a plan to eliminate or reduce conflicts.

6. **Relocate** central marketing and university communications staff to physical location(s) that enable more frequent and richer interaction with university stakeholders.

7. **Do not centralize all marketing and university communications activities.** Instead, create a structure that enables **deployment** of marketing expertise as needed while ensuring **consistency** of marketing and university communications activities.

With respect to **Leadership**, the Team had a preliminary conversation about the possibility of the university seeking the **Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement**.³ While generally perceived to be a positive step in the direction of establishing the university as a leader in the community, the Team did not have sufficient time to review and vet a recommendation that the university pursue the classification.

---

³ For information on this classification, please see: [http://nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=92#Effective%20Approaches](http://nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=92#Effective%20Approaches)
Membership
The PEA Team included the following individuals:

1. Kristy Aoki, Academic Staff Member
2. Lucy Arendt, Faculty Member (Chair)
3. Shannon Badura, Academic Staff Member
4. Kate Burns, Faculty Member
5. Juliet Cole, Academic Staff Member
6. Judy Crain, Community Member
7. Eric Craver, Academic Staff Member
8. Marcelo Cruz, Faculty Member
9. Jeff Entwistle, Faculty Member
10. Kevin Fermanich, Faculty Member
11. Kate Green, Academic Staff Member
12. John Katers, Faculty Member
13. Tim Kaufman, Faculty Member
14. Ryan Kauth, Academic Staff Member
15. JP Leary, Faculty Member
16. Lou LeCalsey, Community Member
17. Bill Lepley, Faculty Member
18. Sue Machuca, University Staff Member
19. Vicki Medland, Academic Staff Member
20. Sarah Meredith, Faculty Member
21. Christopher Paquet, Academic Staff Member
22. Adam Parrillo, Faculty Member
23. Janet Reilly, Faculty Member
24. Stephanie Reilly, Academic Staff Member
25. Gabriel Saxton-Ruiz, Faculty Member
26. Lydia Schwertfeger, Student
27. Linda Tabers-Kwak, Faculty Member
28. Christine Vandenhouten, Faculty Member
29. Lora Warner, Faculty Member
30. Amanda Wildenberg, University Staff Member

With such a large team, it was clear that most meetings would take place without full attendance. The members agreed that what mattered most was moving forward with the team’s agenda.
Meetings
The PEA Team met seven times, on the following dates. Its minutes are available in Appendix B.
- October 17, 2014
- October 31, 2014
- November 21, 2014
- December 10, 2014
- January 23, 2015
- January 30, 2015
- February 6, 2015

The PEA Team split into two subgroups to address its first two tasks: (1) Partnerships, and (2) External Messaging. The Partnerships subgroup, chaired by Professor Adam Parrillo, met three times as a group, on the following dates to address Task 1: “Describe, analyze, evaluate, and make recommendations for enhancing our institutional approach to formal partnerships.” Its minutes are available in Appendix C.
- October 27, 2014
- November 20, 2014
- January 26, 2015

In addition to these subgroup meetings, members of the Partnerships subgroup spent many hours individually gathering data for the subgroup’s review and consideration.

The External Messaging subgroup, chaired by Professor Janet Reilly, met four times as a group, on the following dates to address Task 2: “Describe, analyze, evaluate, and make recommendations for enhancing our marketing and external communications strategies.” Its minutes are available in Appendix D.
- October 29, 2014
- November 19, 2014
- December 5, 2014
- December 15, 2014

In addition to these subgroup meetings, members of the External Messaging subgroup spent many hours individually gathering and analyzing marketing and university communications data for the subgroup’s review and consideration.

The Lay of the Land – Experiential SWOT analysis
In order to achieve the tasks set forth in its charge, the PEA Team took a multi-pronged approach to data collection and review. First, and as will be described in later sections, each of the two subgroups gathered data and then conducted SWOT analyses of the data in their particular focal area (i.e., partnerships, external messaging). These SWOT analyses were labeled the Data-Based SWOT analyses; they were used by the subgroups in their discussions. Next, the PEA Team conducted a SWOT analysis based on the Team’s collective experience (the Experiential SWOT). This analysis was initiated during the PEA Team’s November 21, 2014 meeting and reviewed during its December 10, 2014 meeting.

---

4 SWOT analyses consider an organization’s internal Strengths and Weaknesses in the context of external Opportunities and Threats.
One thing that became quickly apparent to the PEA Team is that the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats affecting Partnerships are generally the same as those affecting the campus’ External Messaging. To that end, the Experiential SWOT analysis that appears on the next several pages combines both perspectives.

**Strengths**

**Campus infrastructure and programming**
- Our problem-focused mission puts us in the ideal position to create these partnerships.
- Strong music, theater, and arts programs provide opportunities to connect to high schools.
- There are a number of campus entities that lend themselves well to the formation of partnerships, such as EMBI, etc.
- Thriving Camps and Clinics Office that bring many, many eyes to campus (prospective students, their parents and grandparents).
- Adult Access and Outreach conducts numerous seminars with professional group (public and private sector) who gain access to the University through attendance to these courses or seminars.
- Service-based learning.
- We are responsive to local needs.

**Faculty, staff, and leadership**
- There is a passion among faculty on campus for building partnerships.
- Personal connections in the community.
- Strong wealth of resources in our faculty and staff.
- High degree of diversity.
- We have a new Chancellor and a new Provost.

**Existing partnerships**
- We have a number of historic/older partnerships.
- Strong relationships with local public schools.
- We have partners who employ our students and graduates.
• International exchange opportunities for students and faculty.

Campus physical assets (e.g., facilities, place)
• We have the campus assets to create and maintain these partnerships, even in non-academic areas such as athletics, Weidner Center, etc.
• Athletic and recreational facilities are made available to the public, which creates an entry point to campus.
• Given our geographic location, we are ideally positioned to engage in research partnerships focusing on the natural environment.
• We have many campus resources to attract people, such as the Arboretum. We do not make the optimum use of these resources.
• We need to make more out of the fact that we have Division I athletics right here at UWGB.

Students
• Our graduates are prepared to succeed in the business community.

Weaknesses
Campus infrastructure and programming
• There is no specific point of contact for someone in the community who wishes to engage in a partnership with UWGB.
• UWGB’s Freshman Seminar offers many good opportunities for students to become active and involved in the community.
• There aren’t enough opportunities on campus to develop partnerships with each other – faculty and staff.
• There is nothing in place currently for new faculty to encourage the development of external partnerships.
• Poorly thought out or outdated campus policies often get in the way. Example: policies surrounding food service make it too expensive to use A’viands, so organizations often hold events in the Mauthe Center where policies are more relaxed.
• Lack of continuity in capturing campus “users” (e.g. getting Admissions information about camp participants as a model) making sure that we self-promote.
• Small communication and marketing staff compared to our institutional needs.
• We see advertising and promotion of other colleges and universities in downtown Green Bay, but not of UWGB.
• Ability to inform different “users” of campus about other offerings.
• This university has all of the “pieces in place.” We need to figure out how use these resources more effectively.
• We need to streamline our efforts and reduce redundancy, thus creating the opportunity to free up/re-purpose unnecessarily over-burdened campus resources.

Campus culture
• Bureaucracy
• We need as a campus to spend more time thinking about how we can partner instead of why we can’t partner. We don’t take risks.
• Too many excuses made as to why we cannot do something.
• Not sure what this is called, but the fact that departments often must pay for innovative or atypical services like specialty web design, video or web conferencing and other event support limits ability to develop community partnerships.
• Pursuit of “custom fit” campus partners e.g., we tend to present packages of what we currently have, but lack the ability to work with the partner to make something work for them.
• UW-Green Bay can seem like a “suitcase campus” as many students go home on weekends or are stranded on campus without transportation to get into the community for events and activities.
• We need to create more of a “community within a community” at UW-Green Bay and make people want to stay here for college and afterward. We need to ask ourselves and our partners, “what makes a strong community?” and then focus on fostering increased pride in our community and our university.
• Young adults who want an on-campus education want social opportunities; we don’t offer much of this.

Faculty, staff, and leadership
• We are in a larger community than UWO, but we have fewer people.
• UW Oshkosh is much more aggressive in the formation of partnerships. We need the type of strong leadership demonstrated by Chancellor Wells at UWO and we need to develop expectations of faculty and staff working here that they are responsible for developing partnerships.
• Permanent loss of positions: As cuts are made, positions are not replaced and remaining staff and faculty must take on those tasks further limiting ability to cultivate and maintain partnerships.
• More international faculty need to be hired.
• Hiring too many UWGB grads. We need more “new” blood.
• There is little interaction between the Board of Directors/Alumni Assoc/community people connected to UWGB and the faculty.
• Increased turnover. Some fear that we are becoming a stepping stone, rather than a destination in the academic career path.
  o Loss of institutional knowledge regarding past and existing partnerships
  o Loss of institutional commitment to existing partnerships
  o Constant job searches are a huge time-sink that take away from ability to work in the community
  o Constant job listings are viewed as a red flag for job seekers and potential partners who want to invest in long-term relationships
  o Loss of community familiarity and stability. Constant rotation of staff and need to retrain will be perceived negatively by partners

Campus physical assets (e.g., facilities, place)
• We are perceived as being “isolated” in our ivory tower.
• We need to create spaces on campus and in our community where people can experience UW-Green Bay.
• University Classified Staff holds a conference in Green Bay. For the first 25 years, it was held on campus. For the last three years, it has been held at the Tundra Lodge because we can get better pricing.
• We need to create processes, signage, etc. that help people who are new to campus to get around and not get lost.
• Certain groups in our community are often intimidated and do not feel that UW-Green Bay is the place for them, such as ethnic minorities.
• We could use on-campus contact points such as campus tours to better articulate what we have on campus.

Existing partnerships
• If someone on campus leaves the university or if the money runs out, then the partnership often just dissolves.
• Do we lag in high profile charismatic partnerships compared to other institutions?
• The fact that we attract the fewest in-county students to UWGB than any other campus in the UWS.

Opportunities
Possible partnerships
• We have chances to form partnerships with other UW campuses.
• We have the opportunity to form stronger and healthier relationships with local tribal communities.
• We must cultivate stronger relationships with local legislators.
• We must take advantage of opportunities to engage in activities with students in other communities around Wisconsin.
• Development of graduate programs will increase need for more environmental based partnerships to support student projects and internships.

Community needs
• We need to be more proactive on working with community problems. Students, faculty, staff, and community members could collaborate to solve issues in NE Wisconsin, such as homelessness, water quality, etc.
• We need to link these efforts to economic development in NE Wisconsin.
• To conduct fee-for-service applied research (program evaluations, surveys) for community partners; students could participate.
• Possible development and/or increase in certificate programs may increase opportunities to form internal and external partnerships.

Existing partnerships
• The new Packers partnership offers many opportunities.
• We can invite our existing partners to join us in training that we offer.

Place
• Green Bay is the third-largest community in Wisconsin.
• We could establish relationships with prominent people in the community to create “professionals in residence.”

Threats
Competition
• Institutional cannibalism (everyone grabbing for the same resources instead of calculating the best allocation). Resource/Turf Battles – we start working against each other, instead of considering the big picture. Increased competition with other UW schools (and others) instead of collaboration (e.g., we canceled our UW psych conference last year that we often host due to low attendance. Some schools didn’t want to “share their secrets”).
• **Existence** of competition, including other public educational institutions in the area (NWTC), other UW System campuses, for-profit (e.g., Globe U), on-line programs.

• **Growth** of non-public for profit higher-ed companies/institutions (Globe U., Rasmussen, U of Phoenix), area private colleges putting campus presences in Green Bay (Lakeland and Silver Lake) as well as E-learning offerings for undergraduate studies (U of Northern New Hampshire).

• Competing institutions (e.g., private and for-profit institutions) can be more nimble and respond to community need with programs and majors that are in demand in terms of content as well as accessibility.

• Increased competition that stems from:
  - Decreasing numbers of high school and middle school students in the area
  - Increase in the number of physical, brick-and-mortar higher education options in the area
  - Primary UW and other competitor institutions that are developing new majors and online options
  - Increase in the amount of advertising being done by external competition in our region – both local/UWS institutions (UW Oshkosh) and online programs (Arizona State)
  - Mission creep – UW Colleges campuses offering baccalaureate options, Tech Colleges offering more Gen Ed.’s

**Stakeholder perceptions**

• Perception that the University is competing with the private sector creating a negative atmosphere.

• Declining enrollment could be perceived by potential and existing partners as unique to our institution and indicate we are a poor investment.

• Legislative climate anti-education and micromanaging. State Legislature/Governor who has, through word and legislative action, favored the technical college education over the university education.

• More antagonism directed toward public universities.

• Public does not place a high value on a 4-year education; they don’t understand why strong education is important to each one of them.

• Belief among local ethnic minority groups that UW-Green Bay does not have much programming and support for ethnically diverse students.

• Pervasive amount of press questioning the value of a liberal arts education; disintegration of the liberal arts degree mentality in the state of Wisconsin.

• Perception of UWGB within the community as not being a “destination college.”

• Lack of complete and accurate information among influencers for traditional students about UWGB (i.e. teachers, guidance counselors, coaches, parents, etc.).

**Resource availability**

• Repeated cuts in state funding over the last several years.

• Inability to find/compensate faculty and staff.

• Many competing institutions can offer a much more robust scholarship package for high achieving students. While we are working hard to build our endowments for scholarships, the reality is we will be behind the financial needs curve of our students for several more years before we can even be able to say we can provide scholarship $ to 10% of our eligible students (vs. the current 5% of our students who qualify for financial aid).

• Competing institutions hire UWGB faculty/staff.

• “More money more problems” by accessing more grants and funding, the review process increases to ensure that you are complying with all regulations, thus it can cause more scrutiny on every application.
• Short-term focus – don’t want to start a bunch of things and not have a long-term financial commitment (engineering technology as an example).

Educational trends
• Growing demand for online education, including MOOCs.
• Lack of interest in the arts, an integral part of our culture/economy.
• Lack of interest in travel and exploration internationally; provincialism.
• Cultural/societal shift demonstrating that more men are choosing technical colleges, the military, and going directly into the work force after high school rather than enrolling in a university.

History (i.e., our previous selves)
• Too much navel-gazing. We struggle to fix our gaze outward. Example: Enrollment issues could become our primary focus and we may lose sight of other opportunities.
• UW-Green Bay has never had a positive regional reputation for strong, supportive, sustained mutually beneficial engagements and positive collaborations/partnering with regional “New North” businesses. This allows other institutions to take advantage of our pattern of hit and miss/one-off behavior relative to helping regional businesses and economic growth.
• The UW-Green Bay marketing of our institution as THE home of interdisciplinarity and special learning methodologies is under pressure from many other institutions of higher learning who now claim they have effectively deployed interdisciplinarity in their curriculums. After 50 years of claiming we are differentiated from other colleges and universities in our interdisciplinarity, we are due for a re-visit to that claim and theme of our better value education.
• Lack of resources – we try to do a bunch of things and we may not do them well, which subsequently damages our reputation.

While this Experiential SWOT Analysis was helpful to the PEA Team as it considered its charge and tasks, it remains incomplete. Further analysis, reflection, and vetting by individuals and groups outside the PEA Team are needed to ensure the most valid and reliable analysis of where UW-Green Bay’s partnerships and external messaging stand relative to the campus’ internal strengths and weaknesses in the context of external opportunities and threats.

In addition to the deliberations of the full PEA Team, the two subgroups focused on Partnerships and External Messaging contributed significantly to the achievement of the PEA Team’s charge and tasks. The details associated with the recommendations in the Executive Summary are provided in the pages that follow, as they are associated with their relevant subgroup.

Task 1 – Partnerships

Tasks and process
The PEA Team approved the Partnership recommendations listed in the Executive Summary at its February 6, 2015 meeting.
The Partnerships subgroup, chaired by Professor Adam Parrillo, was responsible for the following tasks:

A. Examine current manner in which external partnerships are established.

B. Examine how external partnerships are managed/maintained.
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C. Evaluate organization, efficiency, and effectiveness of current partnerships in relation to the regional economy and Talent Initiative.

D. Evaluate how current partnerships are made known to the University and greater communities.

E. Examine the University’s resources utilized to establish and maintain partnerships.

F. Examine the benefits to faculty and students of current partnerships.

G. Suggest strategies for cooperation, collaboration, or expansion of current partnerships in relation to organizational efficiency, the regional economy, the Talent Initiative and benefit to faculty and students.

The primary challenge associated with completion of the subgroup’s tasks was acquiring a reliable listing of current external partnerships. This effort was facilitated by Dr. Debbie Furlong, Director of Institutional Research, and Dr. Lora Warner, Director of the Center for Public Affairs. Working collaboratively, the two offices generated a list of just under 2,000 external partnerships. The nature of these partnerships included service learning opportunities, community-based research, consulting, cultural-arts partnerships, co-ops/internships, professional volunteering, clinical/professional fieldwork, organization sponsorship/donorship, joint programming, and others that did not fit these types. The types of organizations served included businesses, government agencies, non-profit organizations, foundation, education, healthcare, and more. The institutional entities associated with the reported partnerships included all of the academic budgetary units, from Art & Design to Urban & Regional Studies. Other institutional entities included Career Services, the Environmental Management and Business Institute (EMBI), and Student Life.

Despite the high number of reported partnerships, a review of the data revealed significant gaps in reporting, such that individual members of the subgroup knew of many partnerships that had not been reported. While the subgroup hypothesized a variety of possible reasons for non-reporting of external partnerships, the short timeline afforded the subgroup for its tasks precluded a comprehensive investigation and data correction.

The subgroup concluded that greater accuracy in reporting was a prerequisite to effective examination and evaluation of the university’s external partnerships as called for in tasks A-G. Undaunted, the subgroup discussed the available data and was able to make several recommendations. The subgroup’s minutes, in Appendix C, recap its discussions. The minutes of January 26, 2015 were the primary source for the Partnership recommendations listed in the Executive Summary and described next.

**Recommendation details**

The full PEA Team discussed the recommendations from the Partnerships subgroup and agreed upon the following six recommendations.

The PEA Team noted that all university stakeholders are included in these recommendations, such that faculty, staff, and students are all afforded opportunities to engage in high impact experiential learning through community engagement.

1. **Within six months**. Create a “One Stop Shop” called the “Office of Community Engagement.” Do this by renaming and (slightly) repurposing the current Outreach operation. Change the title of the head of this operation to Vice Chancellor (or Dean) for Community Engagement, and have this individual report directly to the Chancellor and serve as a Cabinet member. Begin promoting this office as the initial contact for external stakeholders seeking to
develop, maintain, and enhance collaborative relationships/partnerships with individual faculty/staff/students and units/programs/projects.

2. **Within one year.** Create organizational and operational processes within the Office of Community Engagement that will enable it to:

   a. *Respond* – by visibly serving as the point of initial contact for external stakeholders seeking partnership opportunities.

   b. *Support* – by continually facilitating ongoing collaborative relationships.

   c. *Promote* – by proactively cultivating collaborative relationships between external stakeholders and university members and units/programs/projects.

   d. *Connect* – by communicating needs of external stakeholders to university faculty, staff, and students and by communicating needs of university faculty, staff, and students to external stakeholders.

   e. In addition, create processes that do the following:

      i. Enable ongoing, systematic, simple, time-sensitive, activity-sensitive, reliable, and sustainable *collection of community engagement and partnership data* from both internal and external sources.

      ii. Take advantage of *existing processes for data collection and management* (e.g., SEDONA faculty activities software, Institutional Research and Assessment efforts, Center for Public Affairs efforts).

      iii. Convert community engagement and partnership data to terms of *economic value, time tracking, mission, innovation, and impact*.

      iv. Lead to clear, consistent, and well-communicated *standards* for data collection on community partnerships.

      v. Enable effective and data-based internal and external *messaging* that communicates community engagement needs, activities, outcomes, value, and aspirations. An example might be disseminating the equivalent of an “experts” list with directions on how to make contact with experts.

      vi. Enable data sharing with University Advancement to facilitate achievement of its fundraising and friend-raising mission.

3. **Annually.** Develop and disseminate a strategically focused community engagement plan that delineates:

   a. Precisely who does what with respect to community engagement (internally and externally), with specific identification of why resources are allocated as they are.

   b. External stakeholders targeted for community engagement opportunities, their expected contribution/interaction with the university, and the best means for communicating with each targeted segment of external stakeholders.
c. Community engagement processes used throughout the university for various units/projects/programs.

d. Clear, consistent, and impactful messaging tailored to targeted external stakeholders using appropriate media. Community engagement messaging should address:

   i. Outcomes that accrue to external stakeholders. What do the people who partner with us gain from the partnership? We need to focus on what external stakeholders receive rather than on the internal processes we use to produce those outcomes.

   ii. Outcomes that external stakeholders care about and that establish us as a high quality university deserving of a top-notch reputation in the region and state.

   iii. Outcomes that are described using language that makes sense to external stakeholders.

   iv. Outcomes that clearly demonstrate value to external stakeholders.

   v. Outcomes that are true to the university’s mission, culture, and zeitgeist.

   vi. Outcomes that are sustainable as evaluated through the interdependent lenses of economic soundness, social responsibility, and environmental obligation

   vii. The parameters (individual, organizational) that guide and constrain community engagement activities. Let’s be clear about what we can do with existing resources, what we can do with additional resources, what we need help with. Let’s share key metrics with our external stakeholders so they understand what they can reasonably expect from a university of our size. Let’s find ways to serve the diversity of populations that comprise our region that don’t require all external stakeholders to “pay for play,” since not all are able to or should provide monetary resources in exchange for university service.

e. A proactive calendar for community engagement activities.

f. A process for enabling unplanned/serendipitous community engagement activities.

g. Metrics for evaluating the impacts of community engagement activities and the processes for analyzing and disseminating metric-based “scores.”

h. Funding sources and amounts needed and used throughout and external to the university to support community engagement alongside the “value added” associated with these activities (return on investment).

i. Processes for evaluating and enhancing existing community engagement activities.

4. **Immediately and ongoing.** Create and sustain a Community Engagement culture. Highlight the focus on community engagement in the university’s vision, mission, goals, and value statements. Identify the processes and resources for rewarding and recognizing community engagement activities for faculty, staff, and students. Recognize what it takes to create a culture focused on community engagement: Consider both the visible and not visible components of
culture, e.g., architecture, language, symbols, norms, values, reward systems, recognition ceremonies, and more. Take steps to formally incorporate community engagement expectations and rewards in teaching, learning, scholarship, and service activities and responsibilities for all faculty, staff, and students. Clarify for faculty, staff, and students the importance of community engagement by facilitating their efforts to be involved

5. **Within six months.** Create and assemble a Community Engagement Advisory Board of external and internal advisors who will assist the university with envisioning, evaluating, and transforming the university’s strategic community engagement efforts. The Advisory Board will be chaired by the Vice Chancellor (or Dean) for Community Engagement.

6. **Within one year.** Extend the university’s **physical presence** beyond its current borders to include downtown Green Bay and locations throughout the region. The physical presence should focus on community engagement activities and unequivocally communicate the organization’s commitment to community engagement.

Task 2 – External Messaging

**Tasks and process**

The PEA Team approved the External Messaging recommendations listed in the Executive Summary at its February 6, 2015 meeting.

The External Messaging subgroup, chaired by Professor Janet Reilly, was responsible for the following tasks:

A. Examine the University’s efforts to communicate to the public our work/role/opportunities in/for partnerships.

B. Examine the public’s perception of the University’s partnerships and availability for partnerships.

C. Examine the University’s efforts to communicate to the public our academic mission/strengths/opportunities.

D. Evaluate the effectiveness of the University’s efforts to communicate to the public our academic mission/strengths/opportunities.

E. Examine the University’s efforts to communicate to the public our core values and assets.

F. Evaluate the effectiveness/organization of the University’s efforts to communicate to the public our core values and assets.

G. Develop strategies for effective and efficient communication of the University’s image. Examine current manner in which external partnerships are established.

The primary challenge associated with completion of the subgroup’s tasks was reviewing and understanding the extensive data already gathered by the institution on the effectiveness of its marketing and university communications. This effort was facilitated by the subgroup’s collaboration with staff members from the Office of Marketing and University Communications and the Dean of

---

6 *Guide for Working Groups*, document distributed by Cheryl Grosso, Chair, Inventing the Future Steering Committee, October 6, 2014.
Students. In addition, subgroup members also gathered data from offices throughout campus (e.g., Adult Degree, Weidner Center).
The subgroup systematically evaluated the available data and was able to make several recommendations. The subgroup’s minutes, in Appendix D, recap its discussions. The minutes of December 15, 2014 were the primary source for the External Messaging recommendations listed in the Executive Summary and described next.

**Recommendation details**
The full PEA Team discussed the recommendations from the External Messaging subgroup and agreed upon the following seven recommendations.

1. **Annually.** Develop and disseminate a strategically focused marketing and university communications plan that delineates:

   a. Precisely who does what with respect to marketing and university communications (internally and externally), with specific identification of why resources are allocated as they are.

   b. How those internally involved in marketing and university communications are structured (e.g., use of a matrix structure\(^7\) in which marketing and university communications specialists are both together and distributed throughout the larger organizational structure to meet unit/project/program-specific marketing and university communications needs)

   c. Appropriate and impactful use of various marketing and university communications media, including traditional and social media, as determined by data on usage and impact by external stakeholders.

   d. External stakeholders targeted for marketing and university communications, their expected contribution/interaction with the university, and the best means for communicating with each targeted segment of external stakeholders.

   e. Marketing and university communications processes used throughout the university for various units/projects/programs.

   f. Mechanisms used to ensure that all parts of the university are familiar with and incorporate key core concepts in all marketing and university communications activities. *Examples* of the parts needing to coordinate include\(^8\): Academic programs, Athletics, Centers (e.g., Center for Biodiversity, Center for Public Affairs), Cofrin Library, Outreach and Adult Access, Performing Arts, Phoenix Bookstore, Residence Life, Student Life, Student Services, University Union, and the Weidner Center.

   g. Clear, consistent, and impactful messaging tailored to external stakeholders using appropriate media. External messaging should address:

---

\(^7\) A matrix organizational structure is a structure in which the reporting relationships are set up as a grid, or matrix, rather than in the traditional hierarchy. In other words, employees have dual reporting relationships - generally to both a functional manager (e.g., in the Marketing and Communications area) and a project/unit manager (e.g., in a given unit such as Student Life or Theatre).

\(^8\) This is not an exhaustive list. All parts of the University need to coordinate and be consistent in their external messaging.
i. Outcomes that accrue to external stakeholders. What do external stakeholders want to gain from their interactions with us? We need to focus on what external stakeholders receive rather than on the internal processes we use to produce those outcomes.

ii. Outcomes that external stakeholders care about and that establish us as a high quality university deserving of a top-notch reputation in the region and state.

iii. Outcomes that are described using language that makes sense to external stakeholders.

iv. Outcomes that clearly demonstrate value to external stakeholders.

v. Outcomes that are true to the university’s mission, culture, and zeitgeist.

vi. Outcomes that are sustainable as evaluated through the interdependent lenses of economic soundness, social responsibility, and environmental obligation

h. A proactive calendar for marketing and university communications activities.

i. A process for managing reactive marketing and university communications activities.

j. Metrics for evaluating the impacts of marketing and university communications activities and the processes for analyzing and disseminating metric-based “scores.”

k. Funding sources and amounts needed and used throughout and external to the university to support marketing and university communications alongside the “value added” associated with these activities (return on investment).

l. Processes for evaluating and enhancing marketing and university communications activities

2. **Within six months.** Conduct an evaluation of marketing and university communications talent throughout the organization that determines:

   a. Headcount and FTE.

   b. Physical/geographical distribution.

   c. Portfolio of knowledge, skills, and abilities.

   d. Funding sources and amounts.

   e. *Typical* marketing and university communications person hours needed per unit/project/program.

   f. *Projected* marketing and university communications person hours needed per unit/project/program.

   g. Processes, people, and resources needed to close the gap between typical and projected marketing and university communications needs.
h. The means for recruiting, placing, developing, retaining, and evaluating marketing and university communications talent.

3. **Within six months.** Identify signature activities/behaviors/programs/people/statements that exemplify the desired outcomes delineated in the strategic marketing plan. Emphasize these for the year’s marketing and university communications efforts.

4. **Within six months.** Create and assemble a Strategic Marketing Advisory Board of external and internal advisors who will assist the university with envisioning, evaluating, and transforming the university’s strategic marketing and university communications efforts.

5. **Within six months.** Identify messaging conflicts between university aspirations and marketing and university communications and other activities. Develop a plan to eliminate or reduce conflicts. Examples:
   a. Align university behaviors with message of high quality education (e.g., scholarships available to incoming students, creation of an honors program).
   b. Add to the program array new and enhanced majors, minors, certificates, courses that align with regional needs and aspirations.
   c. Assess messaging used during campus visitations and tours by various internal representatives and determine level of consistency, quality, and effectiveness.

6. **Within one year.** Relocate central marketing and university communications staff to physical location(s) that enable more frequent and richer interaction with both internal (university faculty, staff, and students) and external stakeholders (community members).

7. Do not centralize all marketing and university communications activities. Instead, create a structure that enables deployment of marketing expertise as needed while ensuring consistency of marketing and university communications activities. For example, a matrix structure enables deployment of marketing expertise when, where, and how it is best needed while also ensuring consistency of marketing and university communications activities.

**Task 3 – Leadership**

**Tasks and process**
The PEA Team’s plan, as laid out in Appendix A, called for consideration of Task 3 in February 2015. Circumstances outside the PEA Team’s control, namely the budget crisis created by Governor Scott Walker’s proposed 2015-17 biennial budget, led to the premature (1) termination of the PEA Team’s planned meetings and (2) development of its final report. Accordingly, the PEA Team was not able to complete the following tasks:

A. Research the region’s perception of the University as a leader in establishing, nurturing, and maintaining partnerships.

B. Research and evaluate potential partnerships that will benefit faculty research and student learning; give consideration to the Talent Initiative.

---

C. Research and evaluate potential partnerships that will benefit the regional economy, give consideration to the Talent Initiative.

D. Identify University resources (human and other) that may be useful in establishing, nurturing, and maintaining partnerships related to economic growth.

E. Evaluate the University’s capacity to be a leader in this regard.

While arguably the most important of the PEA Team’s three tasks, the Team agreed early on in its process that the first two tasks needed to be addressed before the third could be undertaken with any degree of success. A preliminary action taken by the PEA Team was to conduct informal polling of external stakeholders, asking them to answer the question, “What opportunities should UWGB be taking advantage of?” The unedited responses received by PEA Team members are in Appendix E. In addition, and as noted in the Executive Summary, the Team briefly discussed the possibility of the university seeking the Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement. While generally perceived to be a positive step in the direction of establishing the university as a leader in the community, the Team did not have sufficient time to review and vet a recommendation that the university pursue the classification. It is the Team’s sincere and strongly held aspiration that the Leadership task will be revisited by university members in the near future, and that the nascent work completed by the PEA Team will inform future thinking and action.

---

10 For information on this classification, please see: http://nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=92#Effective%20Approaches
### Appendix A – What We Need to Do

We have **3 major tasks.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Describe, analyze, evaluate, and make recommendations for enhancing our (UWGB’s) institutional approach to formal <strong>partnerships.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Describe, analyze, evaluate, and make recommendations for enhancing our marketing and external <strong>communications</strong> strategies (including our despised webpage).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Describe, analyze, evaluate, and make recommendations for “taking a <strong>leadership role</strong> in creating partnerships directly related to regional economic growth and prosperity.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We need to consider **4 factor categories** when addressing each of these tasks.

- Our organizational structure, including the divisions and hierarchy of authority
- Our organizational leadership, including our collective capacity to act
- Our institutional mission, including our designation as a regional comprehensive institution
- External factors, including competition, availability of resources, rate of change, and more.

We have **3 reporting deadlines** to meet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 31</td>
<td>First interim report to Steering Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1</td>
<td>Second interim report to Steering Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>Final recommendations and report to Steering Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to complete our tasks and meet our reporting deadlines, I have said that we are going to complete Tasks 1 and 2 by December 10, and Task 3 by February 13. Here’s the logic behind these task deadlines.

**Why December 10?** Final exams start December 11. Faculty members and students will be preoccupied with administering exams and finalizing grades after December 10. After grading, there will be holiday and family gatherings to attend. That takes us to approximately December 28. After the family get-togethers, many faculty, staff, and student members will be away from campus until January 19, leading or taking Travel Abroad courses (**yours truly**), teaching or taking January Interim classes, and gearing up for the spring semester, which starts on January 26. Basically, we won’t be able to have face-to-face meetings of the full group between December 11 and January 18. We have to finish Tasks 1 and 2 in order to tackle Task 3.

**Bottom line:**

We have **SEVEN WEEKS** to finish Tasks 1 and 2.  
(October 22-December 10)

**Why February 13?** While we won’t be able to meet face-to-face until January 19, we will be able to complete at least some of our work using email during this time. We will then commence meeting face-to-face, so that we can conclude our conversations about what we need to do as a campus to be seen as a leader in our community in creating partnerships that yield economic growth and prosperity. I’ll then need some time to draft our final report, and we’ll need to review it together before I send it to the Steering Committee.

**Bottom line:**

We will have **SEVEN WEEKS** to finish Task 3.  
(December 29-February 13)
Appendix B – PEA Team Meeting Minutes

PEA Team Minutes: October 17, 2014

Present (n=21): Kristy Aoki, Lucy Arendt (chair), Shannon Badura, Kate Burns, Juliet Cole, Eric Craver, Marcelo Cruz, Jeff Entwistle, Kevin Fermanich, John Katers, Tim Kaufman, JP Leary, Bill Lepley, Vicki Medland, Sarah Meredith, Adam Parrillo, Janet Reilly, Stephanie Reilly, Gabriel Saxton-Ruiz, Christine Vandenhouten, & Lora Warner

Recorder: Lucy Arendt

1. Introductions – Team members introduced themselves
2. Process, ground rules – Lucy reviewed the Team’s overall process and basic ground rules.
   a. Meeting attendance – Goal: As many attendees as possible, knowing that the likelihood that we’ll all be able to attend a given meeting is very low. If a person misses a meeting (all reasons considered valid), we will not be revisiting topics to catch that person up, because we have a very tight timeline.
   b. Minutes – To be brief.
   c. We’re all busy. Let’s focus on achieving both efficiency and effectiveness.
3. Information: Review of our charge (see Invent the Future and Guide). The Team reviewed the charge as described in the Chancellor’s documents and as articulated by the Steering Committee.
4. Action: Deadlines, tasks, and responsibilities
   a. Review and decide timeline – align with Invent the Future.
   b. Scope of task – see below. Lucy reviewed the Team’s tasks (see below), and encouraged the Team to think of its work in two phases: Tackling Tasks 1 and 3 this fall, to be followed by Task 2 in the spring.
   c. Distribution of work – Two subgroups for 1 and 3. Who’s responsible for what? Subgroup leadership: Adam for Partnerships, Janet for External Messaging. Team members volunteered for their preferred subgroup; non-present Team members to be asked their subgroup preference via email. Anybody we should add? Anybody who wants to participate in our discussions is welcome to do so. The Team discussed the protocol for gathering more input.
   d. Methods of communication – email +
5. Review: Next steps
   a. Need interim report: Timeline, data needs – subgroups to meet and send to Lucy by October 31 – Meet that day to review subgroup discussions.
   b. Meeting frequency? Preferred day/time. Fridays.

Task 1. Current Formal Partnerships

- Review institutional approach to community partnerships

To review – A SWOT Analysis

- To document what we do, our strengths and weaknesses, external opportunities and threats
- To evaluate – against what criteria? Consider:
  o Organizational structure
  o Organizational leadership
  o Institutional mission
  o External factors

What constitutes a “partnership”? The Team brainstormed and discussed its perceptions of “partnership.” Individual Team members described partnerships with which they are affiliated. It
became clear that the Team has a wealth of knowledge at its immediate disposal. For example, the Center for Public Affairs is conducting a snapshot/creating an inventory of who’s doing what in the community (e.g., service learning, student organizations).

What constitutes our community? Regional, national, international? Focus on regional, understanding that at least some of what we do will affect stakeholders outside the region.

Need to think about return on investment (ROI) – Consider our IMPACT.

Need to consider also the resources needed to coordinate what we can offer to our regional community (e.g., transportation issues in Oconto).

As people described their engagement in various partnerships, key words/themes emerged:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Anticipating and responding to needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving</td>
<td>Cultivating</td>
<td>Investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting</td>
<td>Interns</td>
<td>Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service learning</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Enacting the WI Idea&quot;</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver</td>
<td>Help</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing education</td>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Embedded in organizations (all types)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing students</td>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>Passion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating</td>
<td>Small to major</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Not just free labor</td>
<td>External funding, internal sweat equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied research</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating</td>
<td>Fostering</td>
<td>Cultural additions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with</td>
<td>Serving/service</td>
<td>Experts/elders in residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary spanning roles</td>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive</td>
<td>Bettering community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task 2: Leadership Role & Opportunities**

It’s not enough to engage in community outreach programs. The Chancellor is interested in our meeting the “growing expectation in the community that the university will take a leadership role in creating partnerships directly related to regional economic growth and prosperity. ... Meeting this expectation will give the university important new opportunities for faculty and students and expand the level of advocacy for the university in Wisconsin.”

Tackle this task in the spring semester, after Tasks 1 and 3. Tasks 1 and 3 = information needed to help us make recommendations for Task 2.

**Task 3. External Messaging**

“Another goal of this group is to examine our current marketing and external communications strategies.”

To review – **A SWOT Analysis**

- To document what we do, our strengths and weaknesses, external opportunities and threats
- To evaluate – against what criteria? Consider:
  - Organizational structure
  - Organizational leadership
  - Institutional mission
  - External factors

Recommendations expected in re:

- How the U might better organize for external partnerships
- The U’s marketing and communications strategies
- The U’s web page

Need to find better ways to communicate with external stakeholders. Telling our story in **compelling** ways – consistently. We’re doing more than people realize – we have to **own** that failure to communicate.
PEA Team Minutes: October 31, 2014

Present (n=17): Lucy Arendt (chair), Shannon Badura, Kate Burns, Juliet Cole, Judy Crain, Marcelo Cruz, Jeff Entwistle, Kate Green, JP Leary, Bill Lepley, Sarah Meredith, Adam Parrillo, Janet Reilly, Linda Tabers-Kwak, Christine Vandenhouten, Lora Warner, Amanda Wildenberg

Recorder: Lucy Arendt

The Team reviewed three documents in preparation for writing the First Interim Report: What We Need to Do, the Formal Partnerships Subgroup Meeting Recap from October 27, and the External Messaging Subgroup Meeting Recap from October 29.

The Team OK’d the What We Need To Do document. A spirited discussion of the Subgroup reports ensued, beginning with the philosophical question, “How do informal partnerships turn into formal partnerships?” The group agreed that it would return to this core question in the future.

Partnerships subgroup review

- Need a survey? Who’s the target of the survey? Chairs of academic departments, Director of supporting units, Athletics, Weidner Center …
- Information available in PARs?
- Christopher Paquette (get the list from him)
- Debbie Furlong has some data
- Compile by units as the “unit of analysis” rather than individuals
- Excel spreadsheet instead? YES
- Formal partnerships only? For now, YES
- Faculty or students or staff involved?
- Information needed:
  o Nature of the partnering organization? (for profit, nonprofit)
  o Sector of the economy
  o Start of the partnership (date of origin)
  o Category of partnership – service learning, practicum, general, etc.?
  o Impact
- Spreadsheet drafter – individuals who will “pre-test” the survey with partnerships known to them
  o Jeff
  o Kate
  o Marcelo
  o Chris
  o Shannon
  o JP
  o Linda
- Shannon and Lora will draft the spreadsheet for pre-testing
- Internships? No need to solicit? What would we want to know? Policies, procedures, extent of involvement, etc. Range of opportunities. Barriers to success.
  o Do this as part of a secondary data collection
  o Impact with the partner as well as with the university (Judy’s comment)
- How do we get at the impacts experienced by the community? KEY QUESTION
  o Interdisciplinary
  o Problem-solving
- Get Debbie’s data – partnerships
- Benchmark what other institutions are doing (e.g., SNC, other UW System institutions)
- Eventually: Institutionalize requesting impact information from affected partners
External messaging subgroup review
- Branding data from 2008-2009 faculty task force
- Need more data to help us understand effectiveness of our marketing
- Really important to gather data from external stakeholders
  o Including people who give money for scholarships?
- What we’re going to do with the information?
  o Find gaps
  o Learn how we’re perceived
  o How do we try to get the message out – mechanisms
    ▪ Effective or not?
  o Who are the key stakeholder groups?
  o Is 360 working?
  o What do we need to learn to move forward?
  o What are external perceptions?
    ▪ From where?
  o Message and method – impact (don’t lose sight of this)
  o Need to institutionalize our marketing efforts?
  o How to communicate talents of faculty/staff?
  o Need to think of how we will communicate with all stakeholders.
  o Phuture Phoenix – “students want to go elsewhere” – how to deal with this!
  o Marketing: Product, place, promo – keep all of this in mind!
  o Go beyond marketing to reference academic program array
  o Issue with internal messaging – engaging our current students as part of a community.
    Too many programs don’t get marketed beyond our campus. Issue with our students not feeling connected. Not the best word of mouth advertising.
  o Look at existing metrics – Weidner, Athletics, student attendance at campus events, alumni not being invited to events
  o Referencing how issues addressed by other working groups fit with ours (academic programs, enrollment)
  o More data: Campus Preview, FOCUS, etc.
  o Where are we physically located? Not on 172 where some other institutions (i.e., Globe, Lakeland) have plopped themselves
PEA Team Minutes: November 21, 2014

Present: Lucy Arendt (Chair), Kevin Fermanich, Marcelo Cruz, Kate Burns, Sarah Meredith, Janet Reilly, Lora Warner, Judy Crain, Lou LeCalsey, Tim Kaufman, Juliet Cole, Lydia Schwertfeger, Chris Vandenhouten, Vicki Medland, Shannon Badura, Amanda Wildenberg, John Katers, JP Leary, Adam Parrillo, Gabriel Saxton-Ruiz, Kristy Aoki, Bill Lepley, and Eric Craver.

I. Lucy Arendt opened the meeting at 9:30 a.m. and announced that we will be adding new people to the team, including Christopher Paquet from Business and Finance, another University Staff member, and more students. She reaffirmed that the most important function of this team is to make recommendations on how UW-Green Bay can establish itself as a leader in building partnerships and reminded us that we will do everything that we can, given the tight timeline we have.

II. Update from the “Existing Partnership” Subgroup (Adam Parrillo, Chair)
   a. The group last met on Nov. 20.
   b. The team already has some data collected identifying existing partnerships, the units involved and the types of partnerships.
   c. They have a graduate student working on entering data.
   d. Three categories being addressed:
      i. Terms of the partnership agreement
      ii. Geographic location of the partnership
      iii. Revenue generation
   e. More data is coming from Deb Furlong by Dec. 12 followed by additional data after the holidays (i.e. following up on larger partnership relationships.
   f. The team needs to identify processes for reacting when outside entities contact us with an opportunity to partner. How do we currently pursue these opportunities? How do we need to adjust those practices?
   g. The team also identified questions pertaining to “top-down”/”bottom-up” research – which is best and in what situations?
   h. Ultimately, we will end up with a large master list of all the partnerships being supported on campus identifying the functional areas and all outside entities that make up each partnership. Lora Warner referenced the partnership piece that the Chancellor sent out to all committee members.
   i. Juliette Cole commented on making certain that we include K-16 educational partnerships.
   j. These efforts will help to identify revenue generating partnerships, as well as those focusing on interdisciplinary research.
   k. One huge benefit of this exercise is that the database that will be built from our effort will be useful in many different areas of the campus.

III. Update from the “External Messaging” Subgroup (Janet Reilly, Chair)
   a. The group last met on Nov. 19.
   b. Identified several data sources on UWGB already in place. Examples from:
      i. STAMATS
      ii. EduVentures
   c. The committee is using this and other data to create a SWOT analysis
   d. We are thinking about how we create long-term, sustainable data.
   e. Primary Markets (as noted by Gabriel Daxton-Ruiz)
      i. Green Bay, Appleton De Pere, Rhinelander, Milwaukee and Chicago.
      ii. If we are not promoting ourselves heavily in these markets, perhaps that should change.
f. Eric Craver noted that the Adult Degree Program’s percentage of “local” students (i.e. those within a 50 mile radius of campus) is shrinking. While our total numbers have increased, the percentage of those within this radius has shrunk from about 80% to less than 50%.

g. Lucy Arendt discussed the changing populations that we serve (vis-à-vis geography, age, preferred learning styles, etc. as well as teaching, research, and service.) How will our marketing and message change?

h. Kristy Aoki pointed out that Special International students (especially Chinese students at UW-Madison) are taking online Winter Term and summer classes at UW-Green Bay. This speaks to this population’s desire for online learning at a more affordable price.

i. At the Nov. 19 subgroup meeting, there was a presentation from Pat Theyerl from Computing and Information Technology on “One Drive.”

j. The Steering Committee wants to be sure that we are keeping the STAMATS and EduVentures data secure.

IV. Brainstorming: SWOT Analysis:

a. STRENGTHS (Internal to us)
   i. International exchange opportunities for students and Faculty. (Sarah)
   ii. Personal Connections in the community. (Shannon)
   iii. High degree of Diversity. (John)
   iv. Service-based learning. (Lora)
   v. We have a number of historic/older partnerships. (Kevin)
   vi. We have partners that employ our students and graduates. (Christine)
   vii. There is a passions among faculty on campus for building partnerships. (Janet)
   viii. Our problem-focused missions puts us in the ideal position to create these partnerships. (Adam)
   ix. Strong wealth of resources in our faculty and staff. (Judy)
   x. Strong music, theater, and arts programs provide opportunities to connect to high schools (Sarah)
   xi. Our graduates are prepared to succeed in the business community. (Lou)
   xii. Strong relationships with local public schools. (Judy)
   xiii. We have the campus assets to create and maintain these partnerships, even in non-academic areas such as athletics, Weidner Center, etc. (Lucy)
   xiv. Given our geographic location, we are ideally positioned to engage in research partnerships focusing on the natural environment. (Vicki)
   xv. We are responsive to local needs. (John)
   xvi. There are a number of campus entities that lend themselves well to the formation of partnerships, such as EMBI, etc. (Kevin)

b. WEAKNESSES (Internal to us)
   i. We are perceived as being “isolated” in our ivory tower. (Lora)
   ii. There is no specific point of contact for someone in the community who wishes to engage in a partnership with UWGB. (John)
   iii. If someone on campus leaves the university or if the money runs out, then the partnership often just dissolves. (Vicki)
   iv. There aren’t enough opportunities on campus to develop partnerships with each other – faculty and staff. (Sarah)
   v. There is nothing in place currently for new faculty to encourage the development of external partnerships. (Adam)
   vi. UW Oshkosh is much more aggressive in the formation of partnerships. We need the type of strong leadership demonstrated by Chancellor Wells at UWO and we need to
develop expectations of faculty and staff working here that they are responsible for
developing partnerships. Chancellor Miller will be very good for this. (Lou)

vii. We are in a larger community than UWO, but we have fewer people. (Lucy)

viii. UWGB’s Freshman Seminar offers many good opportunities for students to become
active and involved in the community. (Lydia)

ix. We see advertising and promotion of other colleges and universities in downtown
Green Bay, but not of UWGB. (JP)

x. Bureaucracy… (Lora)

xi. University Classified Staff holds a conference in Green Bay. For the first 25 years it
was held on campus. For the last three years it has been held at the Tundra Lodge
because we can get better pricing. (Amanda)

xii. We need to create spaces on campus and in our community where people can
experience UW-Green Bay. This has been a reflection in the past of lack of
leadership. (Marcelo)

xiii. Certain groups in our community are often intimidated and do not feel that UW-Green
Bay is the place for them, such as ethnic minorities. (Marcelo)

xiv. We needs as a campus to spend more time thinking about how we can partner instead
of why we can’t partner. We don’t take risks. (John)

xv. Too many excuses made as to why we cannot do something. (Gabriel)

xvi. We need to create processes, signage, etc. that help people who are new to campus to
get around and not get lost. (Judy)

xvii. Poorly thought out or outdated campus policies often get in the way. Example:
policies surrounding food service make it too expensive to use Aviand’s, so
organizations often hold events in the Mauthe Center where policies are more relaxed.
(Kristy)

c. OPPORTUNITIES (External to us)

i. We have chances to form partnerships with other UW campuses. (Christine)

ii. We must take advantage of opportunities to engage in activities with students in other
communities around Wisconsin. (Janet)

iii. The new Packers partnership offers many opportunities. (Gabriel)

iv. We have many campus resources to attract people, such as the Arboretum. We do not
make the optimum use of these resources. (Kristy)

v. We could use on-campus contact points such as campus tours to better articulate what
we have on campus. (Vicki)

vi. We could establish relationships with prominent people in the community to create
“professionals in residence.” (Lou)

vii. Green Bay is the third-largest community in Wisconsin. (Lucy)

viii. We need to be more proactive on working with community problems. Students,
faculty, staff, and community members could collaborate to solve issues in NE
Wisconsin, such as homelessness, water quality, etc. (Lora)

ix. This university has all of the “pieces in place.” We need to figure out how use these
resources more effectively. (John)

x. We need to link these efforts to economic development in NE Wisconsin. (John)

xi. We need to streamline our efforts and reduce redundancy, thus creating the
opportunity to free up/re-purpose unnecessarily over-burdened campus resources.
(Adam)

xii. We can invite our existing partners to join us in training that we offer. (Amanda)

xiii. We must cultivate stronger relationships with local legislators. (Lou)

xiv. We need to create more of a “community within a community” at UW-Green Bay and
make people want to stay here for college and afterward. We need to ask ourselves
and our partners, “what makes a strong community?” and then focus on fostering increased pride in our community and our university. (Christine)

xv. We have the opportunity to form stringer and healthier relationships with local tribal communities. (Lucy)

xvi. We need to make more out of the fact that we have Division I athletics right here at UWGB. (Eric)

xvii. UW-Green Bay can seem like a “suitcase campus” as many students go home on weekends or are stranded on campus without transportation to get into the community for events and activities. (Lydia)

xviii. We have a new Chancellor and a new Provost. This is, in and of itself, and opportunity. (Lydia)

d. THREATS (External to us)

i. We ran out of time. Lucy asked that everyone on the committee review these minutes and think about “Threats” to our success.

V. Next meeting will take place on Wed., Dec. 10 from 8:30-10:30 a.m. in CL 125D.

a. The Chancellor will be at all or part of this meeting.

b. Our timeline goes until March 1.

c. We will be working on the primary two charges to the group with a goal of being done with them by the end of the fall semester.

d. Plan to meet every Friday in February.

Lucy closed the meeting at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Eric Craver
Dir. of External Relations
Outreach and Adult Access
PEA Team Minutes: December 10, 2014
Present: Lucy Arendt (Chair), Kevin Fermanich, Marcelo Cruz, Kate Burns, Sara Meredith Livingston, Janet Reilly, Lora Warner, Judy Crain, Juliet Cole, Chris Vandenhouten, Vicki Medland, Shannon Badura, Amanda Wildenberg, John Katers, Adam Parrillo, Gabriel Saxton-Ruiz, Kristi Aoki, Bill Lepley, Jeff Entwistle, Kate Green, Stephanie Reilly, Christopher Paquet

Lucy started the meeting at 8:30 a.m.

1. The Chancellor came to discuss his goals for our working group and answer questions we might have. He first thanked us for our hard work. One of our goals is to help develop a future narrative for this institution. He felt our SWOT analyses thus far have been productive and conveyed his excitement about how to organize an institutional strategy about partnerships and how we might leverage this. In terms of the narrative, he reiterated the 3 powers message from his Installation (Innovation, Place, and Transform Lives) that he would like tied in. The 50th year anniversary will also build on this message. However, we will discontinue the 360 degrees of learning narrative and will be developing a different narrative once the capital campaign is done.

2. The Chancellor then opened the floor to questions.
   a) Jeff asked about the bureaucracy involved with community partnerships. The Chancellor said we needed to develop documentation.
   b) Lora asked about lean processes that businesses use to get rid of bottlenecks. The Chancellor replied that The Huron Group has been retained by System to work on this. Right now they are helping Madison, but they will help us once we look at our previous workflow analysis results. The Chancellor also noted that academic institutions are not the same as businesses, and that we should not trim away reflective processes in academia.
   c) John asked how the 4 working groups integrated with the powers of the Phoenix. The Chancellor replied that the Provost will become part of the committees and that we will need a town hall meeting to socialize these ideas across campus. UPIC is currently learning everything about the university. The Chancellor has some ideas for change, including reorganizing existing structures, that he would like to implement through governance processes. He stated his goal was to have a hard hitting narrative with a transparent way of getting there. The Chancellor then described the goals of the other working groups, including another group working on interdisciplinarity. The Chancellor is working on an essay about interdisciplinarity that he will release at a later date.
   d) Judy noted that the concept of interdisciplinarity was confusing to outsiders. The Chancellor agreed that we needed to examine our claim of interdisciplinarity. He posed the question about whether interdisciplinarity was a state of organization or an interaction. He also pointed that there are different ways to organize the disciplines into problems to best represent the current state of the world.
   e) Marcelo stated that fields are becoming more interdisciplinary. The Chancellor noted that we have experience in organizing for interdisciplinarity (unlike other institutions) and that we can be innovative here.
   f) Lucy noted the advantage of interdisciplinarity was that it was part of our institutional fabric, but a disadvantage was ossification and that we can’t imagine things in any other way. Specifically, that the problems of today may not be the same as in 1970 when these units were formed. She argued that we should change the unit of analysis away from the department/unit as interdisciplinary to courses as interdisciplinary instead. She felt other places also do interdisciplinarity well and that we’ve become proud and not as reflective as we should be.
The Chancellor urged us to look at the way the University of Louisville organizes partnership activities because it is organized to respond in a strategic way in the community.

g) Amanda asked what the Chancellor wanted us to do about the website. The Chancellor answered that there is a request for proposals for a company to help us with the website. We need to make the website more outward facing and we’re missing a creative voice in the middle. We need to move from an intranet for us to an external document where students, businesses, nonprofits, and other universities can find information about us. Right now he wants to wait on making website changes until we know more about our narrative, even though he hates the website.

h) Judy asked how the university is perceived in the community. The Chancellor articulated several thoughts on this issue. First, the community wants the institution here and they are very proud of it (he stated this was tied into athletics). Second, the community has high expectations for us, but they are currently not being met (e.g., lack of involvement in K-12 system, downtown, engineering major). The community also desired our institution to be bigger (especially given the size of the campus) and that we should be a bigger partner with more clout. We’re the 3rd largest city in the state, but feel irrelevant in the System. He would like to change the structure of the Board of Trustees so that they are more of a partner with us and can act as our advocates. He gave the example of a Masters of Public Administration that we had applied to offer, and how we could better put that through the approval process.

i) John asked how we could utilize the Foundation. The Chancellor stated he would like the Foundation to be more of an active supporter rather than a holding unit. The President will be the Vice Chancellor of Advancement. The Foundation will allow us to make real estate deals, develop LLCs, and handle the endowment. Our endowment has already surpassed most other comprehensives in money. The Foundation will fund much of the 50th year celebration. We will announce our new fundraising initiatives at the beginning of the 50th year celebration.

j) Marcelo raised the question about whether we were meeting the community’s expectations of us. This led to a discussion of making us perceived as a more urban institution, including a downtown presence and taking advantage of the renovation of University Avenue. The Chancellor mentioned that he wants the city to want to grow by campus, and that he wishes that we could buy land near campus for development projects.

k) Janet asked how far we should be considering our reach to be. The Chancellor stated we should try to get students from wherever we can, including Chicago, Milwaukee, etc.

l) Janet noted that students viewed partnerships as links to jobs. The Chancellor stated that we don’t want to be perceived as a tech school, but that the interdisciplinary mindset can be a good way of thinking about career preparation for “jobs of the future”. There is currently a course in careers at Madison.

3. The Chancellor then left the meeting and Lucy asked for people’s feedback.

a) Juliet noted that Wisconsin is not a good state for Black kids and that other groups are partnering to work on this in Green Bay. She will send an article to the group for more on this (sent 12/11).

b) Building on this, people noted that UWGB is often “not at the table” in trying to address community issues. Chris noted that she felt less welcome at these community tables as a member of UWGB than when she was at Bellin. Vicki suggested that we used our alumni contacts to better partner.

c) Lucy noted that we will address UWGB’s leadership role as part of our 3rd task. She made some observations on our SWOT analysis from last time. First, it was easier for us to generate negatives than positives. She may have moved some of the observations to a different category.
depending on whether they were internal or external in nature. We have control over our strengths and weaknesses, and need to be response to opportunities and threats. In several respects, we seem to be our own worst enemy in the campus culture and infrastructure surrounding community partnerships.

d) Marcelo noted that faculty are evaluated according to teaching, research, and service, but that service is not given the same weight. He also stated that there is a question about whether applied research would count as research or service and the perception that psychology is not involved in the community. Others noted that there is uneven respect for service across campus, including on the staff side. Since some faculty only teach online, there is also a blurring of lines about teaching, research, and service. It was noted that the administration could encourage faculty and staff to get more involved in the community. Lucy noted that there are significant internal barriers that we can control as well (e.g., merit/promotion are in the faculty’s hands, recognizing different types of research, reconfiguring staff jobs to have community involvement).

e) Juliet noted there should be a PK-16 relationship. For example, we could collaborate on remedying the achievement gap.

4) Lucy asked us to think over break about what structural things we can control (e.g., reward systems, organizational structures).

5) Janet provided an update on the External Messaging subgroup. She noted their concerns with the campus website acting as an intranet instead of internet. They had some guest speakers from Marketing and Communications and did a SWOT analysis based on that. The plan is to have the rest of the data analyzed with SWOT by 12/15 and a final meeting on 12/16.

6) Adam provided an update on the Partnerships subgroup. They are waiting on data by the Center for Public Affairs (CPA) Snapshot and Debbie Furlong (due 12/12). They will do some follow-up data collection to further flesh out, especially multilevel partnerships. Lora passed out a handout with an example of the spreadsheet. An intern has been entering these data. Lora noted that she wished the CPA could be a think tank for the community since there was no central place for the community to get in touch with faculty members.

7) Lucy noted that the rest of campus doesn’t know what this group is doing. She asked our permission to send out a message about what we’re doing to get feedback on it (in Log 12/17). Others noted that we might have to have an open forum on campus or involve Marketing and Communications.

8) Lucy has sent the spring meeting requests. We might not need them all, but this way we will have them just in case. Our report is due 3/1 to the Steering Committee. The times vary because of people’s different schedules. She noted that we should come early for the 8:00 a.m. ones because they are only an hour long. She will bring treats. We will be meeting in the spring: 1/23 from 9:30-11, 1/30 from 8-9, 2/6 from 11-12:30, 2/13 from 8-9, 2/20 from 11-12:30, and 2/27 9:30-11.

Lucy ended the meeting at 10:29 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Kate Burns
PEA Team Minutes: January 23, 2015
Present: Lucy Arendt (Chair), Shannon Badura, Kate Burns, Judy Crain, Eric Craver, Kevin Fermanich, Kate Green, John Katers, Bill Lepley, Sue Machuca, Christopher Paquet, Adam Parrillo, Linda Tabers-Kwak, Chris Vandenhouten, Lora Warner, Amanda Wildenberg
Recorder: Bill Lepley


2. Comments/discussion about SWOT survey.
   a. We should communicate what we are doing.
   b. Survey was noted in campus log.
   c. Is survey still available? Yes. Lucy will ask that it be put in campus log again.
   d. Community input: should the survey go out to community?
      1) Issues: If it goes out, to whom? Will it conflict with other surveys? Isn’t SWOT really for internal purposes? A community survey may “taint” what will be coming next.
      2) Alternative idea for getting input: each of us speaks to five people to gather input.

   • Lucy: will send us a request—that we each talk to five people in community—not affiliated with the University—asking: “What opportunities should UWGB be taking advantage of.” Will want results by Feb. 6

   • Committee members offered quick reactions (yes, no, other, and brief comments)—on our External Messaging Group’s suggested interventions, (a) through (t). Summary of reactions to those interventions:
     a. Yes: Branding to indicate the UWGB unique attributes
     b. Relates to marketing; will return – and couple with item (d): Centralize MUC marketing and efforts for benefit of all campus departments
     c. Pass on this for now: Centralize UW Systems marketing and outreach (single application, noting uniqueness of each UW System campus, etc.)
     d. Will return – couple with (b): Increase MUC staff and funding
     e. Yes: Targeted marketing and outreach to diverse and changing potential student body
     f. Yes: Clear marketing/outreach presence and efforts in region and local community of UWGB faculty expertise and service available to the public, partners, community
     g. Not really marketing: Turn competition into collaboration with technical colleges, private and other UW System campuses for diverse program offerings that align with workforce needs
     h. Needs finessing: Maximize alternative funding from alumni, Learning in Retirement participants, local and regional partners to increase student tuition assistance and replace state funding
     i. Create external mechanism: Create new academic undergraduate and graduate programs which align with anticipated regional workforce needs
     j. Yes (but needs polish): Strengthen and maximize partnerships within the region and community to enhance student employment after graduation, service (outsource marketing to local ad firm and donor) and scholarship opportunities/offers to the community (Humana, Schneider Trucking, United Health, New NORTH, etc.)
k. Yes: Increase faculty and staff and department awareness of MUC and its the ability to professionally promote the UWGB public image (i.e. promote public perception/awareness of UWGB through individual faculty expertise or abilities)

l. Yes...maybe: Create a consistent process and scripting for enthusiastic campus visitations

m. Yes: Define a strategic plan for growth and establish campus enrollment goals that align with the desired marketing/public image

n. It’s important, but is it marketing? Strategize with local businesses and services to coordinate regular, free mass transit for students (i.e. Phoenix trolley to downtown, Ashwaubenon shopping. – current bus route not utilized) AND create mass transit options to bring the public to campus for events (i.e. Weidner or cultural events)

o. Yes: Clearly connect Weidner and Phoenix marketing to UWGB campus image

p. Yes: Expand university social media marketing and outreach to all departments and academic programs to reach a growing media-connected community

q. Not messaging: Campus courses in the community (downtown office/classroom)

r. Yes (but it’s more involved; integrative marketing): Continue to market to students within 50 mile radius of campus and Chicago areas (Door County summer or vacation connections to campus), widening the marketing strategy to the north and western regions of the state

s. Yes...maybe: Build supportive relationships between local politicians and UW System personnel

t. Yes: Create and integrate UWGB “places” off campus and within the community for classrooms, exhibit halls, conferences, campus housing, etc.

4. Partnership Subgroup report. Adam Parrillo provided brief report; more will be coming. There’s no one overwhelming theme to the outside partners (possibly: medical).

5. Next steps.
   • Next meeting: Friday, January 30, 2015
   • Want to consider a Carnegie classification: “Community Engagement Campus.” Examples of such: UW-Milwaukee, UW-Madison, St. Norbert College.
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PEA Team Minutes: January 30, 2015
Present: Lucy Arendt (Chair), Shannon Badura, Kate Burns, Judy Crain, Eric Craver, Marcelo Cruz, Kevin Fermanich, Kate Green, John Katers, JP Leary, Bill Lepley, Sue Machuca, Vicki Medland, Sarah Meredith, Christopher Paquet, Adam Parrillo, Gabriel Saxton-Ruiz, Chris Vandenhouten, Lora Warner, Amanda Wildenberg

Recorder: Christine Vandenhouten

1. **Minutes** of January 23, 2015 were approved as presented.
2. **Review of External Messaging Subgroup Recommendations:**

   The group discussed the recommendation to centralize Marketing efforts for the campus. The following points were entertained:

   - While there are some advantages to a centralized approach to university marketing, individual units/departments may need their own marketing staff for unit-specific marketing. Rather than a centralized marketing office, centralization of marketing processes with additional staff may help both the larger university as well as unit specific efforts.
   - C. Paquet reminded the group that several university departments are contracting with external agencies for marketing such as University Athletics and those using the services of Carnegie for digital marketing (Admissions, Adult Degree, Weidner Center, others?)
   - L. Warner suggested a need for more marketing expertise for campus.
   - There is a lack of clarity around when it is acceptable to use logos in marketing materials.
   - S. Meredith described a desire for assistance when marketing events such as visiting artists performing on campus and suggested the need for a downtown campus location to connect the campus to downtown Green Bay.
   - A. Parrillo identified the need for a marketing flowchart that would allow departments to determine where to go for marketing needs, procedures for marketing, as well as identify gaps.
   - A centralized calendar of university events would assist in marketing events.
   - The physical location of the marketing and communications department on the 8th floor of the Cofrin Library building is not conducive to marketing efforts as it removes them from the day to day activities of the campus.
   - J. Katers suggested EMBI needs a greater marketing presence/staff than they currently have.

In summary, the campus is missing a strategic marketing approach:

   - Who are the target markets?
   - What is the best way to access the target market?
   - What are the key messages?
   - What resources do we need to achieve the strategic marketing?

Lucy suggested we revise the structural model to a Matric Structure whereby marketing expertise is located both in a central office as well as within departments. This marketing team jointly (cross campus) develops a strategic marketing plan and rolls this out for the campus. This may not involve hiring additional staff but strategically using the existing staff in more efficient/effective ways. For
example, marketing staff currently aligned in one department may be shared with other depts. in order to maximize their expertise.

3. **Partnerships Subgroup Report**: A. Parrillo reported on the work of the subgroup.
   - The current reporting system for partnerships is incomplete.
   - We need a better, more coordinated approach to data collection and dissemination of information about partnerships with the campus and the community.
   - The workgroup recommends improved data collection/reporting systems that provide a visual summary as well as a method to determine the impact (monetary as well as human service) of the partnerships for the university, community, and region/state.

4. **Community Engagement Infrastructure (Office of Community Engagement)**
   a. Some voiced concern that this type of office may be overwhelmed.
   b. The current system often involves community entities contacting the chair of a department who then refers them to faculty however there is no way to determine the outcome of that communication/request.
   c. Additional comments from members included that there is currently a list of faculty speakers that is used when there are requests.
   d. It is important to recognize the importance of tying community partnerships with fundraising and advancement efforts.
   e. “We should be the first place people look to when solving community problems.” We need to be more proactive, perhaps developing a 12 month plan however this becomes difficult when we don’t have a dedicated department.
   f. Few Negatives of this type of approach were identified such as initial confusion for community partners during the initial phase and the need for $$ budget for start up, however more positives were voiced such as:
      i. This type of approach would provide a more coordinated approach to requests and promote a more interdisciplinary approach/solutions.
      ii. A 2nd function could be to serve as a clearinghouse of partnerships to not only coordinate efforts but also have reporting responsibilities. It may improve accountability as well.
      iii. It was noted that the UW-Extension is the community engagement arm for UW Madison. Outreach and adult access are funded in part under this model.
   g. In summary, a centralized community engagement dept. could facilitate communication between UWGB and prospective community partners, would provide a more proactive rather than reactive approach to partnerships, would help facilitate Public relations, and would help formalize the service work faculty are doing.
      a. Are we the leader to help the community solve problems?
         i. We need a strategic focus (begin with a particular focus and then add)
         ii. Outreach…
         iii. There are many centers/depts. on campus that could benefit from greater visibility & a more coordinated effort.
         iv. Need to determine what are reasonable services and at what cost.
            1. How do we provide community service?
            2. How do we turn these into internships for students?
3. How do we support/value non-paid community service? Should be interested in those services that provide a human service- not just “pay to play”.
4. It is important that advancement be aware of the partnerships when approaching new and existing donors.
5. A center could connect new faculty and staff to community organizations in a more coordinated fashion.

h. Members were reminded to send Lucy a summary of the results of their informal poll of five individuals external to the campus, i.e., people who have no attachment to the campus. The question each of us needs to ask is a straightforward one: What community partnership opportunities should UWGB be involved in?

Alongside each person’s comments, please give me a brief description of the individual – no names, please! A description like, “Female, has a bachelor’s degree, works in retail, middle-aged” is perfect. Please try to avoid gathering information from people who have an insider’s perspective on UWGB – we need external views. The information will be used for our internal thinking; no one’s name will be attached to his or her comments.

Next Meeting: **Friday February 6th from 9 to 10:30**.
Agenda items include the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification.
Results of the Informal Poll of Community Members.
**PEA Team Minutes: February 6, 2015**

Present: Kristy Aoki, Lucy Arendt (Chair), Shannon Badura, Kate Burns, Marcelo Cruz, Kevin Fermanich, Kate Green, John Katers, JP Leary, Bill Lepley, Sue Machuca, Vicki Medland, Sarah Meredith, Adam Parrillo, Gabriel Saxton-Ruiz, Chris Vandenhouten, Lora Warner, Amanda Wildenberg

Recorder: Lucy Arendt
9-10:30 a.m.


2. Discussion. Why the shortened timeframe for our work?
   a. Questions about why our work is being curtailed and whether we should ask to have more time in order to finalize our work to the best of our ability.
   b. Question about the unfulfilled need to tackle the leadership component of our charge.
   c. Disappointed that our timeline was shortened.
   d. What could we do or have done beyond what we did?
   e. Data gathering exercise. Not a governance group. Share our concerns (e.g., loose ends). “It is what it is.”
   f. Lots of ideas, not enough time to work through the details. Decisions have to be made elsewhere. Positive step forward for the people who will take our info next.
   g. Could have done a lot more.
   h. This budget situation has created some realities (e.g., stuff happens sooner).
   i. With a report like this, we don’t know how it will be used. We’re holding administration accountable for what we were asked to do. Informal contract between working group and administration.
   j. Some not opposed to meeting again. What is admin planning to do vis-à-vis budget cuts, etc.? So many unknowns … may not be valuable to continue meeting.
   k. Some ideas may ultimately lead to us accomplishing our third objective.
   l. A humbler document than it could have been. Offer this as an initial conversation, reserve the right to continue the discussion when some unknowns are clarified.
   m. Some of the ideas are good no matter what happens budget-wise.
   n. What’s missing is our chance to bring it all together and to analyze our database and look for partnership opportunities.
   o. Partnership database remains incomplete. Need to note this. Lora: Intern found, will continue to develop the database.
   p. Some people may have chosen not to complete the survey for a variety of reasons (e.g., people not knowing what the database will be used for, people thinking that they are being asked multiple times for the same info – this stuff needs to be coordinated well in the future).
   q. For the final report: Preamble – boundary conditions, limitations
r. Value placed on partnerships … consider how this fits into this conversation. Are they truly valued? Recognized as scholarship, service, teaching – link all three.

3. Review of final recommendations, drafted by Lucy, based on previous conversations
   a. External messaging – suggestions made to enhance the draft.
   b. Partnerships – suggestions made to enhance the draft.
   c. Task 3: Leadership. Evaluate the possibility of the campus pursuing the Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement.
Appendix C – Partnerships Subgroup Meeting Minutes

Formal Partnerships Subgroup Meeting Recap

October 27, 2014

Members in attendance: Adam Parrillo, John Katers, Christine Vandenhousten, Lora Warner, Shannon Badura, William Lepley, Kristi Aoki

Members not in attendance: Juliet Cole, Jeff Entwistle, Kevin Fermanich, JP Leary, Sarah Meredith, Stephanie Reilly

The agenda was to (1) determine the data necessary for inventorying and analyzing the University’s current formal partnerships and (2) establishing a timeline for the subgroup’s activities. The discussion included the following elements:

- What is the greater purpose of this exercise?
  - Adam Parrillo described discussions with Chancellor and the Steering Committee where he expressed concerns that resources may not align with high impact practices and the need to structurally organize outreach efforts.

- Allowing the data to speak for itself without going into the collection process with overly defined requirements
  - We do need some basic guidance to direct the data collection in a manner that produces usable information without putting too much load on programs and departments.

- There have been at least two surveys recently that have collected data relating to partnerships
  - We need this data

- Lora Warner reviewed her Snapshot Project that focuses on voluntary, professional engagement with a community service context
  - We viewed this as a complementary study that would be valuable for identifying possible opportunities in a later stage of this research.

- Discussion of definitions
  - Contractual relationships
  - Informal vs. formal internships
  - External vs. internal
  - Organized by academic review sections (teaching, scholarship, service)
  - Vendor contracts?
  - How partnerships are established (planned/accident)
  - Types of resources necessary to develop/expand relationships

The end result of our discussion:

1. Recent data acquisition – We must obtain the information from the recent surveys about partnerships/community engagement
   - Chancellor’s office?

2. Survey – This is to be sent to the chairs/directors from each unit/program/department on campus. Included in the survey would be a brief description of scope and purpose including a brief definition of formal and informal. We did not want to discount informal relationships at this point for two reasons: (1) even with the definitions, some may still define these terms differently, and (2) these may link to or enable formal partnerships, which may be of benefit for later parts of the PEA Working Group’s tasks.
A formal partnership is accompanied by a signed memorandum that specifies the contributions expected from each entity involved. These can range from student internships to cooperative grants.

An informal partnership includes a professional activity that may enrich either or both a program/unit/department and an external entity but is not elaborated in a memorandum.

The survey would request the following information for all current partnerships:

A. Entity of partnership
B. Formal or informal
C. Contact persons (both from UWGB and the entity)
D. Year initiated or how long ago initiated
E. Is it anticipated to be ongoing
F. Resources necessary to maintain (i.e. financial or time commitment)

3. Timeline – For efficiency in data collection, organization, and analysis, we should organize the data request in a Qualitrics survey. The timeline is as follows:
   a. Week of November 3 – design and release the survey
   b. November 28 – survey period terminates
   c. Week of December 1 – Organize survey data into categorized inventory and analyze for patterns
   d. December 8 – Deadline for Formal Partnerships Subgroup final report
Formal Partnerships Subgroup Meeting Recap
November 20, 2014

Members in attendance: Adam Parrillo, John Katers, Christine Vandenhouten, Kevin Fermanich, Shannon Badura, Juliet Cole, Christopher Paquet

The agenda was to (1) review the current data collection and (2) evaluate the content in order to (3) establish a conceptual mode of the end report. The discussion included the following elements:

- The group was encouraged by the current data collection by Debbie Furlong and the Snapshot project directed by Lora Warner. However, due to the nature of the documents being submitted, the resulting database is lacking some data deemed necessary for our end purposes. Much of this session focused on which types of categorical data would facilitate our intended analysis. The categories are:
  - Term of agreement/partnership
  - State (i.e. professional programs where regulations matter)
    - Possibly of geographic indicators as to evaluate the extent of our partnerships
  - “Revenue generation” – paid or not paid
    - Direction of financial flow – UWGB to Partner, Partner to UWGB, Partner to Faculty, Partner to Intern, Practicum

Related to this discussion of additional categorization and the end/report/purpose, it was realized that this involves additional tiers of data collection.

1. Tier 1 – Initial represented by the database currently being compiled
2. Tier 2 – Data request based upon the initial database. Given that this database contains the campus contact program/individual, an inquiry of the additional categorization is necessary
3. Tier 3 – Directed “case study” tier that would explore those partnerships trends that emerge from the examination of the database

A guiding factor of this element was comments from Chancellor Miller to keep in mind revenue streams and triple bottom line. There are also elements in the Annual Accountability Report that will aid in contextualizing the final data analysis.

It was generally agreed that if strengthening partnerships is a goal, better coordination and possibly centralization is key to achieve this. A mechanism (see U of Louisville’s One Stop Shop) that facilitates various community constituents and groups to contact and engage the variety of University programs is essential, though this must not be the exclusive method of community engagement. The university will still be strengthened by a myriad of mechanisms for engagements, whether top-down, bottom-up, or somewhere in-between. In the end, UWGB must become the “go to” entity for regional economic, cultural, and altruistic (etc.) activities. We must facilitate the activation of the campus expertise.
Formal Partnerships Subgroup Meeting Recap
January 26, 2015

Members in attendance: Adam Parrillo, Lora Warner, Christine Vandenhouten, Christopher Paquet, Kristin Aoki, William Lepley, Kevin Fermanich, Sarah Meredith

The agenda was to (1) review the current database of partnerships, (2) strategize further information gathering, and (3) review related elements of the University of Louisville’s Office for Community Engagement.

Meeting outcomes:

1. We need to understand the implications of the current data collection; how is it currently used by system? To this end we need to speak with Debbie Furlong since this is a regular data collection effort, but is clearly incomplete. We also need to discover where the data for the Annual Accountability Report is generated.
   a. The data are used for transparency/accountability by UW system – i.e., put out there. I don’t believe much more is done with it than that. The data for her report is generated by Debbie contacting the known “recorders” on campus – the people or offices that keep track for education, social work, nursing, and internships, and by putting out a call to faculty to report using her Qualtrics template. The recorders send her their recent reports, a few faculty submit their reports to her (not many). (Amended, Lora Warner)

2. Certain questions arise due to the database capturing an incomplete picture of all partnerships. There is need for a qualitative data inquiry to come from direct contact to campus departments.
   a. Most successful partnerships? (Identification)
   b. How are partnerships cultivated? (Process)
   c. How is success measured? (Outcome)
   d. Are there financial value to the services and are they currently valued; monetized or time tracking? Could this be implemented? (Tracking)
   e. What would enable the formation of partnerships in your area? (Structure)

3. The process and issues with data collection along with exterior examples of community engagement (see U of Louisville) lead to the following working recommendations.
   a. Office/personnel that organize university community engagement by
      i. Ongoing and systematic collection of community engagement and partnership data
      ii. Converting community engagement and partnership data to terms of monetary value, time tracking, AND community impact (connects to messaging);
      iii. Serving as direct contact for exterior entities seeking relationships
      iv. Developing standards for data collection on community partnerships
      v. Develop spotlight/defined efforts of impact that coincides with university mission
   b. This office would work to organize the following outcomes
      i. Better external messaging of community efforts based upon data
      ii. Foster internal collaboration of outreach and partnerships
      iii. Cultivate new relationships between campus entities and external partners
   c. For university personnel, the reporting process must be integrated with expected duties
i. For faculty, reporting of these activities should be integrated with review procedure (i.e. research, service, and teaching)

ii. For staff, these activities should be within job responsibilities

Much of the context for our discussion are previous comments from Chancellor Miller to keep in mind revenue streams and triple bottom line. A major issue related is that this data does not appear to be tracked reliably. The data collected for this subgroup is clearly incomplete.

In addition, a mechanism like an office of community engagement would centralize efforts to organize, coordinate, maintain, and publicize various community engagement, though this must not be the exclusive method of community engagement. The university will still be strengthened by a myriad of mechanisms for engagements, whether top-down, bottom-up, or somewhere in-between. In the end, UWGB must become the “go to” entity for regional economic, cultural, and altruistic (etc.) activities. We must facilitate the activation of the campus expertise.

While the University of Louisville’s community engagement is cited, there are other examples that provide insight to elements that should be included in a centralization. These are NWTC’s Office of Student Service-Learning, St. Norbert College’s Sturzl Center for Community Service & Learning, and UW-Oshkosh’s new community service requirement.
Appendix D – External Messaging Subgroup Minutes

External Messaging Subgroup Minutes: October 29, 2014

Date: October 30, 2014

To: Lucy Arendt. Partnerships and External Messaging subgroup committee chair

From: External Messaging Group (EMG)

RE: 1st EMG meeting minutes (10/29/14) for First Interim report to ITF Steering Committee

The EMG met 10/29/14 from 4-5:30 PM in MAC 305 with these attendees: K. Burns; E. Craver; V. Medland; J. Reilly; G. Saxton-Ruiz; A. Wildenberg.

The EMG charge is: defining, analyzing, evaluating and recommending UWGB external marketing and communication strategies. EMG will address these working group guidelines:

- Examine UWGB efforts to communicate to the public our academic mission/strengths/opportunities/core values/assets.
- Evaluate the effectiveness/organization of UWGB efforts to communicate to the public our academic mission/strengths/opportunities/core values/assets.

The EMG defined UWGB core values to align with the mission as: interdisciplinarity, problem-focused and encouraging internationalism, and an ideal place for adult learners. The EMG defined assets of UWGB as: athletics, faculty expertise, and the Weidner Center.

A. EMG TIMELINE

EMG will meet the following dates to accomplish the listed tasks. (Outlook calendar invites will be sent by email with room locations.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/14/14</td>
<td>11:30 – 1 PM</td>
<td>Share individual data analysis from emailed data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/14</td>
<td>9-10:30 AM</td>
<td>Analyze and evaluate data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/24/14</td>
<td>1-2:30 PM</td>
<td>Evaluate data and SWOT analysis to create strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/14</td>
<td>11-12:30 PM</td>
<td>Finalize recommended strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. EMG DATA REQUESTS

Below are the data sources that EMG brainstormed were necessary to describe, analyze and evaluate UWGB efforts and the effectiveness of these efforts to communicate to the public about our partnerships, mission, strengths, opportunities, core values and assets. Ideas for data needs related to partnerships from a side discussion were forwarded to that subcommittee chair, Adam Parrillo.

a. Data from Chancellor’s faculty survey on public’s perceptions and efforts
b. Data from Chancellor’s community survey on public’s perceptions and efforts
c. Opinions of UWGB communications staff on public’s perceptions and efforts (Kelly Moore, Sue Bodilly, Chris Sampson)
d. Recent HLC accreditation data of perceptions
e. Data analytics from social media (i.e., - # of web hits, attributes of web visitors) (Jenna Richter, Josh Goldman)
f. Digital media use data from Carnegie
g. Recent local news and TV media releases about UWGB (Phoenix athletics, Dr. Draney on huge spiders, heirloom plant sale, scandals, etc.)
h. Data on where the mission statements are located for individual UWGB departments, organizations, institutes in house and on the web
i. Opinions of UWGB fundraisers or development/donor recruitment on above
j. STAMATS data completed in 2012 (brand promises, attributes, external perceptions) (Mike Stearney)
k. Weidner Center marketing (whether it is associated with UWGB or not)
l. OIE data on how post travel course opinions affect UWGB students and the community perspectives
m. Talisma data on how marketing encapsulates UWGB core values (Jen Jones)

Submitted by J. Reilly 10/30/14
External Messaging Subgroup Minutes: November 19, 2014

Date: November 20, 2014
To: Lucy Arendt. Partnerships and External Messaging subcommittee chair
From: External Messaging Group (EMG)
RE: 2nd EMG meeting minutes (11/19/14) for next Interim report to ITF Steering Committee

The EMG met 11/19/14 from 9 -10:30 AM in the Heritage Room in the Union with these attendees: Kate Burns; Eric Craver; Vicki Medland; Marcelo Cruz, Gabriel Saxton-Ruiz; Amanda Wildenberg, Judith Crain, Lindsey Swertfeger (student rep) and Janet Reilly. Excused: Lou LeCalsey. Invited guests for portions of the meeting: Pat Theyerl, Kelly McBride, Chris Sampson, and Sue Bodilly. The EMG charge is: defining, analyzing, evaluating and recommending UWGB external marketing and communication strategies. EMG will address these working group guidelines:

• Examine UWGB efforts to communicate to the public our academic mission/strengths/opportunities/core values/assets.
• Evaluate the effectiveness/organization of UWGB efforts to communicate to the public our academic mission/strengths/opportunities/core values/assets.

Since the last EMG meeting, individual EMG members began to collect and upload data related to our charge to the Office 365 OneDrive shared file. EMG members defined the process for SWOT analysis of these data:

1. EMG members will review the data files in Office 365 OneDrive, noting themes under Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats from each data set.
2. The themes will be written down and added to a shared file in Office 365 OneDrive by each EMG member.
3. The EMG group will review and come to consensus identifying the major themes in each of the four SWOT analysis areas. (to be completed at the EMG 12/5/14 meeting)

Data analysis following this format began at this meeting, after hearing perspectives and opinions related to our charge from the Media and University Communications (MUC) department (Sue, Chris, and Kelly). Pat Theyerl shared helpful tips about the access and use of Office 365 OneDrive.

TO DO:

• Individual EMG members are to upload any further data as soon as possible to Office 365 One Drive.
• EMG members are to complete SWOT analysis of the data, and upload their findings using the process above BEFORE the next EMG meeting on 12/5/14.
• The EMG meeting scheduled for Monday, 11/24/14, 1-2:30 PM will be cancelled to allow more time for individuals to evaluate data and complete SWOT analyses.
• Next EMG meeting: Friday, December 5, 2014 from 11-12:30 PM Rose Hall 315 when EMG will come to consensus on SWOT analyses and recommend strategies to the PEA committee

Submitted by J. Reilly 11/19/14
External Messaging Subgroup Minutes: December 5, 2014

Date: December 9, 2014, 2014
To: Lucy Arendt. Partnerships and External Messaging subcommittee chair
From: External Messaging Group (EMG)
RE: 3rd EMG meeting minutes (12/05/14)

The EMG met 12/05/14 from 11 -12:30 AM in Rose Hall 315 with these attendees: Kate Burns; Eric Craver; Vicki Medland; Amanda Wildenberg, Judith Crain, Lindsey Schwertfeger (student rep) and Janet Reilly. Excused: Lou LeCalsey, Marcelo Cruz, and Gabriel Saxton-Ruiz. Invited guest: Jenna Richter, Social Media expert from the Dean of Students Office.
The EMG charge is: defining, analyzing, evaluating and recommending UWGB external marketing and communication strategies. EMG will address these working group guidelines:

- Examine UWGB efforts to communicate to the public our academic mission/strengths/opportunities/core values/assets.
- Evaluate the effectiveness/organization of UWGB efforts to communicate to the public our academic mission/strengths/opportunities/core values/assets.

We began with discussion of three agenda items from the last Partnerships and External Affairs (PEA) Committee meeting regarding EMG SWOT analysis cognizant of:

1. The focus on teaching in external messaging about the university
2. The unique external messages needed for our growing online student population
3. Sustainability of EMG efforts

Committee member comments related to the above items that surfaced in discussion included encouraging external messaging from UWGB to focus on students spending less tuition at UWGB and connecting through UWGB/community partnerships to obtain career goals and good paying employment (which is why students want for higher education). Other comments noted how current messaging “missed the boat” in emphasis and community awareness of UWGB faculty as ambassadors and content experts available to community agencies, organizations, companies and individuals.

Discussion of the unique marketing and outreach strategies for online students determined the need for focusing on the convenience, quality and rigor of online education with UWGB faculty as experts with years of online education and experience especially in Adult Degree and Nursing. Online student engagement in the learning process with rigorous interactive discussions and group assignments is quite different from the earlier one-way correspondence-type online courses. The public need to be aware of this. Offering an online course as a “try a D2L course” for the public was suggested.

A repetitive theme expressed in the discussion about sustainability of EMG efforts and at other EMG meetings was the need for more UWGB communications and media staff. Examples of media expertise is needed in: graphic design for trendy outreach and marketing materials (UWGB Union currently uses graphic arts students who do a great job, but the constant transition in students [due to graduation] and skill sets causes issues); web content design (zippy language needed to attract students, not scholarly language authored by the professors about programs); and search engine optimization (SEO) to maximize web outreach; website redesign from its current persona as an INTRANET for internal students and faculty to an INTERNET for the public; social media (Twitter, Facebook, Instagram) for individual departmental marketing and outreach and to monitor UWGB student posts in these media (both positive and negative); regular campus outreach features such as “professor of the month” on a local TV station or media outlet (current media folks gets pulled from
this to cover university special events); and templates created by UWGB media experts that busy faculty could use for TV interviews and news articles would be helpful.

Since the last EMG meeting, individual EMG members collected, uploaded and began to review data related to our charge in the Office 365 OneDrive shared file, noting themes in each of the four cumulative documents (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) from each data set. A PowerPoint review of the EMG data in the file entitled: *UWGB Social Media Analytics* was presented by Jenna Richter, followed by discussion between EMG members. SWOT items collectively identified from the committee’s discussion about social media were recorded. The meeting ended at 12:35PM.

**TO DO:**

- Janet will add the social media SWOT ideas to the One Drive SWOT documents
- Individual EMG members agreed to complete review of all data sets in the EMG files and add their final SWOT findings in these data to the Office 365 OneDrive shared file by **Monday, December 15, 2014 at midnight.**
- Next EMG meeting: **Tuesday, December 16, 2014 from 11-12:30 PM Rose Hall 315** when EMG will consolidate the themes in the SWOT analyses and make final recommendations for strategies to the PEA committee.

Submitted by J. Reilly 12/9/14
External Messaging Subgroup Minutes: December 15, 2014

Date: December 17, 2014
To: Lucy Arendt. Partnerships and External Messaging subcommittee chair
From: External Messaging Group (EMG)
RE: 4th and final EMG meeting minutes (12/15/14) for next Interim report to ITF Steering Committee

The EMG met 12/15/14 from 11 -12:30 AM in Rose Hall, room 315 with these attendees: Kate Burns; Vicki Medland; Gabriel Saxton-Ruiz; Amanda Wildenberg, Judith Crain, and Janet Reilly. Excused: Lou LeCalsey, Eric Craver, Marcelo Cruz.
The EMG charge is: defining, analyzing, evaluating and recommending UWGB external marketing and communication strategies. EMG will address these working group guidelines:

- Examine UWGB efforts to communicate to the public our academic mission/strengths/opportunities/core values/assets.
- Evaluate the effectiveness/organization of UWGB efforts to communicate to the public our academic mission/strengths/opportunities/core values/assets.

Since the last EMG meeting, individual EMG members reviewed the data collected and uploaded in the Office 365 OneDrive shared file. Data included:

- UWGB web analytics
- Adult Degree Google analytics Sept/Nov. 2014
- Brand Identity Data from Eduventures, Nov. 2008
- Stamats data from July 2014
- New monthly campus visits and emails summary 2008-2014
- Travel course and semester abroad student comment summaries Summer 2012 through Summer 2014
- Weidner and campus alignment in marketing
- Social media analytics Fall 2014
- Locations of UWGB departmental mission statements

EMG members recorded common themes found in data analyses in a cumulative SWOT document. During this meeting EMG members reviewed the cumulative themes identified in the SWOT, narrowing them to these final categories, in light of the EMG guidelines. Strategies aligned with SWOT that EMG brainstormed are listed in italics below.

**STRENGTHS:**
1. Campus attributes (beauty, geographic size, arts, athletics, etc.)
2. Student attributes (female, dedicated to the local/regional area, first generation)
3. Faculty and staff attributes (dedication, high caliber and expertise)
4. Academic programs (rigorous online and traditional programs, high employment rates after graduation)
5. Current marketing strategies (great efforts)
6. Social media marketing/outreach
7. Existing strong partnerships (UW Extension, Packers, Bellin Health Systems, etc.)
8. Focus on regional issues (First Nations Studies, sustainability, etc.)
9. Cost (high return on investment compared to other higher ed options)
10. Marketing expertise/successful online programs in nursing and adult degree
11. Size and location (comfortable for first generation students and those from small communities; close to home for majority of students living within 50 mile radius)
12. Interdisciplinary problem solving focus of academic programs prepares students well for regional employment

WEAKNESSES:
1. Current marketing strategies (not enough due to staffing limits)
2. UWGB image is misunderstood or does not resonate with many in the community
3. Size ambiguity (some think UWGB is too small, while others think it is just right) / limited diversity within the student body
4. Need for more UWGB Public Relations/Marketing and University Communications (MUC) resources
5. Branding and academic programming need to differentiate UWGB from other UW System Schools
6. Limited academic undergraduate and graduate programs
7. Lack of coordinated and targeted campus visitation program that excites future students
8. Lack of campus/faculty awareness of MUC capabilities
9. Limited scholarship and financial aid options compared to student need
10. Size and location (too small, too remote, viewed as a commuter school; not “visible” to community due to geographic distance from the city center)
11. Variability in mission, goals and external message across UWGB departments

OPPORTUNITIES:
1. Untapped funding resources in region, community and alumni
2. Untapped regional pool of potential students
3. UW System support/centralization of services
4. Community support and desire to partner

THREATS:
1. Decreased external funding/unsupportive political climate
2. Competition from other institutions (for profit, private and others within the UW System)
3. Mismatch between the future economy and future regional jobs for college graduates
4. Changing high school/potential new student demographics

Suggested interventions from these data were brainstormed and include:
  a. Branding to indicate the UWGB unique attributes
  b. Centralize MUC marketing and efforts for benefit of all campus departments
  c. Centralize UW Systems marketing and outreach (single application, noting uniqueness of each UW System campus, etc.)
  d. Increase MUC staff and funding
  e. Targeted marketing and outreach to diverse and changing potential student body
  f. Clear marketing/outreach presence and efforts in region and local community of UWGB faculty expertise and service available to the public, partners, community
  g. Turn competition into collaboration with technical colleges, private and other UW System campuses for diverse program offerings that align with workforce needs
  h. Maximize alternative funding from alumni, Learning in Retirement participants, local and regional partners to increase student tuition assistance and replace state funding
  i. Create new academic undergraduate and graduate programs which align with anticipated regional workforce needs
j. Strengthen and maximize partnerships within the region and community to enhance student employment after graduation, service (outsource marketing to local ad firm and donor) and scholarship opportunities/offerings to the community (Humana, Schneider Trucking, United Health, New NORTH, etc.)

k. Increase faculty and staff and department awareness of MUC and its the ability to professionally promote the UWGB public image (i.e. promote public perception/awareness of UWGB through individual faculty expertise or abilities)

l. Create a consistent process and scripting for enthusiastic campus visitations

m. Define a strategic plan for growth and establish campus enrollment goals that align with the desired marketing/public image

n. Strategize with local businesses and services to coordinate regular, free mass transit for students (i.e. – Phoenix trolley to downtown, Ashwaubenon shopping, – current bus route not utilized) AND create mass transit options to bring the public to campus for events (i.e.- Weidner or cultural events)

o. Clearly connect Weidner and Phoenix marketing to UWGB campus image

p. Expand university social media marketing and outreach to all departments and academic programs to reach a growing media-connected community

q. Campus courses in the community (downtown office/classroom)

r. Continue to market to students within 50 mile radius of campus and Chicago areas (Door County summer or vacation connections to campus), widening the marketing strategy to the north and western regions of the state

s. Build supportive relationships between local politicians and UW System personnel

t. Create and integrate UWGB “places” off campus and within the community for classrooms, exhibit halls, conferences, campus housing, etc.

Gratitude was expressed to each EMG member, especially for the volume and quality of work completed at the end of the semester, one of the busiest times for faculty and staff. This is the final meeting of EMG.

TO DO:

- Individual EMG members are to review this summary and send commentary to Janet Reilly by email before 12/24 to enable corrections/additions to be made
- The edited data summary of the EMG SWOT will be forwarded to Lucy Arendt, Chair of PEA by 12/24/14 at noon

ADDENDUM: EMG members offered edits to the draft version of these minutes through noon on Wednesday, December 24, 2014 which were added to the final version of this document, forwarded to all EMG members and Lucy Arendt, Chair of PEA

Respectfully submitted by J. Reilly 12/17/14 DRAFT; 12/24/14 FINAL
Appendix E – Informal Poll Results from Community Members

Unedited responses to the question, “What opportunities should UWGB be taking advantage of?”

1. Attracting, engaging and retaining talent in the area is a big concern for all of us. Partnering with our (Greater Green Bay Chamber of Commerce) young professional group, Current, to make sure we don’t lose these students to other markets would be beneficial for the entire region. Partnering with youth programs that encourage career and community readiness with our younger students would fill a need our educators at the secondary level are experiencing. This will help students be more focused, raise the high water mark on our workforce as far as engagement/fit goes – and again, perhaps want to stay in this area.

2. We often have interns from UWGB but that’s more of a function of interns seeking us out versus an MOU with departments for consistent placements.

3. Adult internship placements – re-tooling an adult learning in a setting that is accepting of adult interns.

4. I don’t know what non-profit boards UWGB has representation. DTGB, Inc., Olde Main Street, On Broadway, County Committees, etc.

5. Work-to-school placements using with CAD or robotics in factories (engineering or business students) or at businesses in and within an hour of GB, like Schneider Flowers (econ or bio students), Hillshire Farms in New London, WI (food science folks); bring high school athletic teams to Phoenix games (i.e. - free admission for HS girls basketball players one night) or inviting college bound high school students in local pre-professional clubs at tech or high schools, like DECA [www.deca.org] which is for leaders and entrepreneurs to spend a day on campus with engineering, marketing, finance, hospitality and management with business professors and classes.

6. I am frustrated, disgusted and in disbelief with the increase use of heroin (and related deaths) in the area, so anything UWGB can do to help with that would benefit the community!

7. We want our kids to go to college of course. Kids now want us, even beg us, to come and be involved at their school, not like when we were kids. We suggest partnering with parents and kids at an early age in university events.

8. Weekend classes (maybe not for credit) but to bring more folks to campus for certifications or interest; outreach to church or community and ethnic groups to offer classes of interest to them on campus as special events; partner with local HS and have a professor present in a HS class so students can “sample” higher level thinking and learning; offer service to local boards of directors, like school boards; outreach targeted to kids who graduated HS 1-2 years ago or stopped out of college for a semester to “take time off” and don’t know how to go back to college.

9. At West High we have several partnerships with UW GB. Mainly in tutoring and helping guide students toward graduating and entering college. Recently we have reached out to UW GB specifically the coaching program, and have a few volunteers helping in our athletic programs. I would like to see a continued relationship between GB and our public schools in tutoring, helping mentor high school and middle school students, as well as becoming active in our athletic and activities.
10. Interesting question...love it! I am assuming the partnership you are speaking about are specific to the partnerships with schools. If so, I would like to see mentoring/tutoring experiences, UWGB campus visits, etc. Anything to build the confidence, belief, and growth mindset in our students. As I am sure you know, the Phuture Phoenix students spend a lot of time in the schools. The catch is, the school needs to be a Phuture Phoenix partner school which is basically a Title 1 school. Unfortunately, some of our local schools are missed and not all students are not getting the UW-Green Bay exposure and partner experience.

11. You are right about this being a broad topic! I suspect many of the things I can think of have already been thought of by others. A suggestion might be partnering with a company who is doing wide-scale layoffs to provide onsite training or career counseling for those who might be finding themselves out of a job and in need of direction. I think partnering with businesses to find out what types of specific training are needed could be helpful. For example, I can think of some professional training that I might like to have, but I am not interested in taking traditional courses to pursue a more typical degree program. Finding out the needs and designing classes for those needs could be helpful. I also would suggest partnering with the Boys and Girls Club of Green Bay to form mentorships with younger kids to get them thinking of college. It would be nice to have some sort of on-campus camp or program for those who seem particularly interested in going to college after high school.

12. Several high school students and staff members brainstormed the possibility of partnerships with UW Green Bay and local high schools in these areas: 1) the Academies at the high school to bring in university professors and speakers/visits for various areas of study to help high school students explore majors of study in their future college careers. 2) Mentoring with the SEM (School of Enterprise Marketing) projects. 3) Youth Basketball Group Training for younger groups or Players & coaches for skills training to increase profile of UWGB in each surrounding town.

13. Sees opportunities for connecting students and faculty/staff to community life and the well-being of the community. She promotes formal and/or informal partnerships that are part of students’ educational and/or volunteer activities. She also urges that UW-GB focus on greater visibility in the community and addressing its future. She thinks that the role of the University is critical in building a progressive community.

14. Believes that UW-GB’s outdoor campus offers opportunities for individual and group activities and events, both organized and unorganized. This would bring the public (including a young adult demographic) to the University which would raise its visibility. He also encourages more partnerships that offer job-shadowing opportunities for students at all stages of their education.

15. Is a regular at Learning in Retirement classes. She says those experiences have greatly enhanced her regard for UW-GB expertise and quality, especially when she has experienced current and retired professors. She also encourages more exposure of University academic and professional expertise in such programs as Afterthoughts. The community needs to realize the depth of the resources of the University.

16. Wants the University to seek out community input in how UW-GB and community together can make a difference. As a community volunteer he urges UW-GB to connect with non-profit organizations, schools, local government entities, and businesses for targeted purposes. He also values opportunities to be exposed to the academic expertise of UW-GB faculty – life-long learning. He urges more such programs.
17. Is involved in a number of community projects and activities that she believes need University expertise and serious involvement. One of her areas of interest is the environmental well-being of the Brown County area. She looks to UW-GB for conspicuous leadership on these issues, especially as to developing public policy. She also urges partnerships that provide internships for students.

18. Feels we should do more partnering with local companies for training purpose. Example: when we bring speakers to campus (Jamie Schramm: Influence without Authority) we should be reaching out to local companies and getting their workforce to join us. We have enough space to accommodate larger groups and we could even monetize the training.

19. Had no idea that the Weidner Center was located on the UWGB campus. She lives in the Appleton area and frequents the PAC for performances but has never been to the Weidner. She felt that UWGB should capitalize more on the Weidner and vice versa.

20. Felt that UWGB should partner more with the local sporting clubs and sporting events around the area. He ran in the Bellin last year and doesn’t remember seeing a UWGB presence. He was also surprised to see how empty the Resch Center was at the last Men’s Basketball game he attended. He thought a Division 1 school would attract more community members.

21. While each holds high hope for the immediate future, based on their impressions of and listening to the announced intentions of Gary Miller for much greater connectedness and collaboration for mutual benefit between the Green Bay community and its public university, they do not give any better than disappointing assessments of our efforts to build true Green Bay-UWGB linkages in the past 6-8 years. Most of their feedback of our efforts for greater town-UWGB connectedness in our relatively recent past can be summed up in terms/phrases as:

   a. “Good rhetoric of intentions, but actual partnering efforts by UWGB have been intermittent, not sustained and apparently not perceived as an important part of the UWGB mission by its leaders”

   b. “A history of one-off initiatives driven by caring individuals at UWGB “

   c. “A few linkages are working (i.e., EMBI) but even those are narrow in scope and very low profile to the broader Green Bay community”

   d. “Past efforts to enlist UWGB support have been met initially with enthusiasm but then they never seem to go anywhere at the university in terms of broad and deep sustained interest”

   e. “UWGB has, in the past, attempted to establish a physical presence in the downtown, but that was not a success and the effort waned and disappeared in a couple of years … yet UW-Oshkosh has made a successful presence with its MBA venue and courses in the Associated Bank building.”

22. Would like to see more summer camps for elementary school children. She’s researched some camps around town and found nothing interesting at UWGB for kids under 10. Her kids will be doing something at NWTC.

23. Would like the Men’s basketball team to play games on campus.
24. Would also like the Men’s basketball team to play games on campus; would like the university to do something (anything) with the vacant lot that used to be a restaurant on Nicolet; would like to be able to rent the Lambeau Cottage for parties; really likes the involvement of our students at Red Smith school and would like to see a faculty presence like college-planning events for 8th graders; didn’t know about the Cultural Dinners our Outreach department puts on -- thinks they’re a cool idea; would like the Shorewood golf clubhouse to be open year-round because it has “good, cold beer and wonderful eats.”

25. Overall, there is a perception that some areas of campus do a good job and others could do more. Suggestions:

   a. Survey/catalogue how departments are interacting and benefitting the community
   b. Develop a webpage dedicated to community partnerships with links organized by central issues
   c. Partner to address health disparity issues like obesity, smoking, alcohol, and drugs
   d. Partner with local government and NGOs to develop data collection and address the gap of mapping existing data
   e. Target high risk populations for developing services like parent cafes, needle drops, quit smoking campaigns
   f. Develop stronger programs to get UWGB students into the area schools, not just education majors
   g. Work with communities to improve child literacy
   h. Initiate volunteering and service opportunities for UWGB students to engage the younger populations in Green Bay
   i. Engage UWGB students in political awareness, not just party affiliations, but also local processes and mechanisms

26. Opportunities related to culture, education, and sociologic emphases (people in need, people making a positive difference in society)

27. Anything that empowers women or allows women to network or forge relationships. Not enough of that. And not the major player, older women who have a lot of money. Just regular people working hard and trying to make GB a good community.

28. Partnerships beneficial to all parties including the benefactor. In this regard, my concerns are always for the betterment of our communities through the help of the people. How do you help the folks? Providing opportunities and assets for a better life. For example: CP has been around for 60 years. Right now I feel we have an identity crisis that could be helped with a community partner. People think we just serve folks with CP. That is a small part of what we do. We also do a multitude of other things for the community such as: providing child care, brain injury rehab, rehab of all sorts, physical therapy, transportation, pool therapy, cognitive therapy and much more. When you are thinking of who to partner with, Cerebral Palsy, Inc. would love to give a tour and show you what we do for our community.
29. Brown County public and private school districts; GBSO or whatever succeeds that / Civic Music / Civic Symphony / GB Boy and Girl Choir; GB Packers; Oneida Nation; Catholic Diocese of GB; Cnensis Israel Congregation; Service League of Green Bay; PEO NWTC /Bellin College /SNC; Rotary/Optimists

30. More with Scholarships, Inc.

31. “I don’t hear much about UWGB collaborating with small businesses. For example, a marketing / business class getting matched with a business and having their assignments assist the business with a marketing issue or a design class working to develop a new logo or an art class creating art for a lobby….could be anything. It allows the students to get ‘real world’ experience working with ‘clients’ and building portfolios while learning the classroom portion of the class.”

32. Think College … no one in the greater Green Bay area is involved with this program. NWTC is offering Learning for Independence … which is a collaboration between CESA 7 and NWTC for students who’ve been retained in high school until their 21st birthday because of developmental delays. But Think College is a much more robust program for students with disabilities. Beth Moss who is on the Wisconsin Board for People with Developmental Disabilities might be a good contact if anyone wants more information. Edgewood College in Madison has a great program and could also be a helpful resource if this is something UWGB wants to explore. I just think that because the number of children with disabilities living into adulthood is increasing and the incidence of autism is increasing … this might be a huge need in the not too distant future. I also want to pass along … I think the UWGB athletics, Weidner Center and associated arts performances and Learning in Retirement are all very strong programs that bring great benefit to community!

33. Partnering with makerspaces, makerspace on campus

34. Working with Einstein Science Expo

35. Here are my thoughts:

a. How do we gain and retain young professionals in the area? We hired a young professional last year from your Environmental program and we are very pleased with her contribution to the organization.

b. Research triangle I hear about now and then. Make it happen. Leads to improvement in point #1.

c. NEW Manufacturing Alliance - Promote the local manufacturing field as a great place to work. Great paying jobs right here. One of the biggest issues facing GBP is the amount of current employees that will retire in the next 5 to 10 years is significant. We will need the right skill set to replace them. Have a clear understanding of the skill sets needed and local positions that will need your graduates.

d. Deep partnership with the Green Bay Chamber of Commerce. Maybe you already have this or it can be tweaked to be even better?

e. Promote your environmental program. I know the university was built on this program, but do young people know this? Maybe they do.
f. Youth apprenticeship/internship programs in the local area. NWTC has a youth apprenticeship program tied in with the Chamber. Not sure what UWGB offers and success rate of placing you people with local companies? Could this be ratcheted up to address point #1 and #3.

g. Have a local company President’s Forum to ask them what are their needs to address point #1.

36. Have more summer camp options for younger children

37. Have kids come to campus at earlier age with tour and teaching them why college is important

38. Having an innovation lab that students can use to develop the product or services of tomorrow. That space should also be allowed to have organizations in the community rent or utilize that space to work on their innovations.

39. More collaboration with the tourism industry in Green Bay and particularly Door County. Lawrence, St Norbert both have extensive involvement in Door County and are way more visible. More collaborative programs concerning environmental issues and local natural resources...water, lake, wildlife preservation, etc. Better use of Toft Pt Nature Conservancy in Door County that is owned by UWGB...there is never any activity there or if there is, it is not publicized. More partnering with alternative energy research ... again, if this is happening, it is not publicized. More student partnerships and contact with community businesses and organizations.

40. More collaborations like the outreach concert held in Sturgeon Bay last year sponsored by the Music Dept and the university. This was a great example of how important a regional university is to all of Wisconsin and the state. Retain the Wisconsin Idea ... continue to build cooperative programs fostered by UWGB that bring communities together to share expertise, talents, and programs highlighting all areas of the university.