

Partnerships & External Affairs Team

Final Report

February 9, 2015

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.**

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Executive Summary | 2 |
| Membership | 4 |
| Meetings..... | 4 |
| The Lay of the Land – Experiential SWOT analysis | 5 |
| Strengths | 6 |
| Weaknesses | 7 |
| Opportunities..... | 9 |
| Threats..... | 10 |
| Task 1 – Partnerships | 12 |
| Tasks and process | 12 |
| Recommendation details | 13 |
| Task 2 – External Messaging..... | 16 |
| Tasks and process | 16 |
| Recommendation details | 17 |
| Task 3 – Leadership..... | 20 |
| Tasks and process | 20 |
| Appendix A – What We Need to Do | 22 |
| Appendix B – PEA Team Meeting Minutes | 23 |
| Appendix C – Partnerships Subgroup Meeting Minutes | 44 |
| Appendix D – External Messaging Subgroup Minutes | 50 |
| Appendix E – Informal Poll Results from Community Members | 61 |

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**.

¹ *Invent the Future*, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, Design, September 22, 2014. Page 4.

² "Urgent Change in timeline of ITF Work," Email communication from Cheryl Grosso, Chair, Inventing the Future Steering Committee, January 29, 2015.

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.

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

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 analyses⁴ 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.

SWOT ANALYSIS



Image source: http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:SWOT_en.svg

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.
 - Loss of institutional knowledge regarding past and existing partnerships
 - Loss of institutional commitment to existing partnerships
 - Constant job searches are a huge time-sink that take away from ability to work in the community
 - Constant job listings are viewed as a red flag for job seekers and potential partners who want to invest in long-term relationships
 - 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 tasks⁵:

- A. Examine current manner in which external partnerships are established.
- B. Examine how external partnerships are managed/maintained.
- 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.

⁵ *Guide for Working Groups*, document distributed by Cheryl Grosso, Chair, Inventing the Future Steering Committee, October 6, 2014.

- 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 tasks⁶:

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

⁶ *Guide for Working Groups*, document distributed by Cheryl Grosso, Chair, Inventing the Future Steering Committee, October 6, 2014.

- 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 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 structure⁷ in which marketing and university

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

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 include⁸: 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:
 - 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.

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.

- 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 tasks⁹:

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

⁹ *Guide for Working Groups*, document distributed by Cheryl Grosso, Chair, Inventing the Future Steering Committee, October 6, 2014.

- 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**.¹⁰ 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.

1. Describe, analyze, evaluate, and make recommendations for enhancing our (UWGB's) institutional approach to formal **partnerships**.
2. Describe, analyze, evaluate, and make recommendations for enhancing our marketing and external **communications** strategies (including our despised webpage).
3. Describe, analyze, evaluate, and make recommendations for "taking a **leadership role** in creating partnerships directly related to regional economic growth and prosperity."

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.

1. October 31. First interim report to Steering Committee.
2. February 1. Second interim report to Steering Committee.
3. March 1. Final recommendations and report to Steering Committee.

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

- Organizational leadership
- Institutional mission
- 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:

- | | |
|---|---|
| - Impact | - Relating |
| - Relationships | - Small to major |
| - Anticipating and responding to needs | - Involvement |
| - Problem-solving | - Quality |
| - Cultivating | - Not just free labor |
| - Investments | - External funding, internal sweat equity |
| - Connecting | - Applied research |
| - Interns | - Long-term |
| - Projects | - Mentoring |
| - Service learning | - Translating |
| - Community | - Fostering |
| - Partners | - Cultural additions |
| - “Enacting the WI Idea” | - Working with |
| - Potential | - Serving/service |
| - Develop | - Experts/elders in residence |
| - Deliver | - Boundary spanning roles |
| - Help | - Inspiring |
| - Resources | - Initiative |
| - Continuing education | - Inclusive |
| - Expertise | - Bettering community |
| - Embedded in organizations (all types) | |
| - Preparing students | |
| - Enjoyment | |
| - Passion | |
| - Commitment | |
| - Fun | |
| - Exchange | |

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:
 - o Organizational structure
 - o Organizational leadership
 - o Institutional mission
 - o 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

- **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**
 - Interdisciplinary
 - 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
 - Including people who give money for scholarships?
- What we're going to do with the information?
 - Find gaps
 - Learn how we're perceived
 - How do we try to get the message out – mechanisms
 - Effective or not?
 - Who are the key stakeholder groups?
 - Is 360 working?
 - What do we need to learn to move forward?
 - What are external perceptions?
 - From where?
 - Message and method – impact (don't lose sight of this)
 - Need to institutionalize our marketing efforts?
 - How to communicate talents of faculty/staff?
 - Need to think of how we will communicate with all stakeholders.
 - Phuture Phoenix – “students want to go elsewhere” – how to deal with this!
 - Marketing: Product, place, promo – keep all of this in mind!
 - Go beyond marketing to reference academic program array
 - 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.
 - Look at existing metrics – Weidner, Athletics, student attendance at campus events, alumni not being invited to events
 - Referencing how issues addressed by other working groups fit with ours (academic programs, enrollment)
 - More data: Campus Preview, FOCUS, etc.
 - 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 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. (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 responsive 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

1. Review of minutes from December 10, 2014. No changes.
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
3. Review of External Messaging (EM).
 - 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/offerings 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.

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 Matrix 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.

1. Minutes – January 30, 2015. No changes.
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 Vandenhouten, 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 Qualtrics 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:
 - e. Term of agreement/partnership
 - f. State (i.e. professional programs where regulations matter)
 - i. Possibly of geographic indicators as to evaluate the extent of our partnerships
 - g. “Revenue generation” – paid or not paid
 - i. 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 subcommittee 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.)

| | | |
|----------|--------------|--|
| 11/14/14 | 11:30 – 1 PM | Share individual data analysis from emailed data |
| 11/19/14 | 9-10:30 AM | Analyze and evaluate data |
| 11/24/14 | 1-2:30 PM | Evaluate data and SWOT analysis to create strategies |
| 12/5/14 | 11-12:30 PM | Finalize recommended strategies |

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; Cnessis 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.