

## NOTES FROM OCTOBER 19, 2004 BUDGET HEARING

Chancellor Sorensen explained that the budget sessions were held in order to obtain unfiltered information from faculty, staff, and students. Each summer, the Chancellor's Advisory Council holds a retreat to draft priorities and the associated strategies for achieving them. Focus 2010 derived out of last year's retreat, resulting in four working groups: Academic Programs (chaired by Judy Jax); Learning Community (chaired by Bob Johnson); Restructure for Efficiency and Effectiveness (chaired by Mike Galloy); and Stout Technology Advantage (chaired by Bob Meyer). These working groups development the following five Focus 2010 Goals:

1. Prepare alumnus for success.
2. Create a learning community that supports and encourages the engagement of its members in active learning.
3. Achieve national leadership and excellence in educating students in the theory and application of a broad range of technologies.
4. Strengthen the on-campus organization by focusing on Stout's unique mission within the UW system.
5. Create a school outside a school enterprise that serves learners statewide, nationally, and internationally.

Chancellor Sorensen said that during the Chancellor's Advisory Summer Retreat, further goals and draft priorities were defined. Straw voting was done to choose the top ten draft university priorities for 2004-2006.

1. Create and implement an effective and efficient enrollment management plan.
2. Serve as the degree completion portal in the UW system for the Wisconsin Technical College System.
3. Revise programs in line with relevancy, structural guidelines, title and delivery options.
4. Identify and quickly deploy new academic programs.
5. Implement new science, technology and engineering programs and concentrations.
6. Define and develop successful learning communities beginning with freshmen, using a comprehensive targeted approach, and use a model to develop an all university plan.
7. Integrate e-scholar into the learning community and learning community into e-scholar.
8. Promote program specific career opportunities and the Stout Technology Advantage.
9. Establish processes for evaluating and integrating emerging technologies.
10. Create revenue generation for profit curricular arm of UW-Stout that closely interacts with current organization.

A question was asked for the Chancellor to address the technical college proposal. The Chancellor replied that through the UW-System on Committee on Baccalaureate Expansion (COBE), Stout would become a portal for technical college students to access courses and programs that were aligned with the technical colleges in a partnership. Stout would create a planning process with the tech schools in order to ensure transferability of credits. How will this impact general education in departments? A proposal is being developed that all freshmen would live in dorms on the south campus. Residence halls would reassign their hall directors, so more would be available for the freshman; less would be needed for the seniors. This could provide more advisement services and social support systems to the students.

Program alignment would also be done in order to prepare for Stout's future and setting goals. However, programs must be identified first and then decided on how they would be funded. Differential tuition could be analyzed differently, especially for the graduate programs.

Someone asked the Chancellor if majors and minors would still be declared. Chancellor Sorensen replied that he's charged the Provost and deans to develop a model for the allocation of courses; however the environment for Stout's budget is not very good. The Governor has asked each campus to complete an exercise which cuts another 10% from the budget.

The group agreed that graduate education was a priority. Resources would need to be reallocated and a model done for tenured faculty in tenured departments. Would tenure make reallocating more difficult? Maximizing academic staff would make it easier. Reallocating and using more academic staff is a challenge, but it could impact quality/research. However, faculty were tenured to the university, so people could shift departments if necessary.

The group agreed that Stout's website could be flashier, so the web presence could do a better job. Chancellor Sorensen asked Senators to send him any concerns or innovative ideas.

The group discussed the pros and cons of barriers created by departments and colleges and how to overcome them. Where are the natural alignments and how can the campus accommodate these existing barriers as we move into the science/technical programs that benefit each other in order to create more flexibility? How can we strengthen these new positions? Program alignments can cross over to other programs/courses. The Chancellor reminded everyone that the campus was in for a decade of brutal budget constraints.

Someone asked the Chancellor that as the campus moves toward a polytechnic model, how the human services programs would be impacted. The Chancellor replied that they would become stronger, and gave MIT as an example of this. He added that a marketing consultant was coming to Stout in order to analyze our program names and to suggest ways that the campus could tell its story better. Theme dorms would be a good marketing factor as well. Concern was expressed about what would happen to the administrative structure if faculty were moved around—who would they report to? Chancellor said all faculty and academic staff were vital to the university.

Concern was expressed to have strong general education requirements that could market the programs differently, especially for the technical programs. However, we still need to be competitive with other universities. We need to communicate to students, faculty, departments, etc. what Title 3 was and the concept of what general education was. Values need to be reassessed. The technical colleges could help create many opportunities for the general education program. Students would come to campus with their technical pieces completed and would only need their general education courses. Change is inevitable—we need to adjust to it. The campus now has complete freedom to rename its programs. We could present a better portfolio, aimed at the students, that says these are the things that we think are important for you. This portfolio could help anchor the students and give their direction and belonging. We also could have alumni testimonials given on Stout's website that could help reach students. We could have a CD playing as soon as they walk in the door on campus. Discussion ensued concerning students having too many credits for their majors. Some of the campus' programs need to be reduced. Allen explained that general education guidelines were formed in 1992 and 1/3 of a students' credits toward graduation were in general education. Several different models are being studied that run through continuing education that are tuition differential-based programs. There needs to be a common alignment for everything, so they come under one umbrella.

Are we looking at going for a profit model or customized instruction to bring more revenue back into campus—not interchangeable terms.

As long as the campus can charge for customized instruction, we can go other places. We provide more spot advertising in papers. However, the state limited funds for advertising where we can't use state money any more. What can we do? We can increase advertising on television. The marketing person on campus can help

us see what the campus can do to become more effective. Someone suggested to do more on-line advertising as well, and to compare how Stout was advertising with other competition.

Chancellor Sorensen concluded by saying the general consensus he was getting from the campus is that we needed to plan for the future. He asked that any additional feedback be sent to him, so he can forward it to the correct people.