

University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire Strategic Planning Workgroup 3

Serving the Public Good
Final Report

November 2007

Workgroup Members

John Bachmeier, Alumni Relations
Gretchen Hutterli, College of Business
David Jones, English
Robert Knight, Music & Theatre Arts
George Kroeninger, Continuing Education
Elizabeth Lorenz, Student Senate
Marcus Mc Ellistrem, Chemistry
Michael Rindo, University Communications
Marcia Van Beek, UW-Eau Claire Foundation
Mary Zwygart-Stauffacher, College of Nursing & Health Sciences

**UW-Eau Claire Strategic Planning
Workgroup 3: Serving the Public Good Final Report
November 2007**

UW-Eau Claire as an Engaged University

In our Preliminary Report submitted in August, we noted that UW-Eau Claire is already actively engaged within the “community”. In this same report, we noted the many different ways university students, faculty and staff participate in service-learning, joint research opportunities or community service throughout the city, region, state and nation. We summarized by saying that we felt there wasn’t a unit on campus that doesn’t engage in some sort of community service.

However quantity doesn’t beget quality.

In our August report, our workgroup identified three major barriers the university needs to remove if it wishes to serve the community better:

- **Lack of focus.** Although we have had numerous community-focused programs and initiatives scattered across the institution, we lacked a university-wide approach to engagement.
- **Difficulty in accessing services.** University services are scattered throughout the campus making it difficult for community members to locate them. Confusion exists within the community as to who to contact when needs occur.
- **Lack of interest in non-traditional students.** UW-Eau Claire does a wonderful job addressing the needs of traditional-aged students; however, the university falls short when addressing the needs of non-traditional students. Our inability to serve non-traditional students well may have opened the door for educational organizations like Globe University to enter our community.

During the fall semester, members of our workgroup sought internal feedback to our August report by attending charrettes where we presented our preliminary ideas to university students, faculty, and staff and received feedback from those in attendance. We also attended campus dialogue sessions focusing on the university’s campus culture, academic mission and diversity.

In addition, our group conducted a series of nine focus groups during the month of October to obtain feedback from external stakeholders. These groups included the following audiences/special interest groups: business (general); economic development; downtown redevelopment; non-profit; education; health care; music, arts and entertainment; science and non-traditional students. Discussions focused on three topics: 1) how the stakeholders interact with the university, 2) how effective these interactions have been, and 3) what ideas stakeholders have for future partnerships. Information regarding the process we used for the focus groups can be found in the Appendix.

Recommendation: A University-Wide Approach to Engagement

UW-Eau Claire students, faculty and staff are actively engaged in the community. Support for this statement can be found in the HLC Criterion 5 internal survey, HLC Criterion 5 focus groups conducted during the 2006-07 academic year and information gathered from Strategic Planning Work Group 3 focus groups with external stakeholders October 2007.

University-community interactions take many forms. The university is viewed as a source and resource for student internships and practicum's (both paid and unpaid); student teachers; volunteers – student and university employees; student and faculty research; prospective employees; professional development programs (credit and non-credit) for employees; and non-credit educational programs for children.

From our conversations with external stakeholders, our work group heard many positive comments about these partnerships. For example, one non-profit indicated it was “connected at the hip with the U” through internships and service-learning experiences and that students generally did an excellent job. Many stakeholders were also employers of UW-Eau Claire alumni. They told us UW-Eau Claire “graduates make quality employees” and were “stellar.” Still others mentioned they have benefited from the outreach activities of faculty and staff. They cited research done for their organization as further examples of the value UW-Eau Claire provides the community.

While focus group members were generally pleased with their partnerships, they expressed concern about the continuity of service once a service-learning requirement is completed, a class is over, and/or a faculty member moves or retires. The following comments reflect these concerns:

- “It doesn't help me if the students go through the training—then leave because they have fulfilled the number of hours. I would like to establish a link to nursing, social work, computer science, etc. that would have a more specific and long term relationship with disaster preparedness.”
- “One big frustration with research projects started because of a UWEC class assignment is that there is no follow up once the assignment is over. We get excited, but then the [UWEC] students go away. Or they're gone from the middle of December until the end of January. But we don't disappear and neither do our kids. Maybe UWEC can't do anything about that, but it's a frustration.”
- “I worry about sustainability because so many partnerships are based on a personal connection or relationship (e.g. a teacher knows a faculty member; someone at UWEC is also a parent in the schools). What happens when that key faculty disappears and that relationship goes away?”

Focus group members who hadn't previously interacted with the university often mentioned they didn't know who to contact and they were unclear as to what kinds of services the university could provide them. Typical comments were as follows:

- “I didn’t have a clue (who to contact). I only knew because I had a student intern working for me who knew.”
- “I would bring some of my programs to campus to meet student needs, but the route to accomplish this is so confusing. Do I deal with each department? Who in the department do I contact? Where do I even start?”
- “It seems like some community member on your board, knows somebody at the university, who knows somebody, but there isn’t a formal way to access people and resources.”
- “You think you know what’s available, but you really don’t know what else is possible.”

From internal focus groups and the charrettes, it was clear that UW-Eau Claire students, faculty and staff saw value in community engagement. However they were unsure what priority to give this activity given other institutional priorities. The following comments reflect this frustration:

- “I have much to offer the community and would enjoy doing even more than I already do. But where’s the time and energy? I would have to stop doing something in order to start doing this.”
- “Our department could be a “full time public service agent” if it so desired – how do we strike a balance -- define priorities and support these priorities.”

From HLC internal focus groups and the charrettes, it is apparent that a number of questions need to be answered before the university ventures down the path of becoming a “fully engaged” university. These questions include the following:

- What does community engagement mean at UW-Eau Claire? Is it an institutional priority?
- What constitutes service – serving as an officer to a professional organization, sitting on the board of a community non-profit, coaching my child’s little league team?
- What does it mean for my unit? Are service requirements for units the same across the university? What role does Continuing Education play regarding community engagement?
- What does it mean for me personally --how much service should I be doing and how do I fit it into my workload? Are there positive and negative consequences? For example, could it mean that I won’t get tenure or a promotion if I don’t have enough service?

Action Items

The following Action Items represent our summary recommendations based on all internal and external input received to date:

Develop a strategic, university-wide approach to community engagement. Define what community engagement means at UW-Eau Claire and identify institutional priorities or key areas of focus. Update the university's mission to reflect this focus and communicate it via the university's website, and other communication vehicles.

Create an entity for overseeing community engagement. The proposed UW-Eau Claire unit would move campus units currently serving external constituents into a single location that could be easily accessed by external constituents. This location could possibly be in downtown Eau Claire.

Potential units for partial or complete relocation could include Alumni Relations, Autism Center, Center for Service-Learning, Continuing Education/Small Business Development Center, Wisconsin Entrepreneur Network, Entrepreneur Program, Center for Leadership (College of Business), Career Services, Center for Health and Aging Excellence, Center for Collaborative Leadership (College of Education and Human Services) and the Materials Science Center.

Databases, administrative and program support, marketing assistance, and meeting facilities would be shared resulting in better and more consistent service for customers, and cost savings and greater access to resources for campus units.

In addition to administering the above programs, the entity would be charged with the following responsibilities:

- **Administration of a small grant fund to support programs with strong service elements.** One possible model is the Solution Center at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, which provides a single "front door" to IUPUI for people in the Central Indiana region. The Center seeks to develop partnerships, create professional internships, and expand linkages between the community and faculty, drawing on existing assets and creating new capacities when necessary, through a customized approach to community clients.

In addition to serving as a broker between the community and the campus, the Solution Center use funds from a \$1.7 million grant as "venture capital" to invest (as matching money) in worthy projects that may not have sufficient money. The money in the fund is held in trust for the benefit of the community and is available to the community to "buy" goods and services from IUPUI schools, faculty, students, and staff, with priority given to economic development opportunities in one of the university's six strategic clusters.

Projects and proposals could be evaluated using the following guidelines:

- Fit and/or appropriateness given the university's mission
- Ability to connect the campus to the community and have visibility
- Measurable impact within the university and the community
- Supporting trends and data
- Cost of the project
- Availability of funding and revenue sources (matching grants, fees)

- **The inventorying and tracking of community engagement projects.** This process will further collaboration and allow us to communicate success stories to internal audiences and external constituents (general public, donors, media, legislators, etc.)
- **Maintenance and promotion of the Regional Business Assistance Resource directory, a web-based portal developed through the Regional Education Consortium.** This directory lists the collective resources and programs available to businesses through regional public higher education institutions.
- **Development of an on-going program assessment process.** Community engagement programs/projects need to be assessed to determine if they are serving the university's mission and meeting community needs. Further research on assessment tools needs to occur. A possible resource may be the National Center for the Study of University Engagement at Michigan State University.
- **Administration of a longitudinal community survey.** Survey community partners to determine their interests, assets and needs as they relate to community engagement. Maintain survey results in the university's Office of Instructional Research so results can be accessed freely by interested parties.

This unit would be charged with developing regular face to face dialogues between university and community members. Focus group members thought this was important for several reasons, as noted in the following comments:

- "If you have a topic or idea for exploration, is there a forum to do that? How would I access resources across silos of the University? Every quarter, can you get a group of people to discuss and explore? Conversation without expectations..... UWEC could serve as more of a sounding board."
- "Partnerships work when both groups ask "how can we work together better and develop "shoulder-to-shoulder, eyeball-to-eyeball" relationships."

These conversations could happen many different ways -- through focus groups, advisory board meetings, round table discussions or informal "brown bag" luncheons.

Recommendation: Create a Front Door to the University

In our August report, we mentioned that community members had difficulty accessing university services. University services are scattered throughout the campus making it difficult for community members to locate them. Confusion exists within the community as to who to contact when needs occur.

We recommended that the university create a "front door", "umbrella organization" or "coordinating unit" that makes it easy for community members to interact with and access university resources. Focus group sessions overwhelming confirmed the need

for the university to have a community “front door.” The following comments are representative of what we heard in every focus group:

- “Knowing who you would contact to explore is difficult. I don’t know where you would start. The tendency is not to start with the Chancellor.”
- “We don’t always know where to go for information and support. I don’t know who to call...especially with academic community. It would be nice to have a go-to person or single point of contact. It would be nice to have a hook-up, a mentor, someone to grease the skids...”

Many focus group members suggested that the university needed to designate “a “place” or “person” as the “go-to” person”. It would be “like a one-stop shop to access the U”, according to one focus group member.

Other stakeholders thought it wasn’t important to have a single contact person or office if the university website was designed in such a way that external constituents could easily find out who to contact on their own. Suggestions for the university website were as follows:

- “People outside would benefit from a virtual link that shows how people should access people and information from University.... Something that shows the decision pathway.”
- “Where is the portal? Navigating through Web sites is overwhelming. Make it focused on specific Units or areas.”
- “Does the Web site listing faculty include expertise and interests of faculty?”

A third group suggested a combination of communication methods be used to connect with external users such as a “front door” office staffed by knowledgeable staff, a well designed website, and regular face-to-face meetings.

Action Items

Create a “front door”, “umbrella organization” or “coordinating unit” that makes it easy for community members to interact with and access university resources.

There are many possible locations for this unit – News Bureau, Continuing Education, the Chancellor’s office, or some entirely new unit. This unit should be staffed with individuals who understand the various programs the university has to offer. This unit will need to be open evenings and weekends.

Develop a unified events calendar that is easy for university members to update and community members to search.

Provide “customer service” training for front line employees who come in contact with the public. HLC internal focus group participants noted that employees and especially students lacked general knowledge about the university and its programs

and services. Because training varies from department to department, some sort of standardized training program may need to be developed.

Recommendation: Create a Center for Adult Learning

In our August report we stated that UW-Eau Claire does a great job educating traditional aged students but may not do as well meeting the educational needs of adult learners.

Conversations with our external stakeholders supported our earlier belief. Stakeholders told us the following:

- “People want a UWEC degree because of location (EC is a central hub for the surrounding areas) and reputation (Education program does draw people to UWEC). BUT people want high quality, low cost, convenient programs, which UWEC doesn’t have, so people turn to alternative programs (e.g. UWEC programs can be too long, as much as 2 years; classes are offered at inconvenient days/times that don’t work for working adults).”
- “The University is trying to offer non-traditional programs on a traditional student schedule. Need to offer both credit and non-credit programs on a non-traditional schedule.”

Information from the charrettes indicated that non-traditional students often feel disconnected from university life possibly because so many programs, policies and procedures are geared to traditional-age students. Non-traditional students are different from traditional aged college students, as one focus group member eloquently reminded us in an email regarding a proposed study abroad graduation requirement:

- “I believe that my age, 27, and my family situation, having a 5 year old and being married, makes me diverse from most of my classmates. We bring with us so much wisdom and maturity and we are here to learn. We have made serious sacrifices in our lives to attend college and our drive and passion is rubbed off onto traditional students. We can't forget that many of us have full-time jobs, young children, sick parents, illnesses ourselves, family businesses that need to be run by us, or any number of extenuating circumstances that make the 2 week requirement out of the question for us.”

Because many non-traditional students are place and time bound due to work and family commitments, adult students may be a good market for online courses and services. While comments were mixed, focus group members seemed to like the convenience online courses and services could offer them:

- “Online programming is great...Can I take a foreign language without going at 10 a.m. on Tuesday and Thursday?”
- “The internet access is very effective/easy to use. I also enjoyed UWEC’s MBA program online (graduated December 2005—one of the first MBA online graduates)

and thought it was a nice addition to their current programs. I especially liked the program because I lived too far away to commute daily.”

- (I would like) a community website for entrepreneurs to share information”
- (I would like) “access to online resources rather than location – face to face is important”.
- (I would like) “email online forums *after hours*”
- (I would like) “more local use of Internet and getting that out to other people”
- “Online courses are not appropriate for some programs—classes are hard.”

Some focus group members brought up the possibility of offering UW-Eau Claire courses off campus downtown or some other location. While reaction was mixed, comments seem to indicate that the university should explore this option further:

- “Develop more shared use agreements with other organizations....Bring classes off campus for non-traditional students”
- “. . . There are detriments to adult usage of campus – difficult to approach – recommend a satellite campus – e.g., restore a building downtown for a place for non-traditional learning”
- “Move the university to a more accessible location”
- “I would like to see the university have a presence in the downtown”
- “It would be beneficial to expand traditional campus boundaries”
- “Services will be duplicated with an off-site location”
- “Valuable? Not for currently enrolled nontrads”

In our August report, we recommended that the university establish a student center that expands the current base of programs and improves access for non-traditional students. We still believe this is a good idea especially if UW-Eau Claire is serious about attracting and retaining adult students.

Action Items

Explore the development of a student center that expands the current base of programs and improves access for adult learners. This center could include non-traditional student services, and graduate studies, and representatives from the following units: academic colleges, Career Services, Continuing Education (personal enrichment, professional development, business outreach services, other), financial aid, and academic support services. Credit and non-credit courses in the center could be taught face-to-face and online. This center could be offered on-campus or off-campus.

One possible model to explore is Millard Fillmore College (MFC) at the University at Buffalo which has served adult non-traditional students since 1923, MFC offers a variety of course and programs – including traditional on-campus, online and off-campus options – for working adults and other non-traditional students.

Millard Fillmore’s University Study in the Workplace, is an innovative partnership with employers that brings college credit courses to the workplace in a variety of forms (live on-site classes, web-based classes, and combinations of these modalities). University Study in the Workplace staff customizes each program to fit organizational goals and employee educational needs. Student support and advising services are available for each student.

Recommendation: Develop a Feasibility Plan for a Shared University-Community Arts Center and Sports

Focus group members brought up the need for a new community/university arts center, convention center and sports arena at virtually every focus group session. They were excited about the possibility of building these new facilities and were concerned about the need to do it right. (Eau Claire has a history of building facilities that are too small or lack key amenities.) Focus group members realize that it will take the entire community behind a project to make it happen:

- “Endowment board said to think seriously about that (new arts center) – would like to explore collaboration as a possibility – once in 100-year opportunity to do this.”
- “Shared facilities like Hobbs Ice Arena and a Performing Arts Center -- .it seems to me there are overlapping interests. Where there’s a public stake, look to share and not duplicate the cost back to the public.”
- “Both University and ECRAC have got facilities issues – looking forward – parking is an issue, lots of people are intimidated with parking in city (downtown) and University. Ease of access to facilities and parking”
- “Need to get public involved as well. Would love to see a new big building – small theatre, large theatre, convention space. Long-term”
- “All arts organizations should be in same place/building. Bright shiny new Arts Center is a great idea if it can meet needs of all groups – scheduling issues – meets programming needs of all groups.”
- “A broader need would be a shared facility to meet conference facility with full technology and accessible. Need more of a general space....Much of campus space is for specialty use.”
- “Good meeting space is needed to bring people together to engage. Meeting technology is important and its role...the ability to use its expertise to help meetings and promote engagement.”

While focus group members appear to support for creation of new community-university facilities, they understand there are significant obstacles that must be overcome before the first brick is laid:

- “Where do you locate shared facilities? With the UW-System, you are often dealing with state silos when discussing facilities. The University needs to look at different ways of owning, operating and sharing facilities. Regarding silos, University is in the center of community...a focal point and would serve as a logical location for shared facilities, if accessible.”
- “As regards the community/university arts center, the principal concern I have heard from the faculty is that, with over 160 performances put on by the department, any such facility would have to be under departmental control. In addition, as is often not the case with state projects, sufficient storage and rehearsal space would have to be built to accommodate the multiple users. The big "ifs" in my opinion, would center around those issues.”
- (Must remember the) “needs of individual organizations to maintain current identity while working together”
- “Also need to coordinate so there is no confusion about where to buy tickets, etc. – also fundraising activities so they are not overlapping”

It was clear from the focus group discuss with the Arts Community, for example, that that the Eau Claire Regional Arts Center only plans on the State Theatre being viable for six to seven more years. That is our window -- will the university, community, and state step up to make a difference?

In our August report, we recommended that the university explore the possibility of building new facilities in partnership with the community. We still support this recommendation as the university will gain a tremendous amount of good will in the community as well as new and improved venues for students.

Action Items

Recommend that UW-Eau Claire continue to explore the possibility of developing shared Fine Arts and Arena facilities with community partners. We recommend that a feasibility plan be developed for each project and that an inventory of physical spaces and amenities within the community be completed.

When determining the location for both projects, we ask that the university take into consideration the needs of the community as well as the campus. If the best location for both facilities is “off-campus”, the university needs to explore the possibility of a shuttle service.

Finally, the university needs to work with community groups to develop a fund-raising plan. One focus group member wisely observed the following:

- “One thing the University could bring to discussion is that you have the finest professional fundraisers in the community – already deeply involved in the community.”

Final Thoughts: The University as Community Leader

As the focus of our report is on serving the community, we thought it would be appropriate to conclude with several comments from focus group participants regarding the university’s role within the community:

- “Uniroyal was a leader in the community. When Uniroyal left, others stepped in to some extent...The University has the ability to lead or influence the community. The University is in a unique position to change the community dynamic...Such as helping the community make the transition from blue collar to creative class.”
- “The University needs to get more involved in community development...More in a facilitator role. The University cannot dictate or overwhelm partners but rather serve in facilitation role. This should be part of the Strategic Planning Process and Plan and the final draft of the plan should be shared with the community for comment/input.”
- “Community faculty development...the missing piece has always been active presence of the U in an advocacy role. Not hiding, but be an active player – promotion and education”
- “Whether workforce development or economic development, step back and look at the Universities position with the community....It is central to much of what is going on. The University is in a unique position and situation to serve in a facilitator role connecting people within the community around key issues.”
- “The University has the opportunity to bring people together in areas of research and others. Business connections need to be improved.”
- “The U has a gorgeous physical campus. Connecting community and facilities with business... If the U could take a more active facilitative role...that’s a key thing. It doesn’t have to have an end transaction.”
- “The three U’s have an opportunity to collaborate. Any way you can improve connections to business...”
- “The university should have its hands in a lot of activities. Sometimes in a leadership role. Sometimes not.”
- “We would like to see the University at the table or lead in the development of a regional convention center.”
- “The university should not come in as experts to impart knowledge – but should seek to combine University expertise with district expertise.”
- “It’s all about attitude, not about people, programs or politics. UWEC needs to come with an attitude of “together we’re better” – not “come to UWEC and we’ll tell you.” I

need you to come to me and think with me, help me think outside myself to develop new ideas of “how can we....?”

It is clear from stakeholder comments that UW-Eau Claire is viewed as a leader and valued partner in Chippewa Valley. Several of the recommendations detailed in this report will have a major impact on the community. The community views us as a valuable resource and partner. They encourage our increased involvement in local and regional development efforts. UW-Eau Claire has the people and the talent to help make these projects a reality. The real questions relate to our readiness to respond, to act and to change. Do we have the resources, the capacity, the interest and the energy to advance these ideas? Are we up to the challenge? As one of our workgroup members shared during the development of this report, *does UW-Eau Claire possess the institutional will to carry through with the implementation of these ideas*. In other words, do we have the institutional commitment to make these recommendations a reality. Talking about change without actually doing anything is easy - making the decisions that come with prioritization of assets is hard. It would seem from the messages we received from both internal and external stakeholders that the most significant thing holding us back from advancing new ideas may be ourselves.

**UW-Eau Claire Strategic Planning
Workgroup #3: Serving the Public Good
Final Report**

Appendices

Appendix A	List of Focus Groups/Assignments
Appendix B	Focus Group Invitee List
Appendix C	Focus Group Process and Sample Focus Group Question Scripts (Business, and Non-Traditional Students)
Appendix D	Summary of Focus Group Comments
Appendix E	Summary of Campus Comments (Charrettes, Dialogue Sessions and Online Forums)
Appendix F	August 2007 Preliminary Report
Appendix G	HLC Academic and Classified Staff Focus Group

Appendix A

List of Focus Groups/Assignments

<u>Date</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Group</u>	<u>Facilitators</u>	<u>CE Site Support</u>
Oct. 9	7:00 - 9:00 am	Business	Marc McEllstrem and Gretchen Hutterli	Jim Mishefske
Oct. 9	3:00 - 5:00 pm	Science	Marc McEllstrem and Doug Dunham	Phil Huelsbeck
Oct. 10	3:00 - 5:00 pm	Non-Profit	Marcia Van Beek and Bob Knight	Julie Aminpour
Oct. 17	6:30 - 8:30 pm	Non-traditional	George Kroeninger and Bonnie Isaacson	Laurie St. Aubin Whelihan
Oct. 18	3:00 - 5:00 pm	K-12	Dwight Watson and George Kroeninger	Libby Thurston
Oct. 23	3:00 - 5:00 pm	Music	Bob Knight and Mike Rindo	Phil Huelsbeck
Oct. 24	6:30 - 8:30 pm	Downtown Redev.	David Jones and Mike Rindo	George Kroeninger
Oct. 30	7:00 - 9:00 am	Economic/Workforce	Mike Rindo and George Kroeninger	Ann Rupnow
Nov. 5	3:00 - 5:00 pm	Healthcare	Elaine Wendt and George Kroeninger	Barb Enright

Appendix B

Focus Group Invitee List

Business Focus Group (Facilitators: Marcus McEllistrem and Gretchen Hutterli).....OCTOBER 9 - 7:00-9:00 a.m.		
Invitee Name	Title	Organizational Affiliation
Bob Mc Coy	Executive Director	Eau Claire Area Chamber of Commerce
Mike Jordan	Executive Director	Chippewa Falls Chamber of Commerce
Wayne Kaiser	President	Advanced Dynamics
Renee Walz	Business Development Director	Western Dairyland
John Konkell	International Consultant	WI Department of Commerce
Frank Borg	Marketing/PR Director	NWMOC (Northwest WI Manufacturing Outreach Center)
R. Michael Webb	Chairman	U-Fuel
Lisa Nelson	Senior Manager Public Affairs	Walmart
Pat Quinn	President	Ayres Associates
Sue Tietz	Owner	McDonough Manufacturing
Charlie Grossklaus	CEO and President	RCU
Economic/Workforce Development Focus Group (Facilitators: Mike Rindo and George Kroeninger)....OCTOBER 30 - 7:00 to 9:00 a.m.		
Invitee Name	Title	Organizational Affiliation
Brian Doudna	Executive Director	Eau Claire Area Economic Development Corporation
Linda Adler	Executive Director	Chippewa Valley Convention and Tourism Bureau
Jerry Chasteen	Executive Director	West Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Mike Huggins	City Manager	City of Eau Claire
Tom McCarty	County Administrator	Eau Claire County
Mike Golat	City Administrator and Public Works Director	City of Altoona
Linda Clark	Manager	Xcel Energy
Bob Bosanny	Executive Director	Dunn County Economic Development Center
Charlie Walker	Executive Director	Chippewa Falls Economic Development Center
Mike Armstrong	Executive Director	Momentum Chippewa Valley
Downtown Redevelopment Focus Group (Facilitators: David Jones and Mike Rindo)....OCTOBER 24 - 6:30 to 8:30 p.m.		
Invitee Name	Title	Organizational Affiliation
Dave Adler	President	Eau Claire City Council
Marlene Arntson		Randall Park Neighborhood
Stan Carpenter		Third Ward Neighborhood

Marty Fisher-Blakeley		West Grand Ave BID
Mel Jahnke		Downtown BID
Paula Kimblin		Third Ward Neighborhood
Thomas Kemp		Eau Claire City Council
Robert Krause		Corporate Technologies
Chris Lee		
Tami Schraufnagel		Eau Claire County
Linda Soltis-Schroeder		North River Fronts Neighborhood
Cecilia Cronk	Owner and Entrepreneur	City Living
Wendy Chen DongLai	Owner and Manager	DNC Designs
Kirsten Bube	General Manager	Ramada Convention Center Eau Claire
Mike Schatz	Executive Director	City of Eau Claire
Non-Profit Focus Group (Facilitators: Marcia Van Beek and Bob Knight)....OCTOBER 10 - 3:00 to 5:00 p.m.		
Invitee Name	Title	Organizational Affiliation
Kris Becker	Executive Director	Eau Claire Area United Way
Trisha Edwards		
Melinda Haun	President (CPO)	United Way of Chippewa County
Diane Simon	Executive Director	United Way of Dunn County
Laura Hookum	Executive Director	Eau Claire Foundation
Ken Van Es	Executive Director	YMCA
Sara Antonson	Executive Director	Eau Claire Area Boys and Girls Club
Linda McIntyre	Executive Director	Dunn County Community Foundation
Carol Gienapp	Executive Director	Community Foundation of Chippewa County
Heidi Fisher	Executive Director	Literacy Volunterers-Chippewa Valley
Lisa Montgomery		Greater Menomonie Area Chamber of Commerce
Matt Schneider	CFRE/President	Marshfield Clinic/Chippewa Valley Fundraising Professionals
Susan McLeod	Director	Chippewa Valley Museum
Michael Golrick	Director	LE Phillips Library
Yong Kay Moua	Interim Director	Eau Claire Area Hmong Mutual Assistance Assoc. (HMAA)
Nasra Xashi	Refugee Services Coordinator	Barron International Center
Karen Hauck		Girl Scouts of Indian Waters
Helen Heinz	Executive Director	Girl Scouts of Indian Waters
Steve McCarthy	Program Manager	Lutheran Social Services
Brook Berg	Executive Director	Family Resource Center of Eau Claire County
Healthcare Focus Group (Facilitators: Elaine Wendt and George Kroeninger)....NOVEMBER 5 - 3:00 to 5:00 p.m.		
Invitee Name	Title	Organizational Affiliation
Randy Linton	MD, CEO	Luther Midelfort
Steve Ronstrom	Administrator	Sacred Heart Hospital

Richard McClafflin	MD, Associate Chair & Campus Director	UW Health Eau Claire Family Medicine Clinic
Brent M Wogahn	MD, FACS, Medical Director	Oakleaf Surgical Hospital-Eau Claire
Karen Bullock	CEO	Community Health Partners
Donna Marten	Human Resources Director	Community Health Partners
David Fish	Executive Vice President	St. Joseph's Hospital-Chippewa Falls
Pat Keller	Past President of the WNA	Bloomer Hospital
Faye Diech	Past President of the Wisconsin Organization of Nurse Executives	Sacred Heart Hospital
Mark Wenger	Senior Communications Specialist	United Healthcare
Jim Diegnan	Executive Director	Dove Healthcare
Steve Mickelson		Chippewa Valley Chiropractic Alliance
Julie Hall	Executive Assistant	Sacred Heart Hospital
Pete Farrow	Gen. Mgr. and CEO	Group Health
Kitty Rahl	Nursing Director	EC City/County Health Department
Music, Arts and Food Focus Group (Bob Knight and Mike Rindo)....OCTOBER 23 - 3:00 to 5:00 p.m.		
Invitee Name	Title	Organizational Affiliation
Jill Barland	President	Eau Claire Regional Arts Center
Gary Schuster	Executive Director	Mabel Tainter Theatre
Jill Granlund	Executive Director	Chippewa Valley Symphony
Deborah Johnson	Executive Director	Heyde Center for the Arts
Dean Kallenbach	Board President	President Board of Dir.- Eau Claire Regional Arts Council.
Wayne Marek	Executive Director	Eau Claire Children's Theatre
Susie Slota	Executive Director	Eau Claire Children's Museum
Ann Sessions	Executive Director	Chippewa Valley Theatre Group
Pang Cher Vue	Owner	Noodle Wrap Restaurant
Mel Sundby	Retired Art Professor	
Sally Sundby	Supporter of the arts	
Nick Meyer	Editor	Volume One
K-12 Education Focus Group (Facilitators: Dwight Watson and George Kroeninger)...OCTOBER 18 - 3:00-5:00 p.m.		
Invitee Name	Title	Organizational Affiliation
Dr. James Leary	Interim Superintendent	Eau Claire Area Schools
Jesse Harness	Superintendent	Menomonie School District
Mike Schoch	Superintendent	Chippewa Falls School District
Cindy Hofacker	President	CASE
Larry Annett	Executive Director	CESA 10
Mike O'Brien	Board President	Eau Claire School District
Bob Rykal	Administrator	CESA 11

Peg Wolff	Director of Instruction	School District of Marshfield
Richard Fields	Staff Development Specialist	Eau Claire School District
David Valk	Principal	North High School
Jeffrey A. Schierenbeck	Principal	Immanuel Lutheran High School
Laura Nicolett	Teacher	Northstar Middle School
Sarah Duerre	Teacher	Longfellow Elementary School
Jean Romanshek	Teacher	Putnam Heights Elementary School
Thomas Kidd	Teacher	Delong Middle School
Christina Chan Weiher	Teacher	North High School
Jeannie Richie	Teacher	Longfellow Elementary School
Tim Leibham	Principal	Memorial High School
Sciences Focus Group (Marcus McEllistrem and Doug Dunham)....OCTOBER 9 - 3:00 to 5:00 p.m.		
Invitee Name	Title	Organizational Affiliation
Jim Kreilich	Trustee	CVTC District Board
Dan Tolan	Project Engineering Manager	Phillips Plastics
Pete Marsnick	President	CleanWater Solutions, LLC
Roger Gostomski	Lab Analyst	Cardinal Glass
Philip Gelatt	President and Chief Executive Officer	Northern Engraving
S. Mark Tyler	President	OEM Fabricators
Julie Graham	Quality Control Supervisor	Nestle USA
Dean Schley	NanoRite Manager	OEM Fabricators
Tom Schneider		TaylorMade Products
Adult/NonTraditional Student Focus Group (Facilitators: George Kroeninger and Bonnie Isaacson)....OCTOBER 17 - 6:30 to 8:30 p.m.		
Invitee Name	Title	Organizational/Program Affiliation
Kelli Zastrow	Band Director	
Tianna N Huber		
Karen R Hurd		Community Arts
Doug Rhoten		Blue Monkey Software
Patty Chambers		
Trisha Edwards	Non-Traditional UWEC student	
Joel Erickson	Education major	UWEC
Deb Chopper	Nursing major	UWEC
Aaron Whalen	Nursing major	UWEC
Joan Miller	Education major	UWEC
Megan Sigmon	Social Work	UWEC
Melanie Simon	Social Work	UWEC
Jim Kellerman	Music major	UWEC

Appendix C

Focus Group Process and Sample Focus Group Question Script

Focus Group Process

- Using information developed by HLC Criterion 5 subgroup, the Strategic Planning workgroup identified nine stakeholder groups for focus groups: business, economic development, music and the arts, downtown redevelopment, nonprofits, healthcare, education, sciences and non-traditional students.
- Strategic Planning workgroup members compiled a list of prospective focus group participants in each category. This list was share with the HLC Criterion 5 subgroup, which added additional names to the list. Email addresses were supplied by Continuing Education and Strategic Planning workgroup members.
- Focus group questions were reviewed and revised by the Strategic Planning workgroup and the HLC subgroup until a final set of questions was agreed upon. Two scripts were developed: 1) a general external stakeholder script to be used for the business, economic development, music and the arts, downtown redevelopment, nonprofits, healthcare, education, and sciences focus groups, and 2) a script for the non-traditional adult student focus group.
- Prospective focus group participants were sent an email inviting from the UW-Eau Claire Strategic Planning Office inviting them to participate in a focus group session. A follow-up invitation was sent to those who hadn't responded.
- Focus groups were led by members of the Strategic Planning workgroup and other university faculty and staff. Focus group facilitators met prior to the first focus group meeting to review procedures for conducting a focus group.
- Individuals who indicated that they would attend a focus group session, were sent a reminder email from their focus group facilitators. This email confirmed the date, time and location of the focus group and provided an overview of the meeting's format.
- HLC subgroup members and Continuing Education staff took notes during focus group sessions. Refreshments were served participants.
- A thank you email was sent by the focus group facilitators to participants immediate after the focus group was completed.
- Focus group facilitators compiled notes from their sessions. These notes will be shared with the Strategic Planning Committee and HLC Criterion 5 subgroup.

Sample Focus Group Question Script Business Focus Group

Introduce yourself. Have the group members introduce themselves and their companies/organizations.

Thank you for taking time from your busy schedule to join us tonight.

Your group is one of nine focus groups or listening sessions the university has organized within the community. We are very excited about these sessions. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time the university has taken a comprehensive approach to gathering feedback from its constituents.

You are here today because we felt you could give us feedback on various **business and economic development** programs and partnerships your business or organization has with the university.

Our discussion will focus on three main topics: 1) how your organization interacts with the university, 2) how effective these interactions have been, and 3) what ideas you have for future partnerships.

Your input is very important to us. We will be asking you a series of questions. There are no right or wrong answers. Your responses will remain anonymous.

We will use this information to help us write two reports: a re-accreditation report for the Higher Learning Commission and the university's strategic plan that will guide the future direction of the UW-Eau Claire.

Let's begin with some background information.

How does your organization **currently interact** with UW-Claire faculty, staff and students? For example, does your organization have any collaborative ventures, programs, partnerships, internships, service-learning sites, etc. with UW-Eau Claire?

Go around the table and ask the group to list all various partnerships.

How were these partnerships established? Did someone from the university contact you or did you contact us?

Should the university have been more proactive? If so, what suggestions do you have to help us be more proactive in the future?

Once your organization identified an opportunity or need, how easy – or difficult -- was it to work with us?

- *Probe if needed: Did you know who to contact initially?*
- *Probe if needed: Were we responsive to your needs once you made them known?*

- *Probe if needed: Did we follow-up in a timely manner?*
- *Probe if needed: How are university students/faculty/staff working with these programs/services perceived by your organization?*

Did any of you encounter any **roadblocks or problems**? If so, what can we do to improve future interactions?

Let's talk about the value of university programs and services to your organization.

Once programs were developed and implemented, how well did they meet your needs?

- *Probe: What went well? What needs to be improved?*
-

Our final set of questions focus on future partnerships, and/or services. Our subcommittee has been asked to identify new areas in which the university can serve its constituents.

Given this charge, what **future services, programs and/or partnerships** would you like to see between your organization and the university?

- *Probe: Why are they important?*
- *Probe: What role would you like to see the university play?*

Think beyond your own organization now. . .

Are there any **other programs or services** you would like to see UW-Eau Claire provide the community?

- *Probe: These could be **business or economic development related**. Or, they could be broader than that and relate to the arts, diversity, social services, education, the sciences, or health care, for example.*
- *Probe: Why are these important?*
- *Probe: What role would you like to see the university play?*

How well is the university serving the needs of diverse populations in our community?

- *Probe: Are there programs or services we should be providing?*
- *Probe: If so, what are they?*

Are there **any initiatives (other than programs and services—buildings, for example)** you think UW-Eau Claire should help champion within the community?

- *Probe: Why are these important?*
- *Probe: What role would you like to see the university play?*

Do you have any final thoughts you would like to share?

Thank you again for your thoughts and ideas. If you have any additional thoughts, please feel free to email either of us.

Give business cards.

As we mentioned earlier, Information from this session will be used for the university's re-accreditation report and strategic plan. The chancellor will unveil the university's strategic plan in Spring 2008. The reaccreditation report will be available Fall 2008.

**Serving the Public Good Subcommittee
Focus Group Questions: Adult Learners/Non-Traditional Students**

Introduce yourself. Have the group members introduce themselves and their companies/organizations.

Thank you for taking time from your busy schedule to join us tonight.

Your group is one of nine focus groups or listening sessions the university has organized within the community. You are here today because you are currently are or were a student at UW-Eau Claire.

Tonight our discussion will focus on how the university interacts with non-traditional students and how effective these interactions have been. We will also be looking for ideas for future partnerships.

We are very excited about these sessions. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time the university has taken a comprehensive approach to gathering feedback from its constituents.

Your input is very important to us. We will be asking you a series of questions. There are no right or wrong answers. Your responses will remain anonymous.

We will use this information to help us write two reports: a re-accreditation report for the Higher Learning Commission and the university's strategic plan which will guide the future direction of the UW-Eau Claire.

Let's begin with some background information.

Tell us about yourself. Are you getting a first degree or are you a second degree student? What is your current major? If you are a second degree student, what was your first major?

Have any of you attended other universities besides UW-Eau Claire? If so, which ones?

When you decided to go back to school . . .

What programs and support services were you looking for in a university?

What other universities did you consider and why?

When you were considering UW-Eau Claire, how easy – or difficult -- was it to work with us?

- Did you know who to contact initially?
- How difficult was it to contact the right people?
- Were we responsive to your needs once you made them known?
- Did we follow-up in a timely manner?

- Did any of you encounter any roadblocks or problems? If so, what can we do to improve future interactions?

Compared to other universities you considered, how was your interaction with UW-Eau Claire faculty and staff compared to interactions with those at other universities?

What advice do you have for non-traditional students considering UW-Eau Claire?

As a current student at UW-Eau Claire or a graduate of UW-Eau Claire

How would you describe the climate at UW-Eau Claire for non-traditional students?

Probe if necessary: Finish this sentence: To UW-Eau Claire, non-traditional students are _____

Do you think UW-Eau Claire is responsive to the needs of non-traditional students? Do we make policies and procedures that take into consideration the needs of non-traditional students?

How easy or difficult was it to transfer credits to UW-Eau Claire?

How easy or difficult is it to get classes on the days and at the times you need them?

If you had to evaluate your experience at UW-Eau Claire to date, have we exceed your expectations, meet your expectations or failed to meet your expectations? Why or why not?

What has gone well? What needs to be improved?

What programs and/or services do you find especially useful for non-traditional students?

What were your greatest challenges as a non-traditional student at UW-Eau Claire?

What advice do you have for non-traditional students currently attending UW-Eau Claire?

Our final questions focus on future partnerships, and/or services. As you know, the university is engaged in a strategic planning process. Our subcommittee has been asked to identify new areas in which the university can serve its constituents.

Given this charge, what future services, programs and/or partnerships would you like to see the university implement for non-traditional students?

Why are they important -- what impact would they have?

Are there any other programs or services you would like to see UW-Eau Claire provide students? These could be health care related. Or they could be broader than that – diversity-related, social services, economic development, the arts, health care etc.

Are there any initiatives that you think UW-Eau Claire should help champion within the community?

Do you have any final thoughts you would like to share?

Thank you again for your thoughts and ideas. If you have any final thoughts, you can email them to either of us. Give business card.

As we mentioned earlier, information from this session will be used for our reaccreditation report and for the university's strategic plan. The chancellor will unveil the university's strategic plan in Spring 2008. The reaccreditation report will be available Fall 2008.

Appendix D

Summary of Focus Group Comments by Topic Area October 2007

Communication/Front Door

- Have a knowledgeable person be the front door or key contact person for the university. Advertise this person's name and phone number on the web.
- I didn't have a clue (who to contact). I only knew because I had a student intern working for me who knew.
- You think you know what's available, but you really don't what else is possible.
- You need an office or contact that can direct you to the right person for your needs. This person should also be aware of what has been tried in the past with other programs as well.
- Your commercial should talk about this office and opportunity so that business people would know.
- It is critical that internally, departments and students are aware of possibilities.
- I would like to see a list of internship opportunities.
- It's difficult to know how to access information and resources....Where to go...it's a labyrinth, a mystery...
- We don't always know where to go for information and support. I don't know who to call...especially with academic community. It would be nice to have a go-to person or single point of contact. Would be nice to have a hook-up, a mentor, someone to grease the skids...
- I have relationship with Ann Rupnow for programming such as Synergy. The University needs a single point of contact.
- People outside would benefit from a virtual link that shows how people should access people and information from University.... Something that shows the decision pathway.
- Knowing who you would contact to explore is difficult. I don't know where you would start. The tendency is not to start with the Chancellor.
- It's not important to have one general answer person. It is best to go right to the source. Knowing where to start is more valuable. If you can't find it online you tend to give up....the Web site is very important.

- Where is the portal? Navigating through Web sites is overwhelming. Make it focused on specific Units or areas.
- Does the Web site listing faculty include expertise and interests of faculty?
- There probably need to be several strategies and not just one thing. At some point, face to face appointments are important and necessary. Desire informal strategies that allow things to evolve without a formal structure...You need to develop a structure to allow these conversations to occur informally.
- A lot of contact with the U is very pragmatic, focused on a specific transaction. The connection at the top is very strong.
- A “place” or “person” as the “go-to” person – like a one-stop shop to access the U
- It’s nice to have a good contact at the university.
- Would it be valuable to have one point of contact for University?
- Need to develop a front door with two-way communication. Also would be helpful to know about other successful partnerships as well as a sounding board for partners.
- We would benefit from a list of internship opportunities to see what currently exists.
- Where do I start to tap in and is it possible to make it a repeatable resource? For example, it would be nice to have students assist committees, such as compiling research, crunching the numbers, or working on computer programs.
- I would bring some of my programs to campus to meet student needs, but the route to accomplish this is so confusing. Do I deal with each department? Who in the department do I contact? Where do I even start?
- I found it daunting to find the right route. The organizational structure is unclear to those of us on the outside. Who does the decision making? A major roadblock was turnover in the Chancellor’s office.
- Need to know who to contact at the University as well as expertise and capacity of the institution.
- It seem like some community member on your board, knows somebody at the university who knows somebody, but there isn’t a formal way to access people and resources.
- Need better follow-through. Not always responsive to my requests.

Barriers for Interaction

- If I know what I want done I will get good outcomes from the faculty and university. If I'm exploring, the university puts up a huge barrier for participation. That's where the disconnect happens.
- Not always very good follow-up and our projects are not always accepted. The faculty supplied something, but there was no follow-up or offer of "let's tweak this."
- What's missing is an exploration of collaborative ideas. There is a limited opportunity for the regular exchange of ideas. Interactions are very project/need specific and are usually initiated by the University. There is not a coordinated effort to develop and maintain relationships and partnerships.
- Faculty community is a little too inter-directed. They need to find ways to connect with external groups and ideas. They seem to be more available if you are UWEC alumni.
- The University has been difficult to get advice from...Sometimes you hear back from faculty and sometimes you don't. Career Services has been very responsive and helpful in developing projects and services.
- The exploration of ideas may not always be leading to a program or project...Sometimes the value is in the interaction and discussion. What's needed might be the ability to help sort out values and concepts – to bring the expertise of the rigor of thinking.
- Has there been a community project involving two to three departments – on a larger project? I don't know how I'd try to pull that off. Typically, partnerships are with one department or College and rarely integrate all departments. There seems to be a silo approach
- I am not sure the physical location or set-up is an issue. The physical space isn't all that important; most people would think Continuing Education is the place to access.
- Barriers to student volunteers/internships: the academic schedule, holidays off, summers not available, time it takes to train for projects and don't always get their value back in productive work

Extending the University's Boundaries

- Need to get both students and faculty involved in the community at large. Using downtown to meet university facility needs stretches the university and provides a broadening of university spaces. It also facilitates the effective use of scarce resources.

- I would like to see the university have a presence in the downtown.
- Get University involved directly in downtown redevelopment by occupying downtown space to include student housing, office space, other. It extends the campus out and increases interaction with the community.
- It would be beneficial to expand traditional campus boundaries.
- Look at spaces along river.

Educational Access - Physical and Online

- Move the university to a more accessible location
- Develop more shared use agreements with other organizations....Bring classes off campus for non-traditional students
- The problem with the physical campus is more of an access issue than an intimidation issue...It is not easy to navigate or park.
- The University is trying to offer non-traditional programs on a traditional student schedule. Need to offer both credit and non-credit programs on a non-traditional schedule.
- Online programming is great...Can I take a foreign language without going at 10 a.m. on Tuesday and Thursday?
- Need to offer night and evening classes, both personal and professional development courses. Personal classes like horticulture would be valuable and could be promoted to general community.
- I would like to see more evening classes that special students could audit.
- The internet access is very effective/easy to use. I also enjoyed UWEC's MBA program online (graduated December 2005—one of the first MBA online graduates) and thought it was a nice addition to their current programs. I especially liked the program because I lived too far away to commute daily.
- Has a continuing education requirement for his managers – tried to work with U – lots of red tape to work out something for the non-traditional student – not user friendly – ended up driving to UW – Oshkosh for CEU's and graduate coursework

Service-Learning

- I would like to see a change in the service learning program. It doesn't help me if the students go through the training—then leave because they have fulfilled the number of hours. I would like to establish a link to nursing, social work, computers, etc. that would have a more specific and long term relationship with disaster preparedness.
- Wondered if the U track hours of student engagement in the community, beyond fulfilling their hours for service learning? If not, suggested doing that as a way to let the community know of the university's positive impact on volunteerism.

Research

- Faculty/student support in areas of health statistics, general research, geography, math, other
- We need a statistician. Public health has more responsibilities for data collection. Would also benefit from help in developing community health improvement plan and community health surveys.
- There is a lack of understanding regarding what UW-EC faculty and staff can do vs. what they are willing to do. Specifically, for projects that UW-EC was willing to do, no suggestions – the partnership worked. For projects that UW-EC was unwilling to do, it was frustrating – poor communication about the barriers to the partnership.
- Unfortunately, there is a “disconnect” between faculty and staff that want to help and those who have the time or desire to help. Often the people who want to help are really unable to do so, whereas the people with the expertise that you want to connect with are otherwise busy and disinterested in working with you. In short, you can find desire but no expertise, or expertise but no desire.
- Nanorite is a great model. The challenge is to structure the relationship so that all partners benefit. For large projects, getting all the players in the same place at the same time (e.g., UW-EC, UW-Stout, and CVTC) is a real challenge.
- Role for CVTC and UW-EC is distinctly different. CVTC is a training facility to educate a workforce, once a commercial enterprise seems viable. They are not the place to go for research and development.
- UW-EC brings academic research, faculty expertise, and materials testing to the table. There appears to be enormous potential for collaboration and projects that could be addressed by knowledgeable faculty. Example: water

in ethanol. How is that to be done more economically? It would require understanding how water and ethanol behave. Faculty could help here. Once a process was worked out, business could work with UW to commercialize result.

- We have worked with the Materials Science Center in the past. The MSC needs to realize that a key strategy for them is to be out and about communicating the value added supports and services of the MSC. That's a key component – tying what they do to end projects and services.
- It would be valuable to get the technical people together and “dummy down” the messages and approach a little bit. Regarding campus research, we need to get involved with Karen Havholm at ORSP.

Globalization

- I would like to see an overseas study program involving the International Red Cross. You would need trained faculty for this.
- Capitalize on language expertise-- need in the business community for individuals who speak multiple languages and have an understanding of the global market place. Offer language camps for grade school and high school students, provide information on the university website in more than one language, offer a Spanish for employers class.
- We have an interest in interacting more with international faculty and would like to connect with these professionals to promote the area.
- UWEC has done so well at trying to broaden students' perspectives through study abroad, service learning, etc. Along that line, could UWEC have job exchanges between faculty and teachers? It would be great to have opportunities for teachers to participate in international job exchanges.
- UWEC could help provide translators to translate legal documents, driver's education books, etc.
- I believe that my age, 27, and my family situation, having a 5 year old and being married, makes me diverse from most of my classmates. We bring with us so much wisdom and maturity and we are here to learn. We have made serious sacrifices in our lives to attend college and our drive and passion is rubbed off onto traditional students. We can't forget that many of us have full-time jobs, young children, sick parents, illnesses ourselves, family businesses that need to be run by us, or any number of extenuating circumstances that make the 2 week requirement out of the question for us.

I also work in the Student Development and Diversity office and I have seen many students that come in and have serious personal issues or family issues that may make them emotionally unstable. I think that the thought of having to meet these requirements may be too much for some students to handle along with their other issues that they are dealing with. And I haven't even commented on the fact that we may not want some of our more "disruptive" students going out into the world and ruining UWEC's solid reputation. We have to consider that this requirement would lead EVERY student to go out and be an ambassador for UWEC and our reputation would be molded by the actions of EVERY student. Also from working in the SDD office I have seen many students that find themselves in a lot of trouble from a variety of illegal acts. We need to remember that many of the illegal acts could follow these students into other countries and it could have a adverse affect to the UWEC reputation.

These are just a few thoughts that came to my head when thinking about the study abroad requirement and I hope that they can be considered when making the policies that would be attached to this graduation requirement. I think it is a great focus to have but I just don't believe that it should be an absolute. If it would have been instituted 3 years ago I would not have decided to come back for a second degree from UWEC. It may open the doors for some students coming here but it could close them for a large number of non-traditional students.

New or Expanded Courses/Programs

- A School of Public Health
- More evidence-based professional training
- UWRF has Humanitarian Law professor and course we need. UW-Eau Claire does not have specialization in this area.
- Need to "ramp up" ESL program.
- Baby Boomer life enhancement classes, possibly with career change focus.
- I would like to see more courses that are between the basics and the academics (such as in computer classes). E.g.: Senior Center offers course on selling items on EBay, Line Dancing, other.
- Offer more courses for seniors.
- The desire to keep learning doesn't stop with a degree. I would think this community has interest in non-degree learning such as pottery, foreign language, other. You can carve out a three-day weekend, if you're interested.
- The biggest growth cohort is going to be the over-65. What can the University offer the growing retiree community for lifelong learning?

- Develop entrepreneur skills in college students (entrepreneurship isn't just for business students), offer entrepreneur camps for middle school and high school students.
- Simple certifications like “non-profit” leadership/management could be provided by the U for executives in the community – COB focuses only on the “for-profit” world
- Offered their expertise in the form of credit or “CEU’s” for non-profit organizations and business.
- UWEC used to have a Library Media Certification, but it was discontinued. It would be valuable to establish this program as an undergraduate degree graduate specialty to the MEPD. Schools now have huge shortages of library/media specialists. UWEC’s online models for this program have not been well received. There are not many people with this certification currently. UWEC should go back to a set program to address this immediate staffing need.
- How flexible is the Masters of Professional Development program? UWEC should expand the base of specialties in the MEPD to include Library Media, School Business Management and others. Need to offer these specialty tracks to satisfy current needs. Instead of putting boxes around specific majors, UWEC should come up with more creative, flexible, cross-discipline structures.
- UWEC should develop a graduate degree program for central office administrators...You have a very positive reputation and would draw all of interest from staff, including UWEC alumni. If UWEC fought for a program, many people in the district would support it, petition the legislators, speak to the Board of Regents, etc. UWEC could bring guest lecturers/ speakers on educational leadership to the area.

Community Involvement

- The Clear Vision project. There is such community apathy. I would like the university to be more involved.
- Many community organizations are going through the Strategic Planning process. The University could contribute to their efforts by providing support and resources.
- How do we infiltrate students into the community more? A set of strategies may be needed. Service learning very valuable opportunity.

- Find ways to get students out into the community expands their horizons. There are benefits to the students and the community. All of a sudden the students are part of the community. They would have an increased awareness of civic affairs which would make them better citizens and more well-rounded. Faculty should also become more involved.
- As a student, I would not have been involved in the community...Not a lot of interest. You need to focus on getting first year faculty involved who have the potential to significantly impact the community. This may also help with retention.
- This community is network oriented; getting connected can be a challenge. How many first year faculty have a connection with the community? Helping them establish these connections would extend the campus into the community.
- Two things: orientation and infiltration. Engage faculty more as part of the community.
- Faculty community is a little too inter-directed. They need to find ways to connect with external groups and ideas. They seem to be more available if you are UWEC alumni.
- University faculty need to be more involved in the community. I know very few professors. Some suggestions: a community open house that showcases departments and programs and what they can do for the community. Provide incentives for faculty to get involved in the community. Create ads that "welcome" new faculty to the community similar to what the hospitals do -- ads would feature a photo and some information about this person.

The Arts

- Join with the city to build a performing arts center, there are detriments to adult usage of campus – difficult to approach – recommend a satellite campus – e.g., restore a building downtown for a place for non-traditional learning
- Visual Artists – strong public galley – best right now is library – not good option, especially if you are trying to sell. ECRAC gallery is small and hard to get into. Workshop space for art – place where classes could be taught – beginner or advanced. Easy access – parking. Permanent collection of local artist and also traveling exhibits.
- New theater for the performing arts that meets both the university's needs as well as the community's.

- Both University and ECRAC have got facilities issues – looking forward – parking is an issue, lots of people are intimidated with parking in city (downtown) and University. Ease of access to facilities and parking.
- (Need to) inventory performance spaces – some agreements that would be a trade-off – you can use our space if we can use yours. Opportunity to excite student body to come to other (city) venues/performances that are nearby.
- (Need to) Inventory spaces, amenities that are available – where, how big?
- Need to get public involved as will. Would love to see a new big building – small theatre, large theatre, convention space. Long-term.
- Highlight local arts and cultural events – need more across the board, exploration of community events – needs to be early on so they gain an appreciation for all that is happening.
- Volume One has had a big impact on being able to synthesize what is happening. Along with inventory on performance spaces – some collaboration on marketing. Is it time to start considering a United Arts Council that would present? All arts/events happening. Single point website? Look/find new resources.
- Endowment board said to think seriously about that (new arts center) – would like to explore collaboration as a possibility – once in 100-year opportunity to do this.
- All arts organizations should be in same place/building. Bright shiny new Arts Center is a great idea if it can meet needs of all groups – scheduling issues – meets programming needs of all groups.
- Doesn't preclude having other venues. Other than Zorn, no big venue. There are facilities in other communities with multiple venues – large and small.
- Needs of individual organizations to maintain current identity while working together.
- Also need to coordinate so there is no confusion about where to buy tickets, etc. – also fundraising activities so they are not overlapping.

Community Projects

- Decent conference/convention center
- New hockey arena

- Shared facilities like Hobbs Ice Arena and a Performing Arts Center....it seems to me there are overlapping interests. Where there's a public stake, look to share and not duplicate the cost back to the public.
- A broader need would be a shared facility to meet conference facility with full technology and accessible. Need more of a general space....Much of campus space is for specialty use.
- Good meeting space is needed to bring people together to engage. Meeting technology is important and its role...the ability to use its expertise to help meetings and promote engagement.
- There may be a way the broader community looks at owning and sharing facilities, while expanding the university's ability to meet needs.
- Where do you locate shared facilities? With the UW-System, you are often dealing with state silos when discussing facilities. The University needs to look at different ways of owning, operating and sharing facilities. Regarding silos, University is in the center of community...a focal point and would serve as a logical location for shared facilities, if accessible.

Diversity

- The university needs to recruit more diverse population, not only students, but faculty and staff.
- Perception of not a lot of cultural diversity on campus and less in community. Need to support health care needs of diverse audiences.
- We need more interpreters.
- The rural population seems underserved; probably do to lack of transportation...Bus system not conducive to travel.
- Need college preparation programs for college preparation.
- From Longfellow Elementary School's perspective, an ELL program with minority role models would be a great partnership. Our school has a diverse population with many students learning English as a second language. This should also be gender specific, especially for boys – our school has been reading John Coy's book *Why Gender Matters*, which stresses the importance of boys seeing men reading and enjoying learning etc.

Admissions

- College recruitment in rural areas before the 10th grade is essential. I don't think there is the same emphasis on college education. They don't seem to have the same emphasis on a GPA.
- UWEC needs to recruit local high school grads harder. Many students are recruited harder by other UW schools such as Stout and La Crosse. UWEC assumes that local students already know all about UWEC, but they don't.

Role of University

- Uniroyal was a leader in the community. When Uniroyal left, others stepped in to some extent...The University has the ability to lead or influence the community. The University is in a unique position to change the community dynamic...Such as helping the community make the transition from blue collar to creative class.
- The University needs to get more involved in community development...More in a facilitator role. The University cannot dictate or overwhelm partners but rather serve in facilitation role. This should be part of the Strategic Planning Process and Plan and the final draft of the plan should be shared with the community for comment/input.
- Community faculty development...the missing piece has always been active presence of the U in an advocacy role. Not hiding, but be an active player – promotion and education
- Whether workforce development or economic development, step back and look at the Universities position with the community....It is central to much of what is going on. The University is in a unique position and situation to serve in a facilitator role connecting people within the community around key issues.
- The University has the opportunity to bring people together in areas of research and others. Business connections need to be improved.
- The U has a gorgeous physical campus. Connecting community and facilities with business... If the U could take a more active facilitative role...that's a key thing. It doesn't have to have an end transaction.
- The three U's have an opportunity to collaborate. Any way you can improve connections to business...
- The university should have its hands in a lot of activities. Sometimes in a leadership role. Sometimes not.

- We would like to see the University at the table or lead in the development of a regional convention center.
- One thing the University could bring to discussion is that you have the finest professional fundraisers in the community – already deeply involved in the community.
- The university should not come in as experts to impart knowledge – but should seek to combine University expertise with district expertise. A good example is Chuck Larson (retired professor) who regularly came over in person to meet and discuss ideas with me.
- It's all about attitude, not about people, programs or politics. UWEC needs to come with an attitude of “together we're better” – not “come to UWEC and we'll tell you.” I need you to come to me and think with me, help me think outside myself to develop new ideas of “how can we....?”

Other Comments

- Students (interns, students working on service-learning projects) push them (non-profit) to use more technology – good side and bad side to that – e.g., when they leave, no one on staff knows how to manage the more sophisticated technology – “the technology barrier”
- Feels as though some of the faculty are living in “19th Century” boxes – still teaching the same way – on the flip side, though - capstones are excellent and she sees this as a positive as is the freshman experience and research

Appendix E

Summary of Campus Comments (Charrettes, Dialogue Sessions and Online Forums) Strategic Planning Workgroup #3 – Public Good Workgroup

General Comments about Engagement

Our efforts should be aligned with the community's wants and needs. What are these?

Enhanced connections to the community could be enabled by working better with our alumni. The U. needs to develop more alumni 'exhibits' (e.g., Homecoming alumni recognition) to strengthen the connection and solicit our alumni in making the connection to community.

Mutually beneficial interactions between U. faculty and community offer potential for benefit to both. But there time must be made to enable this; "we have to stop doing something else if we are to start working on engagement".

Proposals that might appear to close the door to them (e.g., "mandatory "study abroad!") are counterproductive. A coherent overall initiative is needed, not one that is self-contradictory.

Develop connections with community in a way that allows the U. to benefit from community's experience and expertise (a community member guest speaker program, local expert, etc.).

A "Green Campus" notion will take resources but should be carried out anyway. Ideas from the Clean Commute Initiative should be enacted.

A Performing Arts Center downtown is needed.

Nontraditional students

- We need courses in the evening and weekends. Isolating non-traditional students downtown (by building a downtown center for non-traditional students) is not a good idea.
- Often feel disconnected from the U. life.
- Have unique needs: commuting, family/work commitments, and child care in the evenings and weekends; attention needed at the Child Center on campus to enable this.
- Need graduate programs via the web

The U. must not neglect an important student contingent: low-income, first generation, students are frequently drawn to UW-Eau Claire as their only real (or perceived) option for higher Ed.

“Front Door” to University

We need a new ‘Civic Engagement front door’. It could combine several offices (Continuing Ed, Autism Center, Service Learning, etc.). It should be on campus, not downtown.

An inventory of community engagement projects and a centralized information repository (e.g., a volunteer’s hotline) is needed, since there is work that the U. does that goes unnoticed.

New ideas could come from existing programs and initiatives; we should be cognizant of what we are already doing.

“Having lived in the area for many years, I know that many community members do not feel particularly comfortable on campus. It's really nothing that the university has done; it's just the fact that many community members somehow feel out of their comfort zones on this campus or any other college campus”.
Sample of the confirmation email sent to focus group attendees.

Appendix F
August 2007 Preliminary Report

Strategic Planning Workgroup: Serving the Public Good

Preliminary Report

Overview

UW-Eau Claire has been a leader in community engagement in the past; other universities have used us as a model for collaborative research and service learning. We feel strongly that UW-Eau Claire needs to continue to play a leadership role in the future. Failing to meet the educational needs of community members may result in them going elsewhere for solutions. It may also result in the university not receiving the financial support it needs to thrive.

Our workgroup accomplished the following during the months of June and July:

- We identified strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats as it related to community engagement from our perspectives.
- We reviewed the university's mission for clarification and direction as to what serving the public good meant from a UW-Eau Claire perspective. (For example, does it include graduate programs and baccalaureate degree completion programs for non-traditional students as well as Continuing Education programs, internships and service-learning? Conceivably, everything we do as a public university could be viewed as "serving the public good".)
- We started a list of potential model programs which we have listed in this report. This list is hardly complete and further research is needed.
- We developed a list of regional key constituents that should be contacted for ideas and feedback regarding current and future community engagement.
- We developed focus group questions and an online survey to capture information from those unable to attend a focus group session. Survey information will be used by our work group as well as the university's Higher Learning Commission's Engagement and Service subgroup. Our next step is to conduct focus groups.

The following report highlights our work to date. We have only just begun to wrap our hands around the notion of community engagement.

UW-Eau Claire as an Engaged University

UW-Eau Claire is already actively engaged within the “community”. Students, faculty and staff participate in service-learning, joint research opportunities or community service throughout the city, region, state and nation. Continuing Education reaches out to the community through conferences, seminars, customized training, personal enrichment experiences, and one-on-one consulting opportunities. Through the services provided by Career Services, employers gain access to prospective interns and employees. Alumni Relations hosts special events and informational luncheons (“Let’s Do Lunch” series) that bring “town and gown” together. The university also serves the community through a number of established and emerging collaborative programs such as the NanoSTEM Initiative, Materials Science Center, Human Development Center, University of Wisconsin MBA Consortium, UW-Eau Claire Marshfield Satellite Nursing Program, UW System Collaborative Nursing Program, Center for Communication Disorders and UW-Eau Claire Physics and Engineering Dual Degree Program. This list is by no means exhaustive. It is probably safe to say that every UW-Eau Claire unit engages in some sort of community outreach.

While the university has always had numerous community focused programs and initiatives scattered across the institution, it has lacked a strategic, university-wide approach to engagement. The engagement workgroup wisely recognized that meeting the needs of the external community involves more than just adding a program here or there. Sustainable engagement must be linked to the university’s mission and strategic plan as well as every dimension of campus life -- faculty roles and rewards, campus culture, curriculum and pedagogy, distribution of resources, and community relationships. (Holland 1999).

Our workgroup was very pragmatic. While we all had our own favorite community projects we would like to see the university embrace, we understood that a number of barriers within the university must be overcome first if greater sustainable community collaboration were to occur. These barriers, which we identified in our SWOT analysis, were as follows:

- **Institutional inertia**, which has produced a culture that tends to embrace the “status quo” and is risk adverse.
- **Lack of focus**. Too often, we try to be “all things to all people”.
- **Lack of funding**. Money is needed to develop new curriculum and/or programming and support the hiring/retraining of faculty and staff for new ventures.
- **Increased competition across units caused by limited resources**. Collaboration and real change is difficult as units are more protective of what resources they have.
- **Inability to move resources (financial, human) quickly to respond to community requests and needs**. Our workgroup perceived that Chippewa

Valley Technical College and UW-Stout were able to react much quicker than we could.

- **Inadequate facilities.** Limited office space, limited conference space and aging and obsolete labs and technology make it difficult to add new programs. Identified a need to improve our infrastructure.
- **Limited communication across units.** Faculty and staff know what is happening in their areas but lack knowledge as to what others are doing so collaboration is limited.

Our workgroup also believed the university needed to address the following community perceptions:

- **Difficulty in accessing services.** University services scattered throughout the campus making it difficult for community members to locate them. Confusion exists within the community as to who to contact when needs occur.
- **Lack of interest in non-tradition students.** UW-Eau Claire does a wonderful job addressing the needs of traditional aged students; however, the university falls short when addressing the needs of non-traditional students. We believe the community perceives other area educational institutions, such as Chippewa Valley Technical College, Cardinal Stritch University, Lakeland College, St. Mary's of Minnesota, and UW-Stout, as more receptive to non-traditional, working adult students.

These perceptions were anecdotal as our workgroup wasn't aware of any university-wide longitudinal studies of external constituents that have been conducted at UW-Eau Claire.

Comments and Preliminary Recommendations

Sustainable engagement requires leadership, institutional infrastructure, and financial support that smoothes the path for faculty and students and continually attracts more individuals to participate and contribute. (Percy, Zimpher, Brukardt, 2006). UW-Eau Claire has an opportunity for reinvention and innovation due to recent changes in administrative leadership. We need to do a better job identifying those things that make us distinctive. Priorities need to be set and tough decisions need to be made regarding programs and resources. We need a mindset and structure that allows us to proact to demographic, economic, technological trends.

The following preliminary recommendations are the result of our initial discussions and research within the workgroup. We anticipate that this initial summary of ideas will be revised and expanded significantly as we secure additional input from external stakeholder groups through scheduled focus group meetings.

Institutional Infrastructure

- **Develop a strategic, university-wide approach to community engagement.** Define what community engagement means at UW-Eau Claire and identify institutional priorities or key areas of focus. Update the university's mission to reflect this focus and communicate it via the university's website, and other communication vehicles.
- **Develop a protocol for analyzing potential community engagement programs and projects.** Possible guidelines developed by the workgroup are as follows:
 - Fit and/or appropriateness given the university's mission
 - Ability to connect the campus to the community and have visibility
 - Measurable impact within the university and the community
 - Supporting trends and data
 - Cost of the project
 - Availability of funding and revenue sources (matching grants, fees)
- **Create an inventory of community engagement projects to aid communication and further collaboration.** Develop a strategy for communicating success stories to internal audiences and external constituents (general public, donors, media, legislators, etc.)
- **Develop a resource directory.** Maintain and promote the Regional Business Assistance Resource directory, a web-based portal developed through the Regional Education Consortium that lists the collective resources and programs available to businesses through regional public higher education institutions.
- **Develop an on-going program assessment process.** Assess community engagement programs/projects to determine if they are serving the university's mission and meeting community needs. Further research on assessment tools needs to occur. A possible resource may be the National Center for the Study of University Engagement at Michigan State University.
- **Develop a longitudinal community survey.** Survey community partners to determine their interests, assets and needs as it relates to community engagement. Maintain survey results in the university's Office of Instructional Research so results can be accessed freely by interested parties. To begin this process, the workgroup is conducting focus groups of key constituency groups with the HLC subgroup.
- **Create a "front door", "umbrella organization" or "coordinating unit" that makes it easy for community members to interact with and access university resources.** The proposed UW-Eau Claire unit would relocate campus units that serve external constituents into a single, convenient off-

campus location possibly in downtown Eau Claire. Databases, administrative and program support, and meeting facilities would be shared resulting in better and more consistent service for customers, and cost savings and greater access to resources for campus units. Potential units for partial or complete relocation could include Alumni Relations, Center for Service-Learning, Continuing Education, Entrepreneur Program, Center for Leadership (College of Business), Career Services, Center for Health and Aging Excellence, Materials Science Center, and Small Business Development Center.

One possible model is the Solution Center at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, which provides a single "front door" to IUPUI for people in the Central Indiana region. The Center seeks to develop partnerships, create professional internships, and expand linkages between the community and faculty, drawing on existing assets and creating new capacities when necessary, through a customized approach to community clients. In addition to serving as a broker between the community and the campus, the Solution Center use funds from a \$1.7 million grant as "venture capital" to invest (as matching money) in worthy projects that may not have sufficient money. The money in the fund is held in trust for the benefit of the community and is available to the community to "buy" goods and services from IUPUI schools, faculty, students, and staff, with priority given to economic development opportunities in one of the university's six strategic clusters.

- **Establish a student center that expands the current base of programs and improves access for non-traditional students.** This center could include non-traditional student services, graduate studies, representatives from the academic colleges, and Continuing Education (personal enrichment, professional development, business outreach services, other.) A possible model to explore is Millard Fillmore College (MFC) at the University at Buffalo which has served adult non-traditional students since 1923. MFC offers a variety of courses and programs -- including traditional on-campus, online, and off-campus options -- for working adults and other nontraditional students. On-campus classes meet in the late afternoon or evening, and are typically held once per week for three to four hours. Select courses are offered on weekends.

Millard Fillmore's University Study in the Workplace, is an innovative partnership with employers that brings college credit courses to the workplace in a variety of forms (live on-site classes, web-based classes, and combinations of these modalities). University Study in the Workplace staff customizes each program to fit organizational goals and employee educational needs. Student support and advising services are available for each student. Program benefits include affordable tuition and fees,

convenience, and quality instruction from campus faculty and expert practitioners

Financing Considerations

Our workgroup didn't give much consideration to funding support due to time constraints. However a number of comments regarding funding surfaced from our discussions that we wish to share:

- **Seek strategies for gaining greater financial independence.** We must continue to seek grants and private funds to support programs. We must renew our efforts to work with legislators to seek more control over decisions regarding tuition and other state funding.
- **Leverage the university's reputation to form strategic partnerships that expand our reach and influence with other UW comprehensive campuses and generate new revenue streams.** A number of possible models exist: University of Wisconsin MBA Consortium, Materials Science Center, Center of Health and Aging Services Excellence.
- **Explore the possibility of sharing facilities with community partners.** Possible projects: a larger performing arts center or a better athletic arena. Possible models include the community performing arts center at the South Dakota State University in Brookings, South Dakota.

Closing

Our workgroup will continue our efforts in assessing the University's impact and influence in this area. Next steps include the administration of a series of audience-specific, focus groups which will serve to broaden our net in the collection of data related to general perceptions of, experiences with and recommendations for the University. Stakeholder groups represented will include business, economic development, music and the arts, downtown redevelopment, nonprofit, diversity, healthcare, education, sciences and non-traditional students. These meetings will occur in late summer and early fall and should include some valuable, content-rich discussions and result in a wealth of information from which to draw additional recommendations and provide direction for future planning.

References

Church, R.L., Zimmerman, D.L., Bargerstock, B.A., & Kenney, P.A. (2003). Measuring scholarly outreach at Michigan State University: Definition, challenges, tools. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*.

Holland, B. (1999). From murky to meaningful: The role of mission in institutional change. In R.G. Bringle, R. Games, & E.A. Malloy (eds.), *Colleges and universities as citizens* (pp.48-73). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Percy, S.L., Zimpher, N. L., Brukardt, M. J. (2006). Moving forward along new lines. *Creating a New Kind of University: Institutionalizing Community-University Engagement*, (p 18), Bolton, MA, Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Millard Fillmore College at University of Buffalo, retrieved July 20, 2007 from <http://www.mfc.buffalo.edu/>

National Center for the Study of University Engagement at Michigan State University, retrieved July 20, 2007 from <http://ncsue.msu.edu/>

The Solution Center at Indiana University-Purdue Indiana, retrieved July 6, 2007 from <http://www.iupui.edu/~solctr/>

Appendix G

HLC Academic and Classified Staff Focus Group Feedback

Wednesday, May 16, 2007 • 11:30 am – 1:00 pm

Additions to Constituency List: Neighbors and neighborhood associations, Media, Retired and emeriti faculty and staff; Water Street businesses, Community service organizations/clubs

Question: What processes do you or your department/unit have to determine or assess the needs of external groups for services, programs, etc?

Alumni and Foundation: Has a board of volunteers; Does alumni surveys every 5 years; Alumni Office's Lunch and Learn program targets the community; The annual telefund collects information but they also follow-up on complaints, areas of concerns, etc. They also pass along positive comments they receive from alumni.

Registrar's Office: Has a survey on website. Supports the needs of auditors and special students from the community

Library: Is the copyright officer so answers community questions; Community members can borrow books, etc. from the library; Supports city's Friends of Public Library group; Supports public library via cataloging;

Library-Special Collections: Has done Lunch and Learn for Alumni Association; Is involved with National History Day; Hosts K-12 groups (gives them a tour of what an academic library is); Works with national genealogists

Student Affairs: Conducts exit interviews with students who withdraw from the university; Responds to neighborhood complaints; Supports the after Homecoming Clean-Up day; Participates in the Community Norms Committee includes several community members, students and representatives from University departments such as Student Development and Diversity, Center for Alcohol Studies and Education, Activities and Programs, Health Services and others. They are working with the local baseball team as well as University Athletics and Alumni Association on non-alcoholic activities for young people; Participates in the monthly City Staffing meeting. The group includes university representatives from University Communications (Mike Rindo), Andy Soll, Bill Harms, Student Development and Diversity (Jodi Thesing-Ritter), and University Police, and possibly others. The Eau Claire Police Department, City Zoning and the Assistant City Attorney also attend these meetings.

Davies Center Printing: Does nothing proactive to promote services as doesn't not want to compete with public. Doesn't advertise services but will provide them to people who come looking for them

Davies Center: Activities and Programs' First Friday program is geared toward senior citizens. It includes breakfast and some sort of program (music, other); Davies Center ticketing gets feedback from customers who call in— they pass this information on to event sponsors.

LTS: Is also careful about not competing with the public on services offered but will provide advice and recommendations to people who call them about computers and technology; Distance Education gets involved in K-12 programs and provides services to other campuses; Help Desk provides a lot of advice to people who call in—mentioned emeriti as a group who has used their services

Center for International Education: Organizes campus International folk fair and downtown folk fair which are attended by the community.

Affirmative Action: Responds to requests for public records from the media; Conducts exit interviews with employees who wish them; Diversity commission will have public members; Does community seminars, conducted a recent sexual harassment seminar for the Hmong Mutual Association.

Recreation: Has many exercise programs open to the public

Question: Would you characterize these processes as proactive, reactive, both?

Most units respond reactively to public requests. Mentioned limited resources as primary reason they aren't more proactive.

Question: Once an expectation/need for services and programs has been identified, how does UW-Eau Claire help or hinder you to effectively provide them?

- How quickly are you able to respond to the stated need/expectation?
- What kinds of institutional support and resources are needed for you to respond to these defined needs? (prompt: resources can be human, financial, physical)
- How adequate are these resources to engage and support these programs/services?

The group thought they were able to respond quickly to expectations/needs once they were made known. However, they thought some university employees were not as service oriented as they could be. These individuals may not realize that the university's mission includes meeting the needs of the community.

The group mentioned that community members often didn't know who to contact when a need arose. They felt many perceived the university's structure as intimidating

and not easy to figure out. The group felt the general public was often confused as to how to interact with the university community.

Focus group members also felt the UW-Eau Claire employees are not clear as to who does what and how things are done – the university had lots of islands but too few bridges. Too much information is found out by word of mouth. There seemed to be an “unofficial” way to do things which wasn’t clear to people new to campus. This is especially true as it relates to community events. The group felt there wasn’t a coordinated way to handle parking, catering, room set-up, technology, news media, website calendar of events, etc, for major events. So many different offices are involved. No one takes the lead. One hand often doesn’t know what the other hand is doing. For example, many university employees don’t know the Davies Center is the information center for the university. Davies Center staff felt they do the best they can when people call and ask them questions but the staff often lacks information. This is especially true when students answer the phone. Davies Center staff relies on student help which changes frequently.

Some focus group members felt parents of students lacked knowledge as to what sort of information is legally available to them regarding their children (Someone thought the Parent newsletter might cover this)

Suggestions:

- Need to develop a university-wide community service mentality. The group felt the university did a good job promoting individual service to the community but not collective service.
- Need for training for new employees to include the university’s expectations regarding serving external communities; more comprehensive training about where to find things at the university, terminology, how to organize an event, who should be contacted. The group felt training for new employees varied tremendously from unit to unit and felt some uniform training was needed.
- Need for a unified events calendar that is easy to update and search

Question: The final set of questions focus on whether our external constituents value the programs and services we provide them.

- How do you evaluate the effectiveness of the programs/services to meet the needs of our external communities?
- What type of evaluation processes do you use? —surveys, focus groups, etc.
- How are outcomes shared within the university community?
- How do you use the results to adjust/revise/eliminate programs/services?

Value and effectiveness is evaluated a number of different ways:

- **Foundation:** Number and size of gifts made to the university

- **Davies Center:** Number of tickets sold to an event, whether an individual would like to be added to a mailing list for an event
- **Library:** Number of community library cards issued, number of people who attended an event
- **LTS:** Personal thank you notes sent to the unit
- **Affirmative Action:** Number of complaints/grievances or lack of judicial action
- **Student Affairs:** No news is good news, for example, lack of complaints after an event such as Homecoming
- **All:** Community feedback solicited by units as part of the Five-Year review process

Information is reported back in unit annual reports (although focus group members wondered whether this information is really used), included in Five Year Reviews, thank you notes posted on a unit bulletin board; news shared with News Bureau through their News Tips submission form. (Some group members mentioned that some people may be reluctant to do this as they perceived it as self-promotion but they felt faculty and staff should be made aware of the importance of submitting news.)

All agreed that they followed up on comments/feedback they received. One focus group member mentioned the need to train students to pass on information to faculty and staff. This individual mentioned that the student turnover in her unit was quite high and they often were unaware of the importance of this kind of feedback. Focus group members felt there was a need for a central communication center that connected the university with the community.

Question: How does your work fit into the Mission Statement?

Focus group members felt their work fit into the university's mission although they weren't sure all employees understood this. They reminded us that we also needed to capture student and community interactions within our HLC report. Examples of student-community interaction mentioned included service-learning experiences and internships.