

SYSTEMS APPRAISAL FEEDBACK REPORT

in response to the *Systems Portfolio* of

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT

March 23, 2006



**Academic
Quality Improvement
Program**

The Higher Learning Commission **NCA**

**30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2400
Chicago, Illinois 60602-2504
www.AQIP.org
AQIP@hlcommission.org
800-621-7440**

SYSTEMS APPRAISAL FEEDBACK REPORT
In response to the *Systems Portfolio* of
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT



**Academic
Quality Improvement
Program**

The Higher Learning Commission **NCA**

March 23, 2006

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	4
Elements of the Feedback Report	4
Strategic and Accreditation Issues	6
Using the Feedback Report	8
Appraisal Feedback Report	9
Critical Characteristics Analysis	9
Category Feedback	12
<i>Helping Students Learn</i>	12
<i>Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives</i>	18
<i>Understanding Students' and Other Stakeholders' Needs</i>	21
<i>Valuing People</i>	25
<i>Leading and Communicating</i>	30
<i>Supporting Institutional Operations</i>	33
<i>Measuring Effectiveness</i>	35
<i>Planning Continuous Improvement</i>	39
<i>Building Collaborative Relationships</i>	43

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Systems Appraisal conducted by the Academic Quality Improvement Program of The Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools provides a comprehensive examination of University of Wisconsin-Stout conducted by a trained team composed primarily of higher education peer reviewers. In order to provide fresh and objective insights and perspectives the team also included reviewers from outside higher education.

The complete Systems Appraisal Feedback Report contains evaluation of the processes, performance results, and improvement strategies under each of the nine AQIP categories, pointing out where the team sees University of Wisconsin-Stout current activities and practices as strengths and where it sees in them opportunities for improvement.

As you study the results of this Appraisal, do *not* ignore your strengths and focus *solely* on the possibility of improvements. Your strengths offer significant opportunities as well: they can be celebrated as model practices, deployed or imitated in programs throughout the institution, and used to inspire new approaches to performance enhancement in other areas.

ELEMENTS OF UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT'S FEEDBACK REPORT

The *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report* provides AQIP's official response to your *Systems Portfolio* by a team of readers trained in evaluation. After appraisers independently reviewed your document, the team reached consensus on essential elements of your institutional profile, strengths and opportunities for improvement by Category, and significant issues for your institution. These are presented in three sections of the Feedback Report: Critical Characteristics Analysis, Category Feedback, and Strategic and Accreditation Issues Analysis. These components are interrelated in defining context, evaluating performance, surfacing critical issues, and assessing institutional performance.

Each member of the Systems Appraisal Team devoted many hours to analyzing and reacting to your *Systems Portfolio*, first individually and then via a consensus process. There are no one-person idiosyncratic, or subjective opinions here. Most of the team's members have had executive responsibilities in colleges and universities, but the team also included at least one person whose work and experience lie outside of higher education, and who could help the team maintain perspective on the work higher educators still have to do to bring quality principles into all areas of the Academy. All team members are committed to promoting continuous quality improvement in higher education and have received training in quality processes. We know that you and your colleagues will find the astuteness of their perceptions, as embodied in this report, useful in your commitment for continuous quality learning.

Good as the team was, however, it is important to remember that they had only your *Systems Portfolio* to guide their analysis of your institution's strengths and opportunities for improvement. Consequently, their report may omit important strengths — if you were too modest to stress them in your *Systems Portfolio*, or if your discussion and documentation of them was unconvincing. Similarly, the team may have pointed out areas of potential improvement that are already receiving the institution's attention. Again, the team used its best judgment in identifying improvement opportunities. If some of these areas of potential improvement are now strengths rather than opportunities because of your own focused efforts, that is all to your credit. If the team was unsure about an area, we urged it to err on the side of giving your institution the best possible advice about where investing your efforts might pay off. If some of their advice comes after the fact, after you've already tackled an area, no harm is done.

Strategic and Accreditation Issues Analysis: Strategic issues are those most closely related to your institution's ability to succeed in reaching its mission, planning, and quality improvement goals. Accreditation issues are areas where you have not yet provided evidence that you meet the Commission's *Criteria for Accreditation*, or where the evidence you have presented suggests you may have difficulties, now or in the future, in meeting these expectations. If accreditation is essential for your institution then any accreditation issues identified are, by definition, also strategic. The Systems Appraisal Team identified both of these kinds of issues through analysis of your Organizational Overview and the feedback it provided for each Category, as well as by reviewing the Index to the *Criteria for Accreditation* that you provided along with your *Systems Portfolio*. This list of strategic issues offers a framework for addressing ongoing improvement of processes and systems, serving as an executive summary of the Report's key findings and recommendations.

Critical Characteristics: Your Systems Portfolio's Organizational Overview provides context for the team's knowledge of your institution's identity, mission objectives, strategic goals, and key factors related to improvement. Critical Characteristics are those features most important for understanding the institution's mission, environment, stakeholders, competitive position, goals, and processes. Characteristics having the greatest relevance to each Category are identified in the Report.

Category Feedback: The Report's feedback on each of AQIP's nine Categories specifically identifies strengths and opportunities for improvement. An **S** or **SS** identifies strengths, with the double letter signifying important achievements or capabilities upon which to build. Opportunities are designated by **O**, with **OO** indicating areas where attention may result in more significant improvement. Comments, which are keyed to your *Systems Portfolio*, offer brief analysis of each strength and opportunity. Organized by Category, and presenting the team's

findings in detail, this section is the heart of the Report. At the end of the list of strengths and opportunities for each Category is the team's consensus assessment of the institution's stage of development on that particular Category. This section consists of a series of statements reflecting the reviewers' assessment of the institution's current status in relation to critical quality characteristics: robustness of process design; utilization or deployment of processes; the existence of results, trends, and comparative data; the use of results data as feedback, and systematic processes for improvement of the activities that the Category covers. Since institutions are complex, maturity levels may vary from one Category to another.

STRATEGIC AND ACCREDITATION ISSUES

In conducting the Systems Appraisal, the team attempted to identify the broader issues that present the greatest challenges and opportunities for your institution in the coming years. These are all strategic issues, ones you need to grapple with as you identify your institution's strategies for confronting the future and becoming the institution you want to be. The team also examined whether any of these strategic issues put your institution into jeopardy of not meeting the Higher Learning Commission's accreditation expectations.

Issues Affecting Compliance with the *Criteria for Accreditation*. An important goal for the Systems Appraisal was to review your institution's compliance with the Higher Learning Commission's *Criteria for Accreditation*. The peer quality experts who served on the team were all trained in evaluating colleges and universities using the Commission's *Criteria*, and the Systems Appraisal process they followed included careful steps to ensure the team used the *Criteria* as a major factor in their review. As the team reviewed your presentation of your institutions under each AQIP Category, it searched for accreditation-related issues and concerns. In addition, the team used the *Index to the Criteria for Accreditation* that you provided with your Portfolio to perform a comprehensive review of the *Criteria* and each Core Component to ascertain whether you presented compelling evidence that your institution complies with each of these Commission expectations.

The Systems Appraisal team concluded that University of Wisconsin-Stout has presented evidence that it complies with each of the Five *Criteria for Accreditation* and each of their Core Components. Although the Systems Appraisal does not in itself constitute a review for continued accreditation, the team's conclusion upon reviewing your Portfolio against the *Criteria* will serve as a telling piece of evidence during the Commission's next scheduled AQIP review of your institution for Reaffirmation of Accreditation.

Issues Affecting Future Institutional Strategies. The Systems Appraisal Team identified the following strategic issues to assist University of Wisconsin-Stout in prioritizing and taking action on the important broad challenges and opportunities it faces. From these you may discover your vital immediate priorities, shaping strategies that can lead to a quantum leap in the performance of your institution. Implementing these strategies may call for specific actions, so AQIP's expectation that your institution be engaged in three or four vital Action Projects at all times will help encourage your administrators, faculty, and staff to turn these strategic goals into real accomplishments. Knowing that University of Wisconsin-Stout will discuss these strategic issues, give priority to those it concludes are most critical, and take action promptly, the Systems Appraisal Team identified:

The organization does not have a systematic process for identifying leadership candidates, ensuring they are receiving the training and development they need to be prepared for future leadership positions, and ensuring that the vision, mission, and values are passed on to future leaders.

The performance indicators that are being used to monitor performance of key processes do not appear to be measures that can be effectively used on a day-to-day basis to determine process performance, ensure the process is meeting requirements, and identify improvement opportunities. For example, per Figure 6-1, the measure being used for Student Life Services Processes is user satisfaction but this is a measure that is available only once per year and only represents the input of sophomores and juniors

To enable the organization to do effective trend analysis, correlate data, determine root causes, and identify cause and effect data relationships, the number of data points and the age of data being analyzed need to be improved. In many cases, data that are presented in the Portfolio contain only one or two data points even though the Portfolio indicates that data are available for a longer period of time. In other cases, data that are provided are more than three years old or have missing years with no explanation why specific years were chosen for presentation and if these are the data points being analyzed for decision making and strategic planning.

Information and data provided in the Portfolio do not support the organization's claim that comparative data are being used to set targets and identify performance gaps. For example, the performance targets for 2010 shown in Figure 8-4 seem to be based on current levels of performance and do not clearly enable the organization to sustain its leadership level or address its overall objective to be the school of choice for the 21st century. In addition, comparative data are not provided for many areas of importance or the comparative data provided is only within the UW System.

Results data are not included in the Portfolio for many performance indicators mentioned as important. Examples include faculty student ratio, class sizes, student diversity, licensure/certification exam results, distance education/on-line course enrollment, student and employee complaint data, communication effectiveness, and information technology system availability and response time.

USING THE FEEDBACK REPORT

The AQIP *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report* is intended to initiate action for improvement. It is therefore important that the Report produced by the Systems Appraisal Team stimulate review of organizational processes and systems. Though decisions about specific actions are each institution's, AQIP expects every institution to use its feedback to stimulate cycles of continual improvement. At the next Strategy Forum an AQIP institution attends, its peers will examine in detail how it is using the feedback from its Systems Appraisal.

An organization needs to examine its Report strategically to identify those areas that will yield greatest benefit if addressed. Some key questions that may arise in careful examination of the Report may be: How do the team's findings challenge our assumptions about ourselves? Given our mission and goals, which issues should we focus on? How will we employ results to innovate, grow, and encourage a positive culture of improvement? How will we incorporate lessons learned from this review in our planning and operational processes? How will we revise the *Systems Portfolio* to reflect what we have learned?

How an organization interprets, communicates, and uses its feedback for improvement ought to support AQIP's core values, encouraging involvement, learning, collaboration and integrity. Based solely upon an organization's *Systems Portfolio*, the Report reflects a disciplined, external review of what an organization says about itself. The report should help an organization identify ways to improve its *Systems Portfolio* so it functions better to communicate accurately to internal and external audiences. But the Report's chief purpose is to help you to identify areas for improvement, and to act so that these areas actually improve. These improvements can then be incorporated into an updated *Systems Portfolio*, guaranteeing that future Systems Appraisals will reflect the progress an institution has made.

Within a year following the Systems Appraisal, an institution participates in another AQIP Strategy Forum, where the focus will be on what the institution has learned from its Appraisal (and from its other methods of identifying and prioritizing improvement opportunities, and what it has concluded are its major strategic priorities for the next few years. AQIP's goal is to help an institution to clarify the strategic issues most vital to its success, and then to support the

institution as it addresses these priorities through Action Projects that will make a difference in institutional performance.

APPRAISAL FEEDBACK REPORT

The body of your feedback report contains two elements: a Critical Characteristics Analysis, and an exploration of your institution's Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement as perceived by the Systems Appraisal team.

CRITICAL CHARACTERISTICS ANALYSIS

The purpose of this section is to identify what team members understood to be the critical and distinguishing characteristics of your institution. They are the shared understanding of the most important aspects of University of Wisconsin-Stout, its current dynamics and the forces surrounding it, and its internal momentum and aspirations, at least as team members understood them. This section also demonstrates that the Systems Appraisal Team recognized and knew what makes University of Wisconsin-Stout distinctive. Should you find some characteristics that you think are critical and missing from this list, you may want to clarify and highlight these items when you revise your *Systems Portfolio* and other literature explaining your institution to the public.

Item Critical Characteristic

- 01a Accredited, special mission institution that is one of 13 publicly supported universities in the University of Wisconsin system.
- 01b Mission, Vision, and Values plus strong employer relationships drive an emphasis on integrated theoretical and practical instruction reinforced by extensive technology laboratories and experiential learning described as “hands-on, minds-on” active learning.
- 01c Values – excellence in teaching; high quality, student-centered; active learning; appropriate technology; scholarship and research; collaborative relationships; growth and development of students, faculty and staff; diversity of people, ideas and experiences; active involvement in shared governance; consensus building, teamwork; open and effective communication; and respectful, ethical behavior.
- 01d Three governance bodies make up the shared governance decision-making function responsible for the formation, development and review of policies: Faculty Senate, Senate of Academic Staff, and Student Association. The Chancellor’s Advisory Council

is the core of the leadership system; is comprised of university leaders, faculty, staff, students, and foundation members; and is designed to flatten the organization structure, encourage two-way communication, and emphasize participatory decision making.

- 02a Offers 28 undergraduate and 17 graduate programs that are unique within the University of Wisconsin system (half are not offered at any other University of Wisconsin campus and several are unique in the nation). The programs represent an integrated approach to learning that engages students in both theoretical and practical aspects of careers focused on the needs of society.
- 02b Offers 41 minors, 12 specializations, 12 certificate programs, non-credit courses, and customized training and technical assistance.
- 02c Wireless laptop campus with 80 media enhanced classrooms and programs offered through distance education facilities, and web-enhanced and on-line courses.
- 03a Primary market is Wisconsin residents (68% of students) with a limited number of non-resident students (31% from other states and 1% international).
- 03b Target markets include high school and technical school students, and potential transfer or graduate students. Student segments include: at risk, disabled, minority, and adult/continuing education students.
- 03c Total enrollment of 7,774 students with 6,973 undergraduate, 574 graduate, and 227 continuing education. Five percent of students are minorities and 51% female. Enrollment is managed to keep budgets in balance with infrastructure.
- 03d Five key student requirements: career-oriented programs, quality instruction, effective student support services, employment and/or career growth opportunities, and safe and supportive campus environment.
- 04 Collaborative relationships include five key stakeholder groups who provide opportunities to enhance and improve programs and services: feeder schools, employers, alumni, the community, and the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents.
- 05a Total of 1,215 employees. Types of employees include faculty (260), instructional and non-instructional academic staff (337), administrative (40), classified employees (386), limited term and project employees (130), and graduate assistants (62). Faculty and instructional academic staff (397) are 43% female and 5% minority and classified staff members are represented by five unions.
- 05b Student to instructor ratio of 20:1 and 99% of all course sections are taught by a faculty or academic staff member.

- 06a Campus is 115.5 acres, is located in an urban setting in downtown Menominee, and includes 21 academic and administrative buildings, 11 residence halls and student service buildings, and 310 instructional laboratories.
- 06b State-of-the-art technology is essential. All undergraduate students receive laptop computers (refreshed every two years) and all faculty and staff have computers (replaced every three years). All classrooms and residence halls are wired to the Internet and all areas of the campus are wireless providing access to support services 24/7.
- 06c Students, faculty and staff receive an identification card that can also be used as a bank card, debit card, library card, key, and for access to copiers and vending machine services.
- 06d Wisconsin State Statutes and Administrative Rules set powers for the Board, President and Chancellor and provide the legal framework for tenure and governance for faculty, academic staff and students; student discipline; complaints and grievances; and prohibited conduct.
- 07a Competitors for students and faculty include other University of Wisconsin system universities, Minnesota public universities, and business and industry.
- 07b Competitive differentiators for students include reputation, focused mission, career-oriented programs, technology, support services, and job placement success rate. Differentiators for faculty include quality of laboratories and teaching facilities, technology, peer recognition, campus image, and opportunities for research and professional development.
- 07c Benchmarking on key competitive factors is done against other UW System comprehensive institutions and selected nationally recognized universities with a similar mission and/or curriculum. Major national university benchmarks are used to compare performance in key areas.
- 08a Overall objective is to be the school of choice for the 21st century. Key opportunities and vulnerabilities include:
1. offering high quality, challenging academic programs that influence and respond to a changing society
 2. preserving and enhancing educational processes through the application of active learning principles
 3. promoting excellence in teaching, research, scholarship, and service

4. recruiting and retaining a diverse university population
 5. fostering a collegial, trusting, and tolerant environment
 6. providing safe, accessible, effective, efficient, and inviting physical facilities
 7. providing responsive, efficient, and cost-effective (educational support) programs and services.
- 08b A culture of continuous quality improvement is necessary to meet strategic challenges. Examples of the culture include quality tools such as teaming, process management, and fact-based analysis; the first post-secondary institution to receive the Malcolm Baldrige award (2001); and joining AQIP (2002).
- 08c Improvement opportunities are identified through strategic and annual planning, Baldrige/AQIP assessment and feedback and improvement reviews.

CATEGORY FEEDBACK

In the following sections, each of which deals with strengths and opportunities for improvement for one of the nine AQIP Categories, selected *Critical Characteristics* are again highlighted, those the Systems Appraisal Team believed were critical keys to reviewing that particular AQIP Category. The symbols used in these “strengths and opportunities” sections for each Category stand for *outstanding strength* (SS), *strength* (S), *opportunity for improvement* (O) and *pressing or outstanding opportunity for improvement* (OO). The choice of symbol for each item represents the consensus evaluation of the Systems Appraisal Team members, and deserves your thoughtful consideration. Comments marked SS or OO may need immediate attention, either to ensure the institution preserves and maximizes the value of its greatest strengths, or to devote immediate attention to its greatest opportunities for improvement.

AQIP CATEGORY 1: HELPING STUDENTS LEARN

Helping Students Learn identifies the shared purpose of all higher education organizations, and is accordingly the pivot of any institutional analysis. This Category focuses on the teaching-learning process within a formal instructional context, yet also addresses how your entire institution contributes to helping students learn and overall student development. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to learning objectives, mission-driven student learning and development, intellectual climate, academic programs and courses, student preparation, key issues such as technology and diversity, program and course delivery, faculty and staff roles, teaching and learning effectiveness, course sequencing and scheduling,

learning and co-curricular support, student assessment, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of University of Wisconsin-Stout that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its *Systems Portfolio* section covering Category 1, Helping Students Learn:

Item Critical Characteristic

- 01b Mission, Vision, and Values plus strong employer relationships drive an emphasis on integrated theoretical and practical instruction reinforced by extensive technology laboratories and experiential learning described as “hands-on, minds-on” active learning.
- 01c Values – excellence in teaching; high quality, student-centered; active learning; appropriate technology; scholarship and research; collaborative relationships; growth and development of students, faculty and staff; diversity of people, ideas and experiences; active involvement in shared governance; consensus building, teamwork; open and effective communication; and respectful, ethical behavior.
- 02a Offers 28 undergraduate and 17 graduate programs that are unique within the University of Wisconsin system (half are not offered at any other University of Wisconsin campus and several are unique in the nation). The programs represent an integrated approach to learning that engages students in both theoretical and practical aspects of careers focused on the needs of society.
- 02b Offers 41 minors, 12 specializations, 12 certificate programs, non-credit courses, and customized training and technical assistance.
- 05b Student to instructor ratio of 20:1 and 99% of all course sections are taught by a faculty or academic staff member.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as University of Wisconsin-Stout’s most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 1, Helping Students Learn.

Item S/O Comment

- 1P1 S The organization uses a participatory process for determining common student learning objectives and specific program objectives that draws on input from program directors, the General Education Committee, Faculty Senate, and advisory committees that include faculty, students, alumni, and employers.

- 1P1 O It is not clear what process was used by the General Education Committee to develop the General Education Objectives detailed in Figure 1-1 or the program directors and advisory committees to develop program-specific objectives. As a result, it is not clear how the organization ensures that the objectives meet the needs of all stakeholders and external accreditation bodies.
- 1P2 S The New Program Development Process for Degree Programs (Figure 1-7) is used by program directors, faculty members, and service units to ensure programs facilitate student learning, meet professional objectives, link faculty development to student learning methods, and remain flexible enough to balance changing market issues with student needs. Market requirements are addressed in the Academic Program Review Process (Figure 1-9) which uses information on comparable programs, student demand, projected enrollments, support service needs, and stakeholder needs that are gathered from surveys of students, faculty, advisory committee members, alumni and employers.
- 1P3 S Determining student preparation is an on-going, collaborative process throughout a student's learning career that involves program directors and advisory committees. The process begins with freshman placement tests and continues with interdisciplinary course sequencing that reinforces skill acquisition and gradually develops skills. Program-specific, eight-semester plans identify courses that require completion within a specified timeframe.
- 1P4 S A variety of methods are used to communicate preparation expectations and learning objectives to prospective and current students. These methods include the university and program websites, printed materials, face-to-face communication, a university catalog, a student handbook, program information sheets, and course syllabi. Assistance is provided by Enrollment and Student Services and program directors during campus preview days, new student orientation, registration, advisement day, and individual meetings with students.
- 1P5 S To help students select programs of study, the organization utilizes general admission and program-specific requirements, targeted programs for new and undecided students, pre-enrollment career seminars, individual career assessment, a personality type inventory, and an interest inventory. Student strengths, weaknesses, and success potential

- are assessed using ACT, English, and math placement scores and information on high school performance.
- 1P5 O It is not clear what process is used to detect and address discrepancies between the necessary and actual preparation of students. It appears that placement test scores and high school performance are used in this process but it is not clear what happens when a discrepancy occurs.
- 1P6 S Effective teaching and learning is determined through assessment plans developed by each program director which contain both formative and summative assessment techniques to measure student achievement of intended learning outcomes. Results are documented in the annual "Assessment in Major" report submitted to the Provost to ensure results are used to improve teaching and learning. In addition, evidence of effective teaching is required of faculty members to obtain annual contract renewal, tenure or promotion.
- 1P7 S A variety of information is used to build an effective and efficient course delivery system that balances student and institutional needs. Information used in the process includes program technology, program need, estimated enrollment, and location of students. Course delivery methods include classroom, laboratory, web-based, interactive television, independent study, and experiential learning.
- 1P8 S Key indicators such as enrollment, course evaluations, placement rates and employer and student satisfaction (Figure 1-8); the Academic Program Review Process (Figure 1-9); and the Program or Course Modification Process (Figure 1-10) are used to monitor the currency and effectiveness of the curriculum and to change or discontinue programs and courses. The program review process is designed to identify improvement opportunities and occurs every one to seven years depending on the findings of previous reviews. The program or course modification process occurs annually as part of the strategic planning process and as part of the advisory committee review process.
- 1P9 S Learning support areas determine student and faculty needs through the strategic planning process, faculty and student surveys, Academic Planning Questionnaires completed by new students, and the budgeting process. The process of identifying learning system needs has resulted in a variety of initiatives including the First Year Experience, piloted and

expanded learning communities, tutoring software for math courses, and the ASPIRE program for first generation/low income/disabled students.

- 1P10 O It is not clear what process is used to ensure alignment of co-curricular development goals with curricular learning objectives. Per the Portfolio, alignment is accomplished through student organizations associated with academic programs, student government, and student leadership programs but it is not clear what process these organizations use to ensure their activities support the organization's identified learning objectives.
- 1P11 S The Assessment Sequence Program (Figure 1-11) is used to develop assessment plans to determine student learning at the entry, course, general education, and program level. Each program utilizes a number of direct and indirect methods such as exams, papers, and projects to assess student learning and progress.
- 1P12,1P13 S Multiple measures are collected and analyzed to determine student performance and preparation for further education or employment. Measures include placement data, licensure and certification exam results, alumni and employer follow-up surveys, course pass rates, student retention, and graduation rates.
- 1R1 S Results for the senior-level self-assessment of general education knowledge (Figure 1-15) show a favorable trend from 2001 to 2004. Scores for "understand multicultural world" and "appreciate fine/performing arts" have increased the most improving from 3.21 to 3.35 and 3.04 to 3.20 respectively.
- 1R1 O Freshman Retention (Figure 1-13) has remained constant at 73% since 2001 which compares unfavorably to the UW System at 80%, the best UW competitor at 85-86%, Peer 2 at 88-90% and Peer 3 at 79-85%.
- 1R2 S Results for the Six-year Graduation Rate (Figure 1-19) increased from 44% for 1995 freshmen to 53% for 1998 freshmen. The graduation rate compares favorably to the peer group average of 42-46%, Peer 1 rate of 33-35%, Peer 3 rate of 45-53%, and the national average of 41-44%.
- 1R2 SS Placement Data by Program (Figure 1-21) show 99-100% placement of graduates in five out of six high demand fields. Alumni Ratings of Program Effectiveness (Figure 1-22) show a favorable trend increasing from 65% for 1992 grads to 82% for 2000 grads. Alumni Ratings in Key

- Competency Areas since 1998 (Figure 1-23) have been consistently between 3.9 and 4.4 on a five-point scale.
- 1R2 O Undergraduate Placement Success (Figure 1-20) shows an unfavorable trend from 99-00 to 02-03 declining from approximately 100% to 95%. Although some improvement was shown in 03-04, results have been below or equal to Peer 1 since 01-02.
- 1R2 O Several figures contain trend data that ends more than three years ago or have missing years with no explanation why specific years were chosen for presentation. Examples include the Alumni Ratings of Program Effectiveness (Figure 1-22) that contains data from 1992-2000 graduates, and Employer Competency Ratings (Figure 1-25) which contains data from 1990-2002. Alumni Ratings in Key Competency Areas (Figure 1-23) contains data from 1994, 1998, 2000, and 2002 and Employer Ratings of Graduate Competencies (Figure 1-24) contains data for 1998, 2000, and 2002.
- 1R1-1R3 O Minimal results data are presented for processes associated with helping students learn and how support services improve the teaching and learning process. In addition, results data are not presented for the faculty student ratio which is mentioned in the Organizational Profile as a key measure of enrollment management, diversity of students which is mentioned in Category 1 as an enduring goal, student course evaluations which are described as a measure of effective teaching, and licensure/certification exam results which are mentioned as a measure of how well prepared graduates are for employment.
- 1R1-1R3 O Several figures contain only one or two data points even though the Portfolio indicates that trend data are available for a longer period of time. Examples include ACT CAAP Scores (Figure 1-14) where data for 1998 and 2004 are provided even though the test is administered annually; one data point for the Sample Course-Embedded Assessment (Figure 1-16) which was implemented in 2004; School Psychology Test Scores (Figure 1-17) and Technology Education Test Scores (Figure 1-18) where only one data point is provided from an annual assessment that has been conducted for more than a decade; Advisement Center Effectiveness (Figure 1-27) where data for 2004 and 2005 are presented; Supplemental Instruction and Tutoring (Figure 1-29 and 1-30) where only two data

points are provided; and Professional Development Series Attendance (Figure 1-31) where only one data point is provided.

- 1R4 O No benchmark or comparison data are provided for Placement Data by Program (Figure 1-21), alumni ratings of effectiveness and competency (Figures 1-15 and 1-22), or employer ratings (Figure 1-25).

AQIP CATEGORY 2: ACCOMPLISHING OTHER DISTINCTIVE OBJECTIVES

Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives addresses the processes that contribute to the achievement of your institution's major objectives that complement student learning and fulfill other portions of your mission. Depending on your institution's character, it examines your institution's processes and systems related to identification of other distinctive objectives, alignment of other distinctive objectives, faculty and staff roles, assessment and review of objectives, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of University of Wisconsin-Stout that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its *Systems Portfolio* section covering Category 2, Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives:

Item Critical Characteristic

- 01a Accredited, special mission institution that is one of 13 publicly supported universities in the University of Wisconsin System.
- 01b Mission, Vision, and Values plus strong employer relationships drive an emphasis on integrated theoretical and practical instruction reinforced by extensive technology laboratories and experiential learning described as "hands-on, minds-on" active learning.
- 02c Wireless laptop campus with 80 media enhanced classrooms and programs offered through distance education facilities, and web-enhanced and on-line courses.
- 06b State-of-the-art technology is essential. All undergraduate students receive laptop computers (refreshed every two years) and all faculty and staff have computers (replaced every three years). All classrooms and residence halls are wired to the Internet and all areas of the campus are wireless providing access to support services 24/7.
- 07b Competitive differentiators for students include reputation, focused mission, career-oriented programs, technology, support services, and job placement success rate. Differentiators for faculty include quality of laboratories and teaching facilities,

technology, peer recognition, campus image, and opportunities for research and professional development.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as University of Wisconsin-Stout's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 2, Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives.

<i>Item</i>	<i>S/O</i>	<i>Comment</i>
2P1	S	Other distinctive objectives are determined during the strategic planning process and are derived from long-term (enduring) goals and short-term objectives. Each distinctive objective has defined key performance indicators enabling alignment of performance with strategy.
2P2	S	Each unit involved in distinctive objectives develops its own strategic plan and annual goals. Progress on goals and performance targets is reviewed regularly by the Chancellor's Advisory Council, Provost's Council, and other governance groups. Expectations are communicated to faculty, staff, students and stakeholders via websites, email, and employee, student and community newsletters.
2P3	S	Faculty and staff needs relative to distinctive objectives are gathered through campus-wide advisory councils and committees, surveys, and focus groups. Student input is obtained through advisory councils and annual surveys such as the ACT Student Opinion Survey. The Educational Support Unit Review Committee periodically reviews how each distinctive objective supports the organization's mission and strategic goals and prepares a report on strengths, opportunities for improvement, and recommendations.
2P4,2P5	S	Measures for distinctive objectives include progress on objectives, goals, and action plans; an internal analysis of demand for services and number of customers served; and user surveys. Results on measures and action plans are reviewed on an annual basis by the Chancellor's Advisory Council and reported to leadership. Action plans are created to address performance gaps.
2R1	S	Most enrollment data show favorable trends for the periods shown. The number of Freshman Applications (Figure 2-1) has increased year over year since 2003-2004, Growth in Targeted Academic Programs (Figure 2-

4) shows increased enrollment in all targeted programs, the number of fall enrollments (Figure 2-3) shows increased enrollment each year since 03-04 which exceeds the performance of seven of ten competitors, and Graduate Enrollment (Figure 2-5) shows a favorable trend from 2001 to 2003 with a slight decline in 2004.

- | | | |
|---------|---|---|
| 2R1 | S | Results data related to technology show favorable trends in several areas. The Number of Laptop Computers Deployed (Figure 2-7) has increased almost 400% since 2002-2003 growing from 1250 to an estimated 5900. Freshman and senior ratings of technology use (Figure 2-9) show increased usage from 2002 to 2004 which compares favorably to the Master's Average. The number of Distance Education/Online Courses (Figure 2-19) has increased over 125% from 99-00 to 03-04 with the current level placing the organization first when compared to competitors. |
| 2R1 | S | Data for laboratory instruction and experiential learning show positive results. Junior/Senior Instruction in Labs (Figure 1-20) has shown a slight decline from 2002-2003 to 2004-2005 but the levels of instruction exceed that of the best competitor and the competitive average, with the gap to competitors increasing. The increase in the Percentage of Graduates Participating in Experiential Learning (Figure 2-11) has increased from 76% in 2000-01 to 84% in 2004-2005 |
| 2R1 | O | Transfer Enrollments (Figure 2-2) show an unfavorable trend since 01-02 declining from 916 to 795. The declining trend compares unfavorably to the highest comprehensive institution and the comprehensive comparative average which both show increasing numbers of transfer students. |
| 2R2 | S | Results data related to applied research show favorable trends in number of grants submitted, grants awarded, and contract dollar value (Figure 2-12) and in student research articles published (Figure 2-13). Figure 2-20 shows the organization is fifth among eleven competitors in federal dollars awarded. |
| 2R1,2R2 | O | Student Satisfaction with Financial Aid (Figure 2-15) shows an unfavorable trend declining from slightly above 4.0 in 2001-02 to approximately 3.75 in 2004-05. Over this time period, peer and national ratings have improved narrowing the gap between the comparative data and the organization's level of performance. |

- 2R1,2R2 O Results data for several measures include only one or two data points making it difficult to determine if data are positive or negative over time. Examples include Satisfaction with Financial Aid Office (Figure 2-6) which is for one data point even though the survey has been conducted for over five years, User Satisfaction with Research Services (Figure 2-14) which presents data for 2005 only, Student Technology Usage Trends (Figure 2-16) which presents data for 2004 only, and results for the annual Valley City Survey of Student Learning Related to Laptop Program (Figure 2-17) and Student Computer Use (Figure 2-18) which present data for 2004 and 2005. In addition, data on Transfer Enrollments (Figure 2-2) is not provided beyond 03-04.
- 2R1, 2R2 O Results data are not presented for several measures mentioned as important in the Portfolio. These include results related to class sizes; admission trends; technology training; faculty using on-line/web-enhanced delivery; enrollment in distance education/on-line courses; demand for services; number of faculty, staff or students served; cycle time; and satisfaction with the admissions, registration, and financial aid processes.
- 2R3 O No response provided.

AQIP CATEGORY 3: UNDERSTANDING STUDENTS' AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS' NEEDS

Understanding Students' and Other Stakeholders' Needs examines how your institution works actively to understand student and other stakeholder needs. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to student and stakeholder identification, student and stakeholder requirements, analysis of student and stakeholder needs, relationship building with students and stakeholders, complaint collection, analysis, and resolution, determining satisfaction of students and stakeholders, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of University of Wisconsin-Stout that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its Systems Portfolio section covering Category 3, Understanding Students' and Other Stakeholders' Needs:

Item Critical Characteristic

- 03a Primary market is Wisconsin residents (68% of students) with a limited number of non-resident students (31% from other states and 1% international).
- 03b Target markets include high school and technical school students, and potential transfer or graduate students. Student segments include: at risk, disabled, minority, and adult/continuing education students.
- 03c Total enrollment of 7,774 students with 6,973 undergraduate, 574 graduate, and 227 continuing education. Five percent of students are minorities and 51% female. Enrollment is managed to keep budgets in balance with infrastructure.
- 03d Five key student requirements: career-oriented programs, quality instruction, effective student support services, employment and/or career growth opportunities, and safe and supportive campus environment.
- 04 Collaborative relationships include five key stakeholder groups who provide opportunities to enhance and improve programs and services: feeder schools, employers, alumni, the community, and the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as University of Wisconsin-Stout's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 3, Understanding Students' and Other Stakeholders' Needs.

<i>Item</i>	<i>S/O</i>	<i>Comment</i>
3P1	S	To identify current and changing needs and interests, students in all segments, including those with special needs, participate in a variety of cross-cutting listening and learning activities during the enrollment process and throughout their college career. Examples of listening and learning activities include an Academic Planning Questionnaire, placement tests, special needs surveys, the Beginning College Survey of Student Expectations, course evaluations, the ACT Student Opinion Survey, advisory committees, and focus groups.
3P1	S	The Provost's Council, the Administrative and Student Life Services Council, and the Chancellor's Advisory Council each have processes for reviewing and analyzing data gathered from listening and learning activities, identifying and responding to opportunities for improvement, and identifying new programs. The Office of Budget, Planning and Analysis analyzes and integrates information from environmental scans, trend analysis, and demographic studies and trends, and uses these data to identify potential impacts, make decisions, and align resource allocations.

- 3P2 O It is not clear what process is used by the organization to build and maintain relationships with its students. The methods that are described in the Portfolio and listed in Figure 3-4 appear to be related to providing contact points or methods for expressing dissatisfaction rather than a systematic process for building relationships.
- 3P3 S A variety of methods is used to identify the changing needs of key stakeholders including surveys, face-to-face meetings, and analysis of graduate job placement data. The Stout Foundation, the Career Services Office, the Stout Technology Park, the Stout Technology Transfer Institute, the Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Institute and service on community organizations and boards are also used to obtain feedback on program effectiveness, identify changing employer and community needs, and plan for new programs and initiatives.
- 3P4 S Relationships are built and maintained with key stakeholders through alumni gatherings, technology outreach organizations, internships, participation with community organizations and governance groups, and participation of key stakeholders on campus committees and advisory councils. These methods are used to build long-term relationships and develop innovative programs to attract new stakeholders.
- 3P5 O It is not clear what process is used to identify new student and stakeholder groups. It appears that information from listening and learning methods, the strategic planning process, the legislature, and accreditation agencies are gathered but it is not clear what specific data are gathered, how the data from all of the processes are aggregated, who is responsible for executing the process, and how the process results in identification of new student and stakeholder groups.
- 3P6 O It is not clear how complaint information is collected, analyzed in a formative or summative manner, used to select a course of action, and the actions communicated to students and stakeholders. It appears that the Wisconsin Administrative Code complaint process is utilized to document, share and aggregate formal complaints, but it is not clear what constitutes a formal complaint and how the organization deals with informal complaints.
- 3P7 S Student and other stakeholder satisfaction is determined through a variety of surveys related to satisfaction, dissatisfaction, engagement, utilization,

learning, and general and career competencies (Figure 3-5). Survey data are supplemented by data on enrollment trends, freshmen retention rates, and drop and withdrawal rates. Peer and national comparisons are used to analyze the data and identify opportunities for improvement.

- 3R1,3R2 O Although results for the ACT Student Opinion Survey and NSSE Survey compare favorably to the national sample in all but three areas (Figures 3-6, 3-7, and 3-8), data are presented for 2005 only even though Figure 7-2 indicates that the data have been gathered for 5+ years. As a result, the trend over time is not clear nor is it evident if the gap to the national sample/average is increasing or decreasing.
- 3R3, 3R4 S Results for the alumni survey (Figure 3-9), employer survey (Figure 3-10), and Board of Regents assessment (Figure 3-11) show consistent performance for the periods shown. Alumni and employer satisfaction are above 4.0 on a 5.0 scale and Board of Regents satisfaction is above 3.0 on a 4.0 scale.
- 3R1-4 O Results data are not provided for several measures mentioned as important in the Portfolio including surveys and participation of Advisory Committee Members, complaint trends, exit interview results, community attendance at events, drops and withdrawals, and the placement survey.
- 3R5 O Comparative data are not provided for the alumni survey, employer survey, or Board of Regents Assessment. In addition, for the ACT Student Opinion Survey and NSSE Survey, data are only provided for a national sample or average. As a result, it is unclear how the organization's performance compares to historical trends for other education institutions.
- 3I1 S The organization has a long history of using continuous improvement approaches to improve processes for understanding student and stakeholder needs. The approach includes regular review by the Chancellor's Advisory Council to identify areas needing improvement and set priorities.

AQIP CATEGORY 4: VALUING PEOPLE

Valuing People explores your institution's commitment to the development of your employees since the efforts of all of your faculty, staff, and administrators are required for institutional success. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to work and job environment; workforce needs; training initiatives; job competencies and characteristics; recruitment, hiring, and retention practices; work processes and activities; training and development; personnel evaluation; recognition, reward, compensation, and benefits; motivation factors; satisfaction, health and safety, and well-being; measures; analysis of results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of University of Wisconsin-Stout that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its Systems Portfolio section covering Category 4, Valuing People:

Item Critical Characteristic

- 01c Values – excellence in teaching; high quality, student-centered; active learning; appropriate technology; scholarship and research; collaborative relationships; growth and development of students, faculty and staff; diversity of people, ideas and experiences; active involvement in shared governance; consensus building, teamwork; open and effective communication; and respectful, ethical behavior.
- 01d Three governance bodies make up the shared governance decision-making function responsible for the formation, development and review of policies: Faculty Senate, Senate of Academic Staff, and Student Association. The Chancellor's Advisory Council is the core of the leadership system; is comprised of university leaders, faculty, staff, students, and foundation members; and is designed to flatten the organization structure, encourage two-way communication, and emphasize participatory decision making.
- 05a Total of 1,215 employees. Types of employees include faculty (260), instructional and non-instructional academic staff (337), administrative (40), classified employees (386), limited term and project employees (130), and graduate assistants (62). Faculty and instructional academic staff (397) are 43% female and 5% minority and classified staff members are represented by five unions.
- 06d Wisconsin State Statutes and Administrative Rules set powers for the Board, President and Chancellor and provide the legal framework for tenure and governance for faculty, academic staff and students; student discipline; complaints and grievances; and prohibited conduct.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as University of Wisconsin-Stout's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 4, Valuing People.

<i>Item</i>	<i>S/O</i>	<i>Comment</i>
4P1	S	To identify the specific credentials, skills, and values required for faculty, staff, and administrators, units with openings identify curricular and departmental needs; justify how the needs are aligned with the organization's mission, goals, and priorities; and develop a position description. Approval to hire is obtained, a recruitment plan is developed, and demonstrations, forums, presentations, and interviews are used to enable selection of the best qualified candidate.
4P2	S	The hiring process (Figure 4-4) is used to recruit, hire, and retain qualified individuals. Recruitment strategies include postings in local, regional and national newspapers, trade journals, professional association listings and publications targeting minorities. Hiring committees are responsible for screening and interviewing applicants and making hiring recommendations and have received training on equal opportunity/affirmative action to encourage hiring minorities and women. Retention is addressed through training, development, the performance review process, and the organizational value of open communication.
4P2	S	A three-day orientation program is conducted each fall to orient new faculty and staff on the organization's mission, vision, values, policies, benefits, and the focus on continuous improvement.
4P2	O	It is not clear what process is used to orient new employees who are hired after the three-day orientation has occurred each fall. For example, Figure 4-3 indicates that 42 employees were hired in 2004-05, yet Figure 4-2 shows that only 15 employees attended new employee orientation in 2004-05.
4P3	S	User groups, peer councils, advisory councils, the Chancellor's Advisory Council, the Provost's Council, senates, and other cross-functional committees and forums along with the technology infrastructure are used to ensure communication, cooperation, high performance, learning, and skill sharing. Examples of learning and skill and best practice sharing include the Student and Faculty Research Day, Learning Technology

- Services workshops, and presentations and benchmarking with other organizations.
- 4P3 O It is unclear how the organization ensures ethical practices of all employees. Although the organization publishes policies and procedures in the employee handbook, has an Ethics Committee, and conducts periodic audits, it is not clear what process is used to ensure that employees understand and follow the procedures and to reinforce the procedures on an on-going basis.
- 4P4 S The organization provides training and development opportunities for faculty, staff, and administrators with a focus on improving student learning and support services and on principles of continuous improvement. Training is delivered on-line; in on-campus workshops; at off-campus workshops, conferences, and seminars; and through specialized methods such as paid sabbatical leaves, grants, and leadership development. Training is reinforced through observation, monitoring performance indicators, and demonstration of new skills such as new software. In addition, the organization participates in the UW System's Teaching Fellow and Teaching Scholar program to prepare faculty and academic staff to carry out their roles effectively.
- 4P4 O It is not clear how training and development opportunities address key areas such as leadership training for employees other than senior leaders, safety, use of measures, and continuous improvement for non-faculty and staff. In addition, it is not clear what process is used to determine what training an individual employee needs or will receive to enhance his or her performance and achievement of career goals.
- 4P5 S Identification of organizational training and development needs at the campus, department, and individual levels occurs during the strategic planning process to enable alignment to strategic goals and improvement priorities. Initiatives like the Teaching and Learning Center and the Professional Development Committee help individuals achieve discipline, function, career growth, and or licensure/certification needs.
- 4P6 S The organization's personnel evaluation system for non-tenured faculty and staff is used to evaluate performance on an annual basis, provide feedback to employees regarding strengths and areas for improvement,

and emphasize alignment with organizational goals and objectives. For tenured employees, the evaluation system occurs every five years.

- 4P7 S Formal and informal recognition, reward, and compensation systems align incentives with the organization's key objectives for student learning and organizational improvement, reflect the values and mission, reward high performance, and recognize loyalty to the organization. Examples include salary adjustments that are based on merit compensation and the use of lecturer/senior lecturer titles for academic staff who teach as part of their assignment.
- 4P7 S Employees are provided with a variety of services and benefits including health and life insurance, an Employee Assistance Program, catastrophic leave, and a wellness program that includes recreational facilities and cultural activities.
- 4P8 S Issues related to motivation of faculty, staff, and administrators are gathered through the strategic planning and budgeting processes; department and committee meetings; surveys segmented by gender, race, and employee group; grievances; exit interviews; informal listening posts; and analysis of data such as absenteeism, workers compensation claims, and turnover. The data are analyzed by the Chancellor's Advisory Council to identify priorities and action plans which are validated through consultation with administrators and advisory groups.
- 4P9 S Employee satisfaction and well-being are evaluated through morale surveys taken every three years, an annual climate survey, turnover data, grievances, safety incidences, and workers compensation claims.
- 4P9 S Safety orientations and inspections are used to evaluate employee safety. Technology and the organization's vocational rehabilitation program are incorporated into facility plans and redesigns with a focus on ergonomics, health and safety standards, and best practices. Crime awareness and prevention is promoted in newsletters, in presentations, and on web pages.
- 4R1 S Exit interview data regarding harassment and discrimination (Figure 4-10) shows favorable results that are constant from 98-99 to 04-05 at 4.7-5.0 on a 1-5 scale. Exit interview satisfaction with training and development opportunities (Figure 4-13) has a favorable trend from 98-99 to 04-05 increasing for all employee groups.

- 4R1 O Faculty Voluntary Turnover (Figure 4-5) shows an unfavorable trend increasing from 2.61% in 2002-03 to 3.07% in 2004-05. Turnover data are not presented for the remaining 80% of employee groups including administrative, instructional and non-instructional staff, and classified employees.
- 4R1 O Results data for several measures of valuing people show unfavorable trends including burglary incidents which have grown from 12 in 2000 to 39 in 2003 (Figure 4-7); employee performance ratings for faculty and academic staff which have declined from 95% in 2000-01 to 90.8% in 2004-05 (Figure 4-8); employee exit interview results on satisfaction with experience at the organization which show unfavorable or constant trends for unclassified employees, women and overall from 02-03 to 04-05 (Figure 4-9); overall satisfaction from the morale survey and climate assessment which show an unfavorable trend from 2001-2005 (Figures 4-11 and 4-12); and satisfaction with support for professional development which shows an unfavorable trend from 1999 to 2005 (Figure 4-14).
- 4R2 S The number of professional development grants (Figure 4-15) and dollars expended on these grants have increased from \$40,000 in 00-01 to over \$50,000 in 03-04. The percentage of tenured faculty (Figure 4-16) has remained constant since 2002, the number of sabbaticals (Figure 4-19) has remained flat at a level equal to or above 7 out of 10 competitors, and the number of named chairs (Figure 4-20) exceeds the level of 9 out of 10 competitors.
- 4R2 O Data on Professional Development Expenditures (Figure 4-18) is presented for 2003-04 only making it unclear if this level of expenditure has been sustained over time and whether the gap to competitors has increased or decreased over time. In addition, data are not provided on workers compensation claims which are mentioned as a measure of valuing people that is collected and analyzed regularly. Data are presented on workers compensation premiums paid (Figure 4-17) but it is not clear how these data relate to the number of claims.
- 4R3 O It is not clear what evidence the organization uses to indicate the productivity and effectiveness of faculty, staff, and administrators in helping the organization achieve its goals. The information that is provided in the Portfolio appears to be anecdotal and does not provide

information on how cost per credit relates to productivity and effectiveness or aligns with organization goals.

- 4R1-4R3 O Results data are not presented for several measures mentioned as important throughout the Portfolio including employee complaints, training participation other than that provided by the EO/AA Office, grievances, absenteeism, and safety results such as incidences, near miss forms filed, accidents, and injuries.

AQIP CATEGORY 5: LEADING AND COMMUNICATING

Leading And Communicating addresses how your institution's leadership and communication structures, networks, and processes guide your institution in setting directions, making decisions, seeking future opportunities, and building and sustaining a learning environment. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to leading activities, communicating activities, alignment of leadership system practices, institutional values and expectations, direction setting, future opportunity seeking, decision making, use of data, leadership development and sharing, succession planning, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of University of Wisconsin-Stout that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its Systems Portfolio section covering Category 5, Leading and Communicating:

Item Critical Characteristic

- 01c Values – excellence in teaching; high quality, student-centered; active learning; appropriate technology; scholarship and research; collaborative relationships; growth and development of students, faculty and staff; diversity of people, ideas and experiences; active involvement in shared governance; consensus building, teamwork; open and effective communication; and respectful, ethical behavior.
- 01d Three governance bodies make up the shared governance decision-making function responsible for the formation, development and review of policies: Faculty Senate, Senate of Academic Staff, and Student Association. The Chancellor's Advisory Council is the core of the leadership system; is comprised of university leaders, faculty, staff, students, and foundation members; and is designed to flatten the organization structure, encourage two-way communication, and emphasize participatory decision making.

- 04 Collaborative relationships include five key stakeholder groups who provide opportunities to enhance and improve programs and services: feeder schools, employers, alumni, the community, and the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents.
- 06d Wisconsin State Statutes and Administrative Rules set powers for the Board, President and Chancellor and provide the legal framework for tenure and governance for faculty, academic staff and students; student discipline; complaints and grievances; and prohibited conduct.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as University of Wisconsin-Stout's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 5, Leading and Communicating.

<i>Item</i>	<i>S/O</i>	<i>Comment</i>
5P1	S	Senior leaders use the strategic planning process to set short- and long-term goals and actions that are aligned with the mission, vision and values; promote organizational learning and innovation; and address student and stakeholder needs. The process includes assignment of responsibility for action plans, a timeline for completion, and accountability that is monitored by the Chancellor's Advisory Council.
5P2	O	It is not clear how leaders provide guidance or create an environment that seeks out future opportunities beyond grant activity. In addition, it is not clear how the organization aggressively engages other colleges in creating future opportunities or what process is used to determine which grant opportunities to pursue.
5P3	S	The organization uses a participatory process to involve stakeholders in decision making. Facilitated group sessions each fall are used to gather faculty, staff, and student input on past organizational decisions and directions and listen to ideas concerning future issues, priorities, and goals. The Chancellor's Advisory Council is the primary decision-making body and includes representatives from all stakeholder groups.
5P4	S	The Chancellor's Advisory Council is responsible for reviewing key indicator results and comparative data to determine progress on action plans and the mission and values. Examples of indicators that are reviewed include enrollment trends, tuition rates, freshmen retention, stakeholder satisfaction, and graduation and placement rates.

- 5P5,5P6 S A flat organizational structure, e-mails, websites, newsletters, and open forum meetings are used to communicate down and across organizational levels. These methods plus weekly faculty governance, Faculty Senate, Senate of Academic Staff, and Dean meetings are used by leaders to communicate values, goals, and performance expectations.
- 5P7 S Leadership skills are encouraged, developed and strengthened through the performance evaluation process, regular leadership meetings focused on team building and leadership development, the Women's Leadership Program, and the Executive Employee Development, Growth and Enrichment program for new program directors and department chairs.
- 5P8 O It is not clear what process is used for leadership succession planning to ensure the vision, mission and values are passed on during leadership succession. It appears that the organization is focused on promoting from within but it is not clear what process is used to identify potential leadership candidates and prepare them for future leadership opportunities.
- 5R1 O Results for degree of leadership provided (Figure 5-13) show an unfavorable trend from 1999 to 2005 with ratings below 4 on a 5-point scale for the Chair, Division Heads and the Chancellor. Ratings for Deans/Directors have shown only slight improvement over this time period increasing from 3.37 to 3.40.
- 5R1 O Data on leadership processes and systems shown in Figures 5-2 through 5-4 and Figure 5-7 are for 2004 only making it unclear if this level of performance has been sustained over time.
- 5R1,5R2 O Results data are not presented for several measures of leading and communicating processes and systems including conflicts of interest, violations of policy, and communication effectiveness. In addition, other than Figures 5-2 and 5-4, data are not provided on how the organization's results compare to other education institutions or organizations outside the education community.

AQIP CATEGORY 6: SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONAL OPERATIONS

Supporting Institutional Operations addresses the variety of your institutional support processes that help to provide an environment in which learning can thrive. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to student support, administrative support, identification of needs, contribution to student learning and accomplishing other distinctive objectives, day-to-day operations, use of data, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of University of Wisconsin-Stout that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its Systems Portfolio section covering Category 6, Supporting Institutional Operations:

Item Critical Characteristic

- 02c Wireless laptop campus with 80 media enhanced classrooms and programs offered through distance education facilities, and web-enhanced and on-line courses.
- 06a Campus is 115.5 acres, is located in an urban setting in downtown Menominee, and includes 21 academic and administrative buildings, 11 residence halls and student service buildings, and 310 instructional laboratories.
- 06b State-of-the-art technology is essential. All undergraduate students receive laptop computers (refreshed every two years) and all faculty and staff have computers (replaced every three years). All classrooms and residence halls are wired to the Internet and all areas of the campus are wireless providing access to support services 24/7.
- 06c Students, faculty and staff receive an identification card that can also be used as a bank card, debit card, library card, key, and for access to copiers and vending machine services.
- 08a Overall objective is to be the school of choice for the 21st century. Key opportunities and vulnerabilities include:
- providing safe, accessible, effective, efficient, and inviting physical facilities
 - providing responsive, efficient, and cost-effective (educational support) programs and services.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as University of Wisconsin-Stout's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 6, Supporting Institutional Operations.

<i>Item</i>	<i>S/O</i>	<i>Comment</i>
6P1	S	Needs for student support services are identified through a variety of methods that include surveys, focus groups, analysis of regulatory changes, and the annual strategic planning process.
6P2	S	Administrative support service needs of faculty, staff, administrators, and other key stakeholders are identified during the strategy development, strategic planning, and budgeting processes and through user surveys, benchmarking, and the ESURC process.
6P3	S	Key student and administrative support processes are managed on a day-to-day basis to ensure that they are meeting the needs of students and key stakeholder groups through deployment of systems for measuring, monitoring, and evaluating key performance indicators; analysis of results; and process documentation in policies and procedures.
6P5	O	It is not clear what performance indicators are used to monitor day-to-day performance of each key process. For example, the measure for Student Life Services is satisfaction with services as measured by the ACT Student Opinion Survey. This survey occurs on an annual basis and gathers input from sophomores and juniors only making it unclear how the results are used to manage the processes on a day-to-day basis to ensure they are meeting user needs and to identify improvement opportunities. Another example is the lack of efficiency measures for the physical plant beyond energy usage.
6R1	S	User satisfaction with dining service (Figures 6-3 and 6-4) has remained constant from 2002-03 to 2004-05 with most ratings in the range of 3.7 to 4.1 on a 5.0 scale. The level of satisfaction compares favorably to the industry average.
6R1	O	Student satisfaction with the Student Center (Figure 6-5) has an unfavorable trend from 2000-2005 in four of five areas and only minimal improvement in the other area. In four of five areas, the 2005 level of performance compares unfavorably to the average of six peers.

- | | | |
|---------|---|---|
| 6R2 | S | Data presented on administrative support service processes shows that the organization operates within its budget (Figure 6-6), conserves energy at a level that compares favorably to the UW system and comprehensive average (Figure 6-8), maintains competitive tuition rates that are lower than 12 majors and 3 peers (Figure 6-10), and allocates the majority of the budget to instruction (60% in 03-04) which exceeds the UW comprehensive average and best comprehensive level (Figure 6-12). |
| 6R1,6R2 | O | Data are not provided for several measures of student and administrative support service processes mentioned as important in the Portfolio. These include room occupancy and building utilization, satisfaction with services other than dining and the student center, quality of services, access to services, and measures related to residence halls, physical plant other than energy efficiency, and university services other than security. |
| 6I1 | S | The organization improves its processes for supporting institutional operations through its continuous improvement process. Unit leaders monitor user feedback and performance indicators to identify new requirements or changing needs, determine targets for improvement, identify user satisfaction with current operations, and identify short-term improvement opportunities. |

AQIP CATEGORY 7: MEASURING EFFECTIVENESS

Measuring Effectiveness examines how your institution collects, analyzes, and uses information to manage itself and to drive performance improvement. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to collection, storage, management, and use of information and data – at the institutional and departmental/unit levels; institutional measures of effectiveness; information and data alignment with institutional needs and directions; comparative information and data; analysis of information and data; effectiveness of information system and processes; measures; analysis of results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of University of Wisconsin-Stout that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its Systems Portfolio section covering Category 7, Measuring Effectiveness:

Item Critical Characteristic

- 01c Values – excellence in teaching; high quality, student-centered; active learning; appropriate technology; scholarship and research; collaborative relationships; growth and development of students, faculty and staff; diversity of people, ideas and experiences; active involvement in shared governance; consensus building, teamwork; open and effective communication; and respectful, ethical behavior.
- 07a Competitors for students and faculty include other University of Wisconsin system universities, Minnesota public universities, and business and industry.
- 07b Competitive differentiators for students include reputation, focused mission, career-oriented programs, technology, support services, and job placement success rate. Differentiators for faculty include quality of laboratories and teaching facilities, technology, peer recognition, campus image, and opportunities for research and professional development.
- 07c Benchmarking on key competitive factors is done against other UW System comprehensive institutions and selected nationally recognized universities with a similar mission and/or curriculum. Major national university benchmarks are used to compare performance in key areas.
- 08b A culture of continuous quality improvement is necessary to meet strategic challenges. Examples of the culture include quality tools such as teaming, process management, and fact-based analysis; the first post-secondary institution to receive the Malcolm Baldrige award (2001); and joining AQIP (2002).

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as University of Wisconsin-Stout’s most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 7, Measuring Effectiveness.

<i>Item</i>	<i>S/O</i>	<i>Comment</i>
7P1	S	A four-step process is used to select, align, manage, and use information and data to support student learning, strategies, and improvement. The steps include selection of indicators aligned to strategic and annual plans, identification of targets, assurance of data integrity, and evaluation of the effectiveness of the measures. Seventeen key performance measures have been identified to serve as indicators of overall institutional effectiveness (Figure 7-2). On a semi-annual basis, the Chancellor’s Advisory Council, Provost’s Council, and ASLS review and revise the performance measures.

- 7P2 S Several methods are used to determine needs for information and data collection, storage, and accessibility. Data collection, analysis and distribution processes are managed through DATATEL. Implementation teams that include user representatives meet biweekly to identify data needs. Technology and Information Services uses data collected from forums, focus groups, online surveys and help desk interactions to identify user data access and availability needs. In 2005, the organization formed an Information Technology Advisory Committee with responsibility for strategic technology planning.
- 7P3 S Needs and priorities for comparative data are identified during the strategic planning process, during program and unit performance reviews, and as part of performance improvement initiatives. Criteria for selection of comparative information are detailed in Figure 7-6 and include collection of data from peers, best practices, national databases, and competitor information.
- 7P4 S The Chancellor's Advisory Council summer retreat is the primary mechanism for analyzing overall organizational performance and progress on strategic plans. Correlations, projections, and external and internal information are analyzed by committees, councils, and senates. Results of the analyses are communicated to management and stakeholders through formal reports, newsletters, the website, and at forums.
- 7P5 O It is unclear what process is used to ensure operational activities, analyses, and outcomes align with the goals and plans described in 7P4. Broad participation, widespread access to data, and review and feedback loops are mentioned in the Portfolio as methods for aligning performance analyses but it is not clear how the organization ensures that the alignment has actually occurred. For example, it is not clear how the organization ensures that analyses completed by a committee, council, or senate are shared at the unit level.
- 7P6,7P7 S The effectiveness of information systems is ensured through a variety of methods including involving users in hardware and software selection, incident reporting, use of standardized software, providing user support and interfaces, use of redundant hardware and connections, and training of faculty, students, and staff when new applications are brought online.

Figure 7-9 details the methods used to ensure system reliability, accuracy, timeliness, accessibility, availability, validity, security, confidentiality, standardization, and ownership.

- 7R1 S Results for student ratings on active learning (Figure 7-3) show a favorable trend increasing from 50 in 2001 to 55 in 2004 which compares favorably to the national and masters data. Results data on student ratings on working with other students on projects during class (Figure 7-4) show a favorable trend for seniors growing from 2.88 to 2.94 which compares favorably to UW System, masters, and national data.
- 7R1 S Results data for user satisfaction with help desk services (Figure 7-5) have been consistently between 7 and 8 on a 10 point scale since July 2004.
- 7R1 S The organization has been successful in generating tuition revenue beyond the mandated target since 1999-00 (Figure 7-8) with the percentage of excess increasing from 4.4% in 1999-00 to 11.0% in 2002-03. The excess tuition revenue enables the organization to fund unique priorities and strategic goals.
- 7R1 O Results data are not presented for several measures of information and data collection, analysis, and use that are mentioned in the Portfolio. These include number of help desk interactions, information technology user satisfaction, and system availability, uptime and response time.
- 7R2 O No data were provided in Figures 7-5, 7-8, and 7-10 to compare results with other institutions of higher education.
- 7I1 S Process improvement of systems for measuring effectiveness is accomplished through a support unit performance indicators review system, coordination and centralized management of surveys, and control of access through a web portal.

AQIP CATEGORY 8: PLANNING CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Planning Continuous Improvement examines your institution's planning processes and how your strategies and action plans are helping you achieve your mission and vision. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to institutional vision; planning; strategies and action plans; coordination and alignment of strategies and action plans; measures and performance projections; resource needs; faculty, staff, and administrator capabilities; measures; analysis of performance projections and results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of University of Wisconsin-Stout that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its *Systems Portfolio* section covering Category 8, Planning Continuous Improvement:

Item Critical Characteristic

- 01b Mission, Vision, and Values plus strong employer relationships drive an emphasis on integrated theoretical and practical instruction reinforced by extensive technology laboratories and experiential learning described as “hands-on, minds-on” active learning.
- 07c Benchmarking on key competitive factors is done against other UW System comprehensive institutions and selected nationally recognized universities with a similar mission and/or curriculum. Major national university benchmarks are used to compare performance in key areas.
- 08a Overall objective is to be the school of choice for the 21st century. Key opportunities and vulnerabilities include:
8. offering high quality, challenging academic programs that influence and respond to a changing society
 9. preserving and enhancing educational processes through the application of active learning principles
 10. promoting excellence in teaching, research, scholarship, and service
 11. recruiting and retaining a diverse university population
 12. fostering a collegial, trusting, and tolerant environment
 13. providing safe, accessible, effective, efficient, and inviting physical facilities
 14. providing responsive, efficient, and cost-effective (educational support) programs and services.

- 08b A culture of continuous quality improvement is necessary to meet strategic challenges. Examples of the culture include quality tools such as teaming, process management, and fact-based analysis; the first post-secondary institution to receive the Malcolm Baldrige award (2001); and joining AQIP (2002).
- 08c Improvement opportunities are identified through strategic and annual planning, Baldrige/AQIP assessment and feedback and improvement reviews.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as University of Wisconsin-Stout's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 8, Planning Continuous Improvement.

<i>Item</i>	<i>S/O</i>	<i>Comment</i>
8P1	SS	The strategic planning process (Figure 8-2) is used to identify long-term/enduring and Focus 2010 goals and short-term action plans. The process is grounded in and aligned to the vision, mission, and values; takes advantage of SWOT methodology for situational analysis; uses other quality tools including futurists and predictive instruments to identify opportunities and trends; and uses data to identify opportunities for improvement. The process involves key leaders and key stakeholders and is part of a comprehensive cycle of planning and improvement. The strategic planning process drives the annual priorities development, budget, and resource allocation processes (Figure 8-3). The final plan is communicated through organization-wide forums and is posted on the web.
8P2	S	Short- and long-term strategies are selected as part of the summer retreat process that includes a review of emerging issues at the national, state, and local level; progress on the current strategic plan; organizational performance data; survey data; current priorities; and financial information. A variety of plans are created including the academic, diversity, information technology, capital budget, and marketing plans as well as individual division plans. Over 30% of university employees participate in facilitated group discussions of short-term priorities and provide feedback to the Strategic Planning Group.
8P3	S	A template is used to convert short-term strategies into action plans. The template includes identification of the steps required to accomplish the

strategic priority, who is responsible, the timeline, and measures to be used to track progress.

- 8P4 O It is not clear what process is used to develop individual unit action plans and ensure they are in alignment with organization-level plans. While the planning processes include both a top-down and bottom-up perspective, it is not clear how the organization ensures that Chancellor's Advisory Council members ensure individual planning activities of major units reflect organization-level initiatives.
- 8P5 S The Strategic Planning Group has identified 17 performance indicators for the organization's goals, priorities, and action plans that measure levels of success, create a balanced focus, enable root cause analysis, and provide a focus on organization-wide process performance. Performance targets are set using previous performance, comparative data, and benchmarking studies of best practices. The organization's objective is to sustain a leadership position or close gaps to achieve greater competitive levels. Data on the performance indicators and other information sources are used to identify gaps between the organization's performance and identified benchmarks.
- 8P6 S The organization identifies resource needs as part of the strategy selection and action plan implementation processes. The Strategic Planning Group provides resource principles for making resource allocation decisions and the organization has developed a process to identify human, fiscal, and facility needs as part of the annual priority setting process. The process for identifying needs and allocating resources is open and participatory and includes checks and balances to ensure the overall organizational mission is supported.
- 8P7 O It is not clear what process is used to ensure professional development programs are aligned and integrated with organizational strategies and action plans. For example, it is not clear what type of training has been identified to help the organization increase its scores on the student satisfaction survey, increase the number of grants submitted, improve graduation rates, or address key opportunities and vulnerabilities such as offering high quality, challenging academic programs that influence and respond to a changing society.

- 8R1 S Results data for the 17 performance indicators used to track progress on strategies and action plans are reported throughout the Portfolio. Results reported include high-level performance data, segmented or detail-level data, and comparative data. These data enable administrators to monitor and analyze performance for their units and compare it to benchmark levels.
- 8R2 OO It is not clear how the organization used benchmarking to set the 2010 performance targets in Figure 8-4. The organization's stated goal is to sustain clear leadership or close gaps to achieve greater competitive levels, yet many of the 2010 targets do not appear to put the organization in a leadership position. For example, on retention rates, the 2010 target is 80% which equals the UW FY03 average but is below the FY03 best level of 86% and the Peer 2 FY 03 performance of 90% (Figure 1-13). Similar issues exist for most of the targets in Figure 8-4 making it unclear how the organization will achieve and/or sustain a leadership level and address its overall objective to be the school of choice for the 21st century.
- 8R3 OO Data are not provided in Figure 8-4 on how the 2010 targets compare with other education institutions or organizations outside of the education community. In most cases, the 2010 targets seem to be based on current levels of performance and do not appear to achieve the organization's goal of a leadership position.
- 8R4 O Results data are not provided for the satisfaction survey of the Board of Regents, the campus climate survey on satisfaction with budget actions, and annual planning meeting effectiveness surveys (results for 2005 only are provided in Figure 8-5).
- 8R4 S Favorable results on key performance indicators, feedback from the Baldrige Award process, and feedback from professional organizations indicate that the organization's continuous improvement system is achieving positive results and is moving the institution forward in line with its goals.

AQIP CATEGORY 9: BUILDING COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

Building Collaborative Relationships examines your institution's relationships – current and potential – to analyze how they contribute to the institution's accomplishing its mission. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to identification of key internal and external collaborative relationships; alignment of key collaborative relationships; relationship creation, prioritization, building; needs identification; internal relationships; measures; analysis of results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of University of Wisconsin-Stout that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its *Systems Portfolio* section covering Category 9, Building Collaborative Relationships:

Item Critical Characteristic

- 01c Values – excellence in teaching; high quality, student-centered; active learning; appropriate technology; scholarship and research; collaborative relationships; growth and development of students, faculty and staff; diversity of people, ideas and experiences; active involvement in shared governance; consensus building, teamwork; open and effective communication; and respectful, ethical behavior.
- 01d Three governance bodies make up the shared governance decision-making function responsible for the formation, development and review of policies: Faculty Senate, Senate of Academic Staff, and Student Association. The Chancellor's Advisory Council is the core of the leadership system; is comprised of university leaders, faculty, staff, students, and foundation members; and is designed to flatten the organization structure, encourage two-way communication, and emphasize participatory decision making.
- 03b Target markets include high school and technical school students, and potential transfer or graduate students. Student segments include: at risk, disabled, minority, or adult/continuing education students.
- 04 Collaborative relationships include five key stakeholder groups who provide opportunities to enhance and improve programs and services: feeder schools, employers, alumni, the community, and the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as University of Wisconsin-Stout's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 9, Building Collaborative Relationships.

Item S/O Comment

- 9P1 O It is not clear what process is used to create, prioritize, and build relationships with educational institutions who provide students, educational institutions and employers who receive students, organizations that provide services, the general community, and external agencies and associations. In addition, although there is cross-participation by individuals on committees and councils, it is not clear what process is used to coordinate partnerships and collaborative relationships on an organization-wide basis to avoid duplication or to identify strategic gaps.
- 9P2 O It is not clear how the varying needs of partners and collaborative relationships are integrated with the organization-level continuous improvement process. Although the Portfolio states that it ensures that the varying needs of those involved in relationships are being met through the routine collection of feedback, limited data on partner satisfaction or comparison of satisfaction to other educational institutions are provided.
- 9P3 O It is not clear how the organization creates and builds relationships within the organization and assures integration and communication across these relationships. The Chancellor's Advisory Council, the senates, the Provost's Council, and the Outreach Marketing Committee are mentioned in the Portfolio as responsible for building internal relationships and providing communication links and the organization uses a participatory strategic planning process that is designed to enable communication about internal and external partnerships, but it is unclear what process is used to build internal relationships and accomplish communication with people who are not members of the councils and committees.
- 9P4 S Measures of the effectiveness of collaborative partnerships are provided by the Budget, Planning, and Analysis unit and include external funding sources, training contracts, economic impact studies, tech transfer agreements, non-credit enrollment, articulation agreements, and partner satisfaction.
- 9R1 S Northwest Wisconsin Manufacturing Outreach Center (NWMOC) customer satisfaction results (Figure 9-2) show a favorable trend with satisfaction increasing from 4.53 in 1999-00 to 4.69 in 2003-04. This level of performance results in NIST ranking the NWMOC as one of the top five nationwide.

- 9R1 S Data on economic impact shows a consistent level of performance from 1999-00 to 2003-04. During this period, the number of technical assistance services provided has ranged from 191 to 211 activities and from 90-107 companies (Figure 9-3), the savings in millions has ranged from \$13.4 million to \$15.7 million, and jobs created or retained has ranged from 107-140 (Figure 9-4).
- 9R1 S The number of conferences and workshops offered increased from 20 in 2000-01 to 35 in 2004-05 (Figure 9-11) and the number of registrations increased from just over 5,000 to 10,000 over the same time period (Figure 9-12). This represents an increase in the enrollment per conference from 265 to 286.
- 9R1,9R2 O Trend data are not provided for several measures of building collaborative relationships including Stout Technology Park statistics (Figure 9-5), External Funding (Figure 9-6), Contracts Submitted (Figure 9-7), Economic Impact of Partnerships (Figure 9-13), and Financial Analysis of Extension-Based Revenue (Figure 9-14). Comparative data are not provided for any of the results. As a result, it is not clear whether the reported levels of performance have been sustained over time or how the results compare to other organizations.