Comment Cards

Learning Community
- Interpersonal skills
- Join together learning community and academic programs
- Will the students live in dorms?
- How will the Menomonie community feel about 12 months of students?
- Include classified staff!
- Having enough time to attend to each student. Increasing the class sizes and paperloads inevitably decreases time available for each student, including responses to each students’ work
- Global education. We should focus on how to educate our students to be globally connected.
- Modify the calendar
- Create flexible delivery systems
- Modify the calendar
- Maintain applied learning value
- Examine and clarify roles of unclassified and classified staff
- Stress learning as basis of university work, both for teachers and students
- Innovate gen ed to best in region
- Can we win a “learning” Baldrige?
- Besides students, develop expectations of and for faculty; academic staff is just as important.
- How can the library play a central role in the learning community?
- Develop expectations of and for students; evaluate existing expectations
- Needs of people need to be met
- People skills, people skills, people skills
- Flexible delivery systems need to focus on the educational value not the market value
- Schedule classes on Fridays, currently most classes are Monday through Thursday; possibly create Fridays as an interaction day for students to interact with the faculty members (open labs, etc.)
- What does incorporate ethic and civic values mean?
- It’s more basic, are we teaching/education or training?
- Amplification of speaker in classroom
- Balanced teachers
- Faculty and academic staff are working at 150% already. What has their compensation been? Would implementing more on-line courses be a relief for them or just more work? Would this affect the university experience as a whole?
- Provide events and campus community so that students don’t leave for the weekend to go home

Academic Programs
- Stress the building block essential of getting a strong grounding in General Education; develop writing skills, communication and speaking skills, and overall knowledge of the basics.
- What Americans lack over world wide education is science, math, English in relation to specific careers
- Use of seminars to encourage interdisciplinary learning; limit the number of students (team oriented)
- We need to define those things that we want to keep as well
- New credit grading system: what about transfer students, how will they fit?
- Strengthening program advisory committees can offer many benefits. Some programs would do better if industry advisory committees met separately from on-campus program committees
- That focus on international education with emphasis on general education requirements that allow more international students on campus
• Strengthen program advisory committees
• Convert grad programs to customized instruction
• Develop outcome based programs
• Strengthen program advisory committees
• Relate credit changes to fulltime employee definition
• Involve business and industry, key stakeholders and other stakeholders
• Increased intellectual and financial support of general education and the liberal arts
• Develop outcome-based programs; please expound on this. How is it different from what we do now?
• Advisory committees, budget for participation expenses, e.g. travel, meals
• Strengthen current programs to allow them to change with society’s needs, not new programs
• The university needs to take a much stronger stand on phasing out out-dated and unsuccessful programs
• What effort is being made to be visionary in our academic programs?
• How do you plan to strengthen program-advising committee when cutting and taking from program directors?
• Return or start to focus on being an excellent education institution, rather than a training school
• Would graduate customizing take away from undergrad or is the intent to separate students more? Would this change the difficulties with registering for undergrad customized programs?
• Customized instruction programs are a good idea but are often left behind in funding and instruction for small majors

Stout Technology Advantage
• Support is essential, it must increase as the expectations for on-line activities increase
• On-line service require staff time for development and maintenance of web presence and technology
• Hype about laptop program must be honest and geared toward students
• The marketing effort needs to be realistic, not bait and switch, promising lots of individual attention to students when the reality is students are processed in large numbers. Technology in and of itself does not provide individual attention.
• Distance education that extends internationally so as to take advantage of our uniqueness
• New public relations and marketing effort
• Continue our high tech abilities
• Use technology as a tool to enhance learning with or without walls
• The digital library
• Technology as a tool, not as the change agent
• New public relations and marketing effort
• Recognize needs of different faculty, staff and students for different forms of technology
• Statewide polytechnic, link directly up with high schools and prove to them what the Stout Advantage is!
• What advantage? Technology burden; will reduce admission/retention
• We need to use technology to make things easier, not to use it just because we have it
• How to use e-scholar portfolio, step by step directions
• E-scholar should work in all browsers, not just Internet Explorer
• T & N should have direct control over the network
• Change color of E-scholar to school colors
• My hot-mail account has never been down, yet my Stout e-mail is down every month

Restructure for Efficiency and Effectiveness
• Is “efficiency” the factor that we’re looking for in education
• Program clustering is well worth exploring
• Create a school beyond a school
• UW-SPI (Stout Polytechnic Institute)
• Yes, get flatter
• Could a cohort of faculty be changed into a cohort of students for one year?
• Develop a transition team with clear goals, objectives and timelines, and communicate, communicate, communicate
• Return to small classrooms; fewer students per class
• More writing required throughout the curriculum
• Teaching and learning are often very inefficient processes. Business models do not apply to education matters. Put more emphasis on individualism, less on bureaucratic methods. There are too many “rules”; too many clichés at work hereabouts.
• Continue balanced focus at Stout, technology and humanity
• Create a school within a school
• Eliminate Dean’s office
• This is an exciting area, as long as the focus is on student learning and their roles as citizens and employers/employees is the forefront
• We will never have a school within a school with the present business office climate; not much emphasis on quality education
• Vastly decrease upper administrative levels; combine I-94 school administration
• How do we resolve efficiency with quality?
• Customized instruction courses are good!
• If we combine a lot of click vs. brick are we going to take away from the whole university experience? Are we going to take away from students or even faculty?
• T & N should control the entire network, not split up; Residence Life should not control the network
• More knowledgeable staff at ASK5000
• Phase out computer modules
• Vanguard should be quicker

General Comments

Develop a liberal arts program with a strong technology component; the idea is to provide students with a higher order of skills needed to deal with changes throughout their careers

Increase focus on grad education and global delivery; the quality of the scholar practitioner model

The challenge is to meet these “driving forces of change” without deviating from our core values; pay attention to the true meaning of diversity

The MIT model is an excellent model to follow! Let’s go for it!

If we are currently providing the core values needed by society, we need to make sure this is strengthened, not lost, during this time of change. The Applied Science could support the Allied Health Careers if it is allowed to expand.

Spend less money on athletes and more on academics; consolidate similar departments into one unit

How about fund raising, going out pounding the street to bring in a billion more dollars?
Tuition is not as big an issue as we seem to think; some research suggests that people are willing to pay more for quality. What if we expected more from out students; does Harvard worry about these things? If we are good at what we do, people will come. We need to attack the “when in doubt” belief.

We need a clearly defined mission that includes excellence in education. What is it about Stout that makes us so fearful about Phoenix and DeVry?

We also need to be proud of our facilities not ashamed. Our support staff (custodians) needs to feel pride in the work they do. We do not have this at all now! Examples: continuous dust bunnies, general filth, etc in the Fryklund Hall building. Have Diane Moen and Chancellor Sorensen walk through there and observe it first hand. This does not project pride in our school; direct impact to students and their parents who observe this on tours.

How about fund raising efforts?

You will not get honest and open comments at these meetings, or the input you need. The types of comments people were making were deferential and politically correct. They were not the types of comments people are making to each other in private or in small groups. People feel that technology is taking precedence to sound education, good teaching and good learning. They feel their professional expertise is not being honored. They feel the Chancellor holds these meetings only to get input he wants to hear. If this continues it will build and build. There will be another vote of no confidence.

We need to focus more on what good teaching is; how do we know if it is occurring? Where is the strategic program to improve teaching? Where is the emphasis to improve service? Where is the emphasis to improve scholarship?

There is TOO MUCH emphasis on technology. Stout’s strength is in the classroom and lab activities. No matter what technology is available MOST people prefer the classroom environment for learning; history shows that technologies developed over the last 50 years have not SIGNIFICANTLY changed the way most people prefer to learn, in a classroom with other students and an instructor.

Here! Here! To Bob Meyer’s comment that the best is to balance continuity with change. Thanks for recognizing what we are doing well.

Stout was developed and has grown as a “blue collar” school. Our primary core value is “work.” Regardless of delivery mode, our instruction must continue to provide opportunities for student to find a career.

In order to facilitate change, people need to have the freedom and resources to act differently. Thanks for including us.

I heard a very narrow specialized version of faculty research and scholarship. I would not be able to function intellectually under such a definition. Why can’t we lobby and argue for more state support? I do not like all of the attention given to “teams”. I believe we need more individuals, in university teaching. There is far too much conformity out there.

I’m a student, worried about keeping the quality in education in 2010 as the priority, before the issue of money. I may be a minority in this concern, but there must be more like myself.

It’s not too soon to begin planning for 2010. Administration needs to set an example, a model for change. Pay attention to demographics.
Support contacting employers, schools, business, industry, etc and ask what are their expectations; sports are important, be calendar careful.
The thoughts regarding flexible delivery, modified calendars, customized instruction absolutely thrill me. Coming from a higher ed institution that operates under this mode, I know how effective this can be! I look forward to assisting and operating under this model!

The focus group sessions are a good beginning, however, I would like to see a serious dialogue when we get to the implementation stages. I would also like to see that all these ideas are not just sitting on a shelf somewhere collecting dust.

These focus sessions are well worth having. I’m pleased to work for an administration that looks well ahead and plans proactively, rather than hopes for the status quo, then reacts too late in panic.

The administrators often come off sounding defensive/condescending. Please remember we have not had the benefit of drafting and researching these priorities before today. Listen before you reply. Many of the ideas are interesting and worth looking in to. Resources to support and implement changes will always be an issue. For example: Tech advantage, all technology must be supported with staff, including our ever growing web site and ever expanding on-line course presence. How can we better staff these and provide training (comprehensive and lasting training) to necessary faculty/staff? This needs to be resolved before we can move forward. Also, marketing resources are dwindling via the legislature and a real plan that identifies an audience and a message must be developed.

New staff doesn’t necessarily know who people are other than the Chancellor. Maybe have people say their name and area of study/work before making comments.

I would like to see more focus on excellence, graduate education and the promotion of programs that have achieved excellence. Change is a good thing when programs are not working well. However, several programs are “customizing” their instruction already; these need to be recognized for their effort and used as models for less healthy programs.

We are frustrated, angry and anxious about our future and that of our students, we don’t feel listened to, we don’t feel our views are truly listened to, we are asked to participate and be leaders, but we feel as though the decision are already made. Lip service to the decisions, focus 2010 sounds almost like the charter. Words have changed, emphasis has not; are we pushing for efficiency at the expense of quality? Yes. More work and less pay, the breaking point is here, undermining faculty governance. Students and faculty have taken most of hits; equity of loads has NOT been addressed. Not all disciplines are facilitated with technology; one CANNOT become an excellent teacher or counselor or psychologist on the computer. If we express a difference of opinion, we are shot down.

Registering for class, more “study” rooms, “study choice”, up to date rental movies, not enough “free” things, events that are more appealing, more classes offered (time slots), teachers are here to teach and should have fewer administration duties

There are difficulties with registration

Students are still in the vision but we are concerned about overlooking student development. Technology is only a means to achieve this, although extremely important and ever vital to a students’ education process development, it is second to people development. These processes when developed are useless without people participation. Which is another reason to look at how far we are pushing our faculty and staff.
Reliability of the school’s computer network is very important.

Short introduction of who was facilitating (speaking/writing) and their roles would have been helpful for individuals who haven’t been here long or others who might need a refresher.

Regarding web-based courses and technology integration, are additional trainings or materials needed to ensure a quality learning experience? Instructionally, student services-wise, student and instructor expectations, and how-tos require thoughtful attention. Are students ahead of us on this? How do we adapt our systems to do both bricks and web well, especially student affairs/services areas (class and university orientation, records, etc)?

How are the core values of the institution reflected in this focus? There seemed to be a separation in what the group understood and what was reflected in the document. If our context of how we work with these core values is changing—how should this be reflected? How clear are those core values within the existing community? How are the core values communicated to new members of our community? Reinforced with current members? And..how do we encourage an adaptive flow around these concepts?

While some connections can be made, how is student development addressed for the future? How will we encourage the social and personal development of students outside of the classroom? What if those students aren’t physically present on campus? As administrators, instructors and staff, we know that most of our time is spent managing interpersonal communication issues, regardless of how technically able we are. How do we provide assistance to prepare our students with these skills?

Will our students really know what skills/education they need with outcome based programs? While we can provide a list, ultimately how is that different than the current process of a degree plan and course syllabus? My concern isn’t that this is a bad paradigm shift, rather would it just be a change in thinking while utilizing a similar system with a student thinking…”Here’s my new set of hoops to jump through?” Instead of, “Here’s what I really need and want to learn so that I do this?” A leap to outcomes based programs would relinquish huge amounts of control to the student. Are we ready for that? With the shifting power differential, what kind of support structures need to be in place for our faculty and staff to manage this type of anxiety producing change? And how do we work with the service providers to allow students this much freedom in a hierarchal system? In a flatter system? It’s similar to the difference between supervising student employees and advising a student organization. Advising may be more difficult and time consuming because you don’t have the authority to make people do something, you have to persuade and influence the direction of the group without making decisions for them.

Is service learning meant to be part of this? Where?

I am concerned at the lack of discussion regarding diversity as an issue. While women and the Hispanic population growth are discussed as student characteristics, there was no mention of an increased population of diverse faculty members, nor of other racial, cultural or international populations. The other bulleted items under student characteristics were hit heavily throughout the information. What will we do to attract a diverse student population, meet their needs and meet the needs of our (currently) majority student who will need to know how to live and work within an increasingly diverse population? What processes do we have in place to manage the conflicts that will be part of this change?

**Student.** Who do we anticipate our student will be in 2010 or, better yet, 2030? Where will they come to us from (e.g., culturally, experientially, generationally) and where will they be interacting with or drawing upon the expertise, resources, and opportunities available through UW-Stout? Which student do we want to have as primary customer? To what extent do we advance our strategic planning if we assume that that student is residential, state, cyber, national, or global-based? How possible might it be that our student
will acquire their degree, certificate, skills, and/or credential based upon a single physical location of the institution? What might be the relationship of our student to this institution across a learner life-span (as opposed to 4 years)? What symbiotic relationships will develop between teacher-student, student-expert, expert-teacher, teacher-expert during that learner life-span that change the paradigm for the teaching, mentoring function of faculty? What different functions (broker, referral agent, intellectual pod) will an institution have to take on to service this student? What functions might be shared, developed, and needed to service students who touch us through partner entities (business, government, science, education)? How do we envision this transformation occurring by 2007, 2012, 2017, 2022, or 2027?

**Federal Funding Sources.** These observations are only based upon my experiences with four or five federal agencies, but they may be relevant to how we look to federal funding for research, development, and support for academic and infra-structure development. As I see it, more research dollars are being directed toward policy solutions that apply to large segments of the US population (or international populations). There are more demands and expectations that projects are of national significance and that such projects will be carried out through multi-university, multi-site, multi-national confederations of expertise in research, development, and resource management. There is clearly fiercer (and more strategic) competition for research dollars paired with higher standards of accountability for research outcomes (as opposed to outputs), expected value-added, significance of contribution, and evidence of replicable solutions to persistent (or “problem de juer”): In education (skills, school-to-work transition, graduation), civil (safety, product reliability, rights), social (poverty, underemployment, equitable access), and systems (medical costs, viability of Social Security).

At the same time, larger, multi-million dollar contracts are increasingly being award to collaboratives (e.g., Research Triangle, UC system) and to corporations (including for-profit spin-offs of university R&D) to conduct the policy, research, and development projects typically granted to universities (in much smaller amounts through competitive processes) or to perform essential management functions of federal agencies. Consider the increased importance of *Business Commerce Daily* versus the *Federal Register*, sizes of the awards reported in the *BCD*, and use of “expedited” contracts for to outsource administrative functions (including policy research) by federal agencies. There are obvious reasons to do this: Lower the cost for public infrastructure (reduce number of federal employees); lessen need for “fair” competition that underlie grant making processes; get past the patchwork of solutions that may come through such competitive process from a dozen dissimilar studies; increase capability to take on larger problems; get beyond traditional project periods set in legislation; and finally, impose greater control over the time, course, resources, and ultimately cost of achieved or desired solutions. A very big piece seems to be reducing the cost/unit for a solution, a research finding, or a policy change.

These could mean several things for Stout and how we envision federal funding resources as part of the institutions resources (programmatic, as well as fiscal) and how we approach these potentially more valuable sources for the university: (a) Create different relationships (e.g., pursue more partnerships with “leader” institutions); (b) increase our efforts to influence what will be fundable through agencies (i.e., press policy or program issues at the federal level that are particular to our institution capabilities and perspectives through our congressional delegation and presence at federal agencies); (c) reconsider how we direct our funding development energies (e.g., balance given to institutional level versus investigator interests); (d) put significant resources (dollars, most capable faculty) into developing both the sources and into achieving funded contracts and grants; and (e) reconceptualize the scholarship function of faculty and staff (e.g., as primary versus secondary to teaching).

I do have a concern, however, that was not voiced in this morning's session nor has it been specifically mentioned in any of the written documents I have found. I am more of a process kind of person, concerned not so much with WHAT is taught but HOW we go about this business of educating our students. Hopefully going through this visioning process, we can ALL refocus on the students we serve.
The entire campus could use a good workshop on service management, in my opinion. I find numerous examples each week of some faculty member or support staff that does not exemplify the student-centered business we are involved in every day. This is not a Pollyannaish observation! As we make greater use of the technology tools we have available, there seems to be an even more important role of service we, as educators or support staff, must provide our students in face-to-face encounters, email messages or telephone conversations. Is it too much to ask an office assistant in a departmental office to be helpful to students who have questions? Or is it impossible for someone in the Business Office to view the support they offer me in operating The Niche as part of the educational endeavor we are ALL here for?

We have many GOOD, student-oriented faculty and staff members on campus, but there are DEFINITE improvements that could be made. I believe the new freshmen advisement process is a positive change. As a program director, I was ill-equipped to provide some types of information or advice requested by my advisees. Now, at least for the first year, we have a support team for the students and I'm glad to be part of the process.

We have grand themes going forward for 2010....I'd just like to see some of the little things taken care of as well.

What kind of workplace climate is conducive to the creation of ideas. What leadership values reinforce an atmosphere of creativity and risk taking. How are teams promoted. How do we find the SME? Many of the Baldrige values and processes support creativity. Is there essential training needed? Do we define our internal stakeholders?