

University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee
2030 Think Tank
Meeting Minutes

January 15, 2020, 1:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Lubar Entrepreneurship Center - Jendusa Conference Room

Present: Jennifer Doering, Kathy Dolan, Jackie Fredrick, Scott Gronert, Alejandra Lopez, Margaret Noodin, Kris O'Connor, Wilkistar Otieno, James Peoples, Chia Vang, Leigh Wallace, Stan Yasaitis
Absent: Laretta Henderson, Connor Mathias, Paul Roebber
Guests: Pat Berger, Lori Craig, Pat Cronin, Bob Da Vita, Chris Fiasca, Carl Mueller, John Torinus

1. Approval of the agenda
The meeting was called to order at 1:06 p.m. and the agenda was approved.
2. Approval of the December 16, 2019 Minutes
The Minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Announcements
 - a. Mary Tagliavia is retiring – her last day is January 16, 2020.
 - b. Cheryl Andres will support the committee going forward.
 - c. Updates
 - i. The co-chairs met with Tom Luljak and hope to have him speak at a subsequent meeting.
 - ii. Drew Knab will meet with the committee on January 21.
 - iii. The committee would still like to meet with Amanda Braun.
 - iv. Committee members expressed an interest in having the new deans present their strategic plans. However, it is unclear if they're ready to do that. It was noted that College of Health Sciences Dean Tim Behrens and Lubar School of Business Dean Kaushal Chari have interesting ideas on moving forward.
 - v. Kris O'Connor met with Chancellor Mone and Provost Britz.
 - vi. Paul Roebber has been pursuing an initiative around experiential learning. The idea is to have every student who graduates complete some kind of experiential learning.
4. Review UWM Mission
O'Connor and Doering prefaced the discussion by stating that the goal of the task force is not to change the UWM Mission, but to ground ourselves in what we want to do in the future and what we want to retain and highlight. Are there any parts of the mission that the university is at risk of not meeting going forward?

The discussion focused on the challenges the university faces in meeting our mission as smaller campus? How do we deal with programs and budget models with fewer students on campus? Most of the aspirational mission and vision statements are put at risk by declining enrollment. Much of our current mission is tied to how big we've been in the past.

Some on the community suggested that it is no longer feasible to be all things to everyone. If we want to grow, we need to focus on what we want to be excellent at. We need to align with our community and our growth sectors. To continue doing what we're doing does not distinguish us.

It was also pointed out that the current Select Mission Statement seems to be more of an array of goals and strategies. The mission should be a concise statement of who we are. It seems we first need to decide what we are. There are many layers, but we have to focus on the most important.

Given the long-term projected decrease in undergraduate, it was suggested that graduate education could be an area where we can grow.

There was a discussion regarding the campus's R1 status. If we lose R1 status, will we keep the top-tier research piece of our mission? Are we depleting scarce resources chasing this status at the expense of other programs?

The committee reviewed the campus Vision statement and discussed whether it is time to revisit. Is it okay as an aspirational goal? Deciding what to do with this statement will define the work of this group. The vision statement determines what we'll be for the next 10 years and beyond. There was general consensus that the overall aspirations in the vision still apply but are challenged by the reasons stated in the discussion of the campus mission. The

committee agreed that there is no reason why we can't be a top-tier research institution as the second largest university in the system in the largest city in the state. There are things the university can do to overcome the bad news we received at previous meetings. As a part of the discussion, one member of the committee highlighted three areas of focus for campus enrollment: Increase number of certificate programs; More scholarships; and making UWM a destination campus.

The committee revisited the overall charge of the committee, which is to think differently about what we can do as a campus. Several related questions were posed by the group: How can we leverage what we're doing well? We need to think outside the box and look beyond the constraints of what is. If we could be anything, what would that look like? Does this fit within the current vision or do we need to make changes? There was discussion of the challenge in balancing our teaching and research missions with limited resources and a recognition that the committee will need to explore ways to think differently about how faculty/staff fulfill these roles.

The committee briefly discussed the potential effects and opportunities if UW system pursues further regionalization in the future. As the committee begins to explore specific ideas regarding the future of UWM, various futures for the campus should be considered.

Our 6-year graduation rate is 44% but we'd like it to be higher than 50%. Aspirational goals might include a 60% 6-year graduation rate, which could be achieved in part by student success efforts and attracting high-achieving students. Striving for debt-free for our students and building on our work with veterans were also suggested as goals.

The committee discussed ways to attract more students by becoming their first choice institution, with a particular emphasis on attracting more high-achieving students.

5. University Innovation Alliance Discussion (www.theuia.org)

Reviewer guidelines: Please review your assigned university on the website above and be prepared to share what is listed for primary strategies for being innovative. What was the university doing differently that resulted in improved outcomes/targets?

a. ASU (Kris)

Leadership; operations, entrepreneurial (you raise what you spend), student success app, proactive advising, reframed access as a positive, they have a lot of money, massive online programs, branded as a destination campus, created a brand of quality, presidential (merit-based) scholarship, they're doing a better job with retention and graduation, growth part of the country, raised tuition, program alignment

b. Central Florida (Leigh)

c. Georgia State (James)

d. Iowa State (Kathy and Alejandra)

e. Kansas (Chia)

Made university more affordable, scholarships as high as \$40K, KU Pell advantage, lower ACT, lots of money, micro grants

f. Michigan State (Margaret)

Changes to programs, increased bridge programs, scholarships, experiencing extreme enrollment decline, strong advising.

g. Ohio State (Paul)

h. Oregon State (Paul)

i. Purdue (Jennifer)

j. UC-Riverside (Alejandra)

k. UT-Austin (Chia)

Goal to raise 4-year graduation rates from 51% to 71% (currently at 60%), changed the culture of graduation, focused on students who don't usually graduate in 4 years, \$5M grant for scholarships, rewards, to encourage graduation

l. UMBC and information about the Kern foundation funding for MCW curriculum revision (Jackie)

Phenomenal leader, high achieving, under-represented students, stem-focused, large, well-funded scholarship, total immersion around the student starting in high school, academic and social interaction, knowledge and skill development, monitoring, advising

m. International universities/Singapore, Canada (Margaret)

6. Panther Promoters

Several members of the Panther Promoters were able to attend. They provided a background on their group's formation: Following negative press about athletics a few years ago, a group of business leaders felt the need to do something to improve the image of UWM. They have regular meetings with Chancellor Mone, Vice Chancellor Luljak, and Vice Chancellor Borger. They reach out to regents and legislators who acknowledge that UWM is important but have no ideas on how to promote or improve the university. The Panther Promoters support UWM initiatives and are an informal group not affiliated with foundations (though some of them sit on boards). Members in attendance were:

Pat Cronin – business
John Torinus – research
Bob Da Vita – alum, health care
Lori Craig – PNC Bank
Chris Fiasca – alum, Northwestern Mutual
Carl Mueller – public relations

The committee chairs posed the question: Where do you think UWM should go on the next 10 years?

Their responses focused on UWM differentiating itself. Some suggestions were to focus on our access mission, innovation and research, partnerships, entrepreneurship, and health care. Several reiterated the benefits of our access mission the city and the state, and that affordability could be a point of focus. They also noted that UWM should position itself to meet the needs of employers in the city and the state. They provided their perspective on the future of UWM within UW System and how that could affect positioning of UWM for the future. A major focus of the group was that UWM needs to build a brand and a mindset as the second top-tier university in Wisconsin. Many other states have a flagship and another strong public research university (e.g., U Michigan/Michigan State).

7. Vice Chancellor Pat Borger – UWM Alumni Survey & Employer Feedback

VC Borger focused on two primary areas: Employer feedback and alumni attitudes:

Employer Feedback:

Business is desperate for UWM to provide qualified workers. Business also wants upskilling and reskilling for a technology-based work environment. Business wants more specific, competency-based certificates. They also want us to continue to provide access. The committee asked Pat for her vision for the university “in 40 words or less” Pat’s response: “Fulfilling the promise – our promise to our students that we will provide the tools they need to complete their degree on time, with minimal debt, and prepared to enter the workforce.” It’s our task to help our students meet the promise within themselves. Not enough to just provide scholarship. They need “wraparound” services. We need to institutionalize high-impact practices.

She will provide the committee with a report her office generated that listed top employers and the jobs they need filled.

Alumni Survey:

What students wanted, what they got, and what we’re doing about it. Valid +/- 3%

Overall, they’re very pleased with their time at UWM and would choose to go here again.

They want to be involved in a more meaningful way. They want networking experiences and would also like to be mentors and coaches to current students.

There was also a discussion of how funds from the recent comprehensive campaign can be used to support general student scholarships. She noted that a portion of the funds are unrestricted, but the majority is linked to specific donor interest areas. The committee recommended that a campaign to create a general student scholarship fund should be a priority in the near future

8. Future Scheduling

January 21 – Drew Knab (Budget)

January 24 – How to structure discussion

The committee discussed how to approach the next phase on January 24th, which is to brainstorm ways in which UWM can be positioned for success in ten years. The committee members expressed a desire to think outside the box to innovate in all aspects of UWM's operations, such as improving student success, better alignment with employer needs, reducing the cost of education, and re-focusing on making UWM a "best place to work":

Two possibilities proposed to structure session:

- a. Leigh's Appreciative Inquiry approach
- b. Brian Thompson's design thinking approach

Co-chairs will consult with Leigh and Brian to develop a plan for January 24th.

9. Wrap Up
 - a. Co-Chairs will touch base with Drew Knab regarding the January 21 meeting.
 - b. Co-Chairs will touch base with Leigh Wallace and Bryan Thompson regarding the structure of the January 24 meeting.
 - c. The committee will create a timeline for the report at its January 24 meeting.
10. The meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m.