

UW-Sheboygan Campus Assessment Report, 2007
Prepared by Karl Byrand, Ph.D.,
Campus Assessment Coordinator

I. Summary of Assessment Goals

For academic year 2006-2007 the University of Wisconsin-Sheboygan (UW-S) had chosen to continue to assess its strategic plan. In its plan, the campus had generated multiple goals that it wished to achieve over the next several years. These goals can be placed into six broad categories that include

- Student success
- Faculty/staff success
- Community interaction
- Physical and fiscal needs
- Campus of first choice
- College experience

Since these categories themselves are numerous and varied in their content, during the academic year 2006-2007, UW-S only focused on two of the above categories: student success and college experience. As a way to assess these categories the campus engaged in a broad-based assessment of the services it provided to its students. It furthermore assessed the overall effectiveness of the various campus committees. During this year, UW-S created an assessment plan that focused on four specific areas of assessment (Details of the assessment may be found in the attached UW-S Campus Assessment Plan in Appendix I). These areas are listed below with their specific sub areas and committees:

- Campus functional area assessment
 - Business Office
 - Continuing Education
 - Dean's Office/Campus Services
 - Library
 - Maintenance
 - Student Services
 - University Relations
- Campus committee assessment
 - Appointments
 - Athletic Committee
 - Curriculum Committee
 - Engaging Students in the First Year (ESFY) Committee
 - Information Instructional Technology (IITC) Committee
 - Professional Evaluation Committee (PEC)
 - Special Programs Committee
 - Steering Committee

- Student Aids, Awards, and Appeals
- Environmental Health and Safety Committee

- Student government assessment

II. Assessment Tools and Methodology

Campus Functional Area/Special Programs Committee/Student Government Association Assessment

For their assessment, the campus functional areas, came up with their own questions, and a few of these areas administered the assessment on their own (i.e., the campus library and continuing education). The functional areas who chose to engage in the assessment this way determined their own methodology for the administration of their respective assessments, to whom they were going to administer them, as well as the sample size.

Other functional areas, however (i.e., the campus business office and university relations) chose to place their assessment questions into one tool that could be administered to campus students at the same time (Appendix II). The campus Special Programs Committee (SPC) and the campus Student Government Association (SGA) likewise chose to administer its assessment with this collective tool. The methodology for the administration of this particular assessment was to have the functional areas, the SPC and the SGA phrase their assessment questions in a way that the responses could be recorded on a scantron form. This would therefore allow question responses to be easily tabulated and analyzed. In addition to the scantron responses, there was also a “free-response” section for University Relations and the SPC that allowed students to write in comments in greater detail. In order to generate as large of a sample size as possible, a general call was made to campus faculty and IAS to administer the functional area assessment questionnaire in their classes. In the classes that the tool was administered, students were urged to fill out the assessment form (it was, however, made clear to them that it was optional) and were also told not to fill the form out if they had already done so in another class. All told, there were 218 students who responded to the functional area/SPC/SGA survey administered in this fashion (the statistical summaries for this data may be found in Appendix III).

Campus Committee Assessment

In order to undertake this broad-based assessment initiative the campus Steering Committee met with the CAC in 2006 and determined that a universal tool would be the most efficient and accurate way to assess the various campus committees. As such, the Steering Committee and the CAC designed a universal questionnaire that could be administered to all of the campus committees being assessed. The same questionnaire that was used last academic year was used this year as well (Appendix IV). The employed method was that the tool was administered to each member of each assessed campus committee. Once filled out, the individual committee members were to submit their responses to the committee chair who would then generate a summary of the responses and then forward that on to the CAC as an individual campus

committee assessment report (the results of which may be found below in the Campus Committee Assessment Report section). Because of its more direct relationship and impact on the student population, the Special Programs Committee chose not to use this questionnaire, but rather surveyed a sample of the student population (see Appendix II).

These several assessment tool formats allowed us to cover as broad of a spectrum of the campus population as possible, as well as generate a good sample size.

III. Campus Assessment Reports: Functional Units

Below is a summary of the assessment conducted by the various campus functional units.

Campus Business Office

Overall the data suggests that the majority of those surveyed believe Business Services (BS) is performing at either a fair, good or excellent (positive indicators) level. Of the five questions posed; for each answer, between 88.5% and 92.7% of those surveyed indicated a performance indicator of fair, good or excellent.

The question receiving the most positive answer of a 92.7% positive indicator score suggests that patrons of BS believe the staff members communicate in a friendly manner. Conversely, the question receiving the least positive answer of a 88.5% positive indicator score indicates that there is a greater opportunity for improvement as it relates to a patron's feeling of importance when interacting with the staff members. The overall satisfaction rating of BS received a positive indicator level of 91.3%. For all questions asked, 31.2% to 52.3% of respondents indicated a rating of good.

The results regarding the performance of BS indicate that the staff members are adequately providing services to the campus community. Attention should be paid to ensuring the patrons feel of greater importance during daily interaction.

Campus Continuing Education

The Continuing Education Department requests instructors to turn in evaluations after each class taught. The following is evaluation information is from two different classes.

Ballroom dancing began in fall of 2007. To date it is one of CE's strongest revenue producers plus total number of participants exceeds 200. The evaluations are consistently rated excellent or very good. All enrollees would recommend the class to a friend and the most repeated comment is how fun it is, how attentive the instructors are and how enjoyable the experience has been for the attendee.

The second class is Feng Shui, this has been taught for three semesters. The evaluations ranged from excellent, very good and good. People liked being introduced to a new topic and understanding the placement of furniture in their homes to allow for energy and space to connect. They liked the individual attention the instructor gave and wanted the classes to be longer.

Dean's Office/Campus Services

On the scantron survey a question was posed regarding campus housing. Over 56% (56.5) of those surveyed suggested that adding campus housing would moderately to significantly enhance their college experience – 44.1% indicated that it would be good or excellent.

Library

In spring 2004, the library implemented a regularized process to measure the usage rates of new book titles purchased for the collection – a continually ongoing assessment with cumulated data reviewed annually. We continued to collect this data for academic year 06/7. This assessment work helps to inform future acquisitions decisions. Coupled with usage statistics collected for print journal titles, this also assists in monitoring the “balance” of the library acquisitions budget between book and periodical purchases.

A new assessment process was infused into the library's research instruction sessions this year. At the end of each class session taught by the instruction librarian (time-permitting), students are asked to complete a brief survey rating the usefulness of the session and indicating any suggestions for possible future improvements. These surveys are reviewed by the instruction librarian after each session to identify any trends and consider adjustments to coming sessions. At this time, a comprehensive analysis of all the surveys as a whole is not yet complete.

Maintenance Services

Overall the data suggests that the majority of those surveyed believe Maintenance Services (MS) is performing at either a fair, good or excellent (positive indicators) level. Of the five questions posed; for each answer, between 59.1% and 96.8% of those surveyed indicated a performance indicator of fair, good or excellent.

The two questions receiving the most positive answer both 96.8% as a positive indicator score suggests that those surveyed believe MS provides quality services regarding the level of maintenance in buildings and the level of maintenance on campus grounds. Conversely, the question receiving the least positive answer of a 59.1% positive indicator suggests that those surveyed observed broken items or items in disrepair. This data may not accurately describe the actual opinion as 21.6% of respondents indicated that it was not applicable. For all questions asked, 22.9% to 48.2% of respondents indicated a rating of good.

The results regarding the performance of MS indicate that the department is adequately providing services to the campus community. The question of items in disrepair deserves further study.

Student Services

The responses regarding level of service from the Student Services department indicate over 75% of the respondents think service is good or excellent. This is very positive considering student appeals, suspensions, and grades are connected with this office. There is always room for improvement, but the responses reflect the care we try to give each student and potential student who visits. We strive to be sensitive to each individual's situation.

Over 75% of the respondents think they got adequate information and responses to their questions and ranked it "good" or "excellent". These may be in person, phone or email. This is a positive response especially with the variety of student workers who staff the front desk. They are the first line of contact with visitors. The next most heavily used method is email.

The Student Services staff is seen as friendly by nearly 82% of the respondents. The atmosphere is generally positive and the staff strives to be friendly, even when the office gets extremely busy. The responses still give us areas to work on in our "front line" greeting to visitors.

More than 75% of the respondents think the service in the department is good to excellent. The department plans to use more department-specific surveys to assess specific functions such as Orientation and Advising and Registration sessions.

University Relations

During the spring 2007 UW-Sheboygan Assessment, a survey took collected the following data regarding the University Relations office:

*45% of students rated the University Relations Office as "Good" or "Excellent" in accessibility, while another 38% had no opinion.

*51% of students rated the helpfulness of the UR Office as "Good" or Excellent", while another 33% had no opinion.

*60% of students rated the overall quality of campus communications as "Good" or "Excellent", while another 23% had no opinion.

Based on the response, UW-Sheboygan students have a relatively good impression of campus communications and university relations efforts, but due to the high number of "n/a" responses, it appears many students do not understand or recognize what communication efforts are conducted by the University Relations Office.

In regard to the free response section for University Relations, students responded as follows:

*The following numbers of students reported that they stay informed of campus activities and news via:

Hot News (62) or 30% of respondents
Channel 15/TV Monitors (36) or 17% of respondents
Posters (112) or 51% of respondents
Student Services (16) or 7% of respondents
Campus Web Site (115) or 53% of respondents
Other: E-mail (35) or 16% of respondents
 Socializing/Word of Mouth (7) or 3% of respondents
 Voice Student newspaper (2)

Based on the response, students stay most informed of campus activities through the UW-Sheboygan Web site and Posters, along with Hot News, the student weekly newsletter. Due to the redesigning of the UW-S Web site last summer and University Relations' efforts to post notices and student news items on the homepage on a daily basis, it appears more students are using the Web site as a source of information on campus activities. Students continue to see posters and flyers as another primary source of information on student-related news and events. The use of Hot News has improved with the regular publication of the newsletter Monday-Sunday with distribution the previous Friday afternoon.

University Relations has made an increased effort to use campus email as a way to remind students about upcoming events, and due to the 16% of write-in responses for "e-mail" it appears they are seeing this effort as helpful.

*Students reported that the following methods/mediums would help them stay informed of campus news and other important information:

Student E-mails (147) or 67% of respondents
Mailed Letters (45) or 21% of respondents
Campus Web Site Home Page Links (63) of 29% of respondents
Radio Ads (12) or 6% of respondents
Flyers/Posters (99) or 45% of respondents
Advisor Meetings (8) or 4% of respondents
In-Class Announcements (83) or 39% of respondents
Other: Facebook (2), TV (2), Commons (1), New Bulletin Board in Commons (1)

Based on the response to this question, it appears students actively seek information about the campus through the use of e-mail. University Relations began sending students a weekly list of campus activities from the paper version of Hot News each week beginning this past fall. Additional emails have been sent about campus events as well. Students also continue to respond well to posters and flyers on the campus. University Relations designs and posts flyers across the campus for activities and student organization programs. Currently, posters are only posted on clips outside classrooms or on tables in various study areas. Posters in classrooms, especially for

enrollment reminders, were instituted this spring in effort to capture students' attention upon entering or leaving a classroom. As a result of previous student response to the 2005-06 assessment, University Relations began sending faculty/staff several in-class announcements for use in their classes each week. Since no faculty had taken advantage of the information and were not willing to give up any class time for such announcements, University Relations ceased sending such emails to faculty/staff. It still appears that students would prefer to be reminded of activities and news by their instructors in the classroom, but without faculty support, this medium can't be used effectively. Since the redesign of the campus web site in summer 2006, it appears that more and more students are using the home page for regular updates on campus information. We hope this will only grow as students begin to see the Web site as a much easier-to-use and navigate tool. The Facebook program, which has created a group of UW-Sheboygan students in the online community, continues to grow and there is hope that this will also serve as a major tool for students to stay updated on campus information.

The University Relations Office will continue to make use of the Web site and e-mail, in addition to posters and Hot News, as a way to keep students informed of campus-related news and activities. Mailed letters, radio ads and advisor meetings are not strong methods to capture the largest student audience. Channel 15 and the TV monitor system is not recognized as the same medium, so the University Relations Office will attempt to make students more aware of the fact that they can tune in at home in the City of Sheboygan to channel 15 and see campus news that they see on the TVs on campus. Although in-class announcements are a popular option for students to stay informed, this method is not effective or worthwhile pursuing due to the lack of support from faculty.

Special Programs

During the spring 2007 UW-Sheboygan Assessment, a survey took collected the following data regarding the Special Programs Committee:

*36% of students rated the efforts of the Special Programs Committee as "Good" or "Excellent", while only 14% of students rated the committee's work as "Poor" or "Fair". Another 49% had no response.

*In regard to the timing of Special Programs events, 42% of respondents rated program times as "Good" or "Excellent," while 14% rated them as "Poor" or "Fair." Another 43% had no opinion.

In regard to the free response section for Special Programs, students responded as follows:

*The following number of students reported that they would like to see Special Programs sponsor the follow types of events on campus:

Bands (87)
Comedians (109)
Educational Speakers (48)
Solo Performers (25)

Motivational Speakers (57)

Cultural Presentations (50)

Interactive Programming (92)

Other: Students who perform, Ping-Pong Table in Commons, Locos Por Juana concert, debates, Casino Night, author/book readings, Drive-In movies

*Of the 218 students surveyed, respondents were split in asking for programming during the free hour (11 a.m.-noon) and later in the day. Possible afternoon or evening times for programs were 1-4 p.m., 7 p.m., Friday afternoons and weekends.

While it appears students are satisfied with the committee's efforts to serve their programming needs, nearly half of the student population is not aware of the committee, its work or its resulting programs. Since the focus should be on the program that is planned and not the originating committee (since attendance is the primary goal), it will be difficult to train students to realize that Special Programs brings them many of the activities they enjoy throughout the year. Additional notes on posters or emails promoting events could be added stating that the committee is the event sponsor.

During the 2006-07 academic year, the Special Programs Committee made an effort to offer programs during the free hour and in the evening in order to make programs accessible to both day and evening students. Due to the positive response on the survey (42% rating the committee as good or excellent), it appears this effort worked. The additional 43% with no opinion is troublesome, but many students noted on their surveys that they did not care about campus activities, which could be reflected in this percentage.

Based on student response, it appears students would enjoy seeing comedians and more inactive programming brought to campus, along with bands. In the past, the Special Programs Committee has chosen not to bring bands to campus due to the specific musical tastes that must be met. If a band were booked by the committee, it is suggested that the performer(s) be able to accommodate a number of musical tastes, such as a "musical jukebox" type performer. During the 2006-07 academic year, the committee made an effort to bring in interactive performers such as Comedy Sportz, a hypnotist and a mind reader in order to respond to last year's requests for more interactive programming. It appears that students still enjoy this type of program. Attendance at both the hypnotist and mind reader brought out over 125 people at each event, including students and community residents of all ages. This programming will be continued in the future, and the committee will consider booking a comedian due to student response to this survey. A motivational speaker also will be considered as it received more response than educational, solo or cultural performers.

The committee will continue to try to offer events at two different times, but in the past, evening events have been poorly attended by students. Many times, evening events have attracted only community residents and only one or two students, while afternoon shows were primarily student-attended. After our experiment this year of offering an evening show for the mind reader, it appears that if the performer is of interest, students and residents will come out to campus in the evening. Weather remains a factor, so evening shows should be limited to the fall or spring.

The committee will be committed to offering shows are varying times to allow both day and evening students to participate in campus programming.

IV. Campus Committee Assessment

Appointments Committee

The appointments committee did not submit a report this academic year.

Athletic Committee

The duties of the UW-Sheboygan Athletics Committee include: (1) to aid the athletic department in providing all student-athletes with the opportunities and needed resources to enjoy the sports they love and all that is encompassed in competitive athletics, (2) to create a bond between athletics and the other dimensions of university-life, and (3) to promote UWS athletics and the university as a whole. Our entire committee accomplished these tasks to the best of our ability and with our present resources this year. The committee met consistently each month to discuss important topics regarding our department and athletics on campus. It was open to discussing these topics among all members including faculty, staff, and students. The committee followed the appropriate formal format when conducting meetings, voted when necessary, pooled the opinions of all present at meetings, included students as the recorder of minutes when present, and abided by the appropriate posting of meeting agendas and minutes as is policy.

The committee has added much excitement to the overall aura of our athletic department. I believe we are back on the right path towards a wonderful and successful future for our department. The members have been very supportive and helpful to the adjustments of the new athletic director as well. The committee accomplished the following: (1) finding solutions to various athletic-related issues (i.e., academic standards, budget expenses, etc), (2) fundraising ideas for the end of this year and next year, (3) hiring of basketball and soccer coaches, and (4) promoting UWS athletics on and off campus. Some improvements we are very confident in achieving in the future include: (1) setting specific goals at the beginning of each academic year when we first meet, (2) conducting fundraising events during the school year (which we have set up for next year & ideas too), and (3) selecting a student-athlete per monthly meeting to recognize for their achievements and inform those on campus as well as local papers etc.

Overall, as athletic director and committee chair, I believe the athletics committee deserves an “8” ranking for overall achievement. This is a great committee with wonderful members who have worked hard to fulfill their duties, despite their otherwise busy schedules. Our work this year has been above average, and I am hopeful and looking forward to continue progress of this committee and athletic department in the years to come.

Curriculum Committee

The committee met very early and frequently (about 20 times) during the academic year. We constructed a curriculum for academic year 2007-2008, summer session 2007, and Winterim 2008. We also discussed on revising the duties of the committee as listed in the UWS Constitution and present the new duties to Collegium for review and approval. During the year, the committee provided timely feedbacks to new course proposals. We set a goal to begin reviewing the curriculum at UWS required for Collaborative Programs. We would be looking for any “bottlenecks” that students encounter as they move from the Associates into a Collaborative Degree Program. However we could not find the time to do this and this will be one of our priorities in the next academic year.

Overall the committee members give ourselves a 5/10 average for committee work, partly due to an ongoing change on the committee charge described in the UW-S constitution.

Engaging Students in the First Year (ESFY) Committee

The primary objective of the ESFY programming is “to enrich the first year of college experience through comprehensive curricular and co-curricular activities, which promote an understanding and appreciation of a liberal education, and which assist new students in developing attitudes and strategies conducive to academic success”. Our primary duty as a committee is to place in motion initiatives that would accomplish the ESFY objectives. Our present ESFY offerings on campus consist of six LEC 100 courses and the Knowledge Quest program.

The committee held four meetings over the last academic year. Our list of accomplishments included continued support of our current LEC 100 courses, continued efforts to offer and recruit students for Knowledge Quest, and the recruitment and nomination of a new ESFY Coordinator, as requested by the Dean. Our most notable accomplishment was to successfully establish and fund a “First year Student Award”. Though our committee engages in lively discussions regarding current programming, it was agreed that the committee needed to meet more often during the academic year, establish specific goals, and devise a long term action plan to guide our meetings and activities. In addition, there were many ideas offered to improve and promote growth of the ESFY program on campus, such as establishing learning communities or common readings, establishing courses arranged around a LEC 100 “hub”, and finding a way to accomplish what the discontinued Passport Program failed to accomplish.

As a committee, it was unanimously agreed upon that our weakness was not having specific goals and long term action plans for improving the type of ESFY programming needed for our first year students. Additional LEC 100 courses need to be developed and offered across the disciplines, a means for assessing or measuring the success of the courses needs to be established, and somehow a more unified involvement by faculty and staff needs to be encouraged. In essence, a more comprehensive, campus wide approach to the ESFY concept should be a primary goal for the UW Sheboygan campus. To accomplish a more unified approach, it was suggested that the committee work more closely with the collegium. Should more faculty and staff be persuaded to become involved in the ESFY curriculum, the outcome would be a stronger, more comprehensive, and possibly even a required LEC 100 curriculum that

would help all first year, or new students, become more academically successful during their first year of college.

Our committee gave itself an overall ranking of 6 out of 10. The committee recognized that an absence of goals and long term action plans, in combination with a perceived apathetic attitude amongst faculty with regard to the ESFY program, in general, were real impairments to the growth of the ESFY program at UW Sheboygan.

Environmental Health and Safety Committee

The purpose of the Environmental Health and Safety Committee is to serve as the risk management committee on campus. Therefore, the purpose of such is to comprehensively identify potential and imminent risks to the campus and to systematically reduce the risks identified.

During the past academic year, the committee met monthly and addressed issues stemming from campus, county, and institutional perspectives. Overall, the committee served its purpose in reducing general risks to the campus. The committee believes that although it performed well, more input could be solicited from campus constituents.

The committee is pleased with the major issues addressed this year, including:

- Comprehensive emergency procedures
- Emergency flip charts
- Mercury reduction
- Evening exterior walk-through with County representation
- Ongoing revisions to emergency procedures in light of the VA Tech incident.
- The continuation of comprehensive campus risk management, therefore, addressing issues that arise and are unpredictable from year to year – This ensures campus safety.

Overall, the Environmental Health & Safety Committee in assessing its performance during fiscal year 2007 has chosen an 8/10 to reflect its collective score.

Information Instructional Technology (IITC) Committee

The IITC's function is to serve as an advisory committee for campus computing, the purchasing of technology for instruction and administration, and policy development regarding technology. This past academic year the IITC met a minimal number of times, but still managed to accomplish their campus duties. Given this, however, the members of the IITC agreed that meetings on a more frequent basis may allow the committee to keep itself better apprised of campus technology issues. IITC members suggested perhaps the establishment of bi-monthly meetings.

The IITC had several goals during the past academic year which included:

- The installation of a new tape loader for server back-ups.
- The progress of NetOp work in the library.
- The potential increase of service provided to community users.
- The establishment of a quota for mailbox sizes.

The IITC succeeded in meeting all of these goals, and ranked itself as a 7 out of 10 in its performance during this past year.

Marketing Committee

The Marketing Committee was formed in May 2006. Its mission was to increase internal and external awareness of the campus and its programs. The committee worked very hard to increase community awareness of campus through increased advertising, media coverage, and cross-marketing events. The completion of the new Acuity Technology Center has increased community awareness and this is an opportune time to promote UW-Sheboygan. The committee continues to generate ideas to expand community interest in the campus. This is critical in a time of decreasing Central Marketing budget dollars and increased external competition.

Professional Evaluation Committee (PEC)

The PEC did not “devise standards for” the review process. We did seek input from the various departments and student evaluations to make recommendations for the retention of two first year faculty, one third year, and one fifth year individual. In addition, we recommended for tenure and promotion one faculty member. This was in accordance with the requirements given in 2.06 Committee on Professional Evaluation (pp. 8-9).

The PEC did reasonably well at accomplishing its tasks, even though they were somewhat narrow, but improvements could be made (such as through the better monitoring of what people need to be considered earlier in the fall semester, and specific dates that recommendations were needed).

The committee’s goals this past year were to manage to get through the list of people due for consideration, and the PEC succeeded at accomplishing this goal, and ranked itself as a 8 out of 10 in its performance during this past year. During the next academic year the PEC will be far more involved as it needs to evaluate all teaching staff on the UW-S campus.

Special Programs Committee

During the 2006-07 academic year, the Special Programs Committee did an impressive job of bringing in entertainment and programming to the campus that appealed to a wide range of audience members’ tastes and age brackets. We also planned events based on past student input that requested more fun, interactive programs and fewer cultural/music-based programs.

Based on committee input, we feel that one way to improve the Committee's performance would be to have increased funding from the Student Government Association. We did consider several other educational speakers this year but did not have the funds to afford to bring them to campus. Major speakers cost from \$2,000 to \$4,000 per event, which is not possible at our current funding level. We also feel that additional student support through more student reps on the committee would help better distribute workload and include an even stronger voice in event planning.

We feel our accomplishments included bringing in over 125 to 150 people to both the Frederick Winters hypnotist show and the Chris Carter mindreader show. The Drive-In movie, which was co-sponsored by Special Programs and SGA, was held Friday, May 4, and attracted 150 to 200 people, our second largest drive-in to date. These types of events should be considered again in the future as they were very popular with attendees and feedback was very positive.

Steering Committee

During 8 regular and 3 special meetings in 2006-2007, the Steering Committee tackled a wealth of issues and made significant progress on constitutional, enrollment, administrative, and policy issues.

Our major accomplishments included: clarifying "ex-officio" status on Collegium committees; choosing a Kaplan award winner; organizing a Campus Policy Manual; preparing a slate of nominees to be on the Dean's Search Committee; creating sub-committees to improve summer school and review the 2007-2008 budget; bringing two constitutional amendments to the Collegium, one on the definition of the Curriculum Committee and one on the definition of SLIC; overseeing the on-campus interviews for Dean's candidates; and prioritizing the position requests for 2008-2009.

Future committee goals include: completion of Policy Manual, completion of an annual Steering Calendar, completion of Emeritus Wall, and re-formatting the constitution in bullet form.

The committee was made up of dedicated individuals who worked very well together. We put together a strong slate of nominees from which a strong dean's search committee was formed and we organized the on-campus interviews very well. This was a big challenge because of how we became linked with UW-Baraboo. We brought major issues before the Collegium and I feel we helped steer the campus through a year of uncertainty with transitions in the campus' leadership.

Student Aids, Awards, and Appeals

The AAA Committee's duties are to conduct student hearings for all appropriate appeals to University policy. The AAA Committee also conducts meetings to determine scholarship awards or recommendation of qualified recipients.

During the past academic year the committee met frequently. It heard a variety of student appeals and voted on each in a very fair and consistent manor. The committee found a way to get through scholarship selection in an efficient yet democratic fashion.

Improvements of the committee could be made via accurate updates to outlook calendars. Attendance issues had come up on more than one occasion. It is campus policy to use outlook, yet it hampered the effectiveness of this Committee.

The goal of the committee is to respect all opinions and input from Students, Faculty, and Staff. The committee sought to clarify ambiguity in the language of certain scholarships this past year. It wanted to provide students with ample opportunities to participate in the appeal process when necessary.

The committee accomplished sever tasks during the past academic year including, the insurance that all scheduled meetings occurred, the clarification of language of several scholarships, and the forwarding of recommendations to the Foundation for new categories of scholarship merit. Likewise, the committee found a fast and efficient way to cycle through the scholarship process. A calendar was set up and discussed in advance with Student Services Office and University Relations. A system of weighted tally distribution was used by all committee members to choose the best scholarship candidates for various awards. We found this method to be both fair and extremely efficient.

In the future the committee will try to generate greater confidentiality in the awards process. Confidentiality is very important to this committee, and it needs to develop a better orientation to members who participate. We must also make sure all members are correctly adhering to UW-Sheboygan's campus outlook policy. This will give our next chair the ability to schedule meetings properly. This is vital, because students who appeal rely on the ability of this committee to be timely, and accurate with meetings.

Overall the committee believed that it performed an excellent job and ranked itself a 9 out of 10.

V. Student Government Association Assessment

I was really pleased with our results for the CAC survey for Student Government. We scored an "excellent" for the highest percentage (52.3%) for the first question and "fair" for the highest percentage (32.6%) for the second question. I'm excited that students know more about what SGA is and what we do. However, I would have liked to see a higher percentage of students that were actually interested in the issues suggested on the survey. Perhaps, in the future, SGA could do a survey of issues that students are most interested in and work on them. That might create more excitement, awareness, and recruit more student leaders to help with the issues they'd like to get solved.

After talking with other campuses and SGA's, it was really great to see that more and more of our students at UW-S have an idea of what SGA is and does and how we are working hard to get things done and/or changed. With a large amount of campuses, the students don't even know what the Student Government is, or that Wisconsin is the only state with shared governance. I

think that if students understood shared governance and knew that Wisconsin is the only state where students can sit on these committees, that they would be impressed and be more interested in getting involved.

Thanks for adding questions about SGA, it was nice to see the results. Hopefully in the future the results will be even better.

VI. Reflections on the Assessment Process

Listening Sessions

To get a better idea of how we could enhance campus services during the academic year the campus engaged in a form of formative assessment through listening sessions that were held once a semester. The listening sessions were roundtable discussions attended by faculty, staff, and students alike, and were comprised of at least one representative from each of the campus areas (i.e., student services, business office, maintenance, etc.) and campus divisions (i.e., social sciences, natural sciences, humanities, etc.). The sessions also had representatives from student government.

The fall listening session was held in December. CAC funds were used to buy pizza and drinks for the listening session portion of the event. Many students came; approximately 33 students and 17 staff members were in attendance. The fall listening session worked well. Learning from some of the flaws associated with last year's listening sessions—which tended to be a bit directionless, we decided to try to better steer the discussion through the passing out of note cards. This allowed students to more carefully formulate their questions, and also be anonymous if they wished. The only flaw with this session was that given the campus construction project, the session had to be held in the campus commons. There is considerable foot traffic in the commons and is a student gathering place, so the session had to be held over the din of students talking and passing by. Even given the noise, the session was a success. There was a high level of participation on the part of the students, and many brought up very valid questions regarding the campus environment.

The campus spring listening session was held in April 2007. As with the fall listening session, CAC funds were used to buy pizza and drinks, and approximately 30 students and 10 staff members were in attendance. The campus construction projection was still continuing, so the session had to once again be held in the campus commons. Reflecting on some of the difficulties with last year's session, specifically the noise issue, we used a microphone and a public address system which better facilitated communications with the students.

As with past listening sessions, notes were taken, and these have provided the campus with a sample of student concerns that can be addressed during this summer and the next academic year (Appendices V and VI).

The Assessment Process: Tools, Methodology, and Reflections on the Previous Year's Assessment

Comparing the 2005-2006 assessment with that of 2006-2007 several improvements had been made. Below are last year's (2005-2006) reflections on the limitations of the assessment process, follow by comments on how improvements were made during the 2006-2007 academic year.

- 2005-2006: The administering of the assessment tools need to take place earlier in the semester. During the academic year 2006-2007, the assessment tools were not administered to the campus committees and the students until late April Early March. This may have not given committee chairs and the heads of functional areas adequate time to generate more carefully crafted assessment summaries.
 - 2006-2007: The tools were administered slightly earlier, approximately one week, than the previous year. However, I believe that the tools need to be finalized and sent out even earlier, about one-month earlier, for the next academic year. Perhaps the campus also needs to administer the same tools during the fall semester so as to generate a bi-annual data comparison.
- 2005-2006: Related to the above, the importance of the campus assessment needs to be better communicated to the parties in charge of generating assessment summaries. Although, several reminders were sent out, I believe that the urgency of having assessment summaries in on time needs to be further emphasized by the CAC. Next year these reminders will be given out on a more frequent basis via email and during campus collegium meetings.
 - 2006-2007: The importance of assessment and the submission of results by all of the campus functional units and campus committees was emphasized numerous times by the CAC. As a result, I believe that the assessment results were more thorough in that only one stakeholder failed to submit their assessment results as compared to three the previous year. Likewise, I believe that this emphasis was reflected in the increase in sample size for the assessment tool. Last year we only had 171 students fill out the assessment tool, whereas this year, we had 218 students respond.
- 2005-2006: Finally, campus committees need to write summaries of their survey results. Within this CAC report are the overall campus committee survey results. While the individual responses have been summarized by the various committee chairs, the presentation of the results in this format in the CAC report is a bit unwieldy. IN addition to their overall responses, next year, the committee chairs will be told to submit general summaries of their assessment results.
 - 2006-2007: The summarization of assessment reports by the campus committees was greatly emphasized by the CAC during the 2006-2007 academic year. As a result only three committees submitted their raw data, as compared to the rest who submitted concise and cogent summaries of their self-assessment results. This made the CAC's job of assembling the CAC

report considerably easier. In the future, I will continue to emphasize the importance of data summaries.

Even given these oversights, overall the tools and methods employed in the Sheboygan campus assessment have provided the campus with a broad-based assessment of many of the campus services. The data gathered during the academic year 2005-2006 now gives us base-level data that we can reflect on as we conduct our campus assessment during the upcoming academic year.

Although the campus assessment during the 2006-2007 academic year did achieve its goal of broadly assessing campus services, improvements to the campus assessment process could be made to ensure effectiveness of future assessment ventures. The several ways that assessment could be improved include:

- The administering of the assessment tools need to take place earlier in the semester. During the academic year 2006-2007, the assessment tools were not administered to the campus committees and the students until late April Early March. This may have not given committee chairs and the heads of functional areas adequate time to generate more carefully crafted assessment summaries.
- Related to the above, the importance of the campus assessment needs to be better communicated to the parties in charge of generating assessment summaries. Although, several reminders were sent out, I believe that the urgency of having assessment summaries in on time needs to be further emphasized by the CAC. Next year these reminders will be given out on a more frequent basis via email and during campus collegium meetings.
- Finally, campus committees need to write summaries of their survey results. Within this CAC report are the overall campus committee survey results. While the individual responses have been summarized by the various committee chairs, the presentation of the results in this format in the CAC report is a bit unwieldy. IN addition to their overall responses, next year, the committee chairs will be told to submit general summaries of their assessment results.

Even given these oversights, overall the tools and methods employed in the Sheboygan campus assessment have provided the campus with a broad-based assessment of many of the campus services. The data gathered during the academic year 2005-2006 now gives us base-level data that we can reflect on as we conduct our campus assessment during the upcoming academic year.

Appendix I: Campus Assessment Plan

University of Wisconsin-Sheboygan Campus Assessment Plan 2006-2007

Prepared by Karl Byrand, Ph.D.,
Campus Assessment Coordinator

General Statement of Assessment

For this year's campus assessment, the University of Wisconsin-Sheboygan (UW-S) has chosen to continue to assess its strategic plan as a way to close the loop. In its plan, the campus had generated several goals that it wishes to achieve over the next several years. These goals can be placed into six broad categories that include

- Student success
- Faculty/staff success
- Community interaction
- Physical and fiscal needs
- Campus of first choice
- College experience

Since these categories themselves are numerous and varied in their content, UW-S will only focus on two of the above categories: student success and college experience. As a way to assess these categories the campus will engage in a broad-based assessment of the services it provides to its students, faculty and staff, as well the overall effectiveness of the various campus committees. As such, UW-S will focus on four specific areas of assessment during the 2006-2007 academic year:

- Campus functional area assessment
- Campus committee assessment
- Student government assessment
- Passport program assessment

The details of each of these areas are given below.

Campus Functional Area Assessment

As part of our campus assessment here at UW-Sheboygan, the various functional areas on campus have been undergoing self assessment. The assessment results found by these various functional areas on campus will become part of their annual report to the campus dean. Since this is data that has already been formulated, the plan is to have members from the various functional areas on campus extract that data from their annual reports, and then submit their assessment findings to the Campus Assessment Coordinator (CAC). The CAC will then organize this data

into a comprehensive report that will be submitted to the SAC. Campus functional units to be assessed are listed below.

- Business Office
- Continuing Education
- Dean's Office
- Library
- Maintenance
- Student Services
- University Relations

Campus Committee Assessment

In addition to assessment of the above functional areas, the various campus committees will also undergo self assessment. Campus committees will include an assessment of their activities in their respective annual reports and then submit their assessment results to the CAC. Campus committees to be assessed are listed below.

- Appointments
- Athletic Committee
- Curriculum Committee
- Engaging Students in the First Year (ESFY) Committee
- Information Instructional Technology (IITC) Committee
- Professional Evaluation Committee (PEC)
- Special Programs Committee
- Steering Committee
- Student Aids, Awards, and Appeals

Campus Student Government Assessment

In addition to the above two areas, the campus Student Government Association will also assess the effectiveness of its services during the academic year. This data will be submitted to the CAC and will be included in the annual assessment report.

Passport Assessment

In addition to assessing campus areas and committees, the campus will also assess its Passport program that was launched the fall semester 2005. Passport is a program developed in coordination with ESFY at UWS to promote student success through student involvement in campus activities. Many activities include programs that involve improving learning skills as well as discovering the wide range of activities on our campus. While not all Passport students who participated were incoming freshmen, the majority were. As such, Passport has been strongly linked to the campus's first-year experience initiative (a program that has been deemed important for campus assessment). Like the other areas on campus, the organizers of Passport

will assess the success of the program this academic year and then submit their report to the CAC so it may be included in the campus assessment report.

Dissemination of Assessment Information

In order to ensure that the campus is made aware of assessment, updates of assessment activities will be given by the CAC during monthly campus collegium meetings. This will serve as a monthly forum for campus members to not only receive assessment updates from the CAC, but will also allow these same members to share their insights and concerns regarding campus assessment. The goal of a monthly assessment report is to help foster a greater culture of assessment on the UWS campus.

Campus Listening Sessions

The purpose of campus assessment is to provide the institution a means to gauge its effectiveness of providing services to the students who attend the institution. While the annual report offers a summative assessment of the services we provided to students that academic year, it does not allow us to get a general feel for the adequacy of these services during the academic year. To get a better idea of how we can enhance those services during the academic year the campus will engage in a form of formative assessment through listening sessions that will be held once a semester. The listening sessions will be roundtable discussions attended by faculty, staff, and students alike, and will be comprised of at least one representative from each of the campus areas (i.e., student services, business office, maintenance, etc.) and campus divisions (i.e., social sciences, natural sciences, humanities, etc.). Furthermore, the sessions will also have representatives from student government. Campus groups will strongly encourage students to attend these sessions, and will attempt to draw on as broad of spectrum of students as possible; encouraging traditional and non-traditional, full-time and part-time students alike. As an incentive to attend, CAC funds will be used to provide refreshments for the events.

The purpose of the listening sessions is to provide faculty, staff, and student government with a general method of assessing the adequacy of services provided to students during the semester. Students will be invited to provide face-to-face critical feedback to the above-mentioned groups in a casual and non-confrontational environment. As such, the sessions will provide the campus a general set of formative assessment “data” allowing it to, if deemed necessary, adjust these services so that the students who are currently enrolled receive a nearly immediate benefit from the analysis of the assessment. Thus, these sessions will not only benefit future students (i.e., serving as a form summative assessment), but will also allow the campus to better address the needs of the students currently enrolled (i.e., serving as a form of formative assessment). In short, these listening sessions will serve as a barometer of student services during the fall and spring semesters.

Assessment Report

The assessment report for the UWS campus will consist of summarized data from the reports of the above-mentioned functional areas, committees, student government association, and the listening sessions. The data from this report will allow the UWS campus to reflect on the success of its goals of student success and college experience and allow the campus to enhance these offerings for students during the next academic year.

Appendix II: Functional Unit Assessment Questionnaire

UW-Sheboygan Assessment Tool
Spring 2007

DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THIS SHEET, OR THE SCANTRON SHEET! ALSO IF YOU HAVE ALREADY FILLED OUT THIS ASSESSMENT FORM IN ANOTHER CLASS, PLEASE DO NOT DO SO AGAIN!

The University of Wisconsin-Sheboygan is currently undergoing a broad-based assessment that is designed to examine the effectiveness of its campus services. In order to assess the services the campus provides, and to make improvements to them, we need your help. If you could take a few minutes to provide honest and well-thought responses to the below questions, you will be able to help make this campus a better place for all.

Instructions

For the following questions, please fill in your responses on the scantron form, using the below ranking system and applying it to the numbered questions below:

A = poor, B = fair, C = good, D = excellent, E = not applicable

Assessment of Business Office Services/Campus Services:

1. What is the level of service that you have experienced in the Business Office?
2. Does the Business Office staff provide adequate information and/or responses to/for your questions?
3. Does the Business Office staff communicate in a friendly manner?
4. Do you feel important as a student when interacting with the Business Office?
5. What is your overall satisfaction regarding your experiences with the Business Office?
6. How much more complete and satisfying would your college experience be if UW Sheboygan built a student residence?

Assessment of Maintenance Services:

7. At what level do you feel the campus buildings are maintained?
8. At what level do you feel the campus grounds are maintained?
9. Do you regularly notice broken/items in disrepair on campus?
10. What do you feel the response time is by the Maintenance department to related needs?
11. During the winter months, is the snow removal effective and efficient?

Assessment of Student Services Office:

12. What is the level of service that you have experienced in the Student Services Office?
13. Does the Student Services Office staff provide adequate information and/or responses to/for your questions?

14. Does the Student Services Office staff communicate in a friendly manner?
15. What is your overall satisfaction regarding your experiences with the Student Services Office?

Assessment of University Relations Services:

16. Please rate the accessibility of the University Relations Office for your needs:
17. Please rate the helpfulness of the University Relations Office in promoting campus activities?
18. Please rate the quality of overall campus communications:

Assessment of Special Programs

19. How well as the Special Programs Committee served your needs on campus?
20. How would you rate your satisfaction with the timing of Special Programs events on campus?

Assessment of Student Government Association

For questions 16 and 17, please use the ranking systems below each question

21. How familiar are you with UW-Sheboygan's Student Government?

A = very familiar, B = familiar, C = little familiar, D = not at all familiar

22. Are you as student interested in student issues? (i.e. Tuition, class offerings, and laws that adversely effect students)

A = very interested, B = interested, C = slightly interested, D = not at all interested

Please Provide free responses for the below two sections

University Relations Free Response

How do you stay informed on campus activities/news? **(You may circle more than one media)**

Hot News Channel 15/Campus TV Monitors Posters Student Services
 Campus Web Site Other (please explain): _____

What methods/mediums would be helpful in keeping you informed of campus news/important information?

Student E-mails Mailed Letters Campus Web Site Home Page Links
 Radio Ads Flyers/Posters Advisor Meetings

In-Class Announcements

Other: (please list) _____

Special Programs Free Response

What programming would you like to see the Special Programs Committee to bring to campus?

Bands

Comedians

Educational Speakers

Solo performers

Motivational Speakers

Cultural Presentations/Programs

Interactive

Programming (laser tag, NASCAR racing simulator, movies, etc.)

Other: (please list) _____

Please list what times would be best for campus programs:

Appendix III: Functional Unit/Special Programs Committee/Student Government Association Assessment Statistical Results

Q1
6 2.8% A
22 10.1% B
83 38.1% C
96 44.0% D
11 5.0% E
2 0.9% Blank
Response Count 218

Q2
3 1.4% A
17 7.8% B
88 40.4% C
95 43.6% D
14 6.4% E
2 0.9% Blank
Response Count 218

Q3
5 2.3% A
20 9.2% B
68 31.2% C
114 52.3% D
11 5.0% E
1 0.5% Blank
Response Count 218

Q4
5 2.3% A
36 16.5% B
94 43.1% C
63 28.9% D
18 8.3% E
2 0.9% Blank
Response Count 218

Q5
6 2.8% A
19 8.7% B
90 41.3% C
90 41.3% D
12 5.5% E
2 0.9% Blank
Response Count 218

Q6
21 9.6% A
27 12.4% B
49 22.5% C
47 21.6% D
73 33.5% E
2 0.9% Blank
Response Count 218

Q7
5 2.3% A
20 9.2% B
5/14/2007 1
92 42.2% C
99 45.4% D
0 0.0% E
2 0.9% Blank
Response Count 218

Q8
5 2.3% A
17 7.8% B
104 47.7% C
90 41.3% D
0 0.0% E
2 0.9% Blank
Response Count 218

Q9
43 19.7% A
34 15.6% B
50 22.9% C
45 20.6% D
47 21.6% E
3 1.4% Blank
Response Count 218

Q10
4 1.8% A
20 9.2% B
105 48.2% C
58 26.6% D
30 13.8% E
3 1.4% Blank
Response Count 218

Q11
14 6.4% A
25 11.5% B
87 39.9% C
82 37.6% D
8 3.7% E
2 0.9% Blank
Response Count 218

Q12
9 4.1% A
37 17.0% B
82 37.6% C
84 38.5% D
4 1.8% E
2 0.9% Blank
Response Count 218

Q13
12 5.5% A
29 13.3% B
84 38.5% C
87 39.9% D
4 1.8% E
2 0.9% Blank
Response Count 218
5/14/2007 2

Q14
8 3.7% A
26 11.9% B
81 37.2% C
97 44.5% D
4 1.8% E
2 0.9% Blank
Response Count 218

Q15
8 3.7% A
30 13.8% B
83 38.1% C
87 39.9% D
8 3.7% E
2 0.9% Blank
Response Count 218

Q16
7 3.2% A
25 11.5% B
69 31.7% C
29 13.3% D
84 38.5% E
4 1.8% Blank
Response Count 218

Q17
8 3.7% A
27 12.4% B
75 34.4% C
36 16.5% D
71 32.6% E
2 0.9% Blank
Response Count 218

Q18
6 2.8% A
29 13.3% B
74 33.9% C
56 25.7% D
50 22.9% E
3 1.4% Blank
Response Count 218

Q19
5 2.3% A
25 11.5% B
53 24.3% C
25 11.5% D
106 48.6% E
4 1.8% Blank
Response Count 218

Q20
6 2.8% A
24 11.0% B
5/14/2007 3
55 25.2% C
36 16.5% D
94 43.1% E
4 1.8% Blank
Response Count 218

Q21
14 6.4% A
19 8.7% B
65 29.8% C
114 52.3% D
1 0.5% E
6 2.8% Blank
Response Count 218

Q22
47 21.6% A
71 32.6% B
62 28.4% C
26 11.9% D
1 0.5% E
11 5.0% Blank
Response Count 218
5/14/2007 4

Appendix IV: Campus Committee Assessment Questionnaire

COMMITTEE REPORT QUESTIONNAIRE

In an effort to have all committee reports provide comparable information, committees are asked to answer the following questions as part of the end-of-year report.

1. What are your committee's duties?
For each duty, state "Our committee accomplished duty #1" and ask committee members to circle Strongly Agree / Agree / Neutral / Disagree / Strongly disagree.

2. What did your committee do well this past academic year?

3. What improvements could be made?

4. What were your committee's goals this past year?

5. What were your committee's accomplishments this past year?

6. What did your committee not accomplish that was a goal?

7. What are future committee goals and why are they important?

8. Please rank your committee's overall work: 1 – 10 (1 = poor / 10 = excellent)

Appendix V: Listening Session Notes: Fall 2006

12/5/06, 11am, Commons

In addition to 33 students attending, the following faculty and staff were there:

Karl Byrand, Ronaldo Cordeiro, Dick Jarosch, Carrie Hoppe, Jeff Ellair,
Alice Homstad, Katie Bichler, Kari Rukamp, Yongjun Yang, Rich Barnhouse,
Jeff Goins, Gary Johnson, Tom Peneski, Judy Hartman, Erica Strauss,
Pam Fitzer, Charlie Krebs

Karl opened by welcoming everyone and explaining the purpose of the listening session. He said we have reflected on what you said last year. He asked “

What can we do to make the campus a better place” and
“What are we doing that’s working?”

Comments:

- Why has food been banned from ASC?
- Put a table in the lobby of the science building
- Administrators gave back 20K—can that be used for daycare or bringing in a physician’s assistant? Or things that would help us take the focus off of things that make it difficult to study. \$20 K would pay for everyone’s textbooks. If students get an “A” in a class, we’ll pay for texts.
- Don’t treat us like children.
- Other campuses provide day care.
- Partner up with community day care.
- Have daycare here so the students could have more work study jobs.
- Plan events for days that local schools have days off. FEA students could do activities.
- More teachers incorporate more hands-on activities: paint a mural / do a display for the campus.
- More interaction and discussion through D2L
- Give everyone D2L access and have tutors monitor it.
- Make Yongjun teach Calculus 3 live.
- A stop sign at the gym. People zoom down the street between parking lots.
- Why is parking “free form” these days? (Response: until Acuity building is complete, we need to be a little understanding.
- I got a survey about housing. Does that mean we’re going to become a 4-year? (Response: dorms are being talked about)
- Recycling bins are in some locations. Could there be cardboard boxes in every room? (Response: maintenance load is already extensive)
- Why can’t we have recycling bins in every classroom and have a club empty them?
- More options at café.
- Have a PA in the commons if we’re going to continue to have meetings in here.
- Do we have campus policies on library orientation? Can we incorporate it into orientation? (Response: it’s hard to have a comprehensive program)
- Put library orientation on Passport.
- More complete maps of campus with room numbers

- More student organization days to entice students
- Have a school counselor, when students feel stressed or need emotional support

Ronaldo asked: “What would make UWS your “first choice” of colleges?

What could we do?

- Variety of interesting classes
- 4-year degree
- Offer varsity sports; recruit athletes from afar
- Meeting people that I’ve never met before; living on your own makes you grow up.
- Social places at night: coffee shop like Wonderful World
- Use a camp with cabins for orientation activities
- Make students get to know their classmates on the first day of classes
- Icebreakers to make new friends
- Organized ski trip
- “Bucks” night at games; take bus.

Ronaldo asked about improvements to commons...

- Make it warmer, better couches, carpeting
- More living room environment
- Commons is industrial looking
- Mimic a coffee house: cozier, organic, pictures on wall

Ronaldo asked what we could do to improve marketing

- Shoot real life pictures on billboards
- Sell mugs with UW logo at coffee shops
- Recruit at high schools. Tell them who actually went here. Have students working connections.

Ronaldo asked how many were on Facebook. 14 said they were.

He asked if using FB was a good idea. 10 said yes

- Change the image of UW-Sheboygan
- Adding more of an interactive environment
- Get togethers, parties
- Keep costs low—that’s good. That’s what we do best.
- Tell high school kids they can come here on a regular day of school and visit.

Appendix VI: Listening Session Notes: Spring 2007

CAMPUS ASSESSMENT COORDINATOR – LISTENING SESSION APRIL 25, 2007

Session began at about 11:10 AM.

Professor Karl Byrand asked for questions concerning ways to make the campus a better place and/or constructive criticism how things that might be improved.

One student suggested that Men's Volleyball be added to the campus Athletics program.

Dean Emmerichs said that although there are not currently any plans to field a men's volleyball team, the campus is hiring a soccer coach to begin next fall and a coed soccer team will be formed and compete in Conference play.

Another student raised a concern about the planning of classes, and said they felt that many courses, especially math and science, seem to be offered between 1:00 p.m. and 3:00 p.m. This concentration of courses during this time period means that a student may not be able to take some of the courses they want or need because they are only offered at that one time.

Karl Byrand said this is an issue that had come up before and efforts have been made to try to avoid some overlap and conflicts in the schedule.

The question was asked if it might be possible to have a Calculus III class on campus as opposed to doing it as a Wisline Web course. Having the course FTF there would be an instructor on campus available to assist students.

Unfortunately this course does not usually have a large enrollment and therefore it's more cost effective to teach it on the web.

The student asked if maybe several campuses located near each other could work out an arrangement for a PTP situation so that an instructor could at least be on campus one or two days a week. It was suggested that another possibility might be to have a faculty tutor for a course like this.

The next question was about the new technology building, how it would be staffed, if there would be an increase in custodial staff, and how the space would be used.

Karl responded that a majority of the space would be used for the new library; there will also be new classrooms, computer labs, conference and meeting rooms as well as compressed video and Wisline Web rooms. The current library staff will of course be moving to the new facility.

Mary Beth added that an increase in maintenance staff would not be done until there is an increase in FTE enrollment numbers; unfortunately the extra square footage does not impact the number of staff; however efforts are made to supply more efficient equipment for the custodial staff to use such as riding vacuums.

The question was then asked about what will happen to the current space in the LR building that will be vacated.

Mary Beth stated that the plan is to remodel some of the space into classrooms and to refurbish the faculty offices in the LR. Next fall faculty offices will be temporarily located in the Wombat Room. A final decision has not been made yet as to exactly how all of the space will be used and there has been a discussion about moving some of the Sheboygan County Cooperative Extension Offices to campus from Sheboygan Falls.

Next a question was asked about advising and if there is any way to improve the quality so students could be better prepared to transfer to other institutions.

It was stated that since a lot of the advising is done by Faculty, and some Lecturers who volunteer, it is difficult for the advisors to know everything about a lot of different programs. If someone is trying to advise a student in a different discipline than their own, there may be a problem with knowing exactly what is required.

It was also brought up that full-time faculty may be advising up to 20 students each and that the Student Services Office is always available to help if a student doesn't feel they are getting what they need from their advisor. Another possibility is to match a student with a different advisor.

A student stated that with the programs for returning adult students and the hope of increasing enrollment for adult students she was wondering why there was not a child care facility on campus. She thought that would help a lot of adult students.

The Dean responded that child care facilities on campuses are quite expensive to run and that is one reason UW-Sheboygan does not have one. The Manitowoc campus did have a facility but has closed it because it was not cost effective. She added that there have been some discussions recently about making campus housing available through private companies and that possibly adding a child care center to that kind of a proposal would be possible.

Next a student brought up another question on scheduling of classes, this having to do with a science lab that overlaps in a time period with a foreign language course that meets five days a week; a student cannot take both classes. The student also asked if there could be upper level Spanish classes.

Professor Katie Bichler responded to the problem with the science lab and said that sometimes arrangements can be made with the instructors to make it possible for a student to enroll in both courses and avoid conflicts.

Professor Byrand said that low enrollment, and therefore cost, would probably be the reason for upper level Spanish courses not being offered.

Next a student said she had taken a six credit collaborative course, taught by two instructors, that was very interesting and that she enjoyed very much. She asked if more of these collaborative courses could be offered.

Karl said that faculty members are being encouraged to create more of these Interdisciplinary Studies (IS) courses. An IS course is a requirement for graduation and the Colleges Senate does not want this requirement waived.

A similar question was raised about Ethnic Studies (ES) courses and Professor Byrand responded saying there are actually more ES courses taught on campus each semester than IS courses.

Professor Byrand ended the session at about 11:45 PM asking students to send any additional comments to him via e-mail or to write comments or questions on the blue cards he handed out at the beginning of the session and send those to him.