



UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
OSHKOSH

One Institution - Three Campuses

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh, Oshkosh Campus
University of Wisconsin Oshkosh, Fox Cities Campus
University of Wisconsin Oshkosh, Fond du Lac Campus

**Provost Advisory Committee on University-wide
Academic Structure Final Report**

Appointed Members:

Bruce Atwell, College of Letters & Science, Music, Oshkosh Campus
Michael Beeth, College of Education and Human Services, Teaching & Learning, Oshkosh Campus
Jennifer Bonack, Academic Affairs, Registrar's Office, Oshkosh Campus
Domenic Bruni, College of Letters & Science, Global Languages and Cultures, Oshkosh Campus,
Jennifer Schuttlefield Christus, College of Letters & Science, Chemistry, Oshkosh Campus, Chair
Heather Englund, College of Nursing, Oshkosh Campus
Sara Steffes Hansen, College of Letters & Science, Journalism, Oshkosh Campus
Erika Janssen, College of Nursing, Oshkosh Campus
Alison Jenner, Academic Affairs, Registrar's Office, Oshkosh Campus
Christopher Jones, College of Business, Accounting, Oshkosh Campus
Marc Sackman, College of Letters & Science, Music, Fox Cities Campus
Cindy Schultz, College of Letters & Science, Journalism, Oshkosh Campus
Tracy Slagter, College of Letters & Science, Political Science, Oshkosh Campus
James Stevens, Office of Online & Continuing Education, Oshkosh Campus
Paul Van Auken, College of Letters & Science, Sociology, Oshkosh Campus

Advisory Members:

Elizabeth Alderton, College of Education and Human Services
Jakob Iversen, College of Business
Bonnie Nickasch, College of Nursing
Kimberly Rivers, College of Letters & Science

Table of Contents

Section	Page
Executive Summary	3
Introduction	7
Results	8
Discussion	15
Administrative Perspective	16
Leadership Perspective	18
Academic Perspective	22
Conclusions	25
Appendices	27
Appendix I: Survey Tools	27
Appendix II: Subgroup Reports	28
Appendix III: Quantitative Summary	42

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the fall of 2019, the Provost Academic Committee on University-wide Academic Structure (PACUAS) committee was created and charged with gathering input from the University of Wisconsin Oshkosh (UWO) community **to explore ideas of restructuring UWO's four colleges to help the University grow and thrive in the coming years.** This work was viewed as an extension of the Academic Structure Exploration Team (ASET), who as a campus-wide conversation starter, imagined new college structure scenarios. As a community, this was an opportunity to be innovative and reflective on what we do well and where we can improve to attract, retain, and serve our students.

To obtain feedback, committee members attended leadership and division meetings, held in-person meetings, and gathered data via online surveys to gauge community interest, concerns, and need for restructuring the colleges at UWO. During the fall of 2019, 19 listening/data gathering sessions were attended, 2 open forums were held, 60 Google survey results were collected (19 administrative unit survey responses, 37 academic department survey responses, and 4 access campus survey responses), and 26 online form responses were gathered.

Data analysis began during the interim session in January 2020, but was dramatically slowed by the COVID pandemic. While this report provides feedback from the UWO community, all of the feedback was collected pre-pandemic and can be seen as a snapshot of pre-pandemic interest on restructuring the four UWO Colleges. Pre-pandemic issues or concerns may have been exacerbated by the pandemic, while new ideas or possible benefits might also have developed or been reinforced during this time. It is worth noting that the committee acknowledges this, but continued with this organizational exercise to provide a solid collection of thoughts from across campus prior to the pandemic and all of the social justice issues that occurred in 2020.

In addition to being a point-in-time, the feedback provided was heavily influenced by the person's, unit, or department from which it originated on campus. It was apparent that perspective was a critical factor in the responses that they were grouped and reported in three themes from which the feedback originated: administrative, leadership, and academic. **Perspective is critical in understanding why some issues might be more important to one group than another.**

While the committee did not have 100% participation in the data collection, it was the committee's intent to seek feedback through colleges, divisions, leadership teams, unit

supervisors, open forums, and an anonymous survey for any community member to complete on the Provost website. All data collected was analyzed and summarized for this report. The committee made a concerted effort to represent the feedback as fully and accurately as possible by having multiple committee members review summaries.

During the analysis process, the committee was asked not to consider the impact on the access campuses; the role of the University Resource Alignment results or new budgetary model; the placement of the CAPP program, Honor's College, the Office of Online & Continuing Education, or the Graduate School; and how restructuring would potentially change in governance structure. Therefore, these concepts were largely excluded from the report.

Most responses fell into one of seven themes:

- **Leadership and Restructuring Logistics**
- **Recruitment, Retention, and Marketing**
- **Governance**
- **Financial and Administrative Implications**
- **Interdisciplinary Efforts, Collaborative Efforts, and Research**
- **Operational Efficiencies**
- **Curriculum**

These themes will be explored in greater detail in the report below within each of the three perspectives (Administrative, Leadership, and Academic Department). Overall, there is both support and hesitancy for restructuring.

There was a significant concern reported on the possible cost, time, and resources that would be needed if a restructuring occurred. Additionally, there were big picture questions like “why now”, “what is the problem with the current structure”, or “how can we think about this when the last restructuring is not complete.” Reports of change fatigue were also common pre-pandemic. With the massive amount of change that has occurred since the collection of these results, one might expect “change fatigue” to have been exacerbated by the pandemic and the national and social justice issues of the last year.

At the same time, there was excitement for restructuring and the potential for innovation, creativity, and attracting new students to campus. Restructuring, if done intentionally, could allow for increased flexibility and “nimbleness” of our programs which would make it easier to adapt to trends and student needs. Additionally, it could

help streamline processes and policies, increase collaboration and communication, and create needed identities for programs across campus. Pathways (e.g. degree requirements, etc.) for students could be evaluated and revised.

The ASET report hypothesized six models of university structures with one being the current academic structure. Feedback was collected on the proposed models from the report. Google Surveys were sent to academic and administrative units to collect rankings and feedback for each of the models. Community members were also given the option to provide their own model. Models were ranked from 1 (unfavorable) to 5 (favorable). Overall, the surveys had a 69% response rate. The academic responses tended to favor keeping the current structure (Model #1) or the most minimal restructuring Model #2. Reasons ranged from:

- *“Current model is working well, but some administrative changes would strengthen it”,*
- *“It works, and the workload associated with changing documentation, etc. would be unmanageable at this point and time.”,*
- *“We do not want to make it any harder for students to change majors or take classes; we would only want it to be easier. We would like to ensure that our majors have easy access to liberal arts classes.”,*
- *“This structure may not be perfect, but it works well overall in our view and should be maintained and improved upon, particularly given no compelling explanation for why we should even entertain restructuring.”*

In contrast, the analysis of administrative and leadership units ranked Model #3 as the most favorable, which was a “five-college structure with STEM” where the colleges were STEM, Business and Media Innovation, Arts and Humanities, Nursing and Health Science, and Education and Public Leadership. Feedback from the administrative surveys indicated that while this model had some potential flaws (e.g. expense of adding a 5th college, combining Social Science and Education, etc.) this was:

- *“Most progressive model as we compete for recruitment and retention of students”,*
- *“Appears to highlight STEM and reorganizes colleges in a way to have more defined majors in each college”,*
- *“Model #3 structure is ideal for branding and appeal to all populations of students”, and*
- *“The largeness of the College of Letters and Science, it can be difficult to get up-to-date information about all departments within the college. Communication with the departments is incredibly important to help us promote the university to students and families. Changing to a more descriptive College name would allow us to better explain the offerings of those colleges. More faculty involvement in recruitment efforts.”*

While the data provides evidence for different perspectives on the models, there was a lack of mounting evidence that would provide justification for or against restructuring other than that there are people in favor and against the process. Though documented evidence was requested by the committee, the most that was received was anecdotal or

opinion-oriented. Therefore, **most of the information collected regarding the models is viewed as a “conversation starter” that shows openness to restructuring with proper evidence and justification.** That stated, no conclusions could be drawn from the data collected on whether a particular model presented in the ASET report was the Model-of-Choice, or one that we should move toward.

Importantly, the committee developed “guiding principles,” based on the data, which should be considered if any restructuring actions are planned.

1. UWO’s strong commitment to liberal arts education, while giving visibility to innovative opportunities the liberal arts provides to the marketplace and society, should remain the highest of priorities.
2. Serving our students now and in the future also needs to be one of the highest priorities—including a focus on career paths; easier understanding of degree plans; and clearer navigation of majors and options.
3. Students should be allowed to finish under the program in which they started if a restructuring occurs.
4. No accreditation or licensure program should be put at risk.
5. At a minimum, if changes occur they should be cost neutral with minimal administrative expansion.
6. Incremental or larger restructuring changes should have defined reasons and goals for enrollment, operational improvement, fulfilling institutional goals, etc. that are communicated with an opportunity for feedback from shared governance and the university community.
7. Consider short-term and long-term aspects for improvement, aided through the strengths and weaknesses of the institution brought to light in this data, as well as the opportunities and threats of our environment (budget, enrollment, faculty retention) in the foreseeable five years and beyond.
8. Academic structures should promote (or at least not prevent):
 - a. Stability and resources for each unit to carry out its mission.
 - b. Visibility of educational programs to potential students.
 - c. Support for collaborations across structural boundaries.
 - d. Flexibility to be able to meet changes in student preferences and external conditions (changes in budget, job market, licensure requirements etc).

In light of the data collected, the pandemic, and the national and social justice issues of the last few years, the committee recommends the idea of restructuring and goals of restructuring be evaluated further before any decisions are made. Data and justification are needed to show the importance, if any, of making large-scale changes.

While this feedback was collected some time ago, it is helpful toward informing future opportunities for the institution. The committee encourages any department that sees an area of innovation to capitalize on this reflection process. Restructuring changes can be initiated at the department level through shared governance, and as such should be encouraged by the administration if we can attract, retain and serve more students.

INTRODUCTION

In the spring of 2019, Provost John Koker charged the Academic Structure Exploration Team (ASET) with proposing four to six alternate college structures that had potential to position University of Wisconsin Oshkosh to grow and thrive over the next generation. The group was charged with presenting each structure's potential strengths and weaknesses but also was instructed not to make recommendations or to rank the structures. In addition to considering relevant marketing and personnel data, ASET completed research on potential structures and considered other structures at universities around the nation.

In their deliberations, the group was asked not to consider the University Resource Alignment results, how the new budgetary model would play a role in the development of the college structures, how the 2-year campuses would be impacted, or how the governance structure would change. Additionally, they were asked to not evaluate the structures but instead present them equally for evaluation by the University of Wisconsin Oshkosh community.

The ASET team report was provided to the University for review in April 2019. In the development of the report, all departments and programs were included. The team explored new pairings of departments as well as options for expanding or changing colleges based on observational changes in higher education; structures of peer, larger and innovative universities; and market trend data for this region.

Therefore, the main goal of the ASET team and their report was to propose various collegiate structures that would start a conversation on campus about how to ensure UW Oshkosh is meeting the wants and needs of the students now and for the next generation. Questions we might ask ourselves as a University-wide community are: does the current college structure provide what students are looking for at this time? In the next 5-10 years? Does the current structure provide the best use of resources and marketing? Is the current structure hindering the ability of students to obtain degrees here or recruit students to attend UW Oshkosh? Why are we known as the 5-year institution? Is this a structural issue?

The next step in the process was to obtain feedback on the report from the campus community. The PACUAS (Provost Academic Committee on University-wide Academic Structure) committee was created and charged with gathering input from as many voices in the academic community as possible through both in-person meetings and online data gathering with the end goal of summarizing, reporting, and recommending to the Provost and University-wide community whether there is an aspiration or need to further evaluate the possibility of restructuring the colleges at UW Oshkosh. During the recommendation-making process, we were also asked not to consider the impact on the access campuses, the role of the URA results or new budgetary model, the placement of CAPP, OCE, or the graduate school, and the possible change in governance structure.

Herein, we present the results of the data gathered through four different methods developed by the committee: listening and data gathering sessions at various administrative/unit leader meetings; open forums; department/unit Google survey responses; and an online form for any community member to provide feedback via the Provost's website. Overall, during the fall of 2019, 19 meetings were attended as listening/data gathering sessions, 2 open forums were held, 60 Google survey results were collected (19 administrative unit survey responses, 37 academic department survey responses, and 4 access campus survey responses), and 26 online form responses were gathered. Data analysis began during the interim session in January 2020 and continued through the spring semester. Analysis was slowed by the COVID-19 pandemic and the conversion to online teaching in the spring semester. Analysis continued over the summer and fall, with the final report being reviewed by the committee and approved for submission to Provost Koker.

RESULTS

Analysis: Feedback from Google surveys, online form, and in-person meetings were analyzed, interpreted, and summarized in this report. Details of the analysis process are provided within each section.

In-person meetings: Committee members attended 19 meetings in the fall of 2019. The sessions attended included departmental meetings, college administrative and divisional meetings, 2-year campus Collegiums, administrative meetings (SIS TAG), Office of Continuing Education (OCE) and graduate council meetings. Two open forum "listening sessions" were held and open to the entire campus community to obtain feedback. All efforts were made to have a minimum of 2 committee members present at each

meeting with notes being recorded during the meeting and provided to the committee after the meeting.

The notes from each meeting were analyzed by a qualitative researcher on the committee who categorized the comments into categories and themes from three groups: Academic, Leadership, and Administrative. Results from this analysis were reviewed by committee members. The themes and categories developed in this analysis were used to guide the creation of this report.

Online Google Surveys: Overall, 60 Google surveys were collected. The Google survey questions that were developed through multiple discussions by PACUAS team members appear in Appendix I of this report. The results will be broken down into Academic department, Administrative unit, and Access campus responses with summaries and conclusions for each.

Surveys were sent out to all academic departments via their Deans or Associate Deans. Department leaders were notified at listening sessions that survey responses were being collected.

Table 1: Response Rates by College for Google Surveys from Academic Departments

College	Responses	Number of Departments/Programs	% Responded
COLS	26	38	68%
CON	2	2	100%
COB	4	7	57%
COEHS	5	7	71%
Total	37	54	69%

Collectively, 37 Google survey results were submitted. The breakdown of results is shown in Table 1, where four were from the College of Business (COB), five were from the College of Education & Human Services (COEHS), two were from the College of Nursing (CON), and twenty-six were from the College of Letters & Science (COLS). While the goal was a 100% response rate, the overall response rate of 69% is shown above.

Google surveys were distributed to administrative units via the SIS TAG listserv and other administrative departments on campus. Overall, 19 responses were submitted. All four deans' offices also submitted responses.

Due to their unique position and recent addition to the UW Oshkosh campus, we invited all two-year campus community members to submit feedback on the structures presented in the ASET report. We received 4 responses.

Google survey responses were summarized and reviewed by a minimum of two committee members to ensure that the summary reflected the unit's overall response. The summaries from each unit/department were combined with others in their college, division, or administrative unit to provide recommendations for their unit. See "Subgroup Recommendations" for further details.

Online form feedback: An online form was developed for the Provost's website. This form asked questions similar to that of the Google survey but was simplified to four questions in order to obtain more directed feedback. The questions from the survey are provided in Appendix I.

A qualitative analysis was conducted as results from this form were categorized by question and summarized into themes similar to those used for the in-person meetings by a student researcher, with guidance from a committee researcher. Once those themes were identified and summarized, they were cross-checked with the themes from the in-person meeting and Google surveys to ensure that no ideas, comments, or new themes emerged that had not been previously observed. Any data not captured by the other analyses were added to the larger summary.

Model Analysis

A quantitative analysis was completed on the 60 Google Surveys submitted by both academic departments and administrative units. Each department and unit was asked to rank the proposed university structure models presented in the Academic Structure Evaluation Team (ASET) report. Below is a summary of those results. Table 2 shows the average ranking from the four colleges of each proposed university structure model (Models #1-6), where Model #1 was the current structure and Models #2-6 were variations of other possible structures.

Table 2: Average Ranking per Proposed Academic Structure Model. Rankings were averaged per college from data collected in the submitted departmental Google Surveys. Rankings ranged from 5 which was the most preferred to a ranking of 1 which indicated an unfavored or not preferred model.

College	Model #1	Model #2	Model #3	Model #4	Model #5	Model #6
COLS	4	3	2	2	2	2
CON	4	4	5	2	3	1
COB	3	4	3	3	3	4
COEHS	3	4	3	3	3	3
Average of all Colleges	3.5	3.75	3.25	2.5	2.75	2.5
Average (Rounded)	4	4	3	3	3	3

As shown above, the average rankings were provided from the colleges for both our current structure (Model #1) and Model #2. Each college ranked the models differently. The numbers shown are an average for each model of the data provided by the academic departments from each college. An overall average for the university is shown in the last row where Models #1 and 2 were ranked equally at 4. Models #3-6 were all ranked on average at 3, though differences were observed in those rankings between colleges.

Due to the large number of responses from the College of Letters and Science, a divisional analysis was conducted to provide a more detailed breakdown of the responses. The breakdown of the responses, shown in Table 3, are reported by COLS divisions: Fine and Performing Arts (FAPA), Humanities, Social Sciences (SS), and Math/Science. Additionally, interdisciplinary programs were uniquely identified and included because of their highly collaborative and cross-departmental nature in COLS.

Similar to Table 2, Table 3 shows the average ranking by division per proposed academic structure model from data collected in the Google Surveys. Again, rankings ranged from 5 which was the most preferred to a ranking of 1 which indicated an unfavored or not preferred model. Model #1, our current model, was ranked highest by all divisions and the interdisciplinary programs. Overall, differences in rankings were observed between the individual divisions. Model #2 was ranked overall the second most favorable model

at 3. Models #3-6 averaged a ranking of 2 in the unfavorable range. Model #4 was the only model to receive two rankings at the lowest, unfavored level.

Table 3: Average Ranking per Proposed Academic Structure. Rankings were averaged per COLS Academic Division from data collected in the submitted departmental Google Surveys. Rankings ranged from 5 which was the most preferred to a ranking of 1 which indicated an unfavored or not preferred model.

Division	Model #1	Model #2	Model #3	Model #4	Model #5	Model #6
FAPA	4	4	2	1	2	3
Humanities	4	3	2	2	2	3
Math/Science	4	3	3	2	2	2
Social Science	4	3	2	1	2	2
Interdisciplinary Programs	5	4	1	2	3	2
Average of all Divisions	4	3	2	2	2	2

List of Academic Units in COLS that responded: COLS/FAPA (Art, Music); COLS/Humanities (Anthropology, Global, Religions, and Cultures, Communication Studies, English, Global Language and Cultures, Journalism, Philosophy, Radio TV Film); COLS/Math & Science (Chemistry, Computer Science, Engineering Technology, Geology, Kinesiology, Mathematics, Medical Technology, Biology); COLS/Social Science (Criminal Justice, Geography, History, Military Sciences, Public Administration, Social Work, Sociology, Political Science); & COLS/Interdisciplinary Programs (Environmental Studies, Social Justice, Women’s and Gender Studies)

An analysis was also conducted on the data provided in the Google surveys from the administrative and leadership units, which is shown in Table 4. Similar to Tables 2 and 3, Table 4 shows the average ranking by the various College Dean’s Offices and administrative units per proposed academic structure model from data collected in the Google Surveys. Again, rankings ranged from 5 which was the most preferred to a ranking of 1 which indicated an unfavored or not preferred model.

The administrative and leadership teams indicated that Model #3 was the most favored of the six models. It should be noted that this is a clear difference between the academic rankings (Table 2) and those proposed by the administrative/leadership teams (Table 4). Models #1, 2, and 4-6 had an average ranking of 3 though Models # 2 and 4 each had an unfavorable ranking.

Table 4: Average Ranking per Proposed Academic Structure Model. Rankings were averaged per administrative unit from data collected in the submitted administrative unit Google Surveys. Rankings ranged from 5 which was the most preferred to a ranking of 1 which indicated an unfavored or not preferred model.

Units	Model #1	Model #2	Model #3	Model #4	Model #5	Model #6
College Deans	3	2	4	3	3	3
Admin Units	3	3	4	2	3	3
Average of Admin Units	3	3	4	3	3	3

List of Administrative Units that Responded: Police Department; Student Affairs; Sponsored Programs; UARC; Student Support Services (SSS & SSS STEM); Finance & Administration (Budget office and Postal Services/Doc Services/Receiving); Student Accounts, Procurement, Travel/AP, HR/EEO AA; Project Success; Reading & Study Skills Center; UMC; Admissions; Division of Student Affairs
 College Deans: COLS Dean’s Office, COEHS Dean’s Office, COB Dean’s Office, CON Dean’s Office

Another way to analyze the data would be to examine the number of respondents that preferred Model #1 (current structure) compared to the other Models, not just how each department or unit ranked their favorability. This data is presented in Table 5 (see below).

Of the 56 Google surveys collected (only departmental or unit surveys), only 29% of the respondents indicated that Model #1 was preferred and 5% indicated that they did not have a preference. Fourteen, or 25%, of respondents ranked Model #1 equal to any other model (#2-6). Twenty-three, or 41% ranked any Model (#2-6) more favorably than Model #1, our current structure. This indicates that there is some willingness to change.

In addition to the Google surveys, the same type of analysis, shown in Table 6, was conducted with the responses from the survey submissions on the Provost’s website. Responses could be from any member of the campus community, with most representing individual community members feedback and a few representing departments. Of the 26 respondents, only 25 provided their preferred Model. Of those who did indicate their preference, 40% preferred Model #1 whereas 28% ranked any other Model (#2-6) as their preferred choice. Only 4, or 16%, respondents indicated that

Model #1 and #2 or Models #4 and 5 were preferred. Lastly, a few people (3) indicated that they needed more information to make a decision.

Table 5: Results from the Quantitative Ranking Google Survey Quantitative Summary: Which models were preferred by all responding departments/units? (N = 56, reporting for academic departments or administrative units)

Preferred Model	# of Units/Depts reporting this as their preferred model	Percent of Total
Current Structure, Model #1	16	29%
Current Model ranked at same level as another model (e.g. Ranked Models #1 and 2 both as 5)	14	25%
Ranked any Model (#2-6) over Model #1 as preferred	23	41%
No Preference (i.e., Ranked all models at the same level)	3	5%

Table 6: Results from the responses submitted to the online form on the Provost's website. Data shows which model(s) were preferred by respondents. (N = 26, with one abstention)

Preferred Model	# of Units/Depts reporting this as their preferred model	Percent of Total
Current Structure, Model #1	10	40%
Ranked Two Models Equally Acceptable	4	16%
Ranked any model other than the current as preferred	7	28%
Need more information to make a decision	3	12%

Subgroup Analysis

The identity and purpose of the units responding to the surveys and in-person meetings had a clear influence on whether or not restructuring was viewed as necessary, needed,

not needed, or unwarranted. Therefore, to provide an understanding of the multifaceted analysis from across campus, the data analysis was divided into ten subgroups to provide perspective to each group's recommendations. Each subgroup analysis was provided by a committee member from that group as well as one or two external reviewers from the committee.

The subgroups are as follows:

- College of Nursing
- College of Business
- College of Education and Human Services
- COLS: Fine and Performing Arts
- COLS: Math and Science Division
- COLS: Humanities
- COLS: Social Sciences
- Admin Group A: Admissions, Student Affairs, Undergraduate Advising Resource Center (UARC), Registrar, Student Accounts, University Marketing and Communications (UMC)
- Admin Group B: Police, Sponsored Programs, Student Success Services (SSS)/SSS STEM, Reading & Study Skills Center, Project Success
- Admin Group C: Finance & Administration - Budget Office, Postal Services/Doc Services/Receiving, HR/EEO AA

Subgroups developed reports based on the results, feedback, and recommendations received by the committee for their college, division, or group. The reports submitted by the subgroups can be found in Appendix II. After the subgroup reports were submitted, the non-voting Associate Dean committee members reviewed and provided feedback on the reports. After review, the subgroup reports were sent back to each group for an additional review before being summarized for the final presentation in this report and to our university-wide community.

DISCUSSION

As the committee sought input from across campus, a clear difference in perspective emerged among broad groups on campus: administrative, leadership, and academic departments/faculty. Each perspective provides value and covers similar areas of the institution. However, each group prioritized different aspects of restructuring so data from each group was separated for consideration.

Seeing the different perspectives regarding the possibilities and issues of restructuring provide a broader institutional view of ideas and possibilities for change, as well as philosophical and practical concerns. Within each perspective, multiple themes emerged but there was consistency between each perspective. The themes that consistently were reported from the perspectives were: Leadership and Restructuring Logistics, Recruitment and Marketing, Governance, Financial and Administrative Implications, Interdisciplinary or Collaborative Efforts, Operational Efficiencies, and Curriculum.

The process started with taking feedback from the in-person meetings, and adding in any further aspects to represent responses from the campus fora and surveys. For example, Undergraduate Advising Resource Center (UARC) was not present at an in-person meeting so responses from UARC via survey were incorporated into the summary of feedback from the administrative perspective.

Administrative Perspective

Departments/Units responses included in this perspective:

- Admissions, Student Affairs, Undergraduate Advising Resource Center (UARC), Registrar, Student Accounts, University Marketing and Communications (UMC)
- Police, Sponsored Programs, Student Support Services (SSS)/SSS STEM, Reading & Study Skills Center, Project Success
- Finance & Admin - Budget Office, Postal Services/Document Services/Receiving, HR/EEO AA

Summary: Administrative responses centered on the immense logistical issues and impacts to the student experience that need to be considered with restructuring. Below is a summary of the feedback received from the Administrative units. Themes 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7 were observed in this perspective. *Theme 3: Governance* and *Theme 5: Interdisciplinary or Collaborative Efforts* were not consistently observed in the response from the above units.

Theme 1: Leadership and Restructuring Logistics

Administrative units' main focus was not on whether or not restructuring should happen, but what would need to happen to facilitate such a change. Many issues were illustrated that would be impacted by such a change like the 30 software systems that integrate with PeopleSoft or room designations by facilities. There were also implications of changing department prefixes, the program catalogs, etc. Many units noted key opportunities to standardize processes with a restructure that could improve overall operations. Any changes in university structure would need to follow the Proper Project

Management guidelines, which would require 18 months of analysis. Thus creating a significant timeline for any change to be implemented. HR assignments would also likely need to be adjusted or created if the restructure was significant.

Large systemic changes would require the review of 600 current articulation agreements and transfer equivalencies. This would require work to start a minimum of a year in advance of any changes.

Advising, which is structured by colleges, might need to undergo rearrangement. This could require a significant amount of new training and staff adjustments. Some possible benefits could arise. This is another example of a good opportunity to streamline processes, however it would require a major overhaul with additional (perhaps hired) resources and consultants.

Process and timing for restructuring: Units asked about opportunities for input with any proposed restructure, including time and resources for planning and implementation, or the possibility of a pilot study. They suggested incremental changes or focusing on restructuring a couple colleges first to work out a process if the entire university would need to be restructured. Some groups indicated that consultants might be needed to help with the process.

Theme 2: Recruitment, retention, and marketing

Restructuring could improve how UWO presents options to current and potential students. Streamlining processes could potentially help with students transferring among colleges. Competitive, relevant marketing should be directed towards the student.

Commencement would also be impacted. Both the structure and timing of the event might be impacted but branding would also be impacted. Diplomas, banners, etc. might need to be produced or changed.

Theme 4: Financial and administrative implications

Restructuring with the proposed models will require an immense resource investment from UWO to facilitate the changes that would need to be across core processes – registrar, advising, IT, HR, etc. With reduced resources currently across campus and systems needing support (and possibly upgrades – many are manual), a plan for substantial resources to support restructuring should be in place.

Theme 6: Operational Efficiencies

Restructuring provides an opportunity to improve the consistency of operations across the colleges and streamline the way things are done. This requires an imaginative, thoughtful, informed approach to visualize a new structure and then move in that direction.

Theme 7: Curriculum/ Student education / experience

Units suggested that any restructuring be mindful of degree requirements confusion (possibly) with changes, looking at changes with new major names/codes with software systems, and potential snowball effects of any additional requirements on top of USP. Students would need to be allowed to complete their degrees under the current system, which would create a minimum of a 6-year track thus a dual system would be needed to operate initially.

Other Considerations

Program reviews would be impacted by restructuring so there would need to be specifications on how that would be handled and how data would be compared pre- and post-restructuring.

Leadership Perspective

Departments/Units responses included in this perspective:

- College of Education and Human Service (COEHS) Leadership Council
- College of Letters & Science (COLS) Dean's Office
- College of Business (COB) Council
- UWO's Leadership Council
- College of Nursing (CON) Leadership Council
- Office of Continuing Education (OCE) Leadership
- Graduate Council

Summary: Leadership responses considered issues that academic programs might face during a restructuring process but focused more so on strategy issues with operations and marketing/recruitment/retention. Responses tended to focus on the need to have more flexibility and "nimbleness" for change, indicating that adaptability to student needs and changing interest could be a benefit to restructuring. Leadership indicated that other possible outcomes of a restructuring process could be the ability to reduce administrative oversight in COLS and create a more balanced voting structure, which was

a concern voiced by some Councils and in the open forums. All seven themes were present in the feedback provided by this group and are presented below.

Theme 1: Leadership and Restructuring Logistics

Rationale and timing were questioned for a restructure at this moment (awaiting URA, uncertainty with budget, combining campuses), with suggestions to restructure less top down and/or with smaller changes vs. radical shifts. Needs and benefits should be outlined, with potential outcomes, to inform the process. Departments should play a direct role in a restructuring process, where it's informed through a faculty-driven process, though it was noted that we shouldn't be afraid of change and that change can be positive.

Theme 2: Recruitment, Retention, and Marketing

Strategically, it was suggested that increased program visibility (especially in COLS, graduate college, etc.), focused program marketing (cohesiveness), and nimble programmatic responses to societal changes and student interests could be improved with a possible restructure by enhancing program missions, potentially increasing enrollment and increasing retention. Alternatively, a frequent counterpoint was that many of these things (e.g., increased visibility, increased marketing for departments, changing the name of COLS, etc.) could be accomplished without any restructuring though some of the actions could require both financial and personnel resources. Many indicated a more compelling case that restructuring will increase enrollment and potentially improve retention is needed.

Many in this group noted that it was their observation that COLS was difficult to market during a time in which we need to better communicate programs to prospective students. Some respondents indicated their perception or experience with UWO's recruitment process was not marketing to the 2020 audience and using out-of-date "traditional" methods. Some felt that restructuring would help with recruitment, but others felt the data to support that assertion had not been provided. It was noted that certain programs, like nursing, provide a retention opportunity if nursing applicants do not get into nursing and may be interested in a science-related field at UWO instead. Efforts should be made to create easy pathways to retain those students. We know many students leave UWO for other nursing programs (Marian, Bellin, FVTC, etc.). Perhaps with better collaboration between health science departments, would help retention perhaps even switching programs pre-CON decision. It was suggested that a "College of Nursing and Health Sciences" might better deal with these issues.

Additionally, anecdotal feedback received by this group indicated that many programs, degree requirements, and pathways in COLS are too complicated for prospective students and parents to understand. Therefore, degree requirements should be simplified for clarity. This could be accomplished through restructuring like creating separate colleges like STEM and Liberal Arts, which is common at other institutions, but an internal process might be sufficient.

UWO should increase its online instruction course offerings to reach out to nontraditional students. It was suggested that the Office of Continuing Education (OCE) and Enrollment Management collaborate on UWO's online and adult education offerings. With the Chancellor promoting adult education and consistent waitlists for traditional students to get into OCE classes, the University should capitalize on this interest. Additionally, OCE has stronger partnerships with many departments on campus.

In addition to expanding online offerings, the Graduate Council highlighted the opportunity in expanding graduate education on the campus by creating a Graduate School, where both financial and personnel resources could be established to better support, engage, and recruit graduate students. The Council suggested that in the 50+ years of graduate education on campus, it has not been widely organized or collective where students feel part of a program but not an institution. A graduate school could change that for students.

Theme 3: Governance

COLS outnumbers others in the Senate and influences policy discussions, such as children in the workplace and the consensual relations policy. A large sole voice makes it seem harder to be heard in shared governance making.

Theme 4: Financial and Administrative Implications

Financial stability is essential for a restructuring process to occur. The new budget model will be implemented, so the budget must be considered for any changes. Space, not just personnel costs, should be evaluated if departments or people need to be relocated on campuses. If a restructuring occurs, the administration might need to be restructured also.

Theme 5: Interdisciplinary Efforts, Collaborative Efforts, and Research

Restructuring could create opportunities for collaboration, which has been difficult to this point. Proposed models split some aligned programs while bringing together currently separated programs. Programs currently split across colleges should explore

whether or not their programs could be enhanced and provide better student outcomes through restructuring.

Collaboration is valued, but there are challenges in both the current and proposed models. One example is concern about a major like interdisciplinary studies and splitting it across colleges. If departments that work together are separated from one another, we have to ensure that those departments would be able to continue programming that is of mutual interest to all parties. It was suggested that we should encourage a multi-college structure that supports programs that cross colleges. Collaborations should be encouraged like how the CON has been in talks with the Kinesiology and Social Work departments to provide new pathways for students.

Graduate programs could also be enhanced for programs like nursing.

Theme 6: Operational Efficiencies

Some mentioned balancing the size of the colleges made sense, with thoughts to improve administration and budget. Opportunities for divisions to exert more leadership, standardization of processes and nimble approach to operations so more responsive to societal changes and student needs. Thus giving divisions more “control over their destiny.” Efficiency, manageability, and budgeting could potentially be improved if colleges were more evenly balanced.

Restructuring might also give us an opportunity to take a look at administrative procedures and bylaws in each college. It would be an opportunity for procedural standardization as well as equality among all faculty and staff. An opportunity to reevaluate procedures and policies also is possible.

Theme 7: Curriculum

Strategically, opportunities with restructuring could include new and clearer career paths and options, as well as increase online instruction. A commitment to liberal arts was expressed, though there was concern about increasing the number of colleges unintentionally creating new barriers to graduation for students. A restructuring process may be a time to get creative and innovative for students by creating new majors or programs.

In addition to restructuring, distance/online learning should be incorporated into any planning for restructuring. It was suggested that perhaps the campus needs a Center for Technology and Innovation or some kind of tech center, a place for putting programs online; managing classes online; or providing resources for using tech in classes.

Academic Department Perspective

Departments/Units responses included in this perspective:

- *FAPA*: Art, Music, FAPA Division Meeting
- *Humanities*: Anthropology, Global, Religions, and Cultures, Communication Studies, English, Global Language and Cultures, Journalism, Philosophy, Radio TV Film, Humanities Division Meeting
- *Math/Science*: Chemistry, Computer Science, Engineering Technology, Geology, Kinesiology, Mathematics, Medical Technology, Biology, M/S Division Meeting
- *Social Science*: Criminal Justice, Geography, History, Military Sciences, Public Administration, Social Work, Sociology, Political Science, Social Science Division Meeting
- *ID Programs*: Environmental Studies, Social Justice, Women's and Gender Studies
- Fond du Lac All-Campus, Fox Cities All-Campus meeting
- Master of Public Administration
- Oshkosh Student Association (OSA)

Summary: All seven themes were present in this perspective. Academic responses focused heavily on the budget, process and local program or curriculum issues. While department and divisional issues were reported, here we report themes that were consistent across all academic departments and not "local level" feedback. More divisional- or department-specific information, please see the Subgroup Reports found in Appendix I. Many within COLS felt a stronger divisional structure might be a better first step than a restructure.

Theme 1: Leadership and Restructuring Logistics

Broadly, faculty expressed questions about the rationale and impetus for restructuring; transparency and steps for the process to explore restructuring; if this is the correct timing with the immense change and low instructor morale on campus; and criteria for making structural changes. A few voices expressed interest in considering restructuring but many questions persist such as:

Is there a plan in place to assess the impacts of any restructuring on the Oshkosh and access campuses? Where is the data to show that a restructuring would "work"?

UWO's identity should be defined. Who are we? Who do we want to be? What is the most important factor in restructuring (branding,

marketing, curriculum, administration, budget, etc.)? Which one “wins”?

Faculty expressed concerns with uncertainty about the possibility of moving due to a restructure and other logistics, including questions about ADA support, budget lines, college processes and forms, space utilization, etc.

Theme 2: Recruitment, Retention and Marketing

Some departments and their members identified marketing as a recruitment issue, particularly for COLS programs. It was noted that COLS does not appear to have a brand and it was repeatedly suggested that “Letters & Science” doesn’t resonate with high school students or first-generation families. “Sustainability” as a focus that resonates was also questioned.

Additionally, some felt there is a lack of visibility for some majors within COLS. Many departments said they would like to see increased resources for marketing (e.g., website maintenance, social media support, etc.) which is currently handled uniquely in each department. It should be noted that many questioned whether the restructuring was needed for this purpose or whether improving marketing within the current structure would increase enrollment. There are programs that could benefit from improved marketing through a restructure and improved visibility for those programs. A “College of Health” was thought to possibly help with marketing, recruitment as was a possible “STEM College.”

In addition to increased visibility, departments with similar functions could share resources, potentially saving money and making philosophical decisions that could make marketing, branding and recruitment easier. For example, the FAPA division noted it was difficult to get publicity for their shows, etc. A unified division could increase visibility and make it easier to promote events.

A stronger divisional structure for COLS was suggested as an additional way to improve marketing and increase enrollment.

Theme 3: Governance

COLS has a substantial presence in the governance structure, which some faculty viewed as important to maintaining its voice and viability. A reoccurring assertion was that the large footprint of COLS creates an unbalanced distribution of power. A repeated counterpoint to that assertion indicated that COLS serves the most students and keeping the current structure would maintain the strong commitment to the liberal arts.

Theme 4: Financial and Administrative Implications

There is a lack of clarity surrounding the institutional budget at the department level. The addition of numerous administration positions while increasing teaching loads and budget cuts at the department level contributed to faculty concerns about implications of the cost of restructuring. The implications of the new budget process are unknown and are based per student so in the current system departments are fighting for students rather than working collaboratively. How would restructuring impact the new budget model?

It is also unclear what would happen to department S&E funds, 128 accounts, hiring practices and procedures, ADA positions, how people in cross-college situations would be paid, or how distribution of resources (e.g., marketing, advising, ADA support, etc.) would be impacted. Feedback also indicated that restructuring should not be seen as a solution or panacea to chronic lack of adequate state funding.

Theme 5: Interdisciplinary programs, collaborative efforts, and research

Faculty value collaboration and would not want to lose these opportunities with restructuring though some recognize the need for nimbleness and a process to create collaborations. Some faculty also stated restructuring could make collaboration across colleges and some programs easier though there was worry about cross-listed programs, departments that currently reside in two divisions in COLS (e.g., geography), and multi-disciplinary research projects losing the ability to collaborate.

Divisions add comradery to related departments and promote collaboration. Therefore a stronger divisional system could be a substitute for a restructuring process. Another possibility is to evaluate structures for programs that regularly share students. For example, RTF majors minor in other programs that could be outlined in the structures. There might be existing ties across campus keeping a student-centric approach like looking for minors thus creating collaborations or even using minors to open pathways for students instead of restructuring.

For an interdisciplinary program with no faculty (i.e., a fully cross-listed program), restructuring would need to go through rigorous scrutiny and evaluation prior to the implementation of a new structure. There would be both cross-college labor and courses. Programs, like Environmental Studies and Women and Gender Studies, expressed serious questions and concerns about how a collaborative curriculum might be impacted with many cross-listed courses and a number of cross-discipline collaborations.

Theme 6: Operational Efficiencies

With the larger size of COLS, there could be opportunities for internal and external operational efficiencies with restructuring. As noted earlier, administrative implications are unclear at this time, but the size of COLS makes it a difficult college to manage. Administrative things are tough to manage in COLS and both internal and external operational efficiencies could be improved.

Theme 7: Curriculum

Faculty were concerned about restructuring impacts on degree requirements, general education courses and other unforeseen curriculum impacts. There was a desire to maintain access and a strong commitment to liberal arts education. Students asked if restructuring could lead to improved communication between departments; new majors; and shorter time to degree but at this time the answer to those important questions are unknown.

Questions arose about how degree requirements (i.e., BS, BA, etc.) would be evaluated and decided if restructuring occurred. For example, if majors offered classes in three different colleges, how would the determination of degree requirements be made? There was concern that degrees across multiple colleges could be a deterrent for students if navigation was difficult or clarity was lacking. There was also concern about what the structure would be for USP/general education if restructuring were to occur.

Feedback from OSA indicated that students felt cross-college communication was currently lacking, causing difficulty to solve issues like class time conflicts and curriculum mapping. Additional concerns noted by OSA included ensuring that students could move through their programs quickly and that any restructuring should remove “roadblocks” and help reduce the time to graduation. Students also noted marketing could be improved with no restructuring but rather changing names of programs or colleges.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the Provost Academic Committee on University-wide Academic Structure (PACUAS) committee was charged with gathering input on restructuring UWO’s four colleges from the three-campus community. **This was an opportunity to be reflective and innovative** on what we do well and where our institution can improve to attract, retain, and serve our students. We collected data from 19 listening sessions, 2 open forums, 60 Google surveys, and 26 online form responses.

The analysis, both quantitative and qualitative, showed **willingness to restructure though many felt that the evidence for the need for change had not been provided**, especially in the current budgetary crisis. Additionally, **restructuring would have far-reaching impacts on already stretched resources and unknown impacts on curriculum, student success, recruitment, and retention**. Others highlighted the possibilities that could come with restructuring. **Opportunities in restructuring included the ability to create mechanisms for quicker response to student demand; improved efficiency; and the ability to standardize policies, procedures, and protocols**. If done well, it could improve the institution **with potential to better serve students** by reviving majors, creating new programs and collaborations, and **providing simplified pathways (e.g. straightforward degree requirements) for all students (e.g., first-generation, out-of-state, transfer, adult learners, online learners, etc)**.

A significant amount of the feedback indicated that **there is a strong belief that current marketing strategies have been “ineffective” and “are out-of-date” while not properly funded, which has a direct impact on recruitment**. This has been highlighted as one issue in recruitment that could be improved without restructuring and **where many academic departments are interested in collaborating**. Many programs commented on their lack of visibility, which could be expanded at this time. **Communication in many forms could also be improved without restructuring** (e.g., inter-college, intra-college, communication with students, degree requirements clarity, pathways to degrees, etc.).

Since the data was collected, the COVID-19 pandemic has changed the world and will have lasting impacts on higher education for years to come. **While some of the information gathered here might be out-of-date or no longer relevant, the pandemic might have also created new ideas or opportunities and pushed our institution into new, responsive spaces**.

The committee did not come to a recommendation as to whether or not we should embark on restructuring, but hopes that the data collected helps inform the Academic Planning process. **Perspective was the key component to how departments and units responded. The seven themes that emerged show the complex range of issues that would need to be addressed if restructuring occurred:** Leadership & Restructuring Logistics; Retention, Recruitment, & Marketing; Governance; Financial and Administrative Implications; Interdisciplinary or Collaborative Efforts; Operational Efficiencies, and Curriculum.

APPENDICES

Appendix I. Survey Tools

GOOGLE SURVEY TOOL

- Sent to Academic Departments, the 2-year Campuses, College Leadership, and Administrative Units

Common Questions Across All Surveys

This past year the Academic Structure Exploration Team (ASET) produced a written report that presented and discussed several potential academic structures for the University of Wisconsin Oshkosh. A copy of the report has been provided to the campus. Here we will be obtaining feedback specific to your unit or department. Please discuss the questions with your department and submit one response for the unit.

Share the 3 most important things that your unit or department would not want to lose or be impacted with a restructuring process.

Share the 3 most important things that your unit could imagine being improved with a restructuring process.

Can you identify a cluster of departments/programs (up to 5) that fit with your unit when considering the following dimensions:

- Curriculum
- Marketing, Recruiting & Reputation
- Retention
- Scholarship
- Administration
- Governance

Report List:

Provide comments or feedback on list of departments/programs selected above:

The committee is open to many models for a potential restructuring and is interested in how units perceive aspects of the models brainstormed so far, or new ideas entirely. To get a sense of how units see pros/cons for aspects of the initial models put forth, please indicate your view of the following:

Likert Scale: 1 = unfavorable, 5 = favored or preferred model

- Model 1 - Explain? [text box]
- Model 2 - Explain? [text box]
- Model 3 - Explain? [text box]
- Model 4 - Explain? [text box]
- Model 5 - Explain? [text box]
- Model 6 - Explain? [text box]
- Model 7 - Create Your Own Model - why? [text box]

Explain the rating and any adjustments that would improve on this structure

The committee is interested in any evidence or data to guide the decision making towards a recommendation.

Do you have evidence or data that could help guide the creation of a new college or structure to improve UW Oshkosh? (i.e. alumni feedback, recruiting feedback, other institutions have successfully seen growth, etc.)

If you rated model #1 favorably (i.e. 4 or 5), please provide any data or evidence that might be available to support your answer. How does your unit see this structure fulfilling the goals of curriculum development, recruitment, retention, and scholarship?

Is there other data that we should be looking at in order to make a sound recommendation? Are you interested in committee members attending a department or unit meeting to discuss this further?

Unique Questions Per Survey

Academic Survey Questions:

- Do you currently share resources (e.g., ADA, equipment, etc.) that could be impacted if your unit or department was "rearranged"?
- Do you currently have any courses that are cross-listed that could potentially be impacted?

Administrative Survey Questions:

- How would restructuring impact your unit? Timeline issues? Resources?
- Additional: Are there other issues not noted above that also might be impacted with restructuring?
- Do you currently share resources that could be impacted if a reorganization occurred?

Access Campus Survey Questions:

- Do you have specific concerns that were not addressed above about impacts a possible reorganization of the university would have on the access campuses?

PROVOST WEBSITE SURVEY TOOL

Q1. What model do you prefer and why? If you do not prefer any model, please provide a suggestion for an alternative model.

Q2. Share the 3 most important things that your unit could imagine being improved with a restructuring process.

Q3. Share the 3 most important things that your unit would not want to lose or impact with a restructuring process.

Q4. Other comments (Optional)

Appendix II. Subgroup Reports

Subgroup reports provide the opportunity to report ideas, innovations, and concerns that are specific for each department/unit. While much of the department/unit level

specifics were not included in the report above, the committee felt it was important to provide a record of the feedback received so ideas were not overlooked or lost to time.

College of Nursing (CON)

Summary Statement: CON would consider restructuring if the status of the college can be maintained without diluting the quality and standards of nursing programs. Would prefer a nurse leader with experience in healthcare, accreditation, and clinical placement with strong community involvement. CON would appreciate the opportunity to redistribute the departments into somewhat equally sized colleges to support shared governance, interdisciplinary collaboration, and more efficient daily operations.

CONCERNS: the timing of restructuring due to economic climate, coupled with the recent merging with satellite campuses, restructuring the University is too much. Missing key pieces regarding budget allocation and decision made on how this will impact the university.

- **Leadership/Restructuring Logistics:** highest priority is to keep the status of the College of Nursing if the model of health-related colleges is considered; general agreement on having a nursing dean to maintain high quality outcomes in the nursing programs. Leader needs to have experience in healthcare with expertise in accreditation, clinical placement and licensure exam requirements (state board of nursing, AACN, etc.)
- **Recruitment/Marketing:** large number of students declare nursing as a major, however, many are turned away due to being unable to admit. These students leave to find other nursing programs. Perhaps with better collaboration between health science departments, they would consider staying at UWO here if we could help them transition to other health-related colleges/tracks within UWO. Restructuring would help students to transition seamlessly from one major/minor to another.
- **Governance:** Shared governance could be achieved within the university with restructuring colleges. Within the current structure COLS can outnumber people in the Senate and influences policy discussions.
- **Financial/Admin Implications:** current structure is financially a concern due to redundancy in administrative work within COLS due to its size. Could it be more efficient if colleges are restructured?
- **Interdisciplinary Efforts:** restructuring could enhance interdisciplinary collaboration (right now this is challenging). Could be better for graduate programs both ways, for nursing and for other programs.

- **Operational Efficiencies:** restructuring will allow for proportionate distribution of decision making across campus by creating colleges of similar sizes (COLS outweigh all other colleges- it is a shared governance issue)
- **Curriculum/Liberal Art Education:** CON attempted to work with sociology and kinesiology, but due to very different requirements, enrollment process and plan of study, this has been difficult to operationalize. Discussions, if restructuring, have to start at the curriculum level.

College of Business (COB)

Summary statement: Overall, the COB sought data to back up suggested structural changes, to which they were open but not feeling urgency to embrace. The COB pointed out several potential benefits including increased flexibility for students, equal size colleges, new collaboration opportunities and improved marketing and administrative efficiencies. There were concerns, however, as well: cost, what is going to be lost, and lack of rationale behind the change.

Three Departments did not even fill out the survey, while a fourth, Accounting, did not differentiate between the options. One department, Economics, was enthusiastic about a change. Another department, Finance, did not see the benefit of a change at the moment. Finally, Management and Human Resources did rank all potential models higher than our current system, but were still hesitant to recommend a change. The COB Council provided information in broad terms.

Recommendation(s):

- Many areas identified that this could increase flexibility for students.
- Some cross-listed courses that could be impacted.
- Economics really liked the idea of the “Health College” with all STEM fields and also liked the idea of putting “Corporate Technology” in the COB.
- Finance felt this would increase costs in a very difficult time to be doing so.
- Accounting is looking to work with other, non-COB Departments, to increase student flexibility.
- MHR recognized that a change could be good, but were not supportive at the moment.
- Naming/branding could be very important if restructuring were to take place.

College of Education and Human Services (COEHS)

Summary statement: The following summary for the College of Education and Human Services includes data contributed through in-person meetings, Google survey data, and an Online Form. Only one unit (e.g., Professional Counseling) out of five indicated a desire to

relocate to another college. Of the six models for restructuring, model #2 received the largest number of “yes” responses with 3 out of 5 units indicating yes; all other models received 2 of 5 yes responses although there was no consistent agreement on which of the remaining models was most favorable. Many expressed the potential for positive gains in Graduate-level programs that could occur following restructuring of the University.

Recommendation(s): Overall - maintain current University structure

Budget and Administrative implications

- Concerns expressed about how restructuring would be influenced and ultimately impacted by on-going budget revision(s)
- Concern expressed about the costs for adding administrators to additional colleges if we increase the number of colleges through restructuring

Operational efficiencies

- Restructuring might be most beneficial to individual colleges or units rather than restructuring the entire University
- Restructuring units currently in COEHS may result in operational efficiencies
- Consider sharing of current facilities between units such as: Human Kinetics and Health Education with Kinesiology/Athletics/Intramurals or Professional Counseling and Nursing/Sociology/Psychology

Restructuring logistics

- Concern about restructuring the University at the same time we are merging with UW Colleges campuses

Curriculum/liberal art education

- Some advantages to restructuring could be gained in Graduate-level programs

Interdisciplinary efforts

- Interests in working collaboratively with Sociology, Kinesiology, Psychology, Nursing, Women & Gender Studies, Criminal Justice, et al
- Restructuring could bring opportunities for more collaborations between units within COEHS and the larger University

Recruitment/marketing

- Any change(s) must maintain external accreditations for all units in COEHS to maintain external reputation

Governance

- Concern that COEHS could become smaller in total FTE due to restructuring of the entire University
- Restructuring could allow for more representation by COEHS faculty throughout the governance structures

Other

- Wanted the University to ‘go slow’ on any decision(s)

College of Letters and Science (COLS)

Division: Fine and Performing Arts (FAPA)

Summary: FAPA departments believe they can work within the existing structure to solve problems and that switching to one of the other models could create new problems. FAPA expressed concerns about the new budget model and how a reliance on SCH to determine budgets might impact a stand-alone FAPA college. There was some willingness to change but not without a clear understanding of how department budgets would be impacted. Cost saving through shared resources was mentioned as a possible benefit but lack of adequate funding even in the current model was expressed as a concern. FAPA does not see restructuring (as presented in the proposed models) as viable and stresses that within COLS, FAPA needs to be funded in a manner consistent with its unique nature and given the attention it deserves so it does not get lost in the shuffle.

Recommendation: FAPA does not see a need for restructuring at this time but if it happens the following possible outcomes came up in discussion and on surveys.

Summary from FAPA data and in-person meetings

Budget & administrative implications:

- Some savings and efficiency could occur through shared administrative restructuring.
- Departments want to maintain a certain amount of autonomy.
- Uncertainty about the implications of the new budget model on a stand-alone FAPA college were expressed.
- A suggestion was made to give the associate deans more administrative and budgetary authority
- Current budget is insufficient for FAPA department needs.

Operational efficiencies

- Sharing resources
- Shared marketing and recruitment
- Shared promotion of on-campus events and coordination

Restructuring logistics

- Concerns about possible loss of ADAs.
- Desire to build up and expand the departments under the current structure before considering a change.

Curriculum/liberal art education

- Arts are fundamental to liberal arts education regardless of structure

Interdisciplinary efforts

- Current structure seems to be best in promoting interdisciplinary curriculum

- STEM (Structure #3) might create more barriers not less to this curriculum

Recruitment/marketing

- Restructuring might help in recruitment of majors and raise visibility and profile within the university and community

Governance

- Not specifically addressed in comments or surveys.

Other

- In general, concerns are about the lack of funding; changing the structure will not help that, and may even create increased financial burdens. There were a lot of questions about why there is a need for a new structure and if this is budget based, or how it relates to the new budget model.

Division: Humanities

Summary statement: Discussions with Humanities departments and how they view possible restructuring range from needed to unwarranted. This is not surprising given the size of COLS, the variety of disciplines, and individual departments' personalities. While there was a wide range of topics and concerns, the following themes were the most prevalent:

- Prioritization of the liberal arts
- Visibility for recruitment
- Effect on degree requirements
- Opportunities for collaboration
- Implications on governance
- Change fatigue
- Operational efficiencies

Recommendation(s):

- When surveyed, **more than half of the departments that responded expressed support for the current COLS and/or a modified COLS structure that was less radical than the new proposed models.** Communications, RTF and Journalism were among **some departments expressing interest in exploring other models in addition to, or instead of, the current model.**
- **Priorities differ among Humanities units.** Traditional Humanities programs expressed priority for keeping together COLS units as a **foundation for a liberal arts education**, while programs with connections to industry expressed the importance of **visibility to recruit students**, such as with a media-focused college. While these units may all support liberal arts education and recruitment, their priorities differ when considering structure. Some asked, for example, if

improved marketing could solve issues of recruitment (to better promote values of the liberal arts or specific programs) versus changing structure.

- Concerns with restructure include: **BA and BS degree requirements** being affected and disconnecting liberal arts exposure to students and limiting resources for these programs; impacts on **collaboration and interdisciplinary opportunities** across units of COLS; **less voice in governance** while liberal arts programs feel under threat; and **unclear process, reasons for change and budget implications for departments**. Departments did not want to lose **resources, class sizes and identity**.
- Potential opportunities with restructure: **New collaborations** for arts and sciences and an opportunity to find ways to reduce boundaries toward more collaboration; and **operational and administrative efficiencies** possible. When asked about imagined positives with a restructure, some expressed preferences for **clear rationale** and **reductions to campus administration**. Positives sought included **improved college identity, resource allocation and budget, marketing support for all departments, responsive administration and program visibility for growth**.

Division: Math/Science (M/S)

Summary statement: Based on the data collected, the Math/Science Division of COLS did not have a consensus as to whether or not the existing college structure was preferred over any of the alternatives. Departments were split evenly between keeping the current structure and changing to other models (either #2 or 3). While there is a strong commitment to keeping a liberal arts background, many departments indicated that current marketing and visibility of programs in this division hinders recruiting efforts and puts our programming at a disadvantage compared to other UW System institutions. Some departments found it difficult to assess the models and alternative structures presented due to the lack of data provided and a lack of understanding of how curricula or revenue streams would be impacted.

Recommendation(s): Based on the feedback collected from the M/S division, more information is needed to assess the impact of the creation of a new college or school. This could be a beneficial move in helping departments market and recruit their unique programming, though there is a concern about the integration of curricula, the need to maintain connection to liberal arts, and budgetary increases. Importantly, accreditation requirements must be considered if restructuring occurs.

Key Points

- **Curriculum Issues vary between academic departments in the M/S division, but there is a strong commitment to maintain the connection to liberal arts education while making programming more accessible and flexible.**
 - It is critical that departments in the M/S division be allowed to maintain their accreditations.
 - Feedback indicated concerns about how a possible restructure would increase difficulty for students to shift between degrees or make it harder for STEM students to complete their major courses. M/S division majors are generally credit-heavy in the initial 2 years of college, so students can fall behind quickly or have to “catch up” if they switch majors which delays graduation.
 - If a new college is formed - especially for interdisciplinary programs - negotiating schedules, pre-requisites, seat distributions, and so on could be difficult.
- **Departments would like to continue to maintain or increase collaborations, while keeping autonomy**
 - M/S division departments rely heavily on each other. Collaboration occurs through multiple pathways including curriculum, shared scientific instrumentation and resources, and research. A new structure should only improve the existing collaborations not hinder it.
- **Visibility and Marketing are lacking for the STEM departments**
 - There are differing viewpoints about whether forming a separate college or school within the M/S academic departments would increase recruitment. Feedback indicated that some departments felt out marketed, which hindered UWO’s ability to recruit students into STEM majors because of the lack of a formalized, focused College or School. Two critical pathways that were highlighted as possibilities – “STEM-centric” school/college or “Health Care Career” college/school, where both pathways would allow for increased visibility on the strong M/S division programs and could provide a unique opportunity for students interested in the UW System.
 - The Sustainability Institute was suggested as another way to cluster/market programs without officially moving colleges.
 - Multiple departments indicated marketing and recruitment are critical but felt frustrated by the current level of directed resources provided for marketing the M/S division programs. Feedback indicated that

departments felt resources provided for marketing (e.g., website, social media support, etc.) were minimal and the lack of faculty or current student involvement in the process was detrimental to recruiting efforts.

- **Financial and Resources Issues**

- Concerns about retention of instructors (i.e. the need to increase salaries) and resources (i.e. space, office updates, equipment, etc), which might be able to be better addressed in a smaller, more focused college/school.
- There has been and continues to be a lack of funding for replacement and maintenance of instrumentation. This is a critical issue as instrumentation regularly breaks or becomes out-of-date and students lose the opportunity to learn and gain experience with important techniques. Equipment could be maintained by an inhouse equipment specialist or in a smaller, more focused college/school, a separate budget line for replacing or maintaining equipment could be possible.
- Many departments indicated that administrative costs should not increase if colleges are expanded.

Division: Social Sciences

Summary statement: Based upon the data collected, the Social Science Division of COLS was in general consensus that the existing college structure is preferred over any of the alternatives, that the members of the division should remain together, and that providing a strong liberal arts education at UWO needs to remain a central concern.

Recommendation(s): Based upon the above, it appears that the Social Science Division of COLS would recommend that the current structure be maintained. This is due in part to the desire of its members to maintain their identities, existing working relationships (e.g with each other, the interdisciplinary programs, programs from other divisions but in the college, etc.), and the centrality of the liberal arts to curriculum of the university, but also due to the lack of clear or sound rationale (e.g., supported by research) for any college-level restructuring at this time. The division would also recommend, however, that the Provost's Office seek to address numerous smaller, potential changes that promise greater efficiency that have been identified through our data collection process, and to provide additional leadership and resources that will encourage greater innovation, collaboration, and marketing of departments and programs within the existing college structure.

Key Points

- Concern from departments that straddle divisions or that engage in extensive cross-listing about proper placement and resources available (e.g., ADAs, 128 accounts, etc.);

- Openness to new ideas, but lack of understanding for the rationale behind tackling this kind of project now; seems like a solution in search of a problem and more about marketing than academics; there are smaller changes we could make in order to ensure efficiency and collaboration;
- A lot of concern about who will decide on restructuring and if departments will have any authority over that;
- Maintaining departmental identities, missions, and interdisciplinary relationships is critical, and social sciences generally want to remain together (but not as a generic “social sciences” unit);
- Several members of the division did express interest in developing new, collaborative relationships or new, interdisciplinary programs or ways of packaging their offerings;
- Desire to ensure that, whatever happens, the quality of a liberal arts education is not diminished.

Administrative Recommendations

Group A: Admissions, Student Affairs, UARC, Registrar, Student Accounts, UMC

Summary statement: The behind the scenes technical, logistical changes needed to support a restructuring of the colleges would be immense. The time needed to effectively implement a change of this magnitude cannot be underestimated. Nearly every detail of what is done in advising, the Registrar’s Office and others would be impacted. Timing, communication and training are all concerns.

The changes can be made to PeopleSoft, the Student Information System, but those changes would also need to be made to over 30 3rd party software systems that are integrated into PeopleSoft. Depending on the severity of the changes, we need to follow proper project management guidelines. According to IT, we will likely need 18+ months of analysis to figure out how these changes will impact the other systems and 6,000+ queries.

A restructure does provide many opportunities to streamline business processes if done correctly with the proper amount of analysis and IT support. We also need to reflect on the lessons learned from the restructuring of the UW Colleges to reduce pinch points and have a clearly defined structure, process and outcomes.

Recommendation(s):

- The Registrar’s Office alone feeds integrated systems like Canvas, Navigate, Salesforce, Schedule 25, College Scheduler, RoboRegistrar, etc. Those 3rd party softwares are used by or affect every operation on the UW Oshkosh campuses.
- Commencement, UMC, facilities would all be affected by departments moving from one building to another or one college to another. This would affect the commencement ceremony, commencement processes/lists fed from data in PeopleSoft.
- Structure of departments and colleges feeds room assignment process, Schedule 25.

- Facilities side – Uses software called Archibus (every room on campus, technology) – example: move computer science to the college of business, space in Sage may need to be changed to accommodate Comp Sci, could affect room structure – Schedule 25 controls that assignment.
- Facilities – room scheduling-how classrooms are used in different buildings and the technology in those classrooms – from curriculum point of view, smaller change or renaming other colleges a bit easier.
- The Academic Organizational tree in PeopleSoft would be re-done.
- All curriculum and all prerequisites would be affected and need to be redone.
- Any big changes would mean the whole catalog would have to be restructured or started from scratch.
- There could be confusion with degree/specific College requirements – COB has residency requirements, some of those would have to be ironed out at curriculum level with Form A-C and advising to be sure requirements were clearly communicated to students. Human Services BS is different than other BS requirements – might have to have review of degree requirements at the college level.
- We would need CourseLeaf or some catalog software to ease the process of Form A, B, C's as well as re-creating the bulletin; we have support from the faculty senate on purchasing CourseLeaf – with big restructure catalog software would be a necessity. Catalog software allows curriculum changes to feed right into the bulletin with a workflow to implement Form A, B, C's seamlessly.
- Shadow systems – education, DPI – internal college software (need to be factored into analysis)
- Transfer is under the spotlight throughout the UW System – required by state legislation to provide pathway guides so students who need to transfer can see displayed curriculum. It must be transparent. Required to display accurate equivalencies. Analysis on how a restructure would affect equivalencies would need to be done. A year in advance is best, a semester at the very least, as students are applying a year out. We would want to advise them on current practice but if aware of change, we would advise on a new upcoming change. If department's would change prefixes would change all of our transfer rules and affect the 600 articulation agreements we currently have.
- This would provide a great opportunity to standardize processes/procedures/forms. This is an opportunity to examine who we are, where we can improve business processes. Can we make processes uniform across the colleges?
- This could potentially help with students transferring among colleges. CourseLeaf is again a mechanism that would be a piece of that.
- Possible changes to degree requirements to streamline curriculum making it easier for students to navigate and complete requirements. 2. More effectively distribute resources among programs to better ensure course availability especially for high demand programs/courses. Or, improved collaborations among departments to address the issue of course availability, credits to degree, etc. 3. Streamline processes that impact students (ie: one change of major process for the campus, one way of

maintaining waitlists, etc.). More consistent processes can improve the student experience.

- USP is too complicated – could it be easier and changed with rearranging the departments. We have to market differently; Letters & Science doesn't mean anything. Need to model what makes sense to the students.
- Possible changes to degree requirements to streamline curriculum making it easier for students to navigate and complete requirements.
- The UARC is structured in the same manner as the university - by college - so a restructuring of the colleges would require a complete restructuring of the UARC. This would involve a significant amount of training for current staff - learning new curriculum/policies/procedures associated with new colleges/depts. they would begin advising for. We also have a college/department liaison model that is critical to our ability to advise accurately as well as support faculty advising. The liaisons would be reshuffled requiring advisors and colleges/depts to develop new relationships. While this is doable in the long run, in the short run there can be a disruption in the flow of information and the trust that has been established which could have a negative effect on advising. It is critical for advisors to be in the loop on curriculum/policy/procedure changes well in advance of implementation. It is even better when there is a collaborative relationship that prompts the department to seek input from advising on the impact of proposed changes prior to making decisions. In addition, all advising tools would need to be updated to reflect the new structure. In short, this would be a huge undertaking for the UARC.

Major Concerns:

- Significant time to implement possible changes
- Significant workload to implement possible changes
 - All curriculum and all prerequisites would be affected and need to be redone.
 - Renaming - commencement banners, degrees, etc.
 - Room assignment changes
 - New bulletin
 - Change or reconcile degree requirements
- Significant amount of training/retraining will be required
- Marketing - USP complicated, COLS - no name recognition

Possible advantages:

- Increased uniformity across Colleges in forms, processes, procedures, etc.
- Possibly help transfer students by increasing efficiency and transparency
- Possible changes to degree requirements could streamline curriculum making it easier for students to navigate and complete requirements.
- More effectively distribute resources among programs to better ensure course availability especially for high demand programs/courses.
- Possibly improved collaborations among departments to address the issue of course availability, credits to degree, etc.

- Streamline processes that impact students (ie: one change of major process for the campus, one way of maintaining waitlists, etc.). More consistent processes can improve the student experience.

Group B: Police, Sponsored Programs, Student Support Services (SSS) /SSS STEM, Reading & Study Center, Project Success

Summary Statement: All in favor some type of restructuring to benefit students (easier to navigate between colleges and services, majors, and minors etc.) and minimize operational costs (greater organizational efficiency could potentially reduce costs). and they feel the restructuring will not majorly affect the services they provide with a couple of exceptions. **Police** and **Sponsored Programs** are not impacted by the restructure but made recommendations for alternative models. **Student Support Services/SSS STEM** is housed in Academic Affairs and would prefer to stay. **Reading & Study Center** prefers to stay physically connected to COEHS. **Project Success** is in favor of restructuring and it is important to consider/understand their mission and operation while realigning colleges. Please see each individual department/section for further details.

Recommendation(s): budgeting will drive the restructuring process, until we understand the budget, we cannot figure out restructuring. Conduct a pilot study, focus on couple colleges and work on the process before we try to restructure the entire university. Bring in consultants to help with the process. Do it slowly, in phases

Police: *Not affected by relocation.* While the department would remain largely unaffected by this change, **model #5** makes the most sense and it would be easy for students and parents to understand.

Sponsored Programs: *Not affected by relocation.* Feel it is difficult to market majors and disciplines with the current setup. Prefers updating names to reflect what students seem to want and understand. Nursing, STEM, Performing Arts are easily recognizable. Voted for **Model #3**.

Student Support Services (SSS)/SSS STEM: *Prefers to be housed within Academic Affairs.* SSS felt like **Model #3** would provide the most balanced option if student enrollment is concerned. I would allow students to change majors with minimum disruption as prerequisite courses could be better aligned. Model #6 should also be considered. SSS and SSS STEM are required by the US Department of Education to assure students have access to and receive specific services. SSS STEM does not provide tutoring, students are referred to CAR. In addition, the SSS/SSS STEM staff refer students to and work closely with the staff of the Reading and Study Skills Center, the Writing Center and Project Success. All four departments are housed in Academic Affairs.

Reading & Study Center: *Prefers to be housed within COEHS* since it has structural connection to COEHS where its five Academic Skills courses reside. Any change that makes it easier for students to switch between similar majors/career paths might be helpful. They prefer **Model #1 or #2**.

Project Success: *Not affected by restructuring*. PS is a specialty department that is not always well understood or supported, and it is essential that wherever it is housed, a thorough understanding of operations and mission is essential. Accessibility, availability, and the impact of services must be considered with restructuring. It is also crucial to maintain interdepartmental relationships on campus to reinforce efforts to support all program participants. Although they do not share resources with many, collaboration is essential with the Accessibility Center. However, they believe services provided would likely not be impacted by reorganization. May need additional staff to look at new budget model implementation. **Prefers Models #1, #2, #3 and #5**.

Group C: Finance & Admin - Budget office, Postal Services/Document Services/Receiving, HR/EEO AA

Summary Statement: Budget drives the restructuring process. Current budget is a nebulous variable; without more information on budgetary constraints, informed decisions cannot be made on restructuring. Need to look at enrollment trends, as well as University Resource Alignment Report.

Recommendation(s):

- Restructuring (budget): Restructuring would require a new budget model (cumbersome).
- Possible need for additional staff-Unit Budget Officer would need to be assigned to each College
- Postal/Doc Services/Receiving: Logistically- currently there are 88 mail stops. Would need to completely revise if departments move to another location. Not for or against any of the proposed restructuring models.
- HR/EEO AA: Huge impact on HR to implement a massive reorganization (e.g. position/title changes, recruitment, organizational changes, etc.). Would require review of proposed changes to ensure equitable practices on decisions regarding people and positions.
- Restructuring does allow for better alignment and distribution of programs.
- Restructuring could attract/retain more students through targeted recruitment and marketing.

Appendix III: Quantitative Analysis: Summary of Survey Responses

Table 1: Response Rates by College for Google Surveys from Academic Departments

College	Responses	Number of Departments/Programs	% Responded
COLS	26	38	68%
CON	2	2	100%
COB	4	7	57%
COEHS	5	7	71%
Total	37	54	69%

Table 2: Average Ranking per Proposed Academic Structure Model. Rankings were averaged per college from data collected in the submitted departmental Google Surveys. Rankings ranged from 5 which was the most preferred to a ranking of 1 which indicated an unfavored or not preferred model.

College	Model #1	Model #2	Model #3	Model #4	Model #5	Model #6
COLS	4	3	2	2	2	2
CON	4	4	5	2	3	1
COB	3	4	3	3	3	4
COEHS	3	4	3	3	3	3
Average	3.5	3.75	3.25	2.5	2.75	2.5
Average (Rounded)	4	4	3	3	3	3

Table 3: Average Ranking per Proposed Academic Structure. Rankings were averaged per COLS Academic Division from data collected in the submitted departmental Google Surveys. Rankings ranged from 5 which was the most preferred to a ranking of 1 which indicated an unfavored or not preferred model.

Division	Model #1	Model #2	Model #3	Model #4	Model #5	Model #6
FAPA	4	4	2	1	2	3
Humanities	4	3	2	2	2	3
M/S	4	3	3	2	2	2
Social Science	4	3	2	1	2	2
Interdisciplinary Programs	5	4	1	2	3	2
Average	4	3	2	2	2	2

List of Academic Units in COLS that responded: COLS/FAPA (Art, Music); COLS/Humanities (Anthropology, Global, Religions, and Cultures, Communication Studies, English, Global Language and Cultures, Journalism, Philosophy, Radio TV Film); COLS/Math & Science (Chemistry, Computer Science, Engineering Technology, Geology, Kinesiology, Mathematics, Medical Technology, Biology); COLS/Social Science (Criminal Justice, Geography, History, Military Sciences, Public Administration, Social Work, Sociology, Political Science); & COLS/Interdisciplinary Programs (Environmental Studies, Social Justice, Women’s and Gender Studies)

Table 4: Average Ranking per Proposed Academic Structure Model. Rankings were averaged per administrative unit from data collected in the submitted administrative unit Google Surveys. Rankings ranged from 5 which was the most preferred to a ranking of 1 which indicated an unfavored or not preferred model.

Units	Model #1	Model #2	Model #3	Model #4	Model #5	Model #6
College Deans	3	2	4	3	3	3
Admin Units	3	3	4	2	3	3
Average	3	2.5	4	2.5	3	3
Average (Rounded)	3	3	4	3	3	3

List of Administrative Units that Responded: Police Department; Student Affairs; Sponsored Programs; UARC; Student Support Services (SSS & SSS STEM); Finance & Administration (Budget office and Postal Services/Doc Services/Receiving); Student Accounts, Procurement, Travel/AP; HR/EEO AA; Project Success; Reading & Study Skills Center; UMC; Admissions; Division of Student Affairs
College Deans: COLS Dean’s Office, COEHS Dean’s Office, COB Dean’s Office, CON Dean’s Office

Table 5: Results from the Quantitative Ranking Google Survey Quantitative Summary: Which models were preferred by all responding departments/units? (N = 56, reporting for academic departments and administrative units)

Preferred Model	# of Units/Depts reporting this as their preferred model	Percent of Total
Current Model	16	29%
Current Model ranked at same level as another model (e.g. Ranked Models #1 and 2 both as 5)	14	25%
Ranked any model other than the current as preferred	23	41%
Indifferent to all models (Ranked all models at the same level)	3	5%

Table 6: Results from the responses submitted to the online form on the Provost's website. Data shows which model(s) were preferred by respondents. (N = 25, with one abstention)

Preferred Model	# of Units/Depts reporting this as their preferred model	Percent of Total
Current Model	10	40%
Current Model ranked at same level as another model (e.g. Ranked Models #1 and 2 both as 5)	4	16%
Ranked any model other than the current as preferred	7	28%
Need more information to make a decision	3	12%