

ALUMNI STAKEHOLDER GROUP MEETING
November 9, 2004

Regent Herstam provided an overview of the need for the Feasibility and Planning Study and Mary Jo provided handouts regarding the project and discussed the process and she also provided demographic information. This background information and the Needs Assessment Presentation are on the web site at www.abor.asu.edu (University System Redesign Study).

Feedback from the members included the following:

- It is important to communicate effectively with legislators.
- The group would like to receive information regarding the number of students who apply and are not accepted in our university system, and the number of students accepted from other states.
- Financing is critical...How will the plan be financed? Public vs. private funding

The members broke into regional groups and provided the following input:

- Quality is important
- There is a lack of opportunities/options for students
- Accessibility for underrepresented groups is important
- Community buy-in (marketing)
- Students don't care about brand names
- Latino students want to stay close to home and don't want to leave their communities
- More options need to be available (example: WalMart)
- Need to expand 2+2 model and programs developed in more locations
- What should the campus of the future look like? Do we build something different?
- Expand technology – look at the success of the University of Phoenix
- What will the future students demand?
- Do not forget about the community colleges as resources
- Include opportunities for low income students
- Conversion of four-year colleges
- Preparedness of incoming classes
- Need for a Master Plan
- Goal - Provide more four-year degrees to more students. How do we do this?
-

NAU

The NAU alumni who attended the November 9, 2004, meeting were:

Josh Allen (Co-Convener)
Angela DeLa Cruz
Mike Beatty
Hank Peck
Booker Evans
Christine Farley
William Ekstrom
Ira Greenspan
Rhian Evans
Susan Youngdahl

The NAU group reported (this does not include individual member comments also made during that presentation):

- There are not enough 4 yr campus educational opportunities right now, particularly in non-metropolitan counties. There is currently a system in place w/ NAU's 2+2 program but it needs to be enhanced in number of locations to enable campuses to be created (like in Yuma) as opposed to simply making available degree offerings.
- The community colleges need to be recognized as important resources as does NAU, and between the two it needs to be recognized that we have a framework in place that can create additional opportunities if supported appropriately. Also, the fact is by looking to these current resources you end up having to only invest on the margin as opposed to starting from ground zero (from a financial perspective).
- As you look forward to 2020, we need to consider what the campus of the future needs to look like -- particularly considering the impact of technology in the delivery of education. The campus of 2020 could look radically different and require less of a physical infrastructure than what is traditionally thought of as a university campus.
- It was recognized that the issue of technology is a double edged sword and that thought should be given to how the "campus experience" is valued in and as part of the educational experience.
- Careful attention needs to be paid to the demographics of the future student, and the system needs to accommodate what they will be demanding. If the system does not, then it will not be utilized and then "what was the point."
- As it relates to Brand questions the small group of Alums that were in the group were all from NAU and they felt that brand was of most concern to alums, but that for the good of the institution and ultimately the system they would probably need to be open to looking at name changes.