

METRO CAMPUS RECOMMENDATIONS

Background

- Why are we doing this? We are at a crossroads in our history. We have to plan long range for how we will serve our community. There are several questions that need to be asked: Our students demand an up to date learning environment. Do our current metro campuses provide the learning environments students will excel in, not just today but into the future? When discussing our metro campuses, is it prudent to have five campuses in one small geographic area that pulls services and programs from each other and subsequently spreads the college thin wherein services and course offerings become marginalized, not optimized? Should we duplicate Truax five different times to ensure comprehensive services? I suggest that is prohibitive. What programs should we have at sites, and how do we address other issues that are site-related in the future? What is the best model to best serve our students, the communities, and the underserved and underrepresented segments of our communities? How do we hold true to our mission that ***“Madison College provides open access to quality higher education that fosters lifelong learning and success within our communities”***?, and true to our vision of being ***“The leader in accessible, affordable education that meets the evolving needs of our diverse communities”***, and holding equally as true to our values of ***“Excellence, Respect, Commitment to Students and Diverse Communities, and Making Higher Education Available to All?”***

With funding changes and future funding uncertainties, the necessity to ensure that expenditures do not exceed revenue, we provide adequate resources, we ensure access and the best learning environments for our students, and our environment is conducive to work – are the reasons we undertook the metro campus question and are making the subsequent recommendations you will hear shortly.

- Of the three metro campuses being reviewed – the Downtown Education Center (DTEC), West Campus, and South Campus, two are leased and one is owned. We need to notify the lessor at West Campus in June, 2015 if the college will renew the lease in 2016. The West Campus decision will have a domino effect on decisions at DTEC and the South Campus, whose lease expires in 2017. There has been a substantial erosion of enrollments due to new buildings constructed at Truax for Health Sciences and Protective and Human Services in addition to enrollment reductions based on our changing economy. Couple that with a different funding model than what was in place three years ago and an inability to maintain maintenance of multiple metro sites due to budget revenue/expenditure gaps. As a result of these issues, we must answer: **How do we better serve our communities based on programming and services offered, coupled with budget considerations?**

The issues surrounding the Metro Campus Study are very sensitive and emotional, and that adds to making a difficult recommendation and subsequently a difficult decision.

- Initial Study: Spring, 2014, by Diane Walleser – Focus on programs and demographics; focus groups conducted with faculty, staff, students
- Follow-Up Third Party Study: Focus groups, telephone surveys, community and business persons, government officials
- Board Retreat: February, 2015
- Analyzing Data: Resulted in 1) acknowledgement of strong programs; 2) comfortability of current locations; and 3) the need to serve underserved populations. Many of the subsequent campus visits reaffirmed what was collected earlier.

Process of Arriving at Recommendation

Utilized the Shared Governance structure. The College Assembly referred the question as to the viability of the metro campuses (excluding Commercial and Truax) to the Facilities, Planning and Investment Council, who selected a task force to “drill down” into the metro campus data, have several conversations with stakeholders, and produce a recommendation that would be forwarded to the Facilities, Planning and Investment Council. The Councils would then “thumb” the recommendation, and if thumbed to move forward, the recommendation would go to the College Assembly. If the College Assembly thumbed the recommendation, it would move on to the President for further deliberation with the Cabinet, with a preliminary recommendation being presented to the Board at its April meeting.

At this point I would like to recognize the task force, councils, and College Assembly for their hard work and commitment to seeking a resolution that is acceptable and prudent. Process wise, on first reading, the College Assembly referred the recommendations presented by the Council back to the Council for further discussion and deliberation. The Council again, essentially put forth the same recommendation to the College Assembly, wherein the Assembly after great debate and listening to various viewpoints “Thumbed Down” the Council’s recommendation by a narrow margin. While this internal process was in “full swing,” I, and on several occasions with Tim Casper, met with numerous individuals and groups inclusive of elected leaders, internal constituents, Community Based Organizations, and individuals who have a relationship with the College and/or metro campuses. That list has been provided to you in your binder. With the exception of the immediate neighborhood surrounding the Downtown Education Center and its Madison City Council representative (Alder Zellers coupled with the faculty and staff who feel strongly about staying at DTEC), there was no opposition, and wide support for moving in the direction that the Council had recommended and I support – which I will detail in the next few minutes.

Salient Facts/Points

West Campus

- 100,000 sq ft
- Lease - \$1.925M annually in fixed costs; triple-net lease (not included is the instructional and student services costs)
- Substantial loss of enrollment primarily due to Human and Protective Services moving to Truax
- Students at West Campus come from a from 1-3 mile radius
- No comprehensive services permanently provided at West Campus
- Building has infrastructure issues

Downtown Education Center

- 170,000 sq ft
- Owned facility and city block
- Infrastructure is severely flawed; limited parking
- \$940,000 annual operating costs (not including instruction and student services)
- \$30 Million to address infrastructure and classroom needs
- Transfer students can't take all accepted transfer courses at DTEC; must take some courses at Truax
- Concurrent enrollment between DTEC and the University of Wisconsin is low; only 14 in this academic year – down from 48 the previous year
- Substantial loss of enrollment primarily due to allied health programs relocated to Truax; further projected loss is anticipated due to consolidation of cosmetology in 2017
- Programs currently remaining – English Language Learner (ELL), Developmental Education, High School Completion, Child Development, some Arts & Sciences
- No comprehensive services permanently provided at DTEC
- Most come from beyond 3 mile radius

South Campus

- 12,000 Sq Ft
- Leased facility - \$225,000 annually in fixed costs; limited space (not including instruction and student services)
- Steady, very low enrollment
- Limited credit courses, primarily ELL, Developmental Education, High School Completion
- No comprehensive services permanently provided at South Campus
- Limited parking
- Majority of students come from beyond 3 mile radius

Task Force/Council Recommendations

- End lease at West when lease ends
- Sell Downtown Education Center
- Find a location to establish a comprehensive campus
- College Assembly sent back to Council for review and recommendations were the same

Assembly Recommendations

- None

In 30+ years in higher education, this has been one of the most critical, and ever-consuming recommendations that I have made. The task force and the council have done tremendous work to come to their recommendations and actions. I applaud the Task Force; Facilities, Planning and Investment Council; and the College Assembly for their conscientious focus on this issue. Regardless of the recommendations I am putting forth this evening, though still in its infancy, the Shared Governance process is growing. There has been wide debate through the process on this issue that has not existed at our College in the past. This is a testament to being transparent, providing and listening critically to the voice of the College's constituencies, and the College's commitment to an effective Shared Governance process. Shared Governance is a system that is based on trust and engagement and providing recommendations and input that allow for rationale and effective decision making. I believe our processes have been strengthened during these discussions. I feel that I understand our faculty and staff at DTEC, their current and desired connection to DTEC and the students they serve, and their perspectives relating to proximity to the University of Wisconsin and the arts community, as well as public transportation connections. I also am very conscious of our mission, our programs, and the students and communities we serve or could be serving. Consideration of our mission and our charge, maintaining program and fiscal integrity, and providing educational environments that are conducive to learning are at the forefront of these recommendations.

To that end, I have 3 recommendations that I present this evening:

RECOMMENDATION 1:

Make a commitment to South Madison. Why? Let's look at a few facts:

Considerations in Answering Question of location – 53713

- 53713 borders just north of McCoy Road to the south, Yahara River to the east, Goodman Park and Olin Avenue to the north, and Seminole Highway and Nakoma Golf course to the west.
- Area of greatest poverty in Madison – South Madison.
- Over last five years, South Madison population has increased 8.4% while the state increase is a little less than 2%.
- 58% of residents in South Madison are people of color, with 18.8% African American, 25.6% Latino, and 7.5% Asian. Over 50% of 15-49 year olds are people of color.
- Nearly 60% of the population in this zip code are between 20-60.
- 13% job growth projected between now and 2016.
- Median household income is \$36,000 – 18% have incomes less than 15,000; 17% 15,000 to 24,000; 13% 25,000 to 34,000; and nearly 50% is less than 34,000.
- Unemployment -- +20 percentile in the African-American population; upwards to 27% for African Americans and in the 20th percentile for Latinos and Asians.
- Poverty rate at 18.5% in Madison; 38.4% for African-Americans, 27.3% for Asians and 21.76% for Latinos; 27% persons live below poverty line (family of 4 - \$24,250; family of 1 - \$11,770) – more than double the rate of Madison Metro and the state of Wisconsin, and higher than the national norm of 14.5% though, singularly, the poverty rate of each ethnicity in this zip code far exceeds the national norm.
- Half of students in the Madison Metropolitan School District live in poverty.
- Per capita income is about 2/3rd of Metro Madison.
- 70% of housing is renter occupied.
- Educational Attainment: Nearly 46% of the residents in this zip code only have a maximum of a high school diploma.
- Overall income of African Americans, Latinos and Asians as compared against the state and national averages is below in Dane County; ranging from \$14,000 to \$5,000 below the Anglo population.
- In 2007, the African-American, Latino and Asian business ownership combined was 8.2% in Madison.
- 38% of the population in this zip code are children under 18.

As stated, this area has the greatest unemployment, poverty and low educational attainment, coupled with transportation and access issues. We have not had a comprehensive facility in South Madison inclusive of key student services and the ability to get credit bearing courses that could result in a degree or certificate. Those services would include enrollment services, student success centers, counseling/advising and career services. I caution you, this is not an all-inclusive list. Additionally, our ELL, developmental education and high school completion programs would have a central site from which to work from, though we would continue to have those programs throughout the District. There is also the close proximity of South Madison to downtown

and the likelihood that many of the students served currently downtown can be served in a facility that can serve both populations. Providing a site that reflects the need of South Madison is a core part of our mission and it will also have a strong impact on economic development – that will strengthen that area and at the same time strengthen the region. We must do a detailed “drill-down” to determine which programs will be provided at the site.

I’m recommending that you make that commitment to South Madison by authorizing the College to research and secure an appropriate site for a comprehensive educational center.

Formal Recommendation:

Commit to serving the South Madison community. I am recommending that the Board grant the authority for the college to research sites and secure a site that represents the inclusion of defined comprehensive services and programming and will continue to serve the South Madison area. That site may be leased or owned. Concurrent with researching and securing a site, the current South Madison lease will be addressed. The basis on securing a site will be “what is the best site option to provide defined comprehensive services and programming that is mission driven, fiscally sound and sustainable.” Prior to beginning the process of researching and securing a site, a task force will be created to define a campus, center and site that meets the accreditation standards and is inclusive of the breadth and depth of services and programs to be offered in each of those categories. The task force should complete their work by August 1, 2015.

RECOMMENDATION 2:

For the reasons identified earlier, I am recommending ending the West Campus lease when it concludes in June, 2016. This recommendation is based on the erosion of student population due to the moving of a major program – Human and Protective Services – to the Truax Campus. We are also in a triple net lease that has become cost-prohibitive. A transition team will be created immediately. This team will develop plans that address current and prospective students, program offerings, future services to west Madison (primarily west of the Beltline) and ensure an orderly transition from the facility currently occupied. Discussions on future educational programming for the west side will focus on the question, “How do we best serve the West Side of Madison and the adjacent cities west of the beltline within the context of our mission, vision, and values, coupled with the demand for specific programs and courses.” This recommendation is also requesting authority to research possible sites to serve the West side communities and enter into agreement(s) that we deem responsible and appropriate and fiscally prudent. The transition plan that is created will be adaptable to future situations.

Formal Recommendation:

End the lease at West Campus when it concludes in June, 2016. A transition team would be created immediately to develop plans that address current and prospective students, program offerings, future services to west Madison (primarily west of the Beltline) and ensures an orderly transition from the facility currently occupied. The transition plan will be adaptable to future situations.

RECOMMENDATION 3:

Sell the Downtown Education Center (DTEC). The fiscal reality of the infrastructure needs of the building is that it is prohibitive to renovate the building. Enrollment has dwindled subsequent to the move of the Allied Health programs to Truax. Also, as was approved earlier, cosmetology will be consolidated at Truax within the next 2 years. DTEC should be sold after a comprehensive site is secured that meets student demand and reflects access by populations that have traditionally been underrepresented and underserved. Prior to securing a comprehensive site, the determination of programs and services to be housed in the site will be made. Any sale must be in the best interest of the College and its students. A transition plan will be created to ensure an orderly move of programs, faculty and staff. Strongly considered in making this recommendation were the critical concerns identified by the Capital Neighborhood Council, our outstanding DTEC faculty and staff, and Alder Zeller, including their cogent arguments of closeness to the University of Wisconsin, numerous buses (27) that have downtown as a destination point, and closeness to the arts community. However, long-term issues, and what an educational center's environment should be equipped with for our future students – especially in the next 5-10-15 years – was a strong consideration as well as the capacity for us to renovate DTEC to meet that need within a reasonable timeframe. That renovation is prohibitive. I agree wholeheartedly with DTEC faculty and many throughout the college that we need to focus on the diversity of students and their need for basic and technical skill development – hence the recommendation for the commitment to South Madison. I envision that this process is not a quick sale but more than likely a 2-3 year process. A substantial offer or other option that would allow us to move more expeditiously may be considered, providing that it is in the best interest of the College and its students. The recommendation also includes the authority to begin the process of reviewing options related to the sale in addition to entering into any responsible and prudent agreement for the sale of DTEC.

Formal Recommendation:

Sell DTEC after securing a site that will provide defined comprehensive programming and services that serve South Madison as indicated in Recommendation 1. A transition team will be created to address current and prospective students, program offerings, and the continuing relationship to the University of Wisconsin and the downtown arts community. The process for the eventual sale of the property will probably be over a 2-3 year period. A substantial offer or other option that would allow us to move more expeditiously may be considered providing that it is in the best interest of the College and its students. The recommendation also includes the authority to begin the process of reviewing options related to the sale of DTEC in addition to entering into any responsible and prudent agreement for the sale of DTEC.

When sharing the issues with community leaders, government officials, business organizations, individuals, as I stated earlier, they are supportive of these recommendations. In the downtown area, local residents as represented by the Capitol Neighborhood Association in that area are opposed to us leaving the site. The faculty and staff are primarily opposed to moving from the downtown location. Reasons for staying include the hub of public transportation, closeness to the arts community and University of Wisconsin, and the historical relevance of MATC being located where it is. They also comment on the prospective individuals who are moving back to the downtown area and having access for lifelong learning opportunities. There is no data that supports that new residents will take part at DTEC, nor substantial evidence outside of anecdotal perspectives that closeness to the University of Wisconsin for our students actually enhances transfer. The number of UW students who take transfer classes at DTEC is also low. The School of Academic Achievement's concern was not necessarily staying at that site, but being able to have a central operations site where there are comprehensive services; the faculty and staff could remain, operationally, in one site, though programs are offered throughout the District; and wherever the site is, to continue to increase the numbers of individuals who access developmental, high school completion, and ELL offerings.

CONCLUSION

This is also an opportunity for us to begin to set standards for site determination in the future. Sites should be determined based on enrollment. The projected generation of enrollment should guide development of programs to be offered, as well as services that need to be provided with a focus on enrollment, retention, persistence and success. As we determine the services to be offered at a site that will be comprehensive, as I indicated in the first recommendation, it will be the guide for future site development. Additionally, minimal staffing standards will also be developed for these sites and will guide the current staffing needs that will be needed at a new comprehensive site. Further, the financial elements and framework for purchasing or leasing will be considered in relationship to what is in the best fiscal interests of the College for both immediate and long range integrity.

There has been a lot of discussion over these sites over the past few months. A list of external individuals and companies I have shared with you through an item in your Board binder. As for staff, it is difficult. It is akin to grieving. Mario Dusio made this reference to me recently in this debate and her point is relevant in this discussion. I do agree that we all have one central theme – providing the best instruction and services we can to further our mission, our vision, our values.

We have a great opportunity before us – before you. Mission-driven. Vision secured. Values intact. Service to our community. Program Integrity. Fiscal stability. I believe that these recommendations are in line with each of these critical segments.

I ask that you, over the next month, review these recommendations critically. Ask critical questions. Ask for further detail/data. I will make all information that is requested and accessible available to you. Again, this is a watershed moment for Madison College. It is key to our continued excellence in programs, services and engagement with our communities. Thank you. If there are any questions, I would be happy to entertain them now.