Meeting minutes from Re-Envisioning Lifelong Learning and Credentialing Strategic Plan Taskforce 4/29/20

Focus on overviews from each task force member in terms of what you found with the benchmarked institutions.

1. **Northeastern** – Not a lot of information to answer questions in detail. Impressions from website:

Positives:

- Link to lifelong learning from main page
- Advantage of having campuses all over country
- Ad line was emphasis on career enhancement
- Pathways for different career opportunities
- Programs are very tied to industry
- 100 years of co-op programs for all disciplines
- Have many studies about how higher education should be organized

Negatives:

- Promised more than they delivered (marketing is very important)
- Did not find in-depth information easily
- Very siloed –

1. Harvard

Positives:

- One program that stood out was Learning in Retirement 55 and older
- Pier led instruction and extracurricular activities
- 60 year curriculum

Negatives:

• Hyper exclusive program

1. UC Irvine

Positives:

- Huge amount of information on their site regarding continuing education
- Dean has written many articles on continuing education
- Certificates are well laid out
- Gave career statistics
- Good searching user friendly
- Good resources

Negatives:

- Does not focus on retirement or lifelong education as much as career matters
- Information is under "academics" next to last listing
- Hard to differentiate between credit and non-credit
- Association of Retired Faculty at other institutions? this is something NC State is strong at

1. Washington State University

Positives:

- Well known for all on-line programs
- Offer on-line support for other resources

Negatives:

- Had badging and certificate programs but difficult to navigate
- Content and packaging is very important!

1. University of Washington

Positives:

- Champions the 60 year curriculum
- Lots of on-line and face to face programs
- Partnered with "In-Stride"
- Centralized and well coordinated with Continuum College
- Website is very easy to navigate

Negatives:

• Next to impossible to find "Continuum College" on home page

1. Northwestern

Positives:

- Easily find professional studies
- Continuing Education link on Home page

Negatives:

- Hard to find specific information on programs
- Navigating was difficult for specifics
- Too traditional semester courses

1. Arizona State

Positives:

- Known for on-line contributions
- Made coordinated effort to make Learning Futures Collaborative
- Link all campuses

1. Rutgers

Positives:

- Made effort with certificates to link with industry associations
- Have mantra to link to their land grant mission establish their focus to become global entity
- Education and Employment Research Center information on credentialing

Negatives:

- Decentralized
- No mention of on-line certificates on their website

1. University of Wisconsin – Madison

Positives:

- CIRTL membership/subscription model
- "Advance your Career" website Enrollment coaches/Career counselors
- Had Strategic Plan addressing marketing and communication

Negatives:

- Multi-level marketing?
- Some of their website was difficult to navigate

1. Georgia Tech

Positives:

- Has college of Continuing Education and Professional Ed
- Have specific initiative to Lifelong learning good definition
- Focus on wide audience and alumni

Summary:

Main themes -

Marketing/packaging and communicating is extremely important

Consider talking to Deans/Division Heads at benchmarked institutions

Consider cost of participation – ceiling on what people are willing to pay

Financial models that incentivize each of our entities to get involved

Upcoming 5/4/20 Meeting:

Recommended deadline date for report to Provost – suggested early to mid-July

Spend next meeting talking about goals and outcomes that we collectively want to recommend and capture

What are multiyear strategies that would be game changers?

Look at themes we want to highlight in next strategic plan revolving around Re-envisioning Lifelong Education and Credentialing

May 13th meeting – look at structure of our report and divide sections among committee members