**FINAL REPORT OF COLLEGE TO UNIVERSITY TASK FORCE**

The impetus for this study was the discussion by a small group of faculty who addressed the “college” or “university” question at the January 2011 All College Workshop. At that time, it was noted that the Mount Mary College Carnegie Classification is Basic: Master’s Colleges and Universities (Small Programs). This classification is based on the number of graduate degrees awarded annually. (The Small Programs category is for those who award 50-99 degrees; we currently offer about 130 annually so we should be moving to the Medium Programs category for 100-199.) Not only do we offer seven master’s degrees programs but we recently added the doctoral program in art therapy. The latter is attracting students nationally.

At the June 2011 meeting, the Board of Trustees recommended that the discussion continue. In the summer of 2011 President Schwalbach appointed the College to University Task Force which was given the charge to engage all the Mount Mary College Constituencies in a discussion about whether or not we should change the name from college to university and to submit our findings to her. The constituencies include the alumnae, the administration, the staff, the faculty, the students, and the School Sisters of Notre Dame as the sponsoring religious community. While the Task Force did not directly communicate with the friends and donor group, the Bentz Whaley Flessner firm included this group in the survey.

The basic questions we have tried to focus our study on are:

**Would the name Mount Mary University better communicate who we are today?**

**Would a name change be in line with and enhance our Mission?**

We have looked at reasons other colleges gave for changing their name to university. These include:

* to more accurately reflect the complexity of the institution’s academic offerings.
* to position the institution for national prominence or even international prominence.
* to make a stronger more visible role for their graduate programs.
* to increase visibility by a university designation beyond their region.
* to more effectively recruit students, especially international students.
* to communicate the broad spectrum of learners they serve.

We invited the various Mount Mary constituencies to engage in conversation regarding:

**What might be positive effects of Mount Mary being named a university?**

**What concerns might individuals have about being named a university?**

We did this first, by members dividing into groups related to the constituencies to develop procedures to address the particular groups, then developing a context paper to be used with all groups and finally through offering presentation-discussion sessions, listening sessions, informal conversations and surveys. In October we summarized our findings, submitted these to President Schwalbach and published these on MyMountMary to make them available to all.

Our summary pointed out there were certain questions that were coming from most of our constituencies so we offered a “Continuing Conversation” session to respond to these questions. These dealt primarily with the mission of the college, possible effect on the tenure and promotion process and on finances.

The final process was the collection of information through surveys. The alumnae, administration- staff- faculty (A-S-F), and friends and donors surveys were developed and analyzed by Bentz Whaley Flessner. Students and School Sisters of Notre Dame were surveyed using appropriate selected questions from those developed by Bentz Whaley Flessner. To gain a clearer picture of faculty views, task force members developed a separate survey for faculty.

While the administration of and the nature of the surveys differed in order to meet the particular situations, certain questions were asked of each of the groups.

This brief overview presents responses to items we considered most significant. Of particular note is the similarity of responses related to the most important advantage and the most important risk expected by the change of name. Most groups chose the greater awareness of the graduate programs as the most positive effect and the possible loss of the intimate feel as the most negative. However, some groups did show concern through their second choice of items related to the possible loss of focus on the undergraduate programs and on their single gender focus.

Survey results based on the selected questions are:

1. **Mount Mary College currently offers multiple masters-level and doctoral programs, a structure commonly found within universities. Because the structure is already in place, do you believe it would be a natural transition to university status?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Yes** | **Unsure** | **No** |
| **Alumnae** | **69%** | **16%** | **15%** |
| **Administration- Staff-Faculty** | **52%** | **17%** | **31%** |
| **Friends and Donors** | **56%** | **31%** | **13%** |
| **SSNDs** | **58%** | **29%** | **13%** |

Students were not given this item.

1. **The most important advantage or opportunity that Mount Mary College could gain in changing its name might be:**

Only the top three choices selected by each group are given.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Alumnae** |  |
| **It might bring more awareness to Mount Mary College’s graduate degree programs** | **47%** |
| **The college might gain more prestige** | **16%** |
| **The college might attract more students from outside Wisconsin** | **9%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Administration-Faculty-Staff** |  |
| **It might bring more awareness to Mount Mary College’s graduate degree programs** | **25%** |
| **The college might attract a higher caliber of students** | **20%** |
| **The college might gain more prestige** | **20%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Students** |  |
| **It might bring more awareness to Mount Mary College’s graduate degree programs** | **18%** |
| **The college might gain more prestige** | **28%** |
| **The college might attract more students from outside Wisconsin** | **10%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Friends and Donors** |  |
| **It might bring more awareness to Mount Mary College’s graduate degree programs** | **40%** |
| **The college might gain more prestige** | **14%** |
| **The college might attract more students from outside Wisconsin** | **14%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SSNDs** |  |
| **It might bring more awareness to Mount Mary College’s graduate degree programs** | **52%** |
| **The college might attract a higher caliber of students** | **19%** |
| **The college might attract more students from outside Wisconsin** | **16%** |

1. **The most important risk that Mount Mary College could take in changing its name might be:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Alumnae** |  |
| **The college might lose its intimate feel.** | **40%** |
| **It might diminish the undergraduate experience because of a greater focus on graduate programs.** | **17%** |
| **It might distract from the fact that Mount Mary College is a single gender institutions.** | **13%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Administration-Staff-Faculty** |  |
| **The college might lose its intimate feel.** | **24%** |
| **It might diminish the undergraduate experience because of a greater focus on graduate programs.** | **11%** |
| **It might set up some community expectations that would be hard to meet.** | **26%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Students** |  |
| **The college might lose its intimate feel.** | **59%** |
| **It might diminish the undergraduate experience because of a greater focus on graduate programs.** | **18%** |
| **It might distract from the fact that Mount Mary College is a single gender institutions.** | **27%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Friends and Donors** |  |
| **The college might lose its intimate feel.** | **24%** |
| **It might diminish the undergraduate experience because of a greater focus on graduate programs.** | **13%** |
| **It might lose the support of alumnae who feel alienated.** | **15%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SSNDs** |  |
| **The college might lose its intimate feel.** | **40%** |
| **It might diminish the undergraduate experience because of a greater focus on graduate programs.** | **23%** |
| **Other** | **10%** |

1. **What would be your best advice to the leaders at Mount Mary College regarding this idea about changing the college’s status to “university”?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Proceed with Change** | **Continue Discussion** | **Do Not Change** |
| **Alumnae** | **50%** | **14%** | **36%** |
| **A-F-S** | **48%** | **15%** | **37%** |
| **Students** | **47%** | **23%** | **29%** |
| **Friends and Donors** | **46%** | **24%** | **31%** |
| **SSNDs** | **74%** | **16%** | **10%** |

The following pages give brief background information related to the process used to inform and collect information from each constituency. Where relevant, direct quotations from the Bentz Whaley Fleisner report are provided.

**Engaging Alumnae**

Karen Muth addressed the Alumnae Board at its September meeting. Board members, after reading the “College or University – Introduction to the Conversation” document, were invited to ask questions and discuss the positive aspects of a change of name as well as the concerns. President Eileen Schwalbach was available to field questions.Some of the issues related to cost, possible change of structure,and visibility of graduate programs.

Bentz Whaley Flessner, the firm contracted by the College for the capital campaign, developed, administered and analyzed the results of the online survey. Although all alumnae were sent the URL for the survey through a postcard, 3,300 randomly selected alumnae were sent the survey via e-mail. The participation rate was 17% which is considered a good response. Bentz Whaley Flessner also conducted two in person focus groups and one focus group over the phone. There were a total of twenty people who participated. The goal of the focus group was to meet with a smaller group and discuss the results from the alumnae survey. This was also a way to educate the people who influence opinion among the alumnae and help create a deeper understanding about the topic of college or university.

**Exploration of Advantages and Risks- -**Quoted from the analysis by the firm.

The primary advantage perceived is that the change to university would raise the awareness of Mount Mary’s graduate programs. Sixty-nine percent of survey respondents believe that since the structure of the university already exists through Mount Mary’s multiple graduate-level programs, the name change would be a natural transition. This sentiment was shared by alumnae of all decades especially in the comments sections of the survey. Some alumnae asserted that Mount Mary had “earned” university status through the quality of its education and its offering of advanced degrees. They felt it was important that Mount Mary be recognized as a “vital, viable, relevant, and prestigious world-class institution.”

According to Bentz Whaley Flessner, the primary risk perceived by alumnae is that the change could be perceived as a departure from the character and identity of Mount Mary College itself. The report continued with:

The largest grouping of survey respondents, 40 percent, believe the most important risk that Mount Mary would face is the loss of its intimate feel, with this sentiment being expressed most strongly by alumnae who graduated after 1979. Alumnae expressed a concern that the change would shift the focus from classroom activities to research and precipitate a loss of its (the college’s) sense of mission. And, many felt as well that the college might suffer a loss of the sense that it is a close-knit community. Alumnae who commented frequently mentioned the contrast between their relationship with Mount Mary and their friends’ relationships with the universities they attended, noting the Mount Mary connection is much closer and intimate.

**Engaging Administration-Staff-Faculty**

The 2011 Fall All-College Workshopfocused on the question, “Should Mount Mary College Change Its Name to That of University? Attendees were given an overview of the reasons for doing this. A panel of representatives from other colleges who had explored this question discussed the issue. Participants had the chance to raise questions related to the issue.

During September, the Administration-Staff group held two listening sessions for comments and questions followed by a straw poll. Of the 28 people who responded to the question, “ In the future, would Mt. Mary be better positioned to fulfill its mission and vision if it assumes the identity and name of a university?” 10 respondents answered “Yes;” 5, “No;” and 13, No opinion.

By October, the Task Force members realized that certain questions or concerns continued to be raised from the various groups. They invited all members of the Mount Mary community to a “Continuing Conversation” during which members of the Task Force and administrators gave information which responded to these questions. These concerns involved the effect a change might make related to the mission of the college, related to faculty tenure and promotion requirements, related to enrollment, and related to financial considerations. A summary of this session was placed on MyMountMary.

Questions also had been asked related to the effect a change in name had had on other colleges, particularly as it related to enrollment. A summary of the research from the institutional research office was distributed. The report gave the ten year enrollment trend showing average enrollment for the five years preceding the name change and the average for the five years following the change. Because of the many variables related to enrollment, one could not conclude that the change was the cause of change in enrollment but in each case, enrollment had increased.

In December all administration, staff and faculty were invited to participate in the Bentz Whaley Flessnersurvey. The results were grouped together so the quotation from the summary report relates to faculty as well as administration and staff.

**Quotation from the Summary Report by Bentz Whaley Flessner:**

One hundred-forty nine recipients of the invitation participated in the survey. Faculty comprised forty-one percent of survey respondents, administrators comprised thirty percent, and staff comprised twenty-nine percent. Fifty percent of respondents have been employed four years or less at Mount Mary. Fifty-two percent believed that having the current number of graduate programs was a reason to change to university status, while almost a third (thirty-one percent) did not.

The most important advantages selected were closely split, with one quarter selecting increased awareness to graduate programs, twenty percent selecting added prestige for the institution, and twenty percent selecting the attraction of a higher caliber of students. The most important risks were that the change might set up community expectations that would be hard to meet (twenty-six percent) and the potential loss of the College’s intimate feel (twenty-four percent). Most respondents (eighty-seven percent) indicated this change would not impact their inclination to work at Mount Mary College. Slightly less than half (forty-eight percent) recommended the College proceed with the change, and thirty percent recommended the College stick with its current status until it could say with confidence that the advantages outweigh the risks. Only seven percent indicated they did not see the value of the change.

Faculty, staff, and administrators’ responses largely mirrored the overall results. Each group believed the College’s reputation would be strengthened by the change.”

**Engaging Faculty Assembly**

The faculty representatives on the Task Force worked through the Faculty Executive Committee and the Graduate Council. At the September Faculty Assembly meeting, Karen Friedlen, the chair of the Executive Committee and member of the Task Force, invited faculty to raise questions they had regarding this issue. Division chairs were asked to discuss this in their divisions and turn in the results to the Executive Committee.

Bruce Moon, Chair of the Graduate Council and member of the Task Force, discussed the issue with the Graduate Council in September and submitted the report indicating that it appeared that a majority of the directors of graduate programs view the potential change in name as a positive.

While the survey developed by Bentz Whaley Flessner was sent to all faculty, the results were compiled with those of Administration and Staff . Task Force faculty members developed a questionnaire based on issues specifically related to faculty. This questionnaire was distributed at the December Faculty Assembly meeting. Karen Friedlen summarized the results of that survey and are as follows:

**Faculty Assembly Survey Results**

The data below represents the extent to which faculty agreed or disagreed with the most frequently occurring considerations noted during the various conversations. Collectively, the results suggest that a name change from college to university will enhance Mount Mary’s current identity and support positive growth.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Survey Statements** | **Strongly Disagree &**  **Disagree** | **Undecided** | **Strongly Agree & Agree** |
| **1. A name change will better position Mount Mary to fulfill its mission and vision.** | **17.8%** | **33.9%** | **46.5%** |
| **2. A name change will place more emphasis on expanding graduate programs.** | **7.2%** | **7.1%** | **85.7%** |
| **3. A name change will elevate the status and perception of the institution.** | **10.8%** | **23.2%** | **66.1%** |
| **4. A name change will align us with international terminology regarding higher education.** | **3.6%** | **10.7%** | **85.7%** |
| **5. A name change will hinder our capacity to maintain a supportive community atmosphere.** | **64.3%** | **19.6%** | **14.3%** |
| **6. A name change will enable us to attract and retain greater numbers of qualified faculty.** | **26.8%** | **25.0%** | **44.6%** |
| **7. A name change will reflect who we are in terms of our Carnegie Classification and rigorous programs.** | **21.4%** | **10.7%** | **67.8%** |
| **8. A name change will enable us to acquire more grants partnerships and field placements.** | **12.5%** | **21.4%** | **66.1%** |

**Engaging Students**

Two forums for students to disseminate information and respond were conducted by Martha Nelson, Associate Dean of Student Affairs, in October. To accommodate student schedules, they were held on different days of the week and different times of the day, one at noon and one prior to evening classes. The noon meeting was held in conjunction with the Student Government Board meeting so it included the student leaders across campus.

Students voiced positive aspects of a change, including attracting international students, helping them in getting jobs, making Mount Mary better known, adding to enrollment, and giving a more appropriate name because of graduate programs. Concerns expressed included becoming too large or having potential students thinking this is too large an institution, losing the culture of the school as it is, keeping one school united versus multiple smaller schools of learning, changing from a women’s institution, and costs incurred because of a change.

The student newspaper, *The Arches*, in December published a news story, “What’s In a Name? College Explores Change to University” as well as two student editorials giving the pro and con positions related to a change.

All students were given the opportunity to respond to a survey containing selected questions from the Bentz Whaley Flessnersurvey. This survey was conducted through e-mail during December.

The main advantages which might be brought about by the change in name were that the college might gain more prestige (28%), it would bring more awareness to the graduate degree programs (19%) and it might attract more students from outside Wisconsin (10%).

The greatest amount of agreement on any item in the survey came from the students’ response to the item “The College might lose its intimate feel” with 58% seeing this as the greatest risk the college might face by a change. Concern that it might detract attention from Mount Mary’s status as a single-gender institution while 17% are concerned the college might place more emphasis on graduate rather than undergraduate programs. When asked whether or not to proceed with change, 47% chose change while 23% think we need to continue the discussion and 29% think we should keep the current name.

**Engaging School Sisters of Notre Dame**

The study included School Sisters of Notre Dame in various ways. All School Sisters of Notre Dame who are part of the Milwaukee area of the Central Pacific Province were invited to attend a meeting at Elm Grove related to Mount Mary College’s being named a university. All sisters who belong to the Central Pacific Province through e-mail were invited to submit their response to thequestion of change. School Sisters who are Mount Mary Alumnae were included in the Alumnae Survey; Sisters who are members of the Administration, Staff and Faculty were included in that survey. Sister Joan Penzenstadler discussed the issue with the Corporate Board.

At the Elm Grove meeting, Sister Joan presented the rationale for such a change as well as information relating to the issue that had been gathered. It is important to note that a considerable number of sisters who had previously taught or served at the college attended this meeting.

Some of the comments and questions that arose related to size of the college, costs to be incurred, and how faculty might be affected. The fact that countries other than the United States consider a college similar to a high school here as well as the fact that it does not seem appropriate for a college to offer a doctorate were among the positives mentioned. It was also noted that the two other colleges sponsored by the School Sisters of Notre Dame are now known as Kyoto Notre Dame University and Notre Dame of Maryland University.

Strong support to continue to keep the identity of an institution dedicated to women’s education as well as a focus on first generation undergraduates was expressed.

A survey was distributed asking participants to indicate whether they could or could not affirm Mount Mary becoming a university or that they were leaning toward the change but have a reservation. Sixty-six of the attendees responded.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Affirm Mount Mary Being Named a University** | **74%** |
| **Leaning Toward Being Named a University But Have Reservations** | **17%** |
| **Do Not Affirm Being Named a University** | **9%** |

At a January gathering, 31 School Sisters of Notre Dame who had served at Mount Mary were asked to respond to the four questions listed at the beginning of this report. The results for the School Sisters reflected in the carts on pages 2-4 are from this meeting.

**Addenda**

**Addenda #1 Mount Mary College Enrollment 2001-2010**

**Addenda #2 Impact on Retention and Enrollment**

**Addenda #3 Strategies for Addressing Concerns**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Undergraduate  Unduplicated Headcount | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Fall  2001 | Fall  2002 | Fall  2003 | Fall  2004 | Fall  2005 | Fall  2006 | Fall  2007 | Fall  2008 | Fall  2009 | Fall  2010 | Pct. Change, 2001-2010 |
| Full-time | 484 | 549 | 639 | 765 | 806 | 845 | 757 | 831 | 852 | 922 | +90% |
| Part-time | 538 | 632 | 660 | 588 | 568 | 559 | 570 | 562 | 561 | 479 | -11% |
| No FT/PT status | 64 | 73 | 83 | 56 | 82 | 51 | 36 | 27 | 37 | 22 | -66% |
| Total | **1,086** | **1,254** | **1,382** | **1,409** | **1,456** | **1,455** | **1,363** | **1,420** | **1,450** | **1,423** | +31% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Graduate  Unduplicated Headcount | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Fall  2001 | Fall  2002 | Fall  2003 | Fall  2004 | Fall  2005 | Fall  2006 | Fall  2007 | Fall  2008 | Fall  2009 | Fall  2010 | Pct. Change, 2001-2010 |
| Full-time | 51 | 65 | 90 | 110 | 139 | 167 | 192 | 279 | 326 | 350 | +586% |
| Part-time | 91 | 118 | 128 | 118 | 149 | 99 | 139 | 144 | 220 | 179 | +97% |
| No FT/PT status | 6 | 14 | 21 | 13 | 19 | 19 | 11 | 18 | 12 | 9 | +50% |
| Total | **148** | **197** | **239** | **241** | **304** | **285** | **342** | **441** | **558** | **538** | +264% |

IMPACT ON RETENTION AND ENROLLMENT

**What was the impact on enrollment and retention when colleges in our state changed from a college to university?**

This question has come from various groups. To shed some light on this question, Maya Evans, Director of Institutional Research, has provided us with data from five colleges. She has given us numbers from five years prior to the change and where it is possible, five years after the change. Data related to retention was available only from Marian and Carroll. She also drew some conclusions for each institution about the data, as well as made some comparisons to national trends in college enrollment. This is the information given below. If you would wish to view or have a copy of her data and graphs, please check with me. Obviously, the data does not answer the question of the “impact” since we know there are many variables that “impact” enrollment and retention but while the data does not tell us what caused changes in enrollment it gives us a view of what did take place at these colleges. Sister Ellen

**Concordia University** The change was made in **1989**.

As a college, average total enrollment was 907 students. As a university, average total enrollment was 2,311.

Concordia University exhibited a substantial 29 percent increase in total enrollment between its last year as a college and its first year as a university. Enrollment was already increasing at Concordia prior to the college-to-university change. Five years after the college to university change, total enrollment increased by 133 percent, including undergraduate enrollment by 123 percent and graduate enrollment by 487 percent. The change in enrollment at Concordia is particularly significant because, during that time, national level data show that college enrollment increased by 2 percent to 4 percent on average. In fact, by 1993, college enrollment declined by 1 to 2 percent.

**Cardinal Stritch University** The change was made in **1997.**

As a college. Average total enrollment was 5,429 students. As a university average total enrollment was 5, 935.

Cardinal Stritch University exhibited a 3 percent decrease in total enrollment between its last year as a college and its first year as a university.

Total enrollment after the college-to-university change experienced comparable fluctuations prior to the change.

Five years after the college to university change, total enrollment increased by 31 percent, including undergraduate enrollment by 14 percent and graduate enrollment by 50 percent.

The college-to-university change at Cardinal Stritch happened at a time of declining college enrollment nationally, so we should not expect enrollment increases as significant as Concordia University.

**Viterbo University** The change was made in **2000.**

As a college average total enrollment was 2,008 students. As a university, average total enrollment was 2,549.

Viterbo University exhibited a substantial 11 percent decrease in total enrollment between its last year as a college and its first year as a university.

Total enrollment was already increasing at Viterbo prior to the college-to-university change. Graduate enrollment accounted for much of the increase, as undergraduate enrollment fluctuated.

Five years after the college to university change, total enrollment decreased by 13 percent, including an 11 percent increase in undergraduate enrollment and a 45 percent decrease in graduate enrollment.

The fluctutations between enrollment growth and decline are significant because this period reflected the largest percentage increase in college enrollment on the national level since the 1970’s.

**Carroll University** The change was made in **2008**.

As a college, average total enrollment was 3,142 students. As a university, average total enrollment was 3,400. (2008-2010 only as university)

Carroll University exhibited a 3 percent increase in total enrollment between its last year as a college and its first year as a university, including a three percent increase in undergraduate enrollment and a less than one percent decrease in graduate enrollment.

Three years after the college-to-university change, total enrollment increased by two percent, including a three percent increase in undergraduate enrollment and a three percent decrease in graduate enrollment.

In the year subsequent to the college-to-university change, retention increased from 73 percent to 77 percent. However, the retention rate as a university is comparable to the retention rate as a college.

**Marian University** The change was made in 2008.

As a college, average total enrollment was 3,142 students. As a university, average total enrollment was 3,400.

Marian University exhibited a 2 percent decrease in total enrollment between its last year as a college and its first year as a university, including a one percent decrease in undergraduate enrollment and a four percent decrease in graduate student enrollment.

Three years after the college-to-university change, total enrollment decreased by less than one percent, including a less than one percent increase in undergraduate enrollment and a one percent decrease in graduate enrollment. In the year subsequent to the college-to-university change, retention increased from 71 percent to 76 percent. However, the following year, the retention rate significantly declined to 67 percent-the lowest level in the eight year period.

**Strategies for Addressing Concerns**

If the Board decides to move forward with the change, Bentz Whaley Flessner made the following recommendations related to marketing:

* *Overcome the negative connotations of “university” by using words that contradict the most common negative perceptions*. For example: Mount Mary University is a small, intimate university with a robust academic reputation and clear sense of mission.

At Mount Mary University, faculty are devoted to teaching and to students’ academic progress and character development.

* *Communicate what prompted the consideration of the name change and clarify that it is not a sign that other big changes are pending*. The most repeated question among alumnae was, “How did this discussion begin?” Without background information, alumnae surmised not that something significant had happened but that something significant may be about to happen of which they were not aware.
* *Improve communication about graduate programs*. Alumnae were more open to the name change when they learned that Mount Mary College’s graduate programs had already elevated the school to a new level without having negated the intimate feel. The perception can be guided to show that the name change is a natural transition, an outgrowth of accomplishments Mount Mary has already achieved.
* *When referring to graduate programs, also refer to Mount Mary College’s strong under graduate curriculum*. Alumnae responded most positively when they perceived Mount Mary’s graduate programs as an extension of its undergraduate success. The worry about the name change is most frequently associated with a concern about the potential departure from the traditional success in undergraduate education for women.
* *Address the issues about cost and finance surrounding the change*. Many alumnae felt the funds used to update signage, letterhead, etc. would be better allocated to badly-needed capital improvements. Many alumnae did not believe the institution could afford the higher salaries required by faculty of a “university,” suggesting that they assumed “university” also implied some additional costly changes in the business model. Also, alumnae were not familiar with the potential of the graduate programs to be a growing and significant revenue stream for the institution in the coming years.