

Academic Planning Statement 1.1
(ACPS-1.1)

POLICY PAPER ON
ENTITLEMENTS TO PLAN

Supplement to ACPS-1,
UW SYSTEM ACADEMIC PLANNING PRINCIPLES

Board of Regents

February 6, 1976

February, 1976

ACADEMIC PLANNING STATEMENT 1.1: SUPPLEMENT TO THE UWS ACADEMIC PLANNING
PRINCIPLES: ENTITLEMENTS TO PLAN

POLICY PAPER ON ENTITLEMENTS TO PLAN

I. Background

Subsequent to the development and approval of the University of Wisconsin Academic Planning Principles (ACPS-1) and as an outgrowth of several steps taken to develop Long Range Academic Planning in the UW System, the concept of "entitlement to plan" has been identified as a needed step in organizing the relationship of Institutional planning of new academic programs to the processes of Central Administration and Regent review of new program proposals.

In summary, the concept states that Institutions should bring forward a prioritized listing of the new academic programs which they identify as essential for Institutional development in a projected future period of years. These Institutional listings, together with a brief description of each program and a brief statement of rationale for the priority position assigned to them, would receive review by the Office of Academic Affairs. A list agreed to by the Institution and the Office of Academic Affairs would then be forwarded to the Regents for review and action.

The action which would be requested from the Regents would be that of an "entitlement to plan." This action would not constitute an approval of the program either by the Institution, or by Central Administration, or by the Regents. Approval action would follow the review paths already established within each Institution, within Central Administration, and within the Board of Regents.

An integral part of the concept of "entitlement to plan" and long range planning is the need to maintain flexibility and continuous reconstruction. The Institutions, the System, and the Regents should at all times be prepared to respond to unanticipated needs and appropriate programmatic response to those needs. Changes in perceived needs of students or society will not always occur in ways that permit appropriate response to be planned for four years, or even one year into the future. Moreover, the creative activity of the faculty may generate important proposals in ways and at times which cannot be anticipated in a long range listing of Institutional or System priorities. Continuous reconstruction of the entitlements listing on an annual and biennial basis will ensure the UW System's flexibility to respond appropriately to new or unanticipated societal needs.

II. Rationale

The concept of "entitlement to plan" and the procedure of seeking actions for the several Institutions over a projected future period responds to the following needs:

- A. It is an important cornerstone of effective long range academic planning. Institutions will be served in developing such plans if they receive assurance that their priorities for program development have been examined and found to be consistent with

Regent assumptions concerning Institutional missions and Systemwide academic priorities. The Systemwide planning and coordination responsibilities of the Central Administration will be served by knowledge concerning the program intentions of the several Institutions. Competitive intentions or gaps in perceived intentions can be identified and resolved by appropriate discussions well before institutions have gone through the arduous process of actually planning and developing a particular set of program proposals.

- B. The procedure should reduce the frustration and cost of extensive planning and development activity at program and institutional levels undertaken in pursuit of goals which may be judged in an a priori sense to be unattainable or improbable by the Institution, Central Administration, or the Regents. Since the System and its Institutions now assume that for the foreseeable future, most new academic programs must be funded from reallocation or redeployment of institutional resources rather than through budgetary increments, it follows that for the next several years very few new academic programs can survive Institutional, Central, and Regent review and be in fact implemented. In such an environment the need to identify priorities becomes obvious, and the merit of seeking a closer fit between that which is sought and that which may be possible becomes equally obvious.

III. Planning Process and Cycle

The System is now moving to develop its biennial budget proposals for 1977-1979 on the basis of a 2 + 2 planning cycle in which the System will bring to the 1977 session of the Legislature not only its budget and program proposals for 1977-79, but approximations of its program goals and fiscal needs for 1979-81.

Integral to the 2 + 2 planning cycle is the assumption that the System and its Institutions will state on a four year, rolling front, its programmatic priorities. A statement of new academic program intentions will be an important aspect of this statement of total Institutional and System intentions.

In 1973-74, all Institutions of the System developed statements on academic program intentions for a 10-year period (as part LORAP), and discussions have been undertaken between Central Administration and many of the campuses about the listings of program priority intentions for the first five years of this ten-year period. It is now desirable that earlier five year forecasts of Institutional academic program planning intentions be converted into a statement of intentions for the 1976-81 period, with identification and priority listing of intentions for 1976-77, 1977-79, and 1979-81. Therefore, each Institution is directed to prepare, as expeditiously as possible, an entitlement listing for review by the Office of Academic Affairs. Regent action on entitlements to plan will begin in February, 1976.

In the initial development of Institutional entitlement listings it is not anticipated that all lists will be ready for Regent review and action at the same time. Therefore, entitlement actions will be brought forward to the Regents as agreements are reached on the listings. Further, it is understood that the prioritization and implementation of new programs are not necessarily synchronous elements in academic planning. For a variety of reasons, a program with a lower absolute priority may be moved to the implementation stage earlier than a program with a higher priority.

Following this initial entitlement action by the Regents, each Institution should plan to update its "entitlement to plan" on an annual basis, notifying the Office of Academic Affairs by September 1 of any critical, new or unanticipated program having higher priority than those listed. These will be handled on an exception basis. Each Institution should also plan to extend its first five year plan biennially by submitting to the Office of Academic Affairs, on or before September, 1977, a revision and supplement to the "entitlement to plan" document extending and submitted to the Regents in December, 1977 as an integral part of the 1979-81 biennial budget.

All of this means that amendments to the 1976-81 entitlement list may be requested each year during that period and that by September, 1977, the entitlements anticipated for the period 1981-83 should be brought forward.

IV. Format for Submission of Prioritized Academic Program Entitlement Request

The attached format has been designed to provide the minimal set of data needed by the Office of Academic Affairs for purposes of review and collating prior to submission to the Regents. It calls for a prioritized listing of academic program intentions, a statement on the rationale for the prioritized list and a brief program description of each program listed.

University of Wisconsin - _____

Date _____

PRIORITIZED ACADEMIC PROGRAM ENTITLEMENT REQUEST^{1 2}

Rationale for Prioritization:

PROGRAM TITLE	(Anticipated Implementation Date)		
	1976-77	1977-79	1979-81

Baccalaureate:

Master's/Specialist:

Doctoral:

¹Rank in a single priority order all programs listed. 1 is the highest priority.
²Each program listed should be supported by a brief program description (use Format A, copy attached).

University of Wisconsin - _____

Date _____

FIVE-YEAR ACADEMIC PROGRAM INTENTIONS
(Individual Academic Program Planning Statement)

1. Program Title _____ Priority _____

2. Program Level _____

3. Program Category: New _____ Modified* _____

4. Department (or Equivalent) _____

5. School/College _____

6. Proposed Timetable:

7. Program Description:

8. Special Remarks:

Approvals: Dean, School/College _____

Dean, Graduate School _____

Chancellor _____

*Use Special Remarks space for explaining the program modification.