




**Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System**  
**Office of the Secretary**  
1860 Van Hise Hall  
Madison, Wisconsin 53706  
(608)262-2324

February 28, 2002

***REVISED***

TO: Each Regent

FROM: Judith A. Temby 

RE: Agendas and supporting documents for meetings of the Board and Committees to be held on March 7 and 8, 2002.

Thursday, March 7, 2002

11:00 a.m. – Resources: State Compact

1820 Van Hise Hall

**All Regents Invited**

– Quality: The Value of the Liberal Arts

Bruce Shepard, Chancellor, UW-Green Bay

James Veninga, Dean, UW-Marathon County

Jane Tylus, Associate Dean and Professor of French & Italian,  
UW-Madison

1820 Van Hise Hall

**All Regents Invited**

1:00 p.m. – Department of Public Instruction Presentation on PI - 34

1820 Van Hise Hall

**All Regents Invited**

1:30 p.m. – Education Committee

1820 Van Hise Hall

1:30 p.m. – Business and Finance Committee

1920 Van Hise Hall

1:30 p.m. – Physical Planning and Funding Committee

1511 Van Hise Hall

Friday, March 8, 2002

9:00 a.m. – Board of Regents

1820 Van Hise Hall

*Persons wishing to comment on specific agenda items may request permission to speak at Regent Committee meetings. Requests to speak at the full Board meeting are granted only on a selective basis. Requests to speak should be made in advance of the meeting and should be communicated to the Secretary of the Board at the above address.*

g:\regents\agenda\2\_mar\covltr

**BUILDING OUR RESOURCE BASE:  
SPECIFIC COMPONENTS OF A COMPACT WITH THE STATE  
WHICH MAY BE OF FURTHER INTEREST**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**BACKGROUND**

Last month, the Board of Regents discussed a paper and presentation on possible approaches to a compact with the State. That paper was the seventh in a series of papers under the Regents' 2001-02 theme, Building Our Resource Base. This follow-up paper is the eighth in that series. It was suggested that the Board amend its "Building Our Resource Base" schedule to spend a second month on the option of a compact with the state, in lieu of a March discussion on formula budgeting, since this topic is of interest to the Board of Regents and because the State is unlikely to consider adoption of a formula. This paper will follow up on discussions at the February Board of Regents meeting, and present additional ideas for consideration.

**DISCUSSION**

Typically, a compact between the State and the University is a negotiated arrangement, whereby the State provides a commitment to certain annual increases in funding over a fixed period of years. In addition, the State often also increases operating flexibilities for the University. In turn, the University commits to accountability on a number of performance indicators. In order to maintain predictability and continuity of funding, an important feature of these agreements often is a commitment that the State would exempt the University from budget cuts in future biennia. The February paper indicated that any compact arrangement might have the following four components:

1. Aid – The Board of Regents reaffirms its long-standing principle to ensure that financial aid is adequate to offset increases in the cost of tuition.
2. Accountability – We will continue to report with the nation's most extensive accountability report.
3. Flexibility -- The University proposes a number of management flexibilities to enhance its ability to provide service.
4. Funding – The University would enter into a compact with the State to provide funding that is more equitable and predictable for both partners in this agreement.

Discussion at the Committee of the Whole session and at the Business and Finance Committee follow-up seemed to develop some consensus around the following points:

1. The State, at this point (given a recession and billion dollar budget deficit), is unlikely to be interested in being bound by additional formulas, set-asides or earmarked ongoing funding commitments.

2. Four of the five other states with known compacts are experiencing state funding cutbacks this year, despite the compact terms. Thus, it is not a guarantee of predictable levels of funding increase.
3. The current approach to budgeting does work in many ways, because of three factors operating over the past two years:
  - The commitment by Regents, System administrators and Chancellors to an intensive ongoing dialogue with members of the Executive and Legislative branches, both during the State's budget review cycle and off-cycle.
  - A focus in our operating budget requests on what we can do for the State in pressing areas (such as short-term and long-term economic stimulus).
  - The Board of Regents' and UW System's leadership in sponsoring the statewide Economic Summits, and follow-through on their action items.
4. The UW System continues to provide to the State and public an in-depth annual Accountability Report on more than two dozen indicators.
5. In fact, the current approach (items #3 and 4 above) could be said to itself constitute a compact with the state.
6. Short of a full compact, interest was expressed in considering specific elements of a compact which might be feasible within our current approach to budgeting.

This paper will address the above areas of interest.

## **RELATED REGENT POLICIES**

*Study of UW System in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.* Regents' Tuition Policy. Enrollment Management 21 Policy.

**The "Building Our Resource Base" (BORB) list of possible action items will receive first and second readings at the April and May Board meetings. The list will be based on all BORB items discussed throughout the past year. Action could include approaches that would: take effect immediately; be a priority for further study and possible implementation after study; be tried first as a pilot with one or more institutions; or be deferred for longer-range consideration.**

# **BUILDING OUR RESOURCE BASE: SPECIFIC COMPONENTS OF A COMPACT WITH THE STATE WHICH MAY BE OF FURTHER INTEREST**

## **BACKGROUND**

Last month, the Board of Regents discussed a paper and presentation on possible approaches to a compact with the State. That paper was the seventh in a series of papers under the Regents' 2001-02 theme, Building Our Resource Base. This follow-up paper is the eighth in that series. It will address specific components of a compact that could be considered further, based on February discussion at the Committee of the Whole session and at the Business and Finance Committee follow-up, which seemed to develop some consensus around the following points:

1. The State, at this point (given a recession and billion dollar budget deficit), is unlikely to be interested in being bound by additional formulas, set-asides or earmarked ongoing funding commitments.
2. Four of the five other states with known compacts are experiencing state funding cutbacks this year, despite the compact terms. Thus, it is not a guarantee of predictable levels of funding increase.
3. The current approach to budgeting does work in many ways, because of three factors operating over the past two years:
  - The commitment by Regents, System administrators and Chancellors to an intensive ongoing dialogue with members of the Executive and Legislative branches, both during the State's budget review cycle and off-cycle.
  - A focus in our operating budget requests on what we can do for the State in pressing areas (such as short-term and long-term economic stimulus).
  - The Board of Regents' and UW System's leadership in sponsoring the statewide Economic Summits, and follow-through on their action items.
4. The UW System continues to provide to the State and public an in-depth annual Accountability Report on more than two dozen indicators.
5. In fact, the current approach (items #3 and 4 above) could be said to itself constitute a compact with the state.
6. Short of a full compact, interest was expressed in considering specific elements of a compact which might be feasible within our current approach to budgeting.

## **A. Alternatives to a Comprehensive, "Funding Guarantee" Compact with the State**

Based on discussion in the Committee of the Whole and in the Business & Finance Committee, the Board could consider alternatives to a comprehensive compact with the State. A number of components could be considered, alone or in combination. Some of these would be an initial request for ongoing authorities. Others would be a standard part of each future operating request. Suggestions to stimulate further discussion include:

### **Initial Request for ongoing authorities:**

1. Quality Control: an agreement with the State that spells out accepted ways in which the University System should handle budget shortfalls, including enrollment reductions and tuition increases, to preserve quality.
2. Revenue Control: a full tuition continuing appropriation.

### **Standard new components of each future operating budget request:**

3. Enrollment Purchase: a component that offers the State the opportunity to "buy" further enrollment increases at the standard GPR/fee split.
4. Lump Sum Budgeting (the State incorporates the UW System unclassified compensation request into the operating budget, rather than running it through a separate track requiring approval of the Joint Committee on Employment Relations).
5. Standard Costs: This approach would seek a broader State-accepted definition of "Standard Costs" for the UW System, to provide predictable funding for normal operational costs.
6. Affordability Compact: the State would increase WHEG, Lawton and AOP financial aid appropriations at the same percentage increase as tuition.

Any of these items could require considerable negotiation with the State. Each of them has been of long-term interest to the Chancellors as a means of gaining some predictability of funding and control over costs.

### **1. Quality Control**

This approach would seek an agreement with the State that spells out accepted ways in which the University System should handle budget shortfalls. The purpose of such an agreement on the part of the University System would be to preserve quality, a principle goal of the Board of Regents (see *Study of UW System in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* and also the Regents' *Tuition Principles*).

One possible means of handling budget shortfalls, which would be in keeping with the above policies and the Regents' *Enrollment Management 21* Policy, would be to put into place enrollment reductions and tuition increases to offset cuts and thereby preserve quality. Other means could be considered as well.

This approach could be accomplished by either a statutory provision or a Memorandum of Understanding between the University and the Department of Administration. The advantage of a statutory provision would be that it would provide the concurrence of both the executive and legislative branches.

## **2. Revenue Control**

This approach would seek a full (rather than the current limited) tuition continuing appropriation, and the authority to keep tuition interest earnings rather than credit those earnings to the State's General Fund.

Currently, the tuition continuing appropriation limits rate increases for resident undergraduates (the category of student furthest below peer midpoints) but not for other categories of students. In the current biennium, the state has added 5% annual additional rate increases for nonresident undergraduates on top of regular rate increases. This approach would permit the Regents to manage tuition increases fairly across categories of students, considering distance from peer midpoints while also maintaining the Board's tuition policy of reasonable and predictable tuition rate increases. The authority to keep interest earnings could be used to reduce future rate increases and/or to fund student priorities not funded by the State budget (such as advising).

## **3. Enrollment Purchase**

This would provide a standard vehicle in each biennial budget request, for the State to consider whether it wants to appropriate additional GPR, conditional on enrollment growth in the second year of a biennium (first year enrollment increases require the Universities to "bet on" the appropriation of additional funding, since admissions decisions are made in February through May and state budgets often do not pass until after July or even into the fall semester). The ability to match capacity to enrollment growth would suggest that any enrollment growth number be a Systemwide total with flexibility for Board allocation in accordance with enrollment management principles.

## **4. Lump Sum Budgeting For Compensation and New Initiatives**

This option permits the State to provide the University System with a single sum of money, to cover both the UW System's unclassified compensation cost increases and all other budget initiative requests with one appropriated amount. The Board is then given the discretion to allocate the total among compensation and other needs as they determine most appropriate.

This would modify current budget practice in the following ways:

- Unclassified compensation would not need to go through the Joint Committee on Employment Relations (JCOER), but simply be part of the operating budget request.
- The level of detail supplied for new initiatives requests could perhaps be reduced, depending upon agreement with the State.

- GPR pay plan and fringe benefit funding would be provided upfront, rather than as 4<sup>th</sup> quarter supplements.
- Allocations of new funding among top priorities would be up to the Board of Regents.

## **5. Standard Costs**

This approach would seek a broader State-accepted definition of "Standard Costs" for the UW System, to provide predictable funding for normal operational costs.

Currently the State accepts as standard costs, which it funds routinely as a first call on new budget dollars, the following items:

- full-funding of fringe benefits
- full funding of phased or negotiated compensation increases
- debt service for authorized buildings
- utilities cost increases

Other forms of inflation are not routinely provided, although individual items may occasionally be requested. For instance, inflation on supplies, postage and equipment costs is not provided. However, occasionally, increases in state charges (BadgerNet, WisMart, and others) can be requested and will be funded.

Other proposed expansions for Board consideration could include:

1. custodial and preventive maintenance staff for new buildings as they come on line each biennium
2. automatic increases in funding for any state chargebacks
3. library acquisitions cost increases (books and periodicals documented inflation)
4. inflation for standard supplies and expenses

## **6. Affordability Compact**

This simply enacts the standard resolution passed by the Board of Regents as part of every biennial budget action. These resolutions have requested that the State increase WHEG, Lawton and AOP financial aid appropriations at the same percentage increase as tuition.

## **RELATED REGENT POLICIES**

*Study of UW System in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.* Regents' Tuition Policy. Enrollment Management 21 Policy.



**Revised**

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

I. Items for consideration in Regent Committees

1. Education Committee - Thursday, March 7, 2002  
1820 Van Hise Hall  
University of Wisconsin-Madison  
10:30 a.m.

11:00 a.m. All Regents

- Resources: State Compact.
- Quality: The Value of the Liberal Arts.  
Bruce Shepard, Chancellor, UW-Green Bay  
James Veninga, Dean, UW-Marathon County  
Jane Tylus, Associate Dean and Professor of French & Italian,  
UW-Madison

1:00 p.m.

- DPI Presentation on PI – 34.  
Regent Elizabeth Burmaster, State Superintendent of Public Schools  
Jack Kean, Assistant State Superintendent of Public Schools, Division  
for Academic Excellence  
Peter Burke, Director, Teacher Education, Professional Development  
and Licensing

1:30 p.m. (or upon conclusion of All Regent Sessions) Education Committee

- a. Approval of the minutes of the February 7, 2002 meeting of the Education Committee.
- b. Discussion:
  - (1) Resources: State Compact.
  - (2) Quality: The Value of the Liberal Arts.
  - (3) DPI Presentation on PI – 34.
- c. Report of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- d. UW-Milwaukee Presentation.
- e. The Quality of the Undergraduate Experience.
- f. New Program Authorizations - First Reading.
  - (1) B.A./B.S. in Theatre Arts, UW-Oshkosh.
  - (2) B.A./B.S. in Theatre Arts, UW-River Falls.

(over)

- g. Additional items that may be presented to the Education Committee with its approval.

- (1) UW-Parkside Charter School Proposal  
[Resolution I.1.g.]

Closed session items:

- h. Closed session to consider personnel matters, as permitted by s. 19.85(1)(c), Wis. Stats. [Possible agenda items: appointments of Campus Deans, UW-Baraboo/Sauk County, UW-Fond du Lac, UW-Marshfield/Wood County.]

**THE QUALITY OF THE UNDERGRADUATE EXPERIENCE  
Programs Designed to Engage Students  
in Making Good Decisions About Their Education**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**BACKGROUND**

One of the themes of the Education Committee for 2001-02 is “the quality of the undergraduate experience.” A quality undergraduate experience is one in which there is: excellent teaching that fosters student learning; welcoming classroom and campus environments in which all students can be comfortable and feel valued; and an environment that promotes informed decision-making and helps students set and achieve their educational goals. A quality undergraduate experience maximizes the chances that a student will be retained and graduated. On February 4-5, 2002, the UW System held a conference in Madison that facilitated the sharing of effective institutional practices to foster retention and increase graduation rates. Following is a description of the conference and a discussion of some of the effective practices identified at the conference.

**REQUESTED ACTION**

No action requested. Discussion only.

**DISCUSSION**

*Conference Summary*

Approximately 150 campus and 30 UW System staff attended a retention conference sponsored by UW System Administration at the Pyle Center in Madison on February 4-5, 2002. The conference was designed to identify effective campus practices contributing to a “quality undergraduate experience,” and structured to maximize participant input and facilitate the sharing of ideas. Each UW System institution sent a 7-13 member team to the conference. These campus teams included faculty, administrators, students, and staff from a variety of functional areas, including advising, residential life, financial aid, and multicultural affairs. On the first day of the conference, campus team members presented campus programs designed to increase retention and graduation rates. After these presentations, participants submitted a card on which they indicated what they thought was the “best idea” that they heard from the campus presentations, and these “best ideas” were summarized and shared with participants the next morning.

The final session of the first day was a panel discussion on how the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) results could be used to assess the quality of the undergraduate experience, and how results could be used to improve campus retention efforts. This panel was moderated by Frank Goldberg, Associate Vice President, and consisted of Richard Wells, Chancellor at UW-Oshkosh; Barbara Jones, Assistant Chancellor for Student Affairs at UW-Whitewater; Mary Hampton, Professor of Economics at UW-La Crosse; and Tommie Jones, UW Regent and UW-Whitewater student.

Dr. John Gardner, Executive Director of the Policy Center for the First Year Experience at Brevard College, opened the discussion on Tuesday with a keynote address providing a national perspective on best practices in improving retention. Dr. Gardner was well briefed on UW System institutional efforts and was thus able to integrate discussion of local initiatives into the national framework he presented. Following Dr. Gardner's keynote, participants broke into small discussion groups to discuss the four conference themes:

1. **Campus Climate** – This theme includes strategies that foster retention and increased graduation rates by establishing a climate that makes students feel that the campus is a comfortable and welcoming place to live and learn. Examples of strategies include those that create comfort for ethnically and racially diverse student populations, provide an environment free of alcohol and drug abuse, ensure safety on campus, etc.
2. **Classroom Climate** – This theme revolves around strategies that foster retention and increased graduation rates by establishing a classroom environment in which students are challenged, respected, and actively involved in learning. Examples of strategies include those that focus on an inclusive curriculum, innovative pedagogies, etc.
3. **Engagement** – This theme is concerned with strategies that foster retention and increased graduation rates by engaging students and integrating them into the academic and social life of the campus and community. Strategies include those that focus on commuter students, at-risk students, non-majority students, providing service-learning opportunities, etc.
4. **Transitions** – This theme includes strategies that foster retention and increased graduation rates by easing the transition to college. Strategies include those that enhance the level of student academic preparation in partnership with K-12 educators, provide tutoring, remedial education opportunities, orientation and advising programming, first-year seminars, etc.

Recorders at each session provided summaries to Dr. Gardner who led a discussion of the morning's findings. Most of the afternoon session was devoted to campus team meetings in which each team was asked to identify the two best ideas that they got from the other campuses, and two issues requiring further discussion when they got back to their campuses. In the final session, Dr. Gardner summarized the main conference themes, and Associate Vice Presidents Ron Singer and Frank Goldberg discussed next steps with the participants.

### ***Conference Findings***

A considerable amount of information was generated during the conference. UW System staff is in the process of organizing the information and sharing it with all the campuses. In addition, campus teams will continue to work to bring the information and ideas they obtained to various campus individuals and groups.

Several general themes came up repeatedly in the discussions. These general themes and conclusions will be refined over the next several months as UW institutions review their strategies to achieve their retention improvement goals.

1. Improving retention and increasing graduation rates is not the responsibility of any one segment of the campus; effective approaches to improving retention require participation from all segments of the campus community and a coordinated campus effort. While it is essential to have a strong commitment from senior campus leadership, all members of the campus community must participate in order to establish a supportive campus climate where students feel comfortable and engaged.
2. Classroom environment is a critical factor in determining whether students are retained. Dr. Gardner emphasized this point, which was also made at the December Regent meeting by Dr. Vincent Tinto. Faculty attending the conference agreed that their involvement in campus retention efforts is critical. Numerous suggestions were made about ways to help faculty develop classroom practices that foster engagement and retention.
3. Both Dr. Gardner and Dr. Tinto indicated that most students exhibit at least one retention or graduation risk factor. They emphasized their early identification and the importance of programs targeted to these risk factors.
4. Student support is critical to successful campus retention efforts. Using the NSSE to obtain information about the student experience is an important start. However, there are numerous other ways that students can play an effective role in the development of programs and practices that improve retention. Using focus groups, consulting student government, and including students on committees are all ways in which student input can be obtained.
5. While, in general, campus presentations provided data supporting the connection between the programs presented and the improvement of retention, formal program assessment processes often did not exist. This was identified as an important component of effective retention enhancement efforts.
6. Individual student decisions were identified as a major factor in determining whether or not a student would be retained and graduate. Programs that focus on helping students make good decisions about their education, including choices concerning their major, course scheduling, time management, career paths, and participation in extracurricular activities, were identified as being particularly effective ways of improving retention.

Many of the campus presentations focused on engaging students in making good decisions. Three of those programs, one from UW-Eau Claire, one from UW-Stevens Point, and one from UW-Stout, were selected to share their efforts with the Board of Regents. Today's presentation, *Programs Designed to Engage Students in Making Good Decisions About Their Education*, is designed to highlight some of the best practices on the campuses and serve as examples of the various ways to approach campus retention improvement efforts.

**NEW PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION  
B.A./B.S. in THEATRE ARTS  
UW-OSHKOSH  
INITIAL REVIEW**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**BACKGROUND**

In accordance with the procedures outlined in University of Wisconsin System Academic Planning and Program Review (ACIS-1. revised), the new program proposal for a B.A./B.S. in Theatre Arts at the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh is presented to the Board of Regents for initial review. As stipulated by ACIS-1. revised, this program proposal will be on the agenda for the April 2002 meeting for a second review, at which time UW System Administration will recommend that the Board of Regents take action authorizing the Chancellor to implement the program. If approved, the program will be subject to a Regent-mandated review to begin five years after its implementation. The institution and the UW System Administration will conduct that review jointly, and the results will be reported to the Board.

The theatre program at UW-Oshkosh has been offered as an emphasis within the Communication major since 1970. In recent years, the theatre curriculum has been developed into something akin to a major to meet the educational needs of students and the artistic standards of the theatre profession. This proposal asks that the program be granted the status of a major within the Department of Communication. In its current status as an emphasis, the theatre program represents an underutilized resource. By upgrading it to the status of a major, the program will leverage its existing resources to market itself more effectively at no additional cost to the institution. Major status will allow the theatre program to make better use of resources, facilities, and faculty expertise by helping to:

- Attract highly motivated high school students who are seeking a theatre major;
- Retain current students who decide to pursue a theatre major;
- More accurately identify the skills of our graduates for potential employers.

**REQUESTED ACTION**

This program is presented for initial review. No action is requested.

## **DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Program Description**

The Theatre Arts major, like the emphasis it will replace, will continue to be housed in the Theatre area within the Department of Communication. Students will complete 34-36 credit hours for the Theatre Arts major. Each student will be required to complete a core of 21-22 hours, which includes courses in the performance and design/technical areas. The core also includes three courses in dramatic theory and theatre history. The student will elect 12-15 hours in one of three tracks: acting, design/technical, or integrated. The curriculum within these tracks takes the form of carefully structured four-semester sequences of team-taught courses. Finally, the student will demonstrate his/her level of competency through an individually tailored senior project.

### **Program Goals and Objectives**

The theatre program has a strong commitment to the pursuit of professional artistic standards within a liberal arts setting. The program offers a healthy balance between breadth and specialization, which nurtures the students' intellectual, artistic and personal growth through exposure to a wide range of disciplines. Understanding that the bulk of its graduates may not pursue careers in theatre, the program focuses on the development of such transferable marketable skills as problem-solving, interpersonal relations, speaking, writing, understanding complex human motivations, integrating diverse technologies, and managing complex, time-sensitive projects. The theatre program seeks to build a foundation of solid artistic skills that will allow students to compete for positions in the best professional training programs and, at the same time, prepare them for the private sector in a wide range of management and related positions. For those who choose not to pursue a theatre-related career, their undergraduate experience will prepare them for a lifetime of creative and intellectual fulfillment through avocational theatre participation.

### **Relation to Institutional Mission**

Through its curriculum, the theatre program advances the University's mission "to provide undergraduate course-work designed to develop learning proficiencies and to cultivate the values and the perspectives of educated citizens." The theatre production program challenges "students to develop their talents, intellectual interests and creative abilities." The University's mission "to extend knowledge and its application beyond the boundaries of its campus" is enhanced through aggressive audience development in the Fox Valley community. During the first week of the fall semester, the theatre produces a play as part of "Odyssey," the university's orientation program for incoming freshmen. The university has received national recognition as the only college to incorporate theatrical performance into its orientation program.

## **Strengths/Unique Features**

The Theatre Arts major is able to accomplish its double mission of liberal arts training and pre-professional preparation through an efficient, integrated curriculum. By keeping the required credit hours for the major at one-third (or less) of the total credit hours required for graduation, the major preserves students' freedom to pursue a breadth of interests outside the area of concentration. This efficiency is accomplished through an integrated studio sequence which incorporates: 1) team teaching; 2) strict sequencing of course content; 3) extended classroom contact (two hours per week for every credit hour earned); 4) integration of diverse but related subject matter into an integrated classroom experience; 5) use of technology in many aspects of the training process.

## **Accreditation**

The accrediting agency in this field is the National Association for Schools of Theatre. In the most recent program review of the Theatre Program (1999), the outside reviewer noted that the present curriculum for the Theatre Arts Emphasis meets the minimum standards for accreditation for the bachelor's degree in theatre. The Theatre Program will evaluate the appropriateness of application for accreditation after the first five years of the implementation of the theatre major.

## **Evaluation from External Consultants**

Two external reviewers associated with university theatre programs have commented favorably on the proposal. One reviewer concludes his report: "I once again whole-heartedly endorse this proposal. UW-Oshkosh has the staff, facilities and a solid curriculum already in place. These clearly lead one to the conclusion that a theatre major would be ideally housed there." The second reviewer, a former faculty member at UW Green Bay, remarks, "I know that the Oshkosh program would be a welcome addition to the statewide system." His appraisal of the curriculum attests to the unique features of the program: "There are so many good ideas in this proposal that I will be showing some of them to our faculty."

## **Need**

The opportunity for exposure to, and participation in, the arts is essential to any well-rounded college experience. This requires a strong, vital art presence on every campus. As the art form that integrates many other arts (e.g., literature, painting, dance, music), theatre makes a unique contribution to the artistic life of a campus. A high quality theatre production program requires the presence of a talented and committed group of student performers and technicians. A theatre major will help to attract and retain a larger student talent pool. In this way, not only will the students in the program be benefited, but also the cultural and intellectual life of the entire campus will be enhanced.



The demand for theatre programs in this part of the state is not being met. UW-Green Bay, which is the only other four-year degree granting institution in this service area that offers a bachelor's degree in theatre, has by its own estimate reached the maximum number of majors (75) it can support. UW-Stevens Point, which focuses primarily on its professionally oriented BFA degree in theatre, has also reached its maximum enrollment.

### **Projected Enrollment**

Year	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
New students admitted	10	12	15	19	24
Continuing students	30	32	34	36	39
Total enrollment	40	44	49	55	63
Graduating students	8	10	13	16	19

### **Comparable Programs in Wisconsin**

While several UW institutions offer BFA degrees or undergraduate education in conjunction with nationally recognized graduate programs, there are four UW institutions which offer only the B.A./B.S. degree in theatre: UW-Eau Claire and UW-La Crosse on the western side of the state, and UW-Green Bay and UW-Parkside on the eastern side. UW-River Falls is also currently seeking authorization to change its program designation from a concentration to a major. Private colleges within the state that have theatre programs are: Lawrence, Ripon, Viterbo, Cardinal Stritch. Beloit, Marquette, Lakeland and Carroll.

It is interesting to note that unlike competing businesses, multiple arts organizations do not dilute a fixed market. Theatre production organizations in close proximity to one another actually help to grow each other's audiences. A positive experience in one theatre will increase demand from which all theatres in the area will benefit.

### **Comparable Programs outside Wisconsin**

The Theatre Program appears comparable to those at Hamline, Gustavus Adolphus, St. Olaf, and Illinois Wesleyan universities in number and types of courses offered. Public institutions in neighboring states that have similar programs include: Northern Michigan University, Central Michigan University, Bowling Green University, Mankato State University, and University of Northern Iowa.

### **Collaboration**

The UW-Oshkosh theatre program is presently exploring opportunities to cooperate with other institutions for some theatre classes such as the History of Styles. The theatre program maintains a close working relationship with its sister institutions through participation in Wisconsin theatre department chairs meetings, unified state auditions sponsored by the Wisconsin Theatre Education Association, and adjudication of other university productions through the Midwest Region of the American College Theatre Festival.

## **Use of Technology**

The theatre program has embraced digital technology to support both its curricular and production activities. It has made the transition from analogue to digital lighting and sound control in productions. Design/technical classes are taught in a computer laboratory. Computer generated projections are used in large lecture classes. Main stage productions regularly use digital projections. All theatre students are required to learn a computer aided drafting (CAD) program. The nature of live theatre performance argues against the use of distance education except in non-performance courses such as theatre history and dramatic literature.

## **Academic and Career Advising**

In addition to the traditional role of academic advisor, theatre faculty members also act as artistic collaborators with their students through the production program. Typically, a faculty member will spend twice the amount of time with students outside the classroom as inside the classroom. Through this extensive contact, faculty members play a significant role in the students' artistic, intellectual and personal growth. As they approach graduation, faculty members offer career advice and coach students in such job-seeking skills as resume writing, auditions, and portfolio presentation, creating links with professional organizations, and establishing internships.

## **Assessment**

A set of eight program goals has been established which reflects the three areas of skills, knowledge, and attitude. Assessment of these goals will be based on multiple measures such as portfolio review, production activity file, course grades, and a senior capstone experience. The theatre program is particularly interested in student learning outcomes, seeks to tailor teaching strategies to meet the changing needs of individual students, and is currently exploring strategies at the program level for improving writing skills. In addition to data collected from current students, periodic surveys of alumni will also be conducted. These findings will be used for future program review and curricular revisions.

## **Resource Needs**

The implementation of the Theatre Arts major will require no significant increase over the resources currently allocated to the Theatre Arts Emphasis. All courses in the curriculum are being offered, and all of the faculty lines are in place.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

No action is requested at this time.

## **RELATED REGENT POLICIES**

University Wisconsin System Academic Planning and Program Review (May, 2000), Academic Informational Series #1 (ACIS-1.revised).

**Theatre Major**

Summary of Estimated Costs and Resources for Proposed Program

	FIRST YEAR		SECOND YEAR		THIRD YEAR	
CURRENT COSTS	#FTE	Dollars	#FTE	Dollars	#FTE	Dollars
Personnel						
Fac/Acad Staff	6.0	271,209	6.0	279,345	6.0	290,519
Undergrad Assistants	2	2,500	2	2,500	2	2,500
Classified Staff	.65	19,221	.65	19,798	.65	20,500
Non-personnel						
S&E	5,399		5,400		5,400	
Capital Equip.	5,000		5,000		5,000	
Library	Not Allocated by		Program			
Computing	1,500		1,500		1,500	
Other (Define)						
Production Expense	68,602		68,602		68,602	
Subtotal	373,431		382,145		394,111	
ADDITIONAL COSTS (Specify)	#FTE	Dollars	#FTE	Dollars	#FTE	Dollars
Personnel						
Nonpersonnel						
Other						
Subtotal						
TOTAL COSTS	373,431		382,145		394,111	
CURRENT RESOURCES						
GPR	304,829		313,543		325,509	
Gifts and Grants						
Fees						
Other (Define)						
Segregated Fees	42,500		42,500		42,500	
Ticket Revenue	26,102		26,102		26,102	
Subtotal	373,431		382,145		394,111	
ADDITIONAL RESOURCES						
GPR Reallocation (specify from where))						
Gifts and Grants						
Fees						
Other (Define)						
Subtotal						
TOTAL RESOURCES	373,431		382,145		394,111	

**NEW PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION  
B.S./B.A. in THEATRE ARTS  
UW- RIVER FALLS  
INITIAL REVIEW**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**BACKGROUND**

In accordance with the procedures outlined in Academic Planning and Program Review (ACIS-1. revised), the new program proposal for a B.S./B.A. degree in Theatre Arts is presented to the Board of Regents for initial review. As stipulated by ACIS-1. revised, this program proposal will be on the agenda for the April 2002 meeting for a second review, at which time UW System Administration will recommend that the Board of Regents take action authorizing the Chancellor to implement the program. If approved, the program will be subject to a Regent-mandated review to begin five years after its implementation. The institution and UW System Administration will conduct that review jointly, and the results will be reported to the Board.

The Theatre Arts Major will replace the existing Theatre Arts Emphasis within the Department of Speech Communication and Theatre Arts in the College of Arts and Science. A theatre program has existed at UW-River Falls since 1909. By 1962, an emphasis in Theater and Oral Interpretation existed within a Speech Major. By 1982, a fully developed, 36-credit theatre emphasis was offered. During the 1997 program review, an external reviewer encouraged the department to change the program designation from “emphasis” to “major.”

The change from “emphasis” to “*major*” is requested at this time for the following reasons:

- The term “major” accurately describes the existing program. This is, in effect, a change in name only.
- UW-River Falls' proximity to the Twin Cities metropolitan area provides unique opportunities for student learning and graduate employment.
- A major would meet student demand, make it easier to recruit talented students, and make better and more efficient use of excellent facilities and faculty.
- A major would assist our students in gaining admittance to graduate programs and pursuing theatre careers.

**REQUESTED ACTION**

This program is presented for initial review. No action is requested.

## **DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Program Description**

The major, like the emphasis it replaces, will be offered by the Department of Speech Communication and Theatre Arts (SCTA). The major will include thirty-six credits: 23 required credits (including an internship, a research course, and a senior portfolio course) and 13 directed electives. This is identical to the existing theatre emphasis and comparable to majors offered on other UW campuses. Students choose various minors, depending upon their vocational objectives. Future performers minor in Dance, Music, or Music Theatre. Future designer/technicians minor in Art or Computer Science. Theatre historians minor in English or History, and Arts Management students minor in business or Professional and Organizational Communication. The academic program is complemented by the co-curricular activities of the University Theatre and the St. Croix Valley Summer Theatre, a semi-professional summer stock company run by the department.

### **Program Goals**

The goal of the proposed theatre major is to train students to be creative problem-solvers, critical thinkers, and good communicators through the study and practice of the theatre arts so that they can make meaningful contributions to the modern theatre and to the community. It is a liberal arts program that also develops vocational skills in performance, design, directing, technology, and playwriting. Graduates are theatre generalists, qualified to seek employment in arts management, performance, technical theatre, or business. Some elect to attend graduate school in theatre or a related discipline. Others go on to apply their unique skills and training in theatre to other disciplines.

### **Relationship to Institutional Mission**

This proposal supports and strengthens the ability of UW-River Falls to fulfill its mission to “offer liberal arts programs and degrees to meet regional needs in the arts,” and to provide for “scholarly activity, including research, scholarship and creative endeavor.” Finally, the proposed program enriches life in the region “by providing artistic, scientific and other cultural events.” The theatre major will enable the department to recruit students more effectively, thereby increasing our enrollment. A greater number of students will enable the department to provide more Wisconsin residents with training in the very special art of live performance, to use excellent campus facilities more effectively, and to enhance the quality and quantity of theatre productions offered to the university community and the region.

### **Need**

A vital theatre program is essential to the health and well being of a region and a community. Historically, university theatres have been essential to the culture of communities whose members are otherwise cut off from live theatre. The presence of the theatre program contributes to the quality of life in the St. Croix Valley by creating a culture rooted in this specific community. Theatre cannot be mass-produced or shunted from place to place. It is

rooted in the exchange between live actors and audience members coming together in a specific place to share significant stories and create a sense of regional identity.

U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) statistics indicate that employment among professional performing artists – actors, stage musicians, directors, and producers – is expected to increase by 21 to 35 percent from 1998 to 2008. A similar outlook is reported for employment in the technical and design fields. The DOL also reports that foreign demand for American productions, combined with a growing domestic market, should stimulate demand for performers and other professional personnel. Finally, the DOL reports that an increasing population and a greater desire to attend live performances will fuel this demand, that attendance at stage productions is expected to grow, and that touring productions of Broadway plays and other large shows are providing new opportunities for performers, directors, and technicians. These trends are corroborated by information in the *Encyclopedia of Career and Vocational Guidance*.

The Twin Cities is home to the second largest theatre community in the United States. Although theatre is a profession in which competition for employment is national rather than local, UW-River Falls theatre graduates will be ideally placed to find theatrical employment.

Since 1990, enrollment in the existing emphasis has increased from 16 students to 29 students. This has occurred without any special recruitment efforts and in a context in which students are often unaware that it is possible to receive theatre training on campus.

### **Comparable Programs in Wisconsin**

The University of Wisconsin system offers three categories of theatre majors. UW-Madison and UW-Milwaukee offer undergraduate education in conjunction with nationally recognized graduate programs. UW-Stevens Point, UW-Whitewater, and UW-Superior offer professionally oriented B.F.A. degrees along with B.A. and B.S. degrees. UW-Green Bay and UW-Parkside in eastern Wisconsin, and UW-Eau Claire and UW-La Crosse in the west, focus on the B.A./B.S. undergraduate programs. UW-Oshkosh is also seeking authorization to change its program designation from a concentration to a major, which will make it the third program on the eastern side of the state. The proposed major at UW-River Falls would be the third B.A./B.S. degree in western Wisconsin.

Undergraduate theatre majors exist at most independent colleges, including Lawrence University, Ripon College, and Viterbo University. Clearly theatre majors and production programs contribute to the artistic and cultural health and breadth of their local communities. Being rooted in those communities allows these programs to respond to local needs and issues, to provide live performance to a broad range of audiences, and to train theatre students to continue to engage with local and/or regional arts programs following graduation. The connection between performance programs and the campus, as well as the larger community, make both tangible and intangible contributions.

## **Comparable Programs Outside Wisconsin**

The proposed major will be similar to those at most liberal arts colleges across the nation. Within our region, similar programs are offered at Mankato State University, St. Cloud State University, and the University of Minnesota, Duluth. Among private colleges, the University of St. Thomas/St. Catherine, Hamline University, and St. Olaf College offer similar liberal arts majors.

## **Collaboration**

The department participates in state and national activities including the Council of Theatre Chairs, the Wisconsin Theatre Auditions, the Wisconsin Alliance of Arts Education and the American College Theatre Festival. The opportunity to share resources with UW-Eau Claire is being explored, including an agreement to share guest artist opportunities and to investigate using Distance Learning Technologies to share specialized courses in the areas, e.g., of theatre history and dramatic literature.

## **Use of Technology/Distance Learning**

Because technology is essential to many aspects of theatre, including design and management, all theatre majors will be exposed to the uses of technology. In the academic program, technology is used in many classroom settings including Lighting (MacLux Pro, Virtual Light Lab) and Scene Technology (CAD). The Internet is used for research to support many academic areas such as Design, Theatre History, Acting and Arts Management. In the production program, students are trained to use computer lighting control boards, digital sound editing, computerized drawing tools, and computerized ticketing and reservation systems. The department is seeking funds for the development of a computer laboratory to be shared with the Department of Art.

## **Academic and Career Advising**

Each student is assigned an academic advisor in his/her area of interest. That faculty member and other department members are available to offer academic and career guidance throughout the student's collegiate career. Faculty members mentor students in audition techniques, portfolio development, and interviewing techniques. In addition, all students are required to complete "Careers in Theatre," a course in career planning, and "Senior Seminar" for which students prepare and present professional portfolios. The department maintains career-planning references. The Career Services Office offers a special seminar for students in the arts each year.

## Projected Enrollments

Year	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
New Students Admitted	3	6	7	9	10
Continuing Students	25	25	27	29	33
Total Enrollment	28	31	34	38	43
Graduating Students	3	4	5	5	6

## Assessment and Program Evaluation

Program assessment will be conducted in conjunction with the required Senior Seminar. The assessment will consist of two parts: 1) a senior-year exit interview, and 2) a questionnaire designed to assess student involvement in the program. The results of both will be summarized and compiled annually in order to provide year-to-year comparisons and data that may be used when making changes to the program. Graduate tracking has already begun to determine student career paths and satisfaction with the program. The department is currently engaged in identifying learning objectives for the major and in determining effective ways to measure that these objectives have been met.

The department undertakes a self-study every seven years as required by the University. This review includes the creation of a self-study document, the implementation of student and alumni surveys, visits and review by an on-campus team, and evaluation by an outside assessor. The assessment leads to goal-setting and action agendas.

## Evaluation from External Auditors

The external evaluations of the program have been positive. Evaluator Ruthann Benson (UW-La Crosse) cited both the location and the depth of the program in urging the pursuit of major status. Susan Rush (Viterbo University) noted that, in fact, the program “is a theatre major; it is just not called one yet,” and also applauded the lengths to which the department has gone to integrate technology into the program. Leroy Stoner (UW-Milwaukee) commended the Liberal Arts approach to theatre education.

## Resource Needs

No additional resources are required to support the theatre major. All courses required for the program are currently being offered. All of the faculty lines are currently in place.



## **RECOMMENDATION**

No action is requested at this time.

## **Related Regent Policies**

*University of Wisconsin System Academic Planning and Program Review (May 2000),  
Academic Information Series #1 (ACIS-1.revised).*

**Estimated Total Costs and Income**

	FIRST YEAR		SECOND YEAR		THIRD YEAR	
CURRENT COSTS	#FTE	Dollars	#FTE	Dollars	#FTE	Dollars
Personnel						
Fac/Acad Staff	4	204,378	4	212,553	4	221,005
Grad Assistants	0	0				
Classified Staff	.5	13,600	.5	14,200	.5	14,600
Non-personnel						
S&E	38,025		38,025		38,025	
Capital Equip.	0		0		0	
Library	2,560		2,560		2,560	
Computing	2,000		2,000		2,000	
Other (Define)						
Subtotal	260,563		269,338		278,190	
ADDITIONAL COSTS (Specify)	#FTE	Dollars	#FTE	Dollars	#FTE	Dollars
Personnel		0		0		0
Nonpersonnel		0		0		0
Other		0		0		0
Subtotal		0		0		0
TOTAL COSTS	260,563		269,338		278,190	
CURRENT RESOURCES						
GPR	229,038		237,813		246,665	
Gifts and Grants	1,725		1,725		1,725	
Fees (Annual Ticket Sales)	10,800		10,800		10,800	
Other (Seg. Fees)	19,000		19,000		19,000	
Subtotal	260,563		269,338		278,190	
ADDITIONAL RESOURCES						
GPR Reallocation (specify from where)	0		0		0	
Gifts and Grants	0		0		0	
Fees	0		0		0	
Other (Define)	0		0		0	
Subtotal						
TOTAL RESOURCES	260,563		269,330		278,190	

Charter School Contract:  
Racine Charter One, Inc.  
University of Wisconsin-Parkside

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Resolution I.1.g.(1):

That, upon recommendation of the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Parkside and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the board approves the Charter School contract with Racine Charter One, Inc.

**UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-PARKSIDE  
CENTER FOR CHARTER SCHOOLS CONTRACT WITH  
RACINE CHARTER ONE, INC.**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**BACKGROUND**

The Charter School movement represents an experiment whereby individual states authorize the creation and operation of alternative forms of public schools. The goal of the experiment is to determine if there are alternative ways to deliver effective education to Wisconsin primary and secondary students. The Wisconsin Legislature, as part of the 2001-2003 budget bill, granted University of Wisconsin-Parkside the authority to establish one charter school within the boundaries of the Racine Unified School District. Under Wisconsin statutes, the Board of Regents must approve non-profit third-party contractual agreements entered into by UW System institutions.

UW-Parkside has established the Office of Charter Schools to serve as the University's administrative unit to implement and carry out the oversight responsibilities of the relevant Wisconsin statutes. Following UW-Milwaukee's model for the process of review and approval of charter schools, UW-Parkside announced the opportunity to apply for charter status in the fall of 2001. While two parties expressed interest, only one organization submitted a formal application. Racine Charter One, Inc., proposed the development of 21<sup>st</sup> Century Preparatory School to serve the Racine Unified School District as a Charter School.

Four UW-Parkside faculty members and three community members reviewed the application in January 2002, and a positive recommendation was forwarded to Chancellor Keating in late January. Upon review by Chancellor Keating, the formal process of developing the charter contract was undertaken with the assistance of legal counsel from UW-Milwaukee who had experience with charter school development.

**REQUESTED ACTION**

Approval of the resolution approving the contract with Racine Charter One, Inc. to establish a Charter School.

**ELEMENTS OF THE CONTRACT**

The contract follows the *general* model approved by the Board of Regents at the May 1999, meeting. The major elements are as follows:

- Article One – Definitions - Key terms of the contract.

- Article Two - Parties, Authority and Responsibilities.
- Article Three – Obligations of the Grantee – Under the "Definitions" section of the contract, Racine Charter One, Inc. is defined as the "grantee" of the charter. Article Three is important in that it recites the requirements of the law and how the grantee will meet those requirements.
- Article Four – Additional Obligations – This section includes additional considerations that help define the school, its practices, the UW-Parkside administrative fee, and financial reporting.
- Article Five – Joint Responsibilities – Details the review of management contracts and methods of financial payments.
- Article Six – Notices, Reports and Inspections – Facilitates certain aspects of UW-Parkside's oversight responsibilities.
- Article Seven – Miscellaneous Provisions – Significant in this section is the Code of Ethics provisions (7.2).
- Article Eight – Provision Facilitating UW-Parkside Research – Sets forth the guidelines that UW-Parkside will use to conduct research into the concept of Charter Schools and their impact upon educational practice.
- Article Nine – Revocation of Agreement by UW-Parkside – This section defines circumstances that might constitute default of the contract by the grantee and therefore permit UW-Parkside to revoke the contract. This section is critical to establish that a Charter School can be closed for not complying with the law, contract conditions, or failing to meet its educational purpose(s).
- Article Ten – Termination by the Grantee – This section is the counterpart to Section Nine in that it establishes circumstances under which the grantee may terminate the contract.
- Article Eleven – Technical Provisions – Details standard contract language for mutual protection of the parties.

This document also includes five appendices.

## **Educational Plan**

Racine Charter One, Inc., proposes to develop 21<sup>st</sup> Century Preparatory School, a K-8 elementary school that will serve up to 400 students. The school will adopt the Core Knowledge curriculum and Direct Instruction strategies as the focus of its educational program. Direct Instruction provides the framework for teaching students to master the foundational skills in reading, language arts and mathematics. Core Knowledge provides the framework for the

application of those skills in other curricular areas in a rigorous and engaging way. In addition, the school will have an extended school year of 205 days and a teacher contract with 215 days. The classroom structures will feature multi-age student groupings or communities of learners, and teacher looping to develop prolonged interaction among teachers, students and parents. The school will also offer a two-week special program each summer.

The charter school will assess students yearly starting in third grade and will conform to Wisconsin assessment standards as well as the new standards required by the Elementary and Secondary Act recently approved by Congress. The school will also use the Baldrige model of program evaluation that has been developed in cooperation with the American Society for Quality located in Milwaukee.

The charter school will seek to achieve a racial and ethnic balance among its pupils that is reflective of the Racine Unified School District. The recruitment and admissions process will seek to produce a student body that reflects the community as a whole, is culturally and economically diverse, and inclusive of children at risk.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The University of Wisconsin System recommends approval of the resolution approving the Charter School contract with Racine Charter One, Inc.

### **RELATED REGENT POLICIES**

Regent Resolution 7905 (May 7, 1999).

**Supporting material for Agenda Item .1.g.(1) (Racine Charter One, Inc. Contract) may be obtained by contacting the Board of Regents Office.**

**Phone: 608-262-2324**

**Fax: 608-262-5739**

Revised

I.2. Business and Finance Committee

Thursday, March 7, 2002  
1920 Van Hise Hall  
1:30 p.m.

11:00 a.m. All Regents – Room 1820 Van Hise Hall

Resources: State Compact

Quality: The Value of Liberal Arts

Bruce Shepard, Chancellor, UW-Green Bay

James Veninga, Dean, UW-Marathon County

Jane Tylus, Associate Dean and Professor of French & Italian, UW-Madison

1:00 p.m. Department of Public Instruction Presentation on PI-34

1:30 p.m. - 1920 Van Hise Hall

- a. Building Our Resource Base  
(1) State Compact Discussion
- b. United Council Student Priorities
- c. 2002-03 Annual Budget Decision Rules  
[Resolution I.2.c.]
- d. NACUBO Cost of College Report
- e. Committee Business  
(1) Approval of the Minutes of the February 7, 2002 Meeting
- f. Report of the Vice President
- g. Additional Items which may be presented to the Committee with its approval
- h. Closed session to consider trust fund matters as permitted by s. 19.85(1)(e), *Wis. Stats.*

h /MarchAgenda02



**BUSINESS AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

Resolution:

That, upon recommendation of the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the Board of Regents approves the 2002-03 annual budget allocation decision rules. If subsequent legislative action modifies either the second year funding increases or reductions noted in the rules, the UW System would distribute the changes according to the principles set forth in Section III.

**UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM  
2002-03 ANNUAL BUDGET ALLOCATION DECISION RULES**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**BACKGROUND**

As part of the annual budget development process, the UW System utilizes decision rules to allocate and/or de-allocate GPR, fees and program revenue funding. Decision rules establish how allocations will be made, and are based on the 2001 Wisconsin Act 16, the final state 2001-03 biennial budget as enacted. The Governor's Budget Reform Bill, Special Session Assembly Bill 1, has recently been introduced. That bill would reduce the UW System's base budget. Each item in the decision rules includes the allocation based on Wisconsin Act 16, and the dollar amount of reduction and net allocation resulting from Special Session Assembly Bill 1. If subsequent legislative action modifies either the second year funding increases or reductions, the UW System would distribute the changes according to the principles set forth in section III of the decision rules.

**REQUESTED ACTION**

Approval of the following resolution:

That, upon recommendation of the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the Board of Regents approves the 2002-03 annual budget allocation decision rules. If subsequent legislative action modifies either the second year funding increases or reductions noted in the rules, the UW System would distribute the changes according to the principles set forth in Section III.

**DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Resolution I.2.c. approves the 2002-03 Annual Budget Allocation Decision Rules. The 2002-03 decision rules are based on the state Biennial Budget and will determine how funding will be allocated for those specific items for which the budget has recommended additional 2002-03 funding above the fiscal year 2001-02 level, and how funding reductions will be de-allocated.

**RELATED REGENT POLICIES**

August 2000 – Biennial Operating Budget Request (Regent Resolution 8195)

## **2002-03 PRELIMINARY BUDGET ALLOCATION DECISION RULES**

The Decision Rules included in this document are based on 2001 Wisconsin Act 16, the final state 2001-03 biennial budget as enacted. Each item also includes the dollar amount of reduction and net allocation that would result from the Governor's Budget Reform Bill, Special Session Assembly Bill 1.

If subsequent legislative action modifies either the second year funding increases or reductions, UW System would distribute these changes according to the principles set forth below (essentially, changes to 2002-03 funding would be distributed based on institutions' original share of the budget initiatives).

### **I. ALLOCATION DECISION RULES FOR NEW FUNDING**

#### **A. NEW UW SYSTEM DECISION RULES**

- 1. WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.** The 2001-03 biennial budget provided \$11,089,700 GPR/Fees in 2002-03 for workforce development initiatives at UW institutions. The Budget Reform Bill, Special Session AB 1, would cut \$8,310,700 from this figure, for a total second year increase of \$2,779,000. Funding will be distributed based on the 2001-03 biennial budget act.
- 2. UTILITIES.** The 2001-03 biennial budget included a \$1,682,700 decrease in GPR funding for utilities. The funding will be distributed based upon recommendations by a systemwide utilities working group.

#### **B. MODIFIED UW SYSTEM DECISION RULES**

- 1. STUDENT TECHNOLOGY FEE.** The 2001-03 biennial budget provided \$432,300 in 2002-03 in additional funding to all UW System institutions to meet student needs for instructional technology and information access. Allocation of this funding is proportional to current academic year fee budgets excluding the student technology fee.

#### **C. INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC ITEMS** will be allocated to the designated institution based on gubernatorial and legislative intent.

- 1. UW-MADISON INITIATIVE.** The 2001-03 biennial budget provided \$16,200,000 GPR/Fees in 2002-03 to fund initiatives to

increase learning options for undergraduates, enhance economic development, and support additional strategic faculty recruitment efforts. The Budget Reform Bill would cut \$11,510,700 from this figure, for a total second year increase of \$4,689,300.

2. **UW-MILWAUKEE IDEA.** The 2001-03 biennial budget provided \$12,200,000 GPR/Fees in 2002-03 to fund initiatives to expand faculty and enrollments in high demand programs, increase research efforts, and encourage public-private partnerships. The Budget Reform Bill would cut \$8,862,000 from this figure, for a total second year increase of \$3,338,000
3. **AGRICULTURAL STEWARDSHIP INITIATIVE.** The 2001-03 biennial budget provided \$1,812,400 GPR beginning in 2002-03 to implement the Wisconsin Agricultural Stewardship initiative at UW-Platteville's Pioneer Farm. The Budget Reform Bill would cut \$1,316,600 from this figure, for a total second year increase of \$495,800.

## **II. ALLOCATION DECISION RULES FOR EXISTING (BASE) FUNDING**

- A. **LAWTON UNDERGRADUATE MINORITY RETENTION GRANT/ADVANCED OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM.** Funding for 2002-03 increased by \$326,700. Total funding for these programs will be allocated in the same manner as in prior years. Allocation will be based on each institution's proportion of a three-year rolling average headcount of students of color.

## **III. BASE REDUCTION.**

The Governor's budget adjustment bill included new base budget reductions for the UW System. Wisconsin Act 16 included a \$6,345,000 budget reduction in 2001-02. The Governor's budget adjustment bill further reduced the GPR funding for the UW System by \$10,097,000 in 2001-02 and \$30,339,400 in 2002-03, resulting in new ongoing decreases of \$40,436,400.

\$10,000,000 of the 2001-02 additional base cut in 2001-02 was distributed to UW System institutions based upon their percent of total GPR/Fee funding excluding debt service and utilities. A cut of \$97,000 was specifically allocated to System Administration in the budget adjustment bill.

\$30,000,000 of the additional base cut in 2002-03 was distributed to UW System institutions based on their percentage of new funding provided to the System in 2002-03. A cut of \$339,400 was specifically allocated to System Administration in

the Governor's Budget Reform Bill. Base reductions by institution and remaining new funding amounts available are shown below:

	2001-02 Reduction	2002-03 Reduction	Ongoing Reduction	Economic Stimulus Funding Available
UW-Madison	\$3,935,158	\$11,510,700	\$15,445,858	\$4,335,400
UW-Milwaukee	1,301,882	8,862,000	10,163,882	3,338,000
UW-Eau Claire	507,351	1,349,400	1,856,751	508,257
UW-Green Bay	243,595	363,300	606,895	136,700
UW-La Crosse	440,061	296,400	736,461	111,786
UW-Oshkosh	478,797	318,600	797,397	120,187
UW-Parkside	222,663	428,700	651,363	161,278
UW-Platteville	285,863	1,251,600	1,537,463	471,285
UW-River Falls	279,625	279,300	558,925	105,082
UW-Stevens Pt.	439,327	1,315,800	1,755,127	495,670
UW-Stout	397,446	631,500	1,028,946	238,058
UW-Superior	147,607	185,700	333,307	70,062
UW-Whitewater	451,017	1,407,900	1,858,917	530,235
UW Colleges	347,573	975,300	1,322,873	367,400
UW-Extension	522,007	823,800	1,345,807	310,200
SA/Syswide	97,028	339,400	436,428	329,200
Total	\$10,097,000	\$30,339,400	\$40,436,400	\$11,628,800

Institutions' plans for taking the reductions will be included in the 2002-03 Annual Budget for review at the June 2002 Board of Regents meeting. The reductions will be managed using the following principles:

1. Institutions have the flexibility to take these base reductions among budget activities in such a way as to preserve quality and services to students. UW System administrative expenditures are very slim and cannot absorb all of this reduction.
2. Recognizing that the Governor recommended smaller base reductions for the UW System to protect access, enrollments will not be decreased below 50% of the fall 2002 Economic Stimulus Package enrollment targets. This, however, does leave the UW System short of the Economic Stimulus Package-related enrollments at some campuses. Those institutions that have not yet achieved 50% of their Economic Stimulus Package enrollment targets may do so. Institutions which are above that enrollment level should strive not to grow further, unless UW System achieves restoration of the full funding for the Economic Stimulus Package.
3. Institutions will strive to protect as many instructional positions for faculty as possible. However, to maintain levels of instruction commensurate with our

enrollments, institutions may have to replace some vacant faculty positions with instructional academic staff. This is regrettable, but our ability to reverse this trend is dependent on more GPR dollars and positions.

4. Continued commitment to reallocation of .5 percent of the GPR/Fee funding base is expected, to help meet under-funding for our instructional and information technology needs.

## **NACUBO COST OF COLLEGE REPORT**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

#### **BACKGROUND**

In 1997, given public anxiety over college costs and prices, Congress established the National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education (the Commission) to investigate the college cost-price challenge. In a response to a request from the Commission for making college costs more “transparent,” the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) completed a three-year endeavor called the Cost of College Project with the goal of creating a standardized methodology that any university or college could utilize to explain in comprehensible and simple terms the costs incurred in providing one year of undergraduate education inclusive of related services. The actual title of the report generated is “Explaining College Costs: NACUBO’s Methodology for Identifying the Costs of Delivering Undergraduate Education,” and is available at NACUBO’s website ([www.nacubo.org](http://www.nacubo.org)). Three of the UW System institutions participated in this project.

#### **REQUESTED ACTION**

This report is submitted for information only.

#### **DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

NACUBO developed the Cost of College study to develop a common methodology to derive a “reasonable approximation” of costs for providing undergraduate education for various types of institutions including community colleges, independent four-year colleges and universities, and public four-year colleges and universities. Complexities arose in achieving uniformity in the definition of cost elements for institutional expenditures because of distinct cost structures, resources, and official accounting standard-setting bodies of the various types of colleges and universities. NACUBO project members debated and tested numerous scenarios for the treatment of seven key measures to determine the appropriate accounting approach to ensure conformity with requirements established in the methodology. The seven key measures discussed at length included:

- Definition of Price
- Number of FTE Students
- Weighting of Graduate Students
- Departmental Research
- Institutional and Community Costs
- Student Financial Aid
- Facilities and Capital Costs.

Consensus on the definition of the seven key factors was reached after much debate. The project team determined the definition of price as the full annual tuition and mandatory fees

excluding financial aid and room and board charges. Institutional and community costs include the cost of extracurricular cultural activities and facilities, recreational programs, arboretums and similar entities that contribute directly and indirectly to the educational experience of an undergraduate. Financial aid costs included unrestricted or restricted institutional grants, and excluded state and federal grants as well as all student loans. In the report, the definitions of all key factors are discussed.

After completing three pilot tests, NACUBO conducted a broader field test that included 150 institutions. The pilot test was not based upon a representative sample; therefore, was not statistically based. Colleges and universities were asked to submit price and expenditure information based on the methodology definitions. They were required to submit amounts in 18 expense classifications that were “rolled up” into the expenditure categories of Financial Aid Costs, Institutional and Community Costs, and Instruction and Student Services Costs. The three category amounts were added to obtain total cost. The difference between price and total cost was defined as a student subsidy.

NACUBO found that at almost every participating institution the cost of providing programs and related services to undergraduate students exceeded the price charged to these students in the form of tuition and fees. In addition, NACUBO noted that for the large number of students receiving financial aid there is a much greater difference between cost and actual price. More specifically, the findings indicated subsidies for students at public four-year institutions ranged roughly from \$4,000 to \$11,000. Subsidies provided by the three UW System institutions that participated in the study averaged \$5,548, ranking in the lower end of the range of subsidies.

The study also concluded that the main drivers of cost for most institutions are direct educational expenses inclusive of faculty and academic services that support instruction. The average distribution of total cost by category at public four-year institutions per the report was 86.98% in Instruction and Student Services Costs, 7.46% in Institutional and Community Costs; and 5.55% in Financial Aid Costs. The average distribution of total cost by category for the participating UW System institutions was 85.48%, 12.92% and 1.6%, respectively.

And finally, findings in the report illustrated that total expenditures per student at public four-year institutions ranged from \$7,000 to \$15,000. The total expenditures of the three UW System institutions participating in the study averaged \$8,708, an amount that ranks near the lower end of the total cost range.

The NACUBO Report confirms our belief that the tuition “price” at the UW System is on the lower end of the range of public four-year institutions. The average expenditures per student for the three participating institutions ranked in the lower end of the range of expenditures and our average subsidy is also on the lower end of the four-year public range. The UW System can extrapolate from this ranking the affordability of our colleges and universities and the efficiency of our operations.

## **RELATED REGENT POLICIES**

None.



**The NACUBO report, *Explaining College Costs*, is available on the Internet at:**

[http://www.nacubo.org/public\\_policy/cost\\_of\\_college/final\\_report.pdf](http://www.nacubo.org/public_policy/cost_of_college/final_report.pdf)

**REVISED**

I.3. Physical Planning and Funding Committee

Thursday, March 7, 2002  
Room 1511 Van Hise Hall  
1:30 p.m.

11:00 a.m. All Regents – Room 1820 Van Hise Hall

- Resources: State Compact
- Quality: The Value of the Liberal Arts.  
Bruce Shepard, Chancellor, UW-Green Bay  
James Veninga, Dean, UW-Marathon County  
Jane Tylus, Associate Dean and Professor of French & Italian,  
UW-Madison

1:00 p.m. DPI Presentation on PI – 34

1:30 p.m. or upon conclusion of All Regent Sessions - Physical Planning Committee - Room 1511

- b. Approval of minutes of the February 7, 2002 meeting
- c. Report of the Assistant Vice President
  - Building Commission Actions
  - Other
- d. UW Colleges: Release of Leased Property Rights  
[Resolution I.3.d.]
- e. UW-Green Bay: Gift of Land – Point au Sauble  
[Resolution I.3.e.]
- f. UW-La Crosse: Cartwright Center Chiller Connection  
\$236,200  
[Resolution I.3.f.]
- g. UW-Superior: Aquaculture Demonstration Facility (Design Report)  
\$3,000,000 Program Revenue Bonding, Native American Gaming Funds  
[Resolution I.3.g.]
- x. Additional items which may be presented to the Committee with its approval
- z. Closed session for purposes of considering personal histories, as permitted by s.19.85(1)(f), *Wis. Stats.*, related to naming a facility at UW-Madison.

Authority to Release Leased Property  
Rights, UW Colleges

PHYSICAL PLANNING AND FUNDING COMMITTEE

Resolution:

That, upon the recommendation of the UW Colleges Chancellor and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, authority be granted for the officers of the Board of Regents to terminate the leased property rights to land leased from Taylor County for the site of the UW Center-Medford campus.

# THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

## Request for Board of Regents Action March 2002

1. Institution: The University of Wisconsin Colleges
2. Request: Requests authority for the officers of the Board of Regents to terminate leased property rights to approximately 88 acres of land leased from Taylor County as the site of the UW Center-Medford campus.
3. Description and Scope of the Project: Approval will terminate the 75-year lease of land entered into in June 1969 to provide a site for the UW Center at Medford, Wisconsin. Termination will permit Taylor County to convey approximately 28 acres of the land to the City of Medford as an extension to its industrial park. The leased land is adjacent to the Medford Industrial Park.
4. Justification of the Project: Taylor County has requested that the Board of Regents terminate the 1969 land lease so it can convey a portion of the land to the city of Medford. The Board of Regents terminated operations of the Medford campus at the close of the 1980-81 academic year by Resolution 2294, December 5, 1980. Although operations were terminated, action was not taken to terminate the land lease. The UW Colleges Chancellor and System Administration agree that the lease should be terminated.
5. Budget: None.
6. Previous Action: None.

g:\cpb\capbud\borsbc\col\0302MedfordLandRelease.doc

Authority to Accept a Gift of Land,  
UW-Green Bay

PHYSICAL PLANNING AND FUNDING COMMITTEE

Resolution:

That, upon the recommendation of the UW-Green Bay Chancellor and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, authority be granted to accept a gift of three parcels of land totaling 132 acres located at Point au Sauble on the east shore of Green Bay from the Wisconsin Chapter of the Nature Conservancy.

# THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

## Request for Board of Regents Action March 2002

1. Institution: The University of Wisconsin-Green Bay
2. Request: Requests authority to accept a gift of three parcels of land totaling 132 acres located at Point au Sauble on the east shore of Green Bay, Town of Scott, Brown County, from the Wisconsin Chapter of the Nature Conservancy.
3. Description and Scope of Project: Approval of this request will permit conveyance of three parcels of land to the Board of Regents from the Nature Conservancy: 1) a 54-acre parcel known as the John M. and John P. Rose Tract, 2) a 68-acre parcel known as the Point Lane Tract, and 3) a 10-acre tract known as Sedge Meadow. All parcels are located at Point au Sauble on Green Bay, 3 miles north of the campus. The point is one of the few remaining unmodified estuarine wetlands in the entire Lake Michigan ecosystem. The properties are mainly lowland hardwood forest and wetlands. Environmental Assessments conducted by the Nature Conservancy in 1992, 1993 and 1996, with property acquisitions, indicate the properties are free from environmental hazards. The Nature Conservancy acquired the three tracts for permanent protection during the 1990's. John M. Rose donated the 54-acre point projecting into Green Bay. The estimated value of the three parcels is \$175,900 based on appraisals secured by the Nature Conservancy when the Conservancy purchased the land.

The parcels contain deed restrictions to insure the land is preserved as natural area for scientific, educational and aesthetic purposes. There will be a reversionary clause whereby the land is returned to the Nature Conservancy in the event the University does not use the land in accordance with the restrictions. The deed for the Rose Tract includes the lifetime right for the Roses to hunt waterfowl on the parcel. The restrictions will not inhibit but will protect the area for educational and research purposes.

4. Justification: Because it lies a very short distance from the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay campus, the Point au Sauble Nature Preserve provides outstanding opportunities for student learning and hands-on research. Recognizing the great potential for these activities, The Fox River Group, a consortium of seven local paper companies, donated \$120,000 in 1999, to the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay for stewardship of Point au Sauble. Approximately \$25,000 of this was used to conduct baseline studies during 1999 and 2000, while the remainder has been used to establish an endowment for long-term management and student research opportunities at the site. This resource, in addition to staff support from the newly created Cofrin Arboretum Center for Biodiversity, will provide the

University of Wisconsin-Green Bay with the ability to manage Point au Sauble in a responsible and educationally significant manner. A website, developed largely with student contributions, already provides ongoing information about research and learning at Point au Sauble.

5. Previous Action: None.

g:/cpb/capbud/borsbc/gby/0302PtauSauble.doc

Authority to Construct A Cartwright  
Student Center Chilled Water Utility  
Connection Project, UW-La Crosse

PHYSICAL PLANNING AND FUNDING COMMITTEE

Resolution:

That, upon the recommendation of the UW-La Crosse Chancellor and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, authority be granted to construct a Cartwright Student Center Chilled Water Utility Connection project at an estimated total project cost of \$236,200, using Program Revenue (Cash).



# THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

## Request for Board of Regents Action March 2002

1. Institution: The University of Wisconsin-La Crosse
2. Request: Requests approval to construct a Cartwright Student Center Chilled Water Utility Connection project at an estimated total project cost of \$236,200, using Program Revenue (Cash).
3. Description and Scope of Project: The proposed project will extend the campus chilled water utility distribution system approximately 640 lineal feet, beginning at the southeast corner of the Wing Technology Center to the Cartwright Student Center. Chilled water laterals will be extended into the building basement and connected to the chilled water piping at the existing chiller. Work will include: excavation for the chilled water mains; installation of chilled water mains and capped piping tees for future extension; backfill and vibration tamp compacting of soil; site restoration; repair of floor and wall at building entry; installation of main service valves inside building entry and at existing chiller piping connections; insulation of piping; replacement and/or modification of unit and cooling coil control valves; and testing and balancing.
4. Justification of the Project: This project will connect the Cartwright Student Center cooling system to the campus chilled water utility distribution system. The cooling system is currently served by a 448-ton, CFC-containing chiller that is near the end of a normal 30-year service life. The chiller has undergone three major overhauls, with the latest completed in the spring of 2000. The wear and deficiencies observed at that time indicate that the chiller will not continue to operate much longer without another major rebuild at considerable expense. Due to the age and condition of the existing chiller, the unit should be replaced as soon as practical. Consideration of alternatives led to the determination that it would be more cost-effective to connect the building to the campus central chiller system at the proposed cost of \$236,200 than replace the chiller at an estimated cost of \$400,000. In addition, annual maintenance and operational savings of central chilling are projected at \$32,000, based on reduced electrical consumption of central chilling and elimination of start-up and shut-down costs for the building chiller. Data accumulated over the summer months of 2001 indicates that the capacity of the campus distribution system is sufficient to handle the proposed additional cooling load.

Construction of this project is anticipated to commence during fall 2002, with system start-up targeted for spring 2003.

The University has confirmed the availability of funds, which are designated as part of the on-going student union maintenance and operations budget for FY 2002-03. Accordingly, the cost of this project will have no additional impact on established union services and rates.

5. Budget:

Construction	\$198,000
A/E Design	15,800
DFD Management	8,500
Contingency	<u>13,900</u>
Estimated Total Project Cost	\$236,200

6. Previous Action: None.

Approval of the Design Report and  
Authority to Construct the Aquaculture  
Demonstration Facility, UW-Superior

PHYSICAL PLANNING AND FUNDING COMMITTEE

Resolution:

That, upon the recommendation of the UW-Superior Chancellor and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the Design Report be approved and authority be granted to construct the Aquaculture Demonstration Facility at an estimated project cost of \$3,000,000 Program Revenue Bonding, Native American Gaming Funds, under the terms of a long-term, 40-acre land use agreement between the University of Wisconsin System Board of Regents and the Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians.

# THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

## Request for Board of Regents Action March 2002

1. Institution: The University of Wisconsin–Superior
2. Request: Requests approval of the Design Report and authority to construct the Aquaculture Demonstration Facility at an estimated project cost of \$3,000,000 Program Revenue Bonding, Native American Gaming Funds, under the terms of a long-term, 40-acre land use agreement between the University of Wisconsin System Board of Regents and the Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians.

Approval to proceed is to be contingent upon completion of the land use agreement, with no further expenditures on the project until after the agreement is completed. Approval is being sought prior to completion of the land use agreement to enable construction to occur in the summer of 2002. Completion of the agreement is expected in the very near future. The Board of Regents authorized its officers to enter into the agreement at its November, 2001 meeting.

3. Description and Scope of the Project: The project will prepare the 40-acre site and construct 14,601 ASF/ 17,875 GSF of facilities at the northernmost tip of Bayfield County on land owned by the Red Cliff Band of the Lake Superior Chippewa Indians. Facilities will include an 8,608 GSF aquaculture hatchery building housing research and demonstration laboratories, raceways, and rearing tanks, a 7,533 GSF building housing supporting offices, a resource center, classrooms, and meeting rooms, and a 1,524 GSF storage building housing a well house, water storage tank, and space for storing a tractor and miscellaneous equipment. Exterior development includes rearing ponds, raceways, a wastewater settling pond, experimental wetlands, three wells, and roads and parking to support the facilities. The grounds and buildings have been planned to permit future building additions, ponds, and raceways if needed.

Construction is to occur under two bids, one to clear the site and a second to construct the facilities. The dense brush on the site must be cleared requiring a properly equipped contractor familiar with such work. The project schedule focuses on completing building foundation construction prior to the ground freezing in the fall of 2002. To meet the schedule, site work must be bid in May 2002, and construction work bid in July 2002.

The state 2001-03 biennial operating budget includes \$600,000 operating funds for the Aquaculture Facility supported by Native American Gaming Funds, beginning July 1, 2002.

4. Justification of the Project: In 1996 The Ashland Area Development Corporation, with the assistance of Bright Consulting, Inc., developed a proposal for an aquaculture demonstration facility supported through a state Rural Economic Development grant. The 1999-2001 Wisconsin biennial budget contains a \$3,000,000 budget item for the construction of an Ashland Area Aquaculture with a mission to promote and advance the development of commercial aquaculture in a northern climate. The Demonstration Facility is to be operated by the University of Wisconsin System Board of Regents in consultation with representatives of the aquaculture industry. The University of Wisconsin System President designated UW-Superior to administer the development of this project in consultation with the other UW institutions, representatives of the aquaculture industry, and representatives of other state and federal entities.

5. Budget:

Construction	\$2,424,000
Contingency	122,000
A/E Design and Other Fees	334,000
DFD Management Fee	102,000
Movable Equipment	10,500
Percent for Art	<u>7,500</u>
Estimated Total Project Cost	\$3,000,000

6. Previous Action:

November 9, 2001  
Resolution # 8464

Authorized Board of Regent Officers to enter into a land use agreement to permit the use of 40-acres of land owned by the Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa for the construction of the Aquaculture Demonstration Facility.

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

Friday, March 8, 2002

9:00 a.m.

1820 Van Hise Hall

1220 Linden Drive

Madison, Wisconsin

II.

1. Calling of the roll
2. Approval of the minutes of the February 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> meetings
3. Report of the President of the Board
  - a. Report on the February 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Higher Educational Aids Board
  - b. Report on the March 6<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Hospital Authority Board
  - c. Report of the February 28<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Executive Committee
  - d. Report on governmental matters
  - e. Additional items that the President of the Board may report or present to the Board
4. Report of the President of the System
  - a. 2003-05 Biennial Budget themes
  - b. Additional items that the President of the System may report or present to the Board
5. Report of the Physical Planning and Funding Committee
6. Report of the Business and Finance Committee
7. Report of the Education Committee
8. Additional resolutions
  - a. Meeting schedule for 2003  
[Resolution II.8.a.]
9. Communications, petitions, memorials
10. Additional or unfinished business
11. Recess into closed session to consider UW-Oshkosh honorary degree nominations, as permitted by s.19.85(1)(f), *Wis. Stats.* to confer with legal counsel, as permitted by s.19.85(1)(g), *Wis. Stats.*, to consider personal history related to naming a facility at UW-Madison, as permitted by s.19.85(1)(f), *Wis.*

*Stats.*, and to consider appointment of deans at UW-Baraboo/Sauk Co., UW-Fond du Lac, and Marshfield/Wood Co., as permitted by s.19.85(1)(c), *Wis. Stats.*

The closed session may be moved up for consideration during any recess called during the regular meeting agenda. The regular meeting will be reconvened in open session following completion of the closed session.

Agenda308.doc

February 19, 2002

To: The Board of Regents

From: Judith Temby

Attached is a draft meeting schedule for 2003, along with a resolution providing for adoption.

Meetings would be hosted by the UW-Stevens Point in May, UW-Milwaukee in June, and UW-Oshkosh in October.



BOARD OF REGENTS

Resolution:

That the Board of Regents adopts the attached meeting schedule for 2003.

BOARD OF REGENTS

2003 Meeting Schedule

January 9 and 10 (cancelled, circumstances permitting)

February 6 and 7

March 6 and 7

April 10 and 11

May 8 and 9 (UW- Stevens Point)

June 5 and 6 (UW-Milwaukee)

July 10 and 11

August 21 and 22 (cancelled, circumstances permitting)

September 4 and 5

October 9 and 10 (UW-Oshkosh)

November 6 and 7

December 4 and 5

Unless otherwise indicated, meetings are held in Van Hise Hall, 1220 Linden Drive,  
Madison, Wisconsin

**Board of Regents of  
The University of Wisconsin System**

**Meeting Schedule 2001-02**

2001

January 4 and 5  
(Cancelled, circumstances permitting)

February 8 and 9

March 8 and 9

April 5 and 6

May 10 and 11 (UW-River Falls)

June 7 and 8 (UW-Milwaukee)  
(Annual meeting)

July 12 and 13

August 23 and 24  
(Cancelled, circumstances permitting)

September 6 and 7

October 4 and 5 (UW-EauClaire)

November 8 and 9

December 6 and 7

2002

January 10 and 11  
(Cancelled, circumstances permitting)

February 7 and 8

March 7 and 8

April 4 and 5

May 9 and 10 (UW-Fox Valley and  
UW-Fond du Lac)

June 6 and 7 (UW-Milwaukee)  
(Annual meeting)

July 11 and 12  
(Cancelled, circumstances permitting)

August 22 and 23

September 12 and 13

October 10 and 11 (UW-Whitewater)

November 7 and 8

December 5 and 6

## BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

President - Jay L. Smith  
Vice President - Gerard A. Randall, Jr.

### STANDING COMMITTEES

#### Executive Committee

Jay L. Smith (Chair)  
Gerard A. Randall, Jr. (Vice Chair)  
Patrick G. Boyle  
Guy A. Gottschalk  
Gregory L. Gracz  
Frederic E. Mohs

#### Business and Finance Committee

Guy A. Gottschalk (Chair)  
Roger E. Axtell (Vice Chair)  
Tommie L. Jones, Jr.  
James R. Klauser  
Phyllis M. Krutsch

#### Education Committee

Patrick G. Boyle (Chair)  
Frederic E. Mohs (Vice Chair)  
JoAnne Brandes  
Elizabeth Burmaster  
Toby E. Marcovich  
Jose A. Olivieri

#### Physical Planning and Funding Committee

Gregory L. Gracz (Chair)  
Lolita Schneiders (Vice Chair)  
Jonathan B. Barry  
Alfred S. DeSimone

#### Personnel Matters Review Committee

Toby E. Marcovich (Chair)  
Roger E. Axtell  
James R. Klauser  
Jose A. Olivieri

#### Committee on Student Discipline and

##### Other Student Appeals

Frederic E. Mohs (Chair)  
Jonathan B. Barry  
Elizabeth Burmaster  
Tommie L. Jones, Jr.

### OTHER COMMITTEES

#### Liaison to Association of Governing Boards

Phyllis M. Krutsch

#### Hospital Authority Board - Regent Members

Patrick G. Boyle  
Guy A. Gottschalk  
Frederic E. Mohs

#### Wisconsin Technical College System Board

Lolita Schneiders, Regent Member

#### Wisconsin Educational Communications Board

Patrick G. Boyle, Regent Member

#### Higher Educational Aids Board

Gerard A. Randall, Jr., Regent Member

#### Research Park Board

Roger E. Axtell, Regent Member

#### Technology for Educational Achievement in Wisconsin Board (TEACH)

Jonathan B. Barry, Regent Member

#### Committee on Board Effectiveness

Phyllis M. Krutsch (Chair)  
Jonathan B. Barry  
Patrick G. Boyle  
Jose A. Olivieri

#### Academic Staff Awards Committee

Lolita Schneiders (Chair)  
JoAnne Brandes  
Phyllis M. Krutsch  
Toby E. Marcovich

#### Teaching Excellence Awards Committee

Roger E. Axtell (Chair)  
Elizabeth Burmaster  
James R. Klauser  
Jose A. Olivieri

#### Oversight Board

Patrick G. Boyle, Regent Liaison

*The Regents President and Vice President serve as ex-officio voting members of all Committees.*