

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

of the

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

Madison, Wisconsin

Held in the 1820 Van Hise Hall

UW-Madison

Thursday, February 10, 2005

10:00 a.m.

- President Marcovich presiding -

PRESENT: Regents Axtell, Bradley, Burmaster, Connolly-Keesler, Davis, Gottschalk, Marcovich, McPike, Olivieri, Pruitt, Randall, Richlen, Rosenzweig, Salas, Smith and Walsh

ABSENT: Regent Gracz

- - -

Welcome to Donald Mash

President Reilly began the meeting by welcoming UW-Eau Claire Chancellor Donald Mash, who had just been appointed UW System Executive Vice President. Noting that the appointment has been very well received, he indicated that a search for a new chancellor would begin promptly.

- - -

GOVERNOR'S 2005-07 BIENNIAL BUDGET

Thanking the Board for championing the needs of students, President Reilly pointed out that both the Board's and the Governor's proposed budgets have identified quality, student access, and Wisconsin success as top priorities. The Governor's budget would make a modest reinvestment in the UW system and would begin to reverse the trend of falling state funding for the university. Financial aid would continue to be linked to tuition increases and there would be significant increases in financial aid for the neediest students.

The Governor also proposed creation of a retention fund to help keep talented faculty, funding for Alzheimer's research, funding for the UW-Platteville/UW-Rock county engineering initiative, funding for plans to expand baccalaureate degrees and for domestic partner benefits to help keep the university competitive.

The best way to keep the best faculty and staff, President Reilly observed, is with a competitive pay plan, which is not part of the Governor's budget. In that regard, it will be important to continue working with the Governor, Legislature, and the Joint Committee on Employment Relations to ensure a fair balance of tuition and state support to properly compensate faculty and staff.

Noting that in past budgets the UW had taken a disproportionate proportion of funding cuts, President Reilly stated that having to cut an additional 200 administrative positions, on top of the deep cuts already made, would noticeably reduce services to students and Wisconsin communities.

Turning to the specifics of the Governor's budget, Associate Vice President Freda Harris noted the following:

- The UW requested \$158 million for standard budget adjustments and utilities. The Executive budget included funding of \$164.7 million.
- The UW requested \$11.1 million in increases for Advanced Opportunity Program and Lawton financial aid appropriations. The Executive budget included funding of \$10.6 million to fund ongoing 2003-05 financial aid increases with GPR instead of auxiliary funds and to increase funding by the same percentage that tuition increased in the previous year.
- The UW requested and the Executive budget included \$6.8 million for student technology fee increases.
- The UW requested, but did not receive, \$4.6 million for operation and maintenance of new facilities; \$2.1 million to replace funding for disabled student services that was previously provided by the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation; \$6 million to increase libraries funding, \$4.6 million to expand information technology capacity; and \$26.1 million to create a new financial aid Hold Harmless program.

- The UW requested \$118.7 million to add 300 faculty positions, increase access and graduation rates, expand workforce development initiatives and bring faculty and staff salaries to the 2003-04 peer median. The Executive budget included \$13.1 million in the second year to add 125 faculty positions. \$1.1 million of this funding is to be used for Committee on Baccalaureate Expansion recommendations and \$582 thousand for the Janesville engineering program.
- The Executive budget included \$2.5 million annually to help retain high demand faculty.
- The Executive budget included \$1.5 million annually for Alzheimer's research.
- The Executive budget included \$.5 million annually for domestic partner benefits for UW faculty and staff
- Efficiency measures (-200 positions): The Executive budget removed \$65 million of GPR funding over two years. \$30 million of this reduction is expected to occur through restructuring of procurement contracts and improved asset management. \$35 million would be generated through administrative savings. The budget includes \$15 million of administrative savings in 2005-06, increasing to \$20 million ongoing in 2006-07.
- The budget would require the UW to eliminate 200 administrative positions as part of the efficiency measures, 14.8 of which were identified as potential reductions in procurement and purchasing areas. The UW is required to file a report on the positions reduced with the Secretary of the Department of Administration by May 30, 2006. The UW System's position creation authority would be suspended during the 2006-07 fiscal year, until a plan is approved.
- The Executive budget increases funding for debt service by \$11 million, \$7.5 million in 2005-06, decreasing to \$3.5 million in 2006-07.
- In total, the UW System requested \$338 million in increased GPR/Fees. The Executive budget included \$150 million, composed of \$49 million new GPR and \$101 million new fee funding. GPR would increase by \$24,007,700 in 2005-06 (a 2.4% increase over the base), and an additional \$1,429,700 in 2006-07 (.14%). The average annual increase is 1.27% over two years.

In terms of program revenue:

- The UW requested and received additional tuition expenditure authority to reflect tuition already being collected due to enrollment increases, differential tuition, and programs targeted to nontraditional students. This increase in authority will not require any increase in tuition rates.
- The UW requested and received increased expenditure authority for gift and federal funds and auxiliary operations.
- The UW requested and received increased authority for the Great Lakes Studies appropriation to keep up with salary and fringe needs.

- The UW requested and received increased expenditure authority for UW-Madison Intercollegiate Athletics.
- The Executive budget included \$682,200 to provide operating revenues for the aquaculture demonstration facility operated by UW-Superior.

Statutory language changes included:

- A requirement that the UW provide nonresident tuition remission for citizens of another country if those persons meet all of the following requirements: a) graduation from a Wisconsin high school or receipt of a high school graduation equivalency; b) continuous presence in Wisconsin for at least three years following the first day of attending a high school in Wisconsin; and c) provision of an affidavit to the UW that the student will file an application for a permanent resident visa with the U.S. Department of Homeland Security as soon as the student is eligible.
- Elimination of categorical limits to awarding nonresident tuition remissions.
- Elimination of the Medical School Enrollment cap that limits the size of each Medical School class to 143 students.

The Executive budget requires the Board of Regents to submit a plan to the secretary of the Department of Administration by August 1, 2006, describing faculty positions created for the period July 1, 2004 to July 1, 2006.

The Executive budget requires the UW to lapse funding for legal services related to public broadcasting activities. It provides funding to consolidate OSHA functions within the State Lab of Hygiene and provides increased expenditure authority for the Veterinary Diagnostic Lab for testing.

The Executive budget includes \$46,781,300 GPR (\$20,556,400 in 2005-06 and \$26,224,900 in 2006-07) to increase the UW-WHEG program to replace funding from auxiliary enterprises, increase the appropriation by the statutorily-mandated link with tuition (\$5,523,600 in 2005-06 and \$7,192,100 in 2006-07) and add \$4 million in 2006-07.

In discussion following the presentation, Regent Bradley raised a question about savings to be generated through restructuring state procurement contracts. Ms. Harris replied that, by the Department of Administration's estimate, the new contracts are expected to decrease costs.

Regent Walsh asked if the university would keep the savings, and Ms. Harris replied in the affirmative.

Regent Marcovich explained that the UW initially made some of these procurement suggestions a number of years ago. The Executive budget expands these savings to a statewide basis.

In response to a question by Regent Bradley about asset management savings, Ms. Harris indicated that examples might include selling property or revenue streams, such as parking.

Regent President Marcovich added that, before selling such assets, staff would be asked to investigate alternate ways of using them to raise money. Regent Walsh explained that the initiative also would involve selling state buildings and that the UW is part of a statewide effort.

Replying to a question by Regent Bradley, Ms. Harris indicated that financial aid would be raised to match tuition increases on a percentage basis, but that this would not yield the same dollar amounts.

Regent Walsh asked about the addition \$4 million in financial aid, and Regent President Marcovich indicated that this amount is intended to help reach students in the bottom income quartiles.

Regent Pruitt inquired about distribution of the retention fund for high-demand faculty, to which Ms. Harris replied that implementation would be left to the university.

In response to a question by Regent Walsh, Ms. Harris indicated that the \$97 million tuition request in the UW's budget proposal would amount to an increase of 4.3%. The \$101 million in the Governor's budget would amount to more than 5%. Regent Walsh noted that authorization was included to receive tuition from an increased number of students and asked if this money can be kept within the university. Ms. Harris replied in the affirmative.

Regent Randall expressed comfort with what the Governor has proposed, legislative reaction, and a UW position of support in moving the budget forward.

President Reilly pointed out that the financial aid proposal, the additional faculty, the retention fund and provision for domestic partner benefits all are positive steps and that the rise in tuition would be reasonable. However, he commented that the need to cut 200 positions is hurtful and would hollow out the core of university services.

Regent President Marcovich observed that the state still is confronted with a deficit and that the Governor's budget is as good for the university as can be expected under the

circumstances. He said that the Legislature should be encouraged to give it favorable consideration.

Regent Gottschalk commented that the budget would require \$65 million in reallocation and provide only \$49 million in new GPR. The students would be required to pay an additional \$100 million – more than twice the state contribution. The university's information technology and Hold Harmless financial aid requests were not included. Overall, the UW would receive a 1.27% increase, while the K-12 system would receive over 4% and Corrections would receive 4%. Once again, he commented, the university is being asked to bear an inappropriate share of the state's fiscal burden and the budget is not a good one for students.

Regent Rosenzweig remarked that she had observed much positive legislative reaction in support of the university and thought it would be unwise to react negatively to the proposed budget, particularly since other programs also are hurting financially. She felt that the university should be grateful for what it would receive under the budget and should recognize that passage would require a great deal of work.

Regent Axtell inquired about priorities in requesting any changes that might be made, to which President Reilly replied that the UW could ask for a safety net if it is unable to achieve the \$30 million in required savings. In addition, it will be important to advocate for a competitive pay plan.

Regent President Marcovich pointed out that the university's position has improved since the last budget when the UW received a greater cut than deserved. Noting that this budget is better, he said that the plan should be to continue moving ahead as the state's financial condition improves.

In response to a question by Regent Salas, Ms. Harris indicated that the requested \$118 million included funding for 300 faculty positions and for a 3% salary increase.

Regent Salas asked if there is support for Hold Harmless financial aid, at least for students in the lowest income quintile. Ms. Harris explained that it is not yet known how the Governor's proposal would affect students in the two lowest quintiles and that it depends in part on the population of students and how many have financial need. Assistant Vice President Sharon Wilhelm added that the average WHEG award would go up only about \$200 next year and will not match the increase in tuition because of an increase in the population of financially needy students.

Regent Davis expressed gratitude that the Governor stepped up to help the university, recognizing that it was hurt in the last budget. She felt encouraged by Regent

Rosenzweig's comments about legislative reaction and stated the need to make sure that the UW gets as much as the Governor proposed.

While he recognized that the proposed budget is not enough to meet the university's needs, Regent Walsh also agreed with Regent Rosenzweig that it is necessary to understand that other programs also are hurting and that this is not the time to seem ungrateful. The budget sends the message that the state values education and begins a reinvestment in educational quality by funding for increased faculty, retention, Alzheimer's research, and domestic partner benefits. The legislative response has been positive, with leadership recognizing that the university has been hurt and demonstrating that they value what the UW does for Wisconsin.

President Reilly thanked Associate Vice President Harris and her staff for all their hard work in bringing this budget analysis forward so promptly.

With regard to what comes next, he indicated that he would continue to consult with regents, chancellors, legislators, students, faculty and others to identify the best parts of the budget and potential changes that could help protect quality and access. Then all need to work together and with students to communicate messages to elected officials, the media and other stakeholders. Students will benefit most, he indicated, if there is strong bipartisan support for the university's budget needs in the Joint Committee on Finance, where the Governor's proposal goes next. The best outcome, he observed, is for the state to deliver a budget that supports students and the state's citizens – a reinvestment that puts the UW and Wisconsin on a path toward a bright and prosperous future.

Concluding the discussion, Regent President Marcovich expressed appreciation to President Reilly and his staff and to Regent Walsh for their hard work on the budget. Noting that his contacts with legislators and others will continue, he indicated that he also will call on individual regents for their help. The efforts to date, he pointed out, have helped to convince decision makers of the UW's great value and to obtain a proposed budget increase, even in the face of a state deficit.

PRESIDENT'S EFFICIENCIES AND REPORT TO THE JOINT AUDIT COMMITTEE

President Reilly noted that, at the beginning of his presidency, he had pledged to improve efficiency, maintain quality, open lines of communication, and take every opportunity to show the taxpayers the benefits they receive for their dollars.

The February 1, 2005 report to the Joint Audit Committee, he pointed out, furthered all these commitments to perform the university's mission as efficiently and effectively as possible. The report identified 225 administrative position reductions and more than 250 efficiency measures under way, saving \$15 million per year, which was being redirected to instruction and other priorities. In addition, the President proposed other efficiencies to streamline statewide administrative services that would save another \$2.1 million annually. Other proposals had been made by the Board that would save taxpayers millions more each year. He had met with the Co-Chairs of the Audit and Joint Finance committees, as well as the Governor's office, and their reactions to the report had been positive.

These efficiencies were achieved while increasing access to serve an additional 10,000 students – the equivalent of adding a campus the size of UW-Eau Claire while saving taxpayer dollars.

Noting that the UW already is one of the most efficient university systems in the country, the President observed that finding these savings was not easy but demonstrated the university's commitment to serving the state and protecting quality. Stating that these efforts will be ongoing, he said the university will continue to embrace the Legislative Audit Bureau recommendations and communicate progress and proof of efficiency and effectiveness to the Governor, Legislature and citizens.

Remarking that the UW's budget request demonstrates commitment to student access and Wisconsin success, he looked forward to working with the Governor and Legislature to sustain the university, rebuild quality, restore faculty, increase the number of baccalaureate degree holders and support the university's 160,000 students.

Regent Connolly-Keesler pointed out that the proposed 200 position cut would be in addition to the 225 positions already eliminated.

Regent Bradley cautioned about the importance of making clear that the administrative staff reduction would include people who work in financial aid, advising and other areas that directly serve students.

Regent Rosenzweig noted the importance of bringing these strong efficiency efforts to the attention of the Legislature.

In response to a question by Regent Davis, Vice President Durcan indicated that the UW has been working with the Legislative Audit Bureau and Legislative Fiscal Bureau to reach general agreement on what positions should be categorized as administrative.

Regent Davis commented that, once agreement is reached, perhaps the UW would not be required to cut 200 more positions – a figure that is far too high. Vice President Durcan pointed out that those positions farthest removed from students were the first to be cut and that there are few left that would not directly impact service to students.

Regent Olivieri suggested that the board provide guidance on priorities for further cuts. President Reilly concurred, noting that, of the 8,000 positions identified in the audit report, 44% are clerical and secretarial.

Regent President Marcovich added that many of those categorized as “administrative” hold two or more jobs – teaching and doing research in addition to administrative responsibilities. In that regard, he noted that renowned UW-Madison researcher Hector DeLuca, who has brought huge amounts of money to Wisconsin, is classified as an “administrator” under the LAB categories because he heads a department and hires researchers for the grants he brings in.

Regent Richlen noted that the Legislature could take away the UW’s position authority if they did not approve of the cuts that were made, and President Reilly offered assurance that the university would work hand-in-hand with the Department of Administration and others in implementing cuts.

Regent Salas inquired about reference made by the state auditor to colleges that reported no administrative positions and errors in coding of contractual services. President Reilly explained that peer universities define institutional support as being at the institutional level, while deans and others at the college level are counted as academic support. The UW was working with the LAB on mutually agreeable definitions. Vice President Durcan added that UW institutions were reminded about proper coding of contractual expenses. While there were some errors, those were being corrected.

CONSOLIDATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS OF UW COLLEGES AND UW-EXTENSION, AND AUTHORIZATION TO RECRUIT A CHANCELLOR FOR THE UW COLLEGES AND UW-EXTENSION

Referring to previous connections between the two institutions, President Reilly noted that several of the UW College campuses were part of UW-Extension until the 1960s and that some administrative services, including personnel, payroll and benefits, have been shared between the institutions.

Similarities between the institutions include the fact that both are statewide educational networks operating at geographically dispersed locations; both are key public gateways for Wisconsin citizens to access higher education; both have central administrative offices headquartered in Madison; and both have longstanding partnerships with county and local governments.

The proposed consolidation calls for recruitment of a single chancellor to serve as chief administrative officer of the UW Colleges and UW-Extension, consolidation of administrative services as identified in the report by David J. Ward, and continuation of studies to identify additional means of achieving operating efficiencies in a manner that will most effectively preserve and enhance the missions of both institutions.

The proposal does not call for a merger of the two institutions into one, merger of faculty or staff governance, merger of personnel policies, merger of tenure and promotion structures, or co-location of all physical facilities.

The purpose of the consolidation would be to achieve administrative efficiencies and savings and to strengthen the service capacity of both institutions to their local communities and the state as a whole.

For example, with UW-Extension's distance learning capacity and the UW-Colleges' established degree and course offerings, the UW System could greatly expand access for Wisconsin residents to a college education. In addition, faculty and staff from both institutions could collaborate in new ways to address local economic development.

In addition, the UW Colleges and UW-Extension could work together to help enhance civic life in Wisconsin communities, offering a wide range of campus and community-based public forums, lectures and action-oriented applied research. As has been done in Washington State, UW-Extension county Cooperative Extension offices could serve as UW Colleges information and intake centers.

As to the process leading to the recommended consolidation, President Reilly noted that the recommendation results from a four-month study conducted by outside consultant David J. Ward, which included meetings and consultation with faculty, staff, and administrative leadership of the two institutions. Subsequent conversations included faculty and academic staff governance leaders of the two institutions, the UW System Faculty Representatives, and the Executive Director and President of the Wisconsin Counties Association. If approved by the Board, consultation with internal and external stakeholders would continue throughout implementation.

Marvin Van Kekerix, Interim Chancellor of UW-Extension, reported that the institution approached the proposed consolidation as an opportunity to make the university more efficient and better serve the state as a whole. While faculty and staff have many questions, their approach has been positive. Discussions with faculty and staff have been extensive, including three statewide conference calls. The intention has been to share as much information as possible at the local and state levels.

Margaret Cleek, Interim Chancellor of the UW Colleges, reported that there also has been wide-ranging discussion within that institution. She had visited all of the campuses; and meetings were held with faculty, staff, deans, all employees, and student government leaders. The focus of these discussions was on how to better serve students, and the Colleges had concluded that consolidation is the right thing to do.

If the Board approved the consolidation, it was proposed that a cross-institutional steering committee be created to set goals and manage the implementation process. Under direction of the steering committee, working groups would be established to review specific functions. Interim Chancellor Van Kekerix added that most conversations have led to new ideas about opportunities that would be presented by consolidation and that there is momentum to move forward.

President Reilly observed that, with the right approach, administrative savings can be achieved while preserving and enhancing quality and access. In that regard, concerns such as potential loss of identity or service to clients need to be carefully addressed, using input from internal and external stakeholders throughout the process.

He recognized that there were other ideas for restructuring, such as the one advanced by Representative Kreibich, who indicated that he would be happy to discuss the proposed consolidation and other ideas at a March 2nd joint hearing of the Senate Higher Education and Tourism Committee and the Assembly Colleges and Universities Committee. Approval of this plan, the President noted, would not preclude consideration of other ideas that might be presented to maximize use of university resources.

In the meantime, he urged moving forward to begin realizing administrative savings and building on the momentum the two institutions have developed. He believed that the Governor and Legislature were watching to see if the UW is serious about restructuring to promote cost efficiency and educational effectiveness and that faculty, staff and leadership of the two institutions are eager to move forward with consolidation and innovations that might be undertaken together.

Adoption of the following resolution was moved by Regent Pruitt and seconded by Regent McPike:

UW Colleges and UW-Extension:
Discussion of and Action on Consolidation of
Administrative Operations of UW Colleges
and UW-Extension, and Authorization to
Recruit: Chancellor

Resolution 8960:

Whereas, in October, 2004 President Reilly commissioned a study that would examine opportunities for consolidation of the administrative operations of the UW Colleges and UW-Extension; and

Whereas, pending a report on the results of the study, President Reilly delayed proceeding with previously approved authorizations to recruit a Chancellor for UW Colleges and a Chancellor for UW-Extension; and

Whereas, there are many strong similarities between UW Colleges and UW-Extension, including that both institutions: (1) are statewide educational networks operating at geographically dispersed locations; (2) are key public gateways for Wisconsin citizens to access higher education; (3) have central administrative offices headquartered in Madison; and (4) have longstanding partnerships with county and local governments; and

Whereas, administrative consolidation between the two institutions should build on these similar ties to strengthen their capacity to reach new audiences in new ways, increasing thereby the number of university degree holders in communities throughout Wisconsin; and

Whereas, administrative integration between the two institutions has potential for reducing overall administrative costs by as much as \$1.5 million annually, while preserving and enhancing access and service to students, citizens, and clients; and

Whereas, based on the observations and options presented in the report of David J. Ward dated January 14, 2005, and follow-up discussions with affected partners and stakeholders, President Reilly recommends the recruitment of a single chancellor for UW Colleges and UW-Extension;

Be it therefore resolved:

That, UW-Extension shall have as its chief administrative officer the chancellor who is also appointed to serve as the chancellor of the UW Colleges; and

That, the UW Colleges and UW-Extension, under the direction of their single chancellor, are directed to integrate the administrative services identified in the report, and to continue to study additional means of achieving operating efficiencies in a manner that will most effectively preserve and enhance their identified institutional missions; and

That, to the extent that they are inconsistent with this resolution, Regent Policy Documents 82-3 and 88-5 are superseded; and

That, the President of the University of Wisconsin System be authorized to recruit for a single Chancellor of the UW Colleges and UW-Extension, at a salary within the Board of Regents salary range for university senior executive salary group three.

Regent Pruitt commended President Reilly and Chancellors Van Kekerix and Cleek, along with their colleagues, for their successful effort to look for opportunities for cost savings and educational improvements.

Regent Gottschalk commented that savings generated by the consolidation should remain with the Colleges and Extension.

Regent Olivieri noted that the proposed consolidation would not eliminate the College deans, who are important to their communities, and that the college foundations could continue raising money for their campuses. Congratulating President Reilly for proposing this initiative, he noted that David J. Ward is a credible outside consultant and encouraged the institutions to be creative in working together to find additional opportunities for cost efficiencies and improved service.

In response to a question by Regent Salas, President Reilly noted that this proposed consolidation does not require statutory change, while other ideas would need legislative action.

Noting that one goal for President Reilly has been to improve efficiency, Regent Bradley urged the Board to strongly support the proposed consolidation.

Regent Connolly-Keesler observed that leading the two institutions would be a huge job for one chancellor and asked if it is reasonable to expect that one person could succeed. Replying in the affirmative, President Reilly indicated that the key is to do the consolidation in the right way in terms of structure and personnel.

The discussion having concluded, the question was put on Resolution 8930, and it was adopted on a unanimous voice vote.

The meeting was recessed at 12:00 p.m. and reconvened at 12:35 p.m.

- - -

PLAN 2008: EDUCATIONAL QUALITY THROUGH RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY – PHASE II

Regent President Marcovich introduced the presentation by noting that closing the achievement gap between students of color and their white peers remains a great challenge and one to which the Board is deeply committed. He called on Senior Vice President Cora Marrett to comment on how the UW System is working to ensure that Phase II of Plan 2008 results in real progress in that regard.

Dr. Marrett began her remarks with the following observation by Nancy Cantor, President of Syracuse University and a key force in building the case for diversity at the University of Michigan: “What really needs to happen is that every major institution in this country has to be fired up to make [not only affirmative action per se, but the educational benefits of diversity] front and center.”

Remarking that there is perhaps no entity better prepared to advance diversity than the UW System, Dr. Marrett referred to President Reilly’s statement in his first address to the Board that he was “fired with enthusiasm.” Such intensity at the top, she observed, can only ignite others in the cause of diversity.

She then cited remarks by chancellors on the benefit of diversity for all. UW-Stevens Point Chancellor Linda Bunnell stated: “We seek to prepare graduates to learn how to engage and shape the array of diverse communities in which they will live, work, and play. We seek with our Plan 2008 Phase II to create the enrollment, staffing, curricula, programs, and activities that will promote and celebrate diversity in ways that stimulate critical thinking, problem-solving capacity, and cognitive complexity...”

UW-Milwaukee Chancellor Carlos Santiago in his recent plenary address to the campus stated: “The reality is that if we do not become a more diverse community that welcomes all members of our society, we will never become a truly premier research university. Academic excellence and diversity are the pillars upon which this institution will thrive and achieve the prominence that was envisioned by its founders. Our diversity complements academic excellence and the growth in research that is our goal. Diversity is an issue that is of paramount importance both to our university and to our larger society.”

In addition, Dr. Marrett pointed out, individual Regents, as well as the Board as a whole, have placed diversity front and center. In that regard, she noted the generous and vigorous involvement of Regent Davis in the Best Practices Conference last fall and in the development of the Phase II report; the strong focus of Regents Olivieri and Richlen on results and not mere plans; and the demand from Regent Salas to attend to differences within the populations of color.

Finally, she pointed out that no group has demonstrated more clearly its enthusiasm for diversity than the students of the university.

Turning to the specifics of Phase II, she recalled that the review of Phase I of Plan 2008 indicated persistent differences in retention and graduation between students of color and their counterparts. The Board determined that closing the achievement gap should be the focus of the second phase.

Drawing on knowledge of successful blueprints for diversity, UW System Administration proposed that institutional plans focus on: Linkages to institutional mission; emphasis on commitment to diversity in and out of the classroom; attention to assessment; addressing specific needs of the institution; and specification of the implementation process, including the ends sought and the timeframe.

Generally, Dr. Marrett commented, each plan contained strong components for advancing diversity. However, some plans were submitted as preliminary rather than final documents. Noting that a large team of people from UW System Administration discussed the plans, she expressed special gratitude to Ron Singer, Marilyn Rhodes, Anne Bilder, Sal Carranza, and Christa Bruhn for the extraordinary efforts they expended.

The review showed plans with several recurring elements: Identification of a problem inherent in the culture, demography, or other specific characteristic of the institution; a set of objectives for addressing the problem; action steps; and means for assessing change.

In the interest of strengthening all plans, she then cited some particularly worthy of note. The UW-Oshkosh plan identified five areas that would impact recruitment and

retention of students of color and narrow the achievement gap: Faculty/staff consciousness-raising regarding diversity; academic support for minority/disadvantaged students; financial aid for those students; campus climate development; and parental partnership programs. The plan presented a set of strategies for each area; the person with overall responsibility; and the methods for assessing performance.

The UW-Stevens Point plan noted short, medium, and long-term challenges to achieving the goals in Plan 2008 and presented actions to be taken to meet each challenge, along with the person to be held accountable, the deadline, and expected costs. One such challenge is that faculty and staff do not perceive that the university rewards efforts to promote diversity. An action to meet the challenge would be to include diversity efforts in the rewards managed administratively.

The UW-Madison plan also identified obstacles and means of reducing them. The institution observed how limited is the body of minority/disadvantaged students with the credentials from high school necessary for admission. The response would be to create pathway programs and secure funds for expansion. Assessment holds a prominent place in the pathway plans.

Noting that United Council also undertook a review of the plans, she called on Academic Affairs Director David Glisch-Sanchez for his comments on the concerns of students with regard to the submissions.

Mr. Glisch-Sanchez remarked that campuses are not able to communicate the experience of African-Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, and Asian/Pacific Islanders when there is no critical mass of students of color and that corporations have refused to recruit graduates from UW institutions because students are not able to engage in a diverse work environment.

Although better education and preparation of graduates is an important objective, he said, from the standpoint of students Plan 2008 is really about safety, equity, and equal opportunity. Stating that United Council staff receive steady reports of racial prejudice, bias, and discrimination, he cited examples from a number of campuses and indicated that decisive action often is not taken in response to such incidents. Students understand, he said, that Plan 2008 has the potential of being the vehicle by which these types of events may be addressed and prevented in the future. However, to meet that objective, numerous changes to the institutional plans would be required.

Noting that the Board's Resolution 8850 provides that institutions develop a means of assessing Phase II initiatives, he commented that, while some campuses made good attempts at fulfilling that requirement, many plans do not include strong assessment protocols. Such assessment, he emphasized, is crucial to knowing exactly what the problems are at each institution and what progress is being made in addressing them.

Stating that campuses currently do not have a mechanism to assess their climate, he said that a system-wide climate study that includes a section specific to particular campus concerns, would provide information that is needed to understand what problems exist and at what levels of severity. He felt that the study should be coordinated by System Administration and that it should be comprehensive in focus in order to understand not only why students are leaving for racial/ethnic reasons, but also because of gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, disability, age, or immigrant status. In that regard, he noted that students of color leave for reasons attached to all parts of their identity.

With regard to tracking progress of Plan 2008 initiatives, he commented that most campus plans include mainly input indicators, such as program participation rates, rather than output measures, such as educational attainment. United Council identified two strategies to address this concern.

The first strategy would be the Diversity Scorecard developed by Dr. Estela Mara Bensimon, Director of the Center for Urban Education at the University of Southern California. When she presented at the Best Practices Conference, Dr. Bensimon explained that “evidence about the state of equity in educational outcomes for underrepresented students presented in the form of graphically displayed quantitative data can have a powerful effect in mobilizing institutional attention and action.” The second strategy would be to develop relevant output measures for any programs that do not fit under the scorecard rubric.

Turning to program content, Mr. Glisch-Sanchez said that it is important to address two areas: financial aid and the varied identities of students of color. With regard to financial aid, students have become concerned with recent shifts away from race-conscious grants and scholarships. There had been allegations that the Lawton Grants and similar programs discriminate against white students, and some institutional plans signaled a shift toward “race-neutral” alternatives. Such allegations and movements, he stated, ignore the fact that poverty is not race or gender neutral. For example, the Center on Wisconsin Strategy recently reported that 44% of working families of color are low-income, as opposed to only 19% of working white families. Therefore, he urged a strong show of support for programs like the Lawton Grants in order to send a clear message to those who would forsake race-conscious efforts.

Stating that there must be recognition of differences among people in order to best serve them, Mr. Glisch-Sanchez indicated that only one institutional plan made an attempt to connect Plan 2008 to other diversity efforts to better address the multiple identities of students of color. In order to retain and graduate students of color, he commented, the plans must address all of the reasons they leave campus.

Addressing the matter of accountability, Mr. Glisch-Sanchez commented that, while improving accountability was one of the seven original goals of Plan 2008, this also was the largest failure of Phase I and that major changes would be needed for Phase II. In that regard, he expressed the view that Phase I was not a high priority for the UW, a result for which no one was held accountable. When students tried to hold administrators and faculty responsible, they were characterized as being too demanding and having impractical expectations. In Phase II, he stated, “the promise of safety, equity, and equal opportunity must be realized, and individuals must be held accountable for its accomplishment.”

Accountability, he continued, should not only involve penalties, but should rely to a large extent in incentives and rewards. In that regard, students supported the proposed Diversity Award as a means of recognizing significant success. If there is no progress on a campus, the chancellor should provide a detailed explanation and a comprehensive strategy for moving forward. If there is consistent failure, there should be stringent consequences for the campus or chancellor. In addition, he suggested that revisions to Phase II plans incorporate accountability measures that use both incentives and penalties to ensure everyone’s participation in closing the achievement gap.

In conclusion, he expressed appreciation to Marilyn Rhodes on behalf of students for her consistent dedication to the goals of Plan 2008 and for her extensive work with students in that regard.

As to next steps, Senior Vice President Marrett indicated that feedback on plans would be provided to every institution and a further report would be made to the Board in March. In addition, there would be sharing of best practices among institutions and more linkages would be established among activities of the Institute on Race and Ethnicity, the Women and Science Program, the Wisconsin Alliance for Minority Participation, and the Multicultural Center for Educational Excellence

In discussion following the presentation, Regent Salas congratulated Dr. Marrett and colleagues for an encouraging report on diversity. He was particularly pleased to see the excellent campus models. The challenge, he commented, is make significant improvements on the 1% increase in students of color in the past ten years and on retention rates of 33% for African American students and 40% for Hispanic students. In addition, he noted that more than half of faculty of color are Asian and urged further break outs by ethnic background.

He also emphasized the importance of assessment and of connecting the plans to institutional mission. Finally, he urged that the goals of Plan 2008 be made more specific in order to provide better guidance to the institutions.

In response to a question by Regent Connolly-Keesler, Dr. Marrett indicated that Plan 2008 activities have been funded for the most part through reallocation. However, she

added that attainment of diversity is a core activity, which is not dependent on receipt of extra dollars.

Regent Davis remarked that she was moved by Mr. Glisch-Sanchez's comments and appreciated the large number of students in the audience. Commending President Reilly and the chancellors for their leadership, she stated that the bottom line is maximum success for all students and that there must be rewards for significant progress, as well as consequences for not meeting objectives. In that regard, she noted that there must be clarity on who is accountable for what. Stating that there must be a sense of urgency about accelerating the movement forward, she suggested using best practices to prevent having to "reinvent the wheel" and noted that campuses must feel that they have the resources and support to achieve success.

The discussion having concluded, the meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m., upon motion by Regent Rosenzweig, seconded by Regent Bradley.

Judith Temby, Secretary

G:regents/minutes/Feb.10,2005min.bor.doc