

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
of the  
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

Madison, Wisconsin

UW-Milwaukee  
Held in the Union – Wisconsin Room  
Thursday, June 9, 2005  
11:00 a.m.

- President Marcovich presiding -

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

ABSENT: Regents Gracz and Smith

- - -

**Introduction of New Regents**

Regent President Marcovich welcomed to the Board three new members recently appointed by Governor Doyle.

Judy Crain, who was appointed to succeed Guy Gottschalk, is a highly respected civic leader who lives in Green Bay. She served for many years on the Green Bay Board of Education, including five years as president. She also has been active in the Brown County United Way, the Wisconsin Council on Children, Youth and Families, the UW-Green Bay Chancellor's Council of Trustees, and other civic service organizations.

Michael Spector, of Shorewood, was appointed to succeed Jose Olivieri. The retired Chair and Managing Partner of the law firm of Quarles and Brady, he recently chaired Governor Doyle's Statewide Task Force on Educational Excellence and serves on the Greater Milwaukee Committee, the UW Pathways to Excellence Board of Visitors and the UW-Milwaukee School of Education Board of Visitors.

Christopher Semenas, who was appointed to succeed Beth Richlen as student regent, is a senior at UW-Parkside, where he is majoring in English and History. He also is the past president of the Parkside Student Government Association.

- - -

## **THE EQUITY SCORECARD: AN INSTITUTIONAL STRATEGY TO ACHIEVE EQUITY AND EXCELLENCE**

In introductory remarks, Senior Vice President Cora Marrett indicated that Phase II documents for Plan 2008 provide evidence of the strong commitment to closing the achievement gap between students of color and other students, thanks to the diligent work of students, faculty, staff and administrators. Noting that the resoluteness of the Board of Regents also warrants recognition in this regard, she recalled that focus on an equity scorecard emerged from the interest of the Board at the March meeting in the importance of assessment and evidence.

Review of Phase II plans also showed growing momentum for assessment and planning based in internal cultures of evidence. While there is increased demand for public accountability in higher education, institutions at the same time require information in order to promote internal planning, decision-making and improvement. A culture of evidence seeks to advance continuous improvement from within the institution for those who learn, teach and work there.

In March, a two-pronged approach to accountability and continuous improvement was proposed: First, inclusion in the annual accountability report of more specific benchmarks on and indicators of progress in closing the achievement gap; and second, development of evidence-based tools for achieving equity in educational outcomes.

Indicating that one such tool is the equity scorecard, she said that the emphasis is on the importance of evidence, rather than on a single model. That emphasis would allow institutions to adopt and adapt models that fit their distinct missions and circumstances.

Senior Vice President Marrett then introduced Assistant Vice President Vicki Washington for description of the equity scorecard approach.

Assistant Vice President Washington began her remarks by defining the equity scorecard as a framework and process that is intended to enable campuses to implement more effective strategies to close the gap in access and achievement. After 16 years of effort – 10 in Design for Diversity and six in Plan 2008, considerable progress has been made, but much remains to be accomplished.

The equity scorecard, she explained, was developed by Dr. Estela Mara Bensimon, Professor of Higher Education and Director for the Center for Urban Education, and a team of researchers at the University of Southern California's Rossier School of Education. It is being field tested at 14 institutions in the Los Angeles metro

area that were selected because their student populations were already diverse, allowing them to focus on internal equity. In Wisconsin, where student populations are less diverse, equity indicators would need to consider both external and internal indicators. The scorecard provides a process to improve institutional effectiveness in terms of access, retention, climate, faculty and staff recruitment, teaching and learning, and accountability.

It is important, Ms. Washington pointed out, to bear in mind that the equity scorecard being proposed for the UW is not a mandate; rather, four or five campuses are being sought to pilot the model. It is not a report card; rather, it is a campus-based assessment model, but it is not a standardized or uniformity driven assessment model. And it is not a replacement for existing assessment and evaluation efforts; rather, it is intended to improve existing practices.

According to Dr. Bensimone, the core principle of the equity (diversity) scorecard is that the “evidence(i.e., factual data) about inequities in educational outcomes (access, enrollments, retention, graduation) greatly motivate administrators, faculty, counselors and others to solve them.”

Explaining that the scorecard model requires an examination of the entire campus experience, Ms. Washington pointed out that its remedial outcomes may require structural changes in policies, practices and programs, in order to move toward equity of outcomes. According to the Diversity Scorecard Project of the Center for Urban Education at the University of Southern California, “Equity is achieved when students of color succeed in any variety of measures relative to their representation (including access and excellence)” in all aspects of campus life.

As to why an equity scorecard should be considered at this time, Ms. Washington identified the following reasons:

- To address educational outcomes stratified by race and income;
- To reap the benefits of increasing economic returns by enhancing the skills of the workforce needed to remain competitive in a global economy;
- To equip all students for a knowledge-based economy, including racial and ethnic groups that have yet to derive full benefit from increasing economic returns on education;
- To eliminate educational inequities; and
- To increase institutional accountability

According to Drs. Estela Mara Bensimon, Donald Polkinghorne, and Georgia Bauman, as cited in *The Accountability Side of Diversity*, the disaggregation of data about educational outcomes by race and ethnicity and the determination of equity standards are evidence-based practices that will both make individuals more conscious about educational outcomes for underserved students and enable them to act purposefully to improve those outcomes.

In the USC experience, the equity scorecard worked to promote awareness by providing a clear and unambiguous picture of inequities. After analysis of the meaning of the inequities, strategic actions were developed to achieve equity in educational

outcomes based on data, not assumptions. Ms. Washington stated the belief that the equity scorecard can also be beneficial in Wisconsin in promoting strategic, focused action designed to yield better outcomes for students.

Dr. Bensimone found that, through the simple act of disaggregating existing data on indicators of student outcomes, institutions are able to locate specifically the most critical gaps in the academic performance of students of color and other underrepresented students. People then are able to better see the problems, identify the remedies and become agents of change.

Ms. Washington explained that the scorecard approach examines data through four perspectives:

- Access
- Retention
- Excellence
- Institutional receptivity

There are four steps in the process:

- 1) Create campus evidence teams, including provosts, deans, faculty, staff and institutional researchers.
- 2) Analyze existing data through the four perspectives listed above.
- 3) Develop a scorecard by selecting goals and developing equity measures and benchmarks where unequal outcomes are uncovered.
- 4) Share results by presenting a report to the Chancellor, strategic planning committees, academic senates and faculty members; launching an initiative tailored to the specific campus context; mobilizing stakeholders to engage in institutional change to address inequities; and fostering sustained conversations needed to transform information into knowledge.

Turning to specific indicators, Ms. Washington explained that, in the area of access, indicators would enable institutional leaders to become more fully informed about the extent to which underrepresented students gain access to the institution, its programs, and its resources. With regard to external access, indicators would deal with access to higher education or to a campus. Internal indicators would address questions like:

- In what programs and majors do underrepresented students enroll?
- Do underrepresented students have access to important career enhancing programs like internships or fellowships?
- What access do underrepresented students have to financial support?
- What access do underrepresented students at four-year colleges have to graduate and professional schools?

Indicators constructed from the retention perspective address such questions as:

- What are the comparative retention rates for underrepresented students by program?

- Do underrepresented students disproportionately withdraw from high demand programs like engineering and computer science?
- How successful are underrepresented students in completing basic skills courses?  
Retention indicators may also address faculty and staff retention issues.

Institutional receptivity indicators examine campus climate, raising questions such as:

- How well are faculty and staff of color represented in all areas of university life?
- How well is the postsecondary education system serving the needs of students of color?
- Do educational outcomes for students of color in specific areas reveal an equity gap?

Excellence indicators have both access and achievement components. When viewed through the lens of access, questions might include:

- Which majors or courses function as “gatekeepers” for some students and “gateways” for others? For example, is there a western-culture or race bias in particular courses? Why are African American students concentrated in certain majors?

When excellence is viewed through the lens of achievement, questions might include:

- What are the comparative completion rates for underrepresented students in highly competitive programs?
- What is the pool of high-achieving underrepresented students in each academic discipline who are eligible for graduate study?
- What percentage of underrepresented students graduate with a GPA of 3.5 or higher?

As next steps, Ms. Washington identified the following:

- Build capacity of UW System Administration to facilitate implementation of the scorecard
- Identify current assessment practices at UW institutions
- Explore options for piloting the equity scorecard at UW institutions

In closing, Ms. Washington stated in summary that the equity scorecard is an approach that is intended to identify factors that create gaps in access, achievement and excellence; direct attention and resources toward those areas; implement actions to eliminate the gaps and achieve equity in all dimensions of campus life; and monitor accomplishments using improvement targets to achieve equity.

Following Ms. Washington’s remarks were two presentations on how campuses currently make use of evidence-based approaches.

UW-Madison Provost Peter Spear began his remarks by noting that the university began collecting data on students of color in 1976 and on targeted minority students (African American, Native American, Hispanic/Latino, and Southeast Asian) in 1989.

These data showed progressive increases in students of color from under 4% of undergraduates in 1976 to about 11% in 2004 and in targeted minority students from about 4% in 1989 to about 7% in 2004. The data also showed an upswing soon after implementation of Plan 2008, reflecting focus on recruitment of targeted minority students and students of color.

With regard to retention of first-year undergraduates, data showed the gap between targeted minority and other students closing, with retention of the former increasing from about 76% in 2001 to about 90% in 2003, close to the 93% retention rate for all other students. Given credit for this dramatic improvement in retention is the PEOPLE Program which involves mentoring, scholarships and bringing students to campus in the summer. The program also has helped to improve retention of targeted minority students after two years from about 66% in 1999 to about 77% in 2002, compared to a retention rate of about 83% for all other students.

Referring to a large gap in the percentage of six-year graduation rates (80% for all students versus about 55% for targeted minority students), Dr. Spear noted that these data do not yet reflect the effects of Plan 2008 and the PEOPLE Program.

With regard to campus climate, a 2003 undergraduate student survey showed a difference in perception between students of color and other students. About 21% of students of color, but over 31% of other students rated the university excellent or very good in responding to the interests and concerns of students. About 22% of students of color, but almost 35% of other students, rated the university as excellent or very good in creating a sense of belonging for students. Sixty-eight percent of students of color, compared to about 48% of other students, considered race relations at UW-Madison an extremely or somewhat serious problem.

Six-year graduation rates for 1994-1996 new freshman with ACT scores from 28-31 were 80% for majority students but much lower for targeted minority students. Data showed, however, that minority students receiving scholarships graduated at significantly higher rates than other minority students.

Turning to data on faculty, Provost Spear displayed a graph showing a large increase in minority faculty hires under the Madison Plan and the Strategic Hiring Initiative. Tenure rates did not show significant differences between minority and other faculty.

A survey of all faculty showed that over 80% of department chairs and almost 80% of majority faculty, but less than 60% of faculty of color, felt that the climate for faculty of color in their departments was good.

Finally, data showed minority faculty steadily gaining as a percentage of total faculty, from about nine percent in 1995 to about 15% in 2004.

Gerald Greenfield, Assistant Provost at UW-Parkside, spoke about the diversity initiatives of the Criminal Justice Department, noting that the campus as a whole has a high percentage of students of color compared to other UW institutions and that diversity is a core mission of the campus.

To accommodate the lifestyles of students and their responsibilities, the Criminal Justice major is offered both during the day and in the evening, enabling those employed

full time to earn a degree. Between 1998 and 2003, 23.4% of graduates in the program were students of color, which exceeds the percentage of students of color at the university as a whole.

Incorporating diversity is a key feature of the Criminal Justice curriculum, Dr. Greenfield indicated, so that students can better relate to what is being taught. The department also is beginning to focus on diversity from a global perspective.

An ethnically diverse faculty also has been critical in attracting a growing number of students of color into the major. Strategies for hiring faculty of color have included meeting with potential applicants face-to-face during conferences, having an extensive network of colleagues nationwide, and paying particular attention to concerns and needs of applicants, such as spousal placement.

In conclusion, Dr. Greenfield indicated that involvement in community issues by faculty and students has been effective in attracting and energizing students of color in the program. Having faculty of color also assists in making connections with the local community.

In discussion following the presentation, Regent Salas referred to a document on enrollment that showed some campuses lagging in recruitment of students of color while others excelled. He expressed the hope that those which have fallen behind would redouble efforts to improve recruitment outcomes.

- - -

## **2005-07 BIENNIAL BUDGET UPDATE**

Connie Hutchison, Executive Secretary of the Higher Educational Aids Board, remarked that the board shares a goal with the university of ensuring that money gets to students in a fair and equitable manner. Noting that HEAB and UW staff have excellent relationships, she expressed special appreciation to Associate Vice Presidents Freda Harris and Sharon Wilhelm and to Kristen Hendrickson for their help and support.

She explained that HEAB determines formulas in February so that aid packages can be prepared for students in a timely way and that it is not possible to wait until a biennial budget is passed. For this year, the packages were based on the \$40 million included in the Governor's budget for 2005-06. However, the Joint Committee on Finance approved \$3.4 million less than the Governor's recommendation.

In addition, the Governor proposed increasing the maximum WHEG award to \$3000, up from \$2500; but the Joint Committee on Finance removed that provision, keeping the cap at \$2500.

Because of these changes, it will be necessary to re-calculate the financial aid awards, she noted, adding that the most significant change is \$7 million less than the Governor's budget in the second year of the biennium, making it more difficult to hold students harmless from tuition increases in that year.

Associate Vice President Freda Harris began her remarks by noting that, in 2003-05 UW funding was cut by \$250 million, the largest reduction ever, which was partially offset by a \$150 million increase in tuition revenues. For 2005-07, the combined effect of the Governor's budget and Joint Finance Committee actions would reduce the UW's budget by another \$90 million, with no tuition offset.

The Board of Regents' biennial budget request, she recalled, addressed some of the major concerns raised in its year-long study of the challenges facing the UW, its students, and the state. The budget called for moderate increases in tuition, substantial increases in financial aid for lower-income students, more faculty in the classroom, and targeted efforts to increase the number of baccalaureate degree holders in Wisconsin.

The Governor's budget addressed the Board's concerns by providing funding for financial aid, new faculty and baccalaureate expansion efforts. It also required \$65 million of operations reductions over the biennium, in part to fund the \$22 million in new initiatives, including 125 new faculty positions. The Joint Finance Committee budget would require \$90 million in operational reductions, cuts to student services, administration, research, etc., to fund fuel utilities, debt service, and \$9 million in new initiatives. Reductions of \$1.5 million annually would be directed to System Administration.

The Governor's budget provided a biennial increase of \$49.4 million over the UW's 2004-05 base. The Joint Finance Committee budget reduced the GPR in the Governor's budget by \$40.6 million, to an increase of \$8.8 million over the base. It would decrease financial aid by \$1.9 million and would eliminate \$11.4 million for 120 faculty positions

The Governor's budget included the expectation that tuition would need to increase between five and seven percent to cover the items included in the budget. With the pay plan proposed by the Office of State Employment Relations in May, tuition increases would need to be around seven percent under both the Governor's and Joint Finance Committee's budgets. A tuition cap was discussed, but ultimately not included in the Joint Committee on Finance budget.

Ms. Harris indicated that current statutes authorize resident undergraduate tuition to be increased to cover amounts included in the legislative budget, increases for pay plan and related costs, state imposed costs, differential tuition, changes in mix, etc. In the last biennium, specific language was included to allow the UW to recoup \$150 million of the budget reduction from tuition, but no such option has been included for the coming biennium.

Another major impact on students, Ms. Harris continued, is the reduction in financial aid in the budget of the Higher Educational Aids Board. Wisconsin Higher Education Grant (WHEG) funds were decreased by \$11 million biennially and \$3.4 million in the upcoming year. While the Governor's budget came close to fully funding a hold-harmless provision for WHEG students in the coming year, the Joint Finance Committee's budget would increase financial aid appropriations by six percent annually. The dollar increases provided by this percentage would not be enough to cover the dollar amount of tuition increases, causing the financial aid gap to widen.



In addition, funding for Advanced Opportunity Grants and Lawton Grants, the two major financial aid appropriations within the UW System, were reduced biennially by \$1.9 million.

In 1986, Ms. Harris recalled, the Legislative Audit Bureau performed a management audit of the UW System that noted the need for enrollment planning to provide sufficient funding to maintain high quality instruction. At that time, the UW System enrolled 139,134 students and state funding per student was \$1,222 below the national average. After implementing enrollment management and receiving additional funding from the state, the UW was \$161 above the national average in state funding per student by 1994-95. In 2003-04, due to a combination of increased enrollments and reduced state funding, the state support per student was once again more than \$1,200 below the national average.

While the 2003-05 GPR reduction was partially offset by significant tuition increases, Ms. Harris pointed out that UW institutions remain well below their peers in tuition and fees paid by students: UW-Madison ranks eighth out of nine; UW-Milwaukee ranks eleventh out of fifteen; and the UW comprehensive universities rank 33<sup>rd</sup> out of 35.

Other actions by the Joint Committee on Finance included student surcharges, various studies and changes in reporting requirements. There also would be a tuition remissions to veterans, costing an estimated \$3 million to \$7.6 million, which would result in an additional budget reduction or an increase in tuition.

In conclusion, Ms. Harris remarked that, if the Joint Finance Committee budget remains unchanged, UW students and families will again pay more to receive less – no additional faculty, fewer services, fewer sections, and more ad hoc instruction.

In discussion following the presentation, Regent Salas noted that the Governor's budget would have held the lowest income students harmless from tuition increases. He asked if any relief could be provided to them with the cuts made by the Joint Committee on Finance. Ms. Harris replied that, while some students would receive up to \$2,500, there would not be enough money available to hold harmless the population of students that receive WHEG grants. Ms. Hutchison added that higher individual awards would mean that fewer students could be served. In the coming year, students would lose \$30 to \$250 out of their aid packages; but the second year of the biennium would require greater reductions.

Regent President Marcovich asked whether, if students decided not to enroll, their aid packages would become available to others, to which Ms. Hutchison replied that all aid would be distributed. It was HEAB's belief that most students still would enroll, but would graduate with increased debt.

Regent Randall asked if HEAB commits over 100% of available aid, to which Ms. Hutchison replied that about 130% is committed, partly because of duplication of applications. The formula that is developed attempts to stretch the aid money as far as possible.

In response to a question by Regent Walsh, Ms. Hutchison said that all recipients will receive letters about changes in their aid packages. An award between \$2,500 and \$2,600 will decrease by about \$118. The average award will be close to \$1,700.

Regent Walsh noted that a six percent increase in aid would not cover a six percent increase in tuition, increasing the aid gap. He pointed out that it is a top priority of the Board to focus on financial aid for student access. Ms. Hutchison added that the Governor is committed to that goal as well.

Regent Walsh added that another top priority is funding for faculty, and that money for 120 positions was removed from the Governor's budget.

Referring to the reduction in state support per student, Regent Bradley remarked that, as a parent, he would view that as an indication of declining quality. In 1986 the problem had been addressed by reducing enrollment. Ms. Harris explained that the 1986 audit had been done because of complaints that students were unable to access the courses and services they needed. Observing that the same kinds of problems are occurring now, Regent Bradley pointed out that, in the absence of the ability to raise tuition to cover costs, the UW either must become smaller or sacrifice quality.

In response to a question by Regent Olivieri, Ms. Harris explained that the rationale for the financial aid cut by the Joint Committee on Finance was that, if tuition is increased by six percent, then financial aid should increase at the same rate. One problem, she pointed out, is that Wisconsin has less financial aid than surrounding states.

Ms. Hutchison emphasized that the Governor and HEAB are supportive of the UW's priority on financial aid. She added that the Joint Committee on Finance had left the aid appropriation as GPR, rather than the UW auxiliary funds used in the last biennium, causing new money to flow into the budget, even though it is not as much as needed.

Regent Rosenzweig did not believe that the message was clearly conveyed about the link between increased numbers of baccalaureate degrees, economic growth and expanded student access, including access for lower income students. Noting that the Joint Committee on Finance had provided \$22.5 million for utilities, along with money for faculty retention and Alzheimer's research, as well as eliminating some reporting requirements, she urged that legislators be thanked for these positive actions and encouraged to listen to the Board's message about student access and economic growth.

President Reilly added that many editorials have made the point that Regent Rosenzweig stated.

Turning to legislative action on the Capital Budget, Associate Vice President Harris reported the following actions by the Joint Committee on Finance:

- Reduction of all-agency funds for maintenance, repair and renewal by \$20 million, from \$220 million to \$200 million. Because the UW would normally receive about half of these funds, the impact would be approximately \$10 million. Even after the reductions, the funding provided to the UW should remain virtually the same as the last biennium.
- Reduction of funding for UW major projects by \$10 million, from \$164 to \$154 million. This level of funding supports 14 major projects, and the UW has been directed to submit a plan to the Building Commission.

- Authorization for the Governor's Wisconsin Institute for Discovery at UW-Madison for 2005-07, with enumeration for future biennia withheld; and
- Setting of a state target for future borrowing which could significantly reduce the amount of funding available.

Noting that the Governor and the co-chairs of the Joint Committee on Finance had spoken about wanting to make future reinvestments in the UW, President Reilly said that the Legislature should be asked to restore the funding for financial aid and for faculty that was in the Governor's budget.

He called for creation of a bi-partisan commission to consider what the state wants and expects from the UW System in the long term. The results of such a study, he indicated, could drive targeted investments in the university and promote the well-being of the state as a whole.

Upon conclusion of the discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 12:55 p.m., upon motion by Regent Olivieri, seconded by Regent Salas.

Submitted by:

---

Judith A. Temby  
Secretary