Comment

What was the purpose of CCOET? The distribution of budget cuts was defined early in this process. Why wasn't the execution of the reductions left to the division heads?

In other words, if you tell "division X" to cut expenditures by 10%, than tell them that. Don't tell them how to do it.

Comment

I just wanted to reach out to you to make sure that, whatever decisions are made, those decisions will make sense for soft money offices like mine. Of specific concern was the plan to have a waiting period before being able to hire academic staff. All of my staff are grant funded and it would be significant disruption to my projects if I had to wait four months to hire replacement staff. Further, not being able to hire people would actually cost the university money, since it would not be earning indirect on grant money spent on the staff salary and fringe. That was my main concern that I wanted to convey. Thank you for your time.

Comment

I’m sure that many will express concerns about Item II. iii of the CCOET Report (p. 13: “Gather all aspects involving a student’s academic trajectory under one administrative line”). The text presents an argument about 1) efficiencies to be gained by consolidating reports to a single administrative line and 2) effectiveness to be gained by coordinating efforts.

This would presumably include gathering Undergraduate Admissions, Center for International Education, Financial Aid, Student Accounts, Registrar, and Career Planning and Resource Center under one administrative report within the Provost’s office. Such reorganization will enhance consistent messaging and should be accompanied by transparent flow of student information through the Student Success Center, shared advising records, and so on. This process should be data driven and outcome measured. These core functions could be augmented by placing programs such as learning communities, targeted/undecided intensive advising, bridge programs, cultural centers, diversity and inclusiveness centers, TRIO programs, Panther Academic Support Services, Student Success Center, Military and Veterans Resource Center, Accessibility Resource Center and the Office of Undergraduate Research under the same administrative line, while retaining the individual identity of each of these valuable programs. This would allow scarce resources to be applied in the most effective manner consistent with mission-related outcomes. It must be recognized that this implementation will require moving additional support staff (e.g., UITS) as well as the offices themselves.

Leaving aside whether this approach would actually yield cost-savings or retention increases, I would suggest that the kinds of programs being grouped together could be more strategically selected. Without speaking for other units, I would like to clarify that the Office of Undergraduate Research is an undergraduate student-facing part of the research infrastructure of the campus and is administratively part of the Office of Research, reporting to the Vice-Provost for Research. Because the OUR works directly with faculty, supporting their research and grant-writing, there is a clear strategic advantage for the OUR remaining part the Office of Research. While clearly focused on undergraduate student success, the OUR [Office of
Undergraduate Research] is not a student academic support center in the same way that most (though certainly not all) of the units in this list.

I would be happy to provide more information about the structure, efficiency, and successes of the Office of Undergraduate Research if such information would be helpful.

Comment

I have a comment regarding the recommendation for “Increasing Courses Offered during Non-peak Times, which appears on pages 33-34 of the CCOET Report.

Courses at non-peak hours generally have lower enrollments than courses offered at midday, and courses with lower enrollments are the first to be cut; thus, there is no incentive for any instructor to take the risk of scheduling courses during non-peak times.

Comment

I am curious as to why campus is recruiting for the Assistant Vice Chancellor, Assistant to the Provost for Budget and Planning, position.

The CCOET Final Report on page 14 recommends a simplification of the senior level campus administration. In light of the current critical fiscal situation UWM faces at this time, why is the campus recruiting for this position?

Comment

My only feedback I have right now concerns the Graduate School.

Given the recent award of an R1 status to UWM, it seems rather counterproductive to eliminate the Graduate School. Secondly, mentions of duplicative services occurring in schools and colleges v. the Graduate School are minimal at best. Further study would show that placing all of the services the Graduate School offers into each school and college would not only increase the time and cost it takes to do business and provide student services, it would also add to the overall bottom line in an even larger payroll expense.

A centralized Graduate School provides students with the services they have said they needed and want. Our programs here are growing. From professional development opportunities to centralized recruiting, an annual Fellowship celebration to a campus-wide Open House, each year we have brought in students who would not have looked at UWM previously. We are proud of the work we are doing here, continue to do and look forward to growing further.

I strongly urge leadership to consider not only keeping the Graduate School in its current structure, but to also invest in and grow the services we provide for students. Our graduate students make up ¼ of the current student body; I encourage the additional investment in them.

Comment

First, I’m disappointed as a longtime UWM community member that objections from faculty seemed to roadblock any significant ideas regarding reorganization or funding. With tenured faculty holding the power that they do, and CCOET being largely led by deans and department heads, there was a generally committee-wide reluctance to taken on anything that would be “too hard” or controversial. That, it seems to me, is antithetical to what CCOET was called to do. I’d also say that — at least from my perspective on the CCOET “support team” — that I was surprised by paltry attendance from many fellow members. (There was also — and this was certainly true in open forums as well — a kind of “Not in My Backyard” response from members; budget cuts are for other people, it seems.) The chairs did a great (and fairly under-recognized job) of keeping
discussions in the realm of the possible, but were maybe a little too ready to declare ideas affecting faculty as too difficult or too long-term to be vetted in depth.

Second, I was surprised at how often the suggestions coming from CCOET members seemed to forget that students constitute our chief mission (and nearly our sole source of income). I don’t mean to suggest that we are solely a customer service organization now, but our service to students, learning, and graduation shouldn’t come second to the university’s ability to provide employment. I don’t think it would be bad practice for every department — or every area with an operating budget — to provide an annual statement on how the work done in that department/unit/center/etc. contributes to student graduation.

Third, as an academic staff member and someone conversant in governance, it seems to me that once you remove the “too hard” stuff (that is, those that might impinge on faculty rights, employment, or livelihood), you’re left with cost-savings that must come from a reduction of services to students (see paragraph 2) and/or the reduction of academic staff and University staff positions. I’m not opposed to that, so long as this can be done strategically or by letting go under-performers while retaining strong-performers, etc., and that governance is kept apprised of these activities. Also, faculty should be made aware — and feel the burden — of what they lose by cutting our already lean administrative and programmatic staff. In a gesture towards shared sacrifice, faculty should not expect the work of lost academic/university staff to be taken up by those already over-worked staff who remain.

Finally, I’d like to mention that very little in the CCOET suggestions (or at least in the immediately actionable suggestions) is particularly strategic. Managing through attrition and retirements will create an atmosphere of winners and losers, as would any across-the-board cut irrespective of departmental budgets. Re-aligning campus priorities and re-organizing campus offices around our core mission functions is a good step, but not necessarily a costs-saving step. More could be made of tying departmental course offerings to student demand, maximizing course enrollment while shrinking the cost of instruction (due to offering two full sections of a class rather than five partially full sections, for example). This will be hard to do, and may require investing in third-party software to achieve, but currently there’s no penalty for running a course that is only a third full. This, like many recommendations both great and small, relies upon buy-in at the faculty and department level, which in turn requires the attention of administration.

Thank you, Academic Staff Committee, for giving me the opportunity to participate in CCOET representing my fellow staff. It was a responsibility I did not and do not take lightly. I’d be happy to follow up with the committee or its members in person if you have any further questions for me.

Comment

I do not believe that the proposed restructuring of the College of Letters and Science as outlined in the CCOET Report will provide an effective solution to UWM’s ongoing budget crisis. The College is the heart and soul of UWM and weakening that structure will weaken the University as a whole. One of the great strengths of L&S is the diversity of disciplines and academic programs the College supports. I know that that diversity is extremely important to the success of the anthropological enterprise in general. I know that our program, as well as any other interdisciplinary program, would be negatively affected by a weakened L&S. This may translate to a loss of extramural revenue that might offset any potential gains due to downsizing. I understand that we have reached a point where hard choices must now be made. However, before we tinker
with the core of our institution I would like to see other cost reduction strategies targeted including a concerted effort to reduce administrative overhead at the campus level.

Comment

I want to take this opportunity to comment on the CCOET Final Report.

While I think we need analysis to determine the cost of education (research and everything else) I think the first chart on the cost per Student Credit Hours (SCH) is misleading.

I looked what was included in the data for the “Support Costs” which includes development costs and some research support. This means if a school is doing a high level of development work and/or a high level of research then it will be reflected in a higher costs per SCH.

This is comparing apple to oranges.

I work with these numbers every day across several schools. I would be happy to assist in a better analysis.

Comment

Regarding the recommendation about combining the Writing Center and Tutoring on p.31:

I would not recommend combining them.

These services have been separated at UWM in the late 1990s or early 2000s as they are on most large campuses throughout the country.

Both the Writing Center and PASS follow national guidelines: PASS follows learning center standards are written in the CAS Standards. Both are well respected nationally.

The populations are different:

The Writing Center serves all levels and PASS serves student in the first 2 year courses.

We have not found referrals to the other center to be a problem, especially with the decision to have the centers in close vicinity in the library first floor East Wing. Students are well served by both centers.

Both staffs are lean, so I don't see a budget savings. Both contribute to student retention saving UWM tuition dollars.

Comment

I am writing to submit my feedback about the CCOET Report. First, I would like to provide some context about my work that ties into the major concern I want to raise. I have worked at UW-Milwaukee’s School of Public Health. Since I began with UWM’s SPH, the organization has seen immense growth. Faculty numbers have grown from two in 2010 to 25 today. Student enrollment has increased twentyfold (from 4 to 89). We added two PhDs and five masters’ degrees. I take pride in this growth.

I was to rally multiple stakeholders around a goal to achieve Council on Education in Public Health (CEPH) accreditation. I am happy to say that we have achieved almost everything necessary, and I anticipate CEPH will approve our accreditation in 2017. We are in the last stages to submit a comprehensive self-study in May.
I am reaching out to you because upon scanning the CCOET Report, I was disheartened to see the presumptive combination of the School of Public Health with the College of Health Sciences, particularly because I worry about implications this may have for our pending CEPH accreditation.

I have heard in the past few days that the Chancellor and Provost will not combine SPH and CHS at this time. That is good. However, this important and good news does not change the fact that the view of many on campus is that a merger makes sense - so much so that CCOET slashed our names throughout its report (CHS/SPH).

I worry that the existence of this report - and our Interim Dean being relegated to submission of a minority report to question the presumed combination of our School with CHS - will have unfavorable consequences with the accreditors. Whenever I heard the topic of combining CHS and SPH discussed, someone (sometimes me, in the case of the Academic Staff Senate) mentioned the implications this would have on our accreditation goal. The School of Public Health CANNOT become CEPH-accredited under the umbrella of any other school or college. It's very important to me that our School has the support of the university to become CEPH-accredited. My concern comes from a strong sense of duty to our alumni and students.

I realize there are details about how a merger might fit with CEPH-accreditation, which have surfaced during the calls for feedback from CCOET. It's important to me to provide detailed explanation about what is possible and why I think it would not make sense at this juncture. While it's possible we could accredit our master's program under the umbrella of CHS, this would alienate students enrolled in our doctoral programs, not to mention our three recent PhD graduates. Accrediting an MPH program requires much less work than we put in over the past six years. For example, the five tracks of our master's degree are unnecessary. Only one track is required for MPH accreditation. It would also require a separate application to CEPH to request a self-study of our MPH, changing the time frame we have communicated to students about which of our MPH cohorts will "count" as graduating from a CEPH-accredited program.

I understand that it's possible that the two could combine by the Zilber School of Public Health "taking in" degrees from CHS. While this is technically true, it would certainly have implications for accreditation, too. I am leading two work groups for the CEPH self-study (academic programs and students), and there are sections we would have to write to cover these degrees.

I am not a fundraising expert, by any means, but I also want to mention that the Zilber Family Foundation's generosity has supported UWM to build this school. They donated millions of dollars for construction of a facility, as well as hundreds of thousands of dollars to support student scholarships. These gifts were meant to support the university's goal of school wide CEPH accreditation.

Not to discount the importance of living up to our partner agreements, but honestly, I am most concerned because I recruited students into our programs with the promise of school wide CEPH accreditation. Public health students are talented individuals pursuing important careers, and I believe their professional success will equate to improved population health in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and beyond. It has been a privilege for me to get to know them and to support them in their career development. I want UWM to provide the best opportunities for them to succeed in their careers.
The best way to support students in the School of Public Health is to support the School's CEPH-accreditation.

If possible, I would appreciate a redacted CCOET report that does not slash SPH/CHS throughout the document. If the CCOET Report comes up during our site visit, which I think it might, I would like to be able to communicate to CEPH Councilors that after clarification about what a combined CHS/SPH would mean for accreditation, the university committee took action to correct its mistake.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

**Comment**

The CCOET Final Report makes reference to the web-based retention platforms being utilized by UW-Milwaukee on page 29. Currently UWM utilizes both Mapworks and the Student Success Collaborative. Both tools offer the ability to communicate to and about students, provide a network of referral resources, and generate tailored reports. While these tools have overlapping features one is not a replacement for the other.

Mapworks utilizes pre-college data, in-progress academic performance, and student survey data factored into an algorithm to provide a fluid student risk that examines the holistic student experience. Non-cognitive aspects (sense of engagement, integration, and motivation) are the focus of the Mapworks surveys and are utilized by student affairs professional and student staff along with academic advisors to have intentional conversations with at-risk students.

The Student Success Collaborative (both in its current platform and fall 2016 platform) utilizes pre-college data, UWM course and major specific historical data, and in-progress academic performance to generate a fluid risk that examines the academic experience. This tool allows academic advisors to have important conversations with students about their academic choices and options based on how similar students have performed.

Together these tools offer the best of both realms of student success. The Student Success Center received demonstrations of the leading web-based retention platforms in the industry and are confident Coupling the non-cognitive data provided directly from the student with the predictive academic data, UWM can provide a network of care that comes from a deep understanding of our students.
Comment

Dear CCOET,

I am very concerned about the current status of the Academic Opportunity Center, American Indian Student Services, Southeast Asian American Student Services, and African American Student Services given my belief that these programs facilitate our recruitment and retention efforts. In addition, those programs provide academic support for low-income students. After review of the Report, I am left wondering if those departments will exist in the future. I was glad to see that there was clarity as to the status of the Roberto Hernandez Center based upon the recommendations made in the Report. I have been a strong supporter of all of these programs and have first-hand knowledge of the positive impact they have on our diverse student body. Thank you in advance for addressing my concerns.

Comment

I am writing in response to the CCOET report. It is vital that the Graduate School remain intact at the university.

It is essential that the Graduate School processes are kept centralized. This centralized model allows one school to provide the oversight for all of the schools and colleges. There is a tremendous amount of planning, processing, implementing and assessing that is held in the Graduate School. Their important work allows the rest of the colleges and universities to work more closely with their students.

I am fortunate to work as an Academic Advisor that works with doctoral students. My role within the college relies heavily on the Graduate School. They are the gatekeepers of our policies and procedures from admissions processes all the way through to graduation.

As a result of the severe staffing shortages in the Graduate School, my work takes a much longer in terms of getting back to students and faculty. This is not best practice.

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to voice my concern.
I vote that the Graduate School remain a “school”.

Comment

Hello Academic Staff Committee,

Find attached a letter for your consideration. This letter represents a coordinated effort from the Joseph J. Zilber School of Public Health staff, copied here. We were not able to finalize this letter until today. We sincerely hope that you can take into account this feedback at this time. (One of my colleagues will send the attached letter to the University Personnel Committee, too.)

(please see attached letter)
March 1, 2016

Dear Academic Staff Committee and University Personnel Committee:

We respectfully submit comments in response to the Chancellor’s Campus Organization and Effectiveness Team report. Our main concern stems from the proposed consolidation of the Joseph J. Zilber School of Public Health with the College of Health Sciences, among other units. Please consider forwarding the following points to the decision makers as they consider this proposal:

- Implications for Council on Education in Public Health (CEPH) Accreditation – While it is possible to achieve schoolwide CEPH-accreditation as a merged entity, the School of Public Health would take the lead. The title must remain School of Public Health.
- Financial concerns
  - Student enrollment – In the most recent recruitment cycle (to enroll Fall 2016), the School first participated in the national School of Public Health Application System. This option is only available to schools and programs that are CEPH-accredited or have had their CEPH application accepted, which the Zilber SPH has. This has increased the pool of applicants by 2.5 times. Many of the recent applicants come from out-of-state and international pools, seldom tapped by UWM. It is anticipated that achieving CEPH accreditation will result in continued increased enrollment.
  - Understanding with a major private donor – The Joseph J. and Vera Zilber Family Foundation has donated a substantial amount to found and build the School. Their main goal is to achieve schoolwide CEPH accreditation.
  - Any merger would require resources to succeed. It would require time and careful consideration to combine cultures, policies, logistics, and other imbalances.
- Commitment to improving population health in Milwaukee and the region – Public health is different than healthcare in two ways. It focuses on prevention, instead of treating patients after they are sick or injured. Also, it frames health as a population-based issue, unlike clinical professionals, which treat patients one-on-one.
- Truth in advertising to students and alumni – We have 89 current students and 26 alumni throughout eight graduate programs. These students and alumni enrolled at UW-Milwaukee with the understanding that it had a commitment to support the first and only accredited School of Public Health in Wisconsin.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signatures]

Suzanne Abler (Assistant Dean), George Henion (Faculty Support Associate), Bonnie Murphy (Sr. Financial Specialist), Joy Neilson (Community Engagement Coordinator), Elise Papke (Sr. Public Health Specialist), Tanika Reesnes (HR Manager), and Darcie Warren (Sr. Graduate Program Manager)
Consolidation of Career Centers is a bad idea and will only hurt the Lubar School of Business students. Over the past 21 years we have built the Lubar Career Services Center from nothing to a thriving Center serving the needs of the 4,000 undergraduate and graduate students of Lubar.

The Lubar Career Services Center is much more than just a career center, it is also an integral part of the academic framework of Lubar. Members of the Career Services Center staff teach four sections of the Bus 300 Career and Professional Development course. Each major at Lubar has a specific section of the course, as course content is adjusted based on the specific major. Also, all applications for internship academic credit are reviewed by the Director of Career Services, who must approve the internship before academic credit is granted. Additionally, with a dedicated Career Center in Lubar, there is a close relationship with Lubar faculty and the Career Services Center staff.

Every quality business school in the country has their own Career Services Center. It is vital to accreditation. In fact, in recent accreditation reports, the Lubar School of Business Career Services Center has been cited as one of the strengths of the Lubar School.

The countless functions coordinated by the Lubar Career Center are major contributors to the life, pride, and wellbeing of the Lubar School and business students. No one can overestimate the excitement throughout the Lubar community on the day of the annual Lubar School of Business Career Fair. From maintenance people who make the building look its best, to academic advisors who help with registration tables, to the many student volunteers who help take employers’ materials to their respective tables, to all the students who attend the Fair in their business suits, the Career Fair is a great day for the Lubar School. In each of the past three years we had at least 75 employers in Lubar Hall, with employer tables spread throughout three floors for the Career Fair. In each of the last five years we had at least 600 business students attend the Career Fair.

Other events coordinated through the Lubar Career Center include Accounting Night, multiple Career Forums each semester as part of the Career and Professional Development course, Etiquette Luncheons and Mock Interviews as part of the course, as well as numerous employer events and meetings.

The Lubar Career Center is of tremendous importance in the recruitment and retention of business students. Having our own Career Center is highlighted in every presentation to prospective students. The value of having a dedicated Career Center is of upmost importance when talking to parents of prospective students, who are most concerned about employment outcomes. Retention of students is increased with a dedicated Career Center. Students are able to form strong advising relationships with advisors. They are able to ask difficult questions because of the trust they have found in the advisor. Retention is improved as students have increased opportunities for internships as well as full-time employment, because they frequent the Career Services Center. Retention is also improved as the Lubar Career Advisors work closely with the Academic Advisors when assisting students. Also, being a specialist, the Lubar Career Advisors know and understand the academic curriculum.

The Lubar Career Services Center provides outstanding career preparation for business students. Any centralization of Career Services would severely damage the quality of services provided to
business students. The Lubar Career Center is key to Lubar operations, academically, professionally, for recruitment and retention, internships, and permanent placement.

Lastly, since we are looking at ways to save dollars, there would be no significant dollar savings by eliminating the Lubar Career Services Center. As indicated by the CCOET report, advisors would be “dedicated” for certain degree programs. We have three professional staff in the Lubar Career Services Center. To come close to providing the necessary services, at least three staff would have to be dedicated to Lubar.

**Academic Staff Committee Response to CCOET Report**

**February 29, 2016**

When the CCOET Final Report was delivered to the campus community on February 15, Chancellor Mone asked the Academic Staff Committee (ASC) to provide comments and suggestions about the report. This document is a compilation of feedback provided by members of the ASC and by individual members of the academic staff who delivered their comments to ASC.

**Overall Feedback**

- Given the scope and the impact of the CCOET proposals, the Academic Staff Committee believes transparency will be paramount in the next stages of analysis and decision making to address the budget crisis.
- As representatives of UWM academic staff, the Academic Staff Committee needs to be engaged in evaluating and implementing the administration's proposals concerning both Primary and Secondary Options. This document will focus on the Primary Options: Position Control, Administrative Organization and Balance, and Campus Academic Reorganization.
- Building on the valuable work that CCOET has done, the Academic Staff Committee calls on UWM administration to weigh recommendations and to find a strategic approach that addresses budget issues while still fulfilling the University's mission of instruction, research, extended education and public service.

**Position Control**

Regarding the Position Control process, the Academic Staff Committee finds that there are too many unknown variables at this time to assess the full impact of implementation.

- Regarding the Resource Allocation Group, the Academic Staff Committee requests:
  - transparency in the creation, charge, and function of the Resource Allocation Group
  - clarification of how critical hires would be determined and how duties for vacant positions would be redistributed
• The Academic Staff Committee requests clarification regarding circumstances under which “fast track” hires would be approved. Units are worried about how this process could affect urgent, core-mission staffing needs, accreditation, etc.

**Potential benefits of Position Control:**

• The use of position control can lead to more consistent hiring practices. All governing bodies must be involved in the process and in developing standard practices.

• Position control can, while creating a leaner organization, help to streamline and eliminate duplicative positions.

• Having position control in a single area can hold all units to a common set of consistent, objective standards.

• The Priority Referral Program may mitigate the expenses of recruiting academic staff for approved positions.

**Potential risks of Position Control:**

The CCOET report highlights problems associated with position creation but focuses on centralizing the decision making process, with the potential for more negative than positive outcomes at the unit level.

• The use of a single campus entity is not strategic at the unit level.

• This is purely budget-driven and may not be responsive to strategic academic initiatives related to the mission of our university.

• As positions are eliminated, not approved, or redistributed, remaining positions are subject to expansion in duties without compensation or consideration of impact on students.

• The change in position control to a single entity is not temporary and may exist long after its purpose for budgetary assistance is no longer needed.

• The impact of the position control is likely to have disproportionate impact on academic staff.

---

**Administrative Organization and Balance**

The Academic Staff Committee endorses CCOET’s recommendation of ensuring a student-centered approach to reorganization and firmly believes that administrative reorganization can make us a more effective and nimble university. However, the selection of metrics to evaluate our effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and transparency must be made carefully to ensure valid measurement of outcomes.
Potential benefits of CCOET proposals for Administrative Organization and Balance:

- A well-implemented reorganization process would allow for a fair and objective evaluation of positions at all levels.
- With reduced staffing, the need to critically evaluate current as well as new projects and programs would be heightened.
- Shared services can increase talent pool available for any given project.

Potential risks of CCOET proposals for Administrative Organization and Balance:

- There is a lack of strategic vision in the exact nature of the reorganization of administration, making it difficult to assess impact.
- Shared services could lead to a loss of expertise in units that make unique contributions to our student services, research, instruction, and public services missions.
- Shared services is likely to have a disproportionate impact on academic staff and can increase workloads to unsustainable levels.

Campus Academic Reorganization

The Academic Staff Committee recognizes the potential for synergies with respect to strategic campus academic reorganizations. What is needed now is a thorough cost-benefit analysis of proposed reorganizations. Administration needs to involve faculty, staff and students in the analysis process to foster interdisciplinary research, instruction and engagement.

Potential benefits of Academic Reorganization:

- The creation of clusters or the merging of schools and colleges may help break down existing silos and address any disparities in our existing structure.
- Past proliferation of schools and colleges aligned with UWM’s past vision of continuous growth in enrollments. We can create a new array of schools and colleges that more closely aligns with UWM’s new strategic vision that is responsive to student demographics and the economic environment.

Potential risks of Academic Reorganization:

- The clustering of support services may rearrange workload without streamlining processes and/or gaining efficiencies.
- We need a better cost-benefit analysis to determine the full impact of campus reorganization. The academic clusters may only have potential cost savings (if any) and no immediate savings.
- We need processes in place to ensure that reorganization is mutually beneficial to the units involved.
Secondary Options

Because many of the recommendations in the Secondary Options section of the CCOET report were contradictory and/or too numerous for the Academic Staff Committee to fully vet, we submit only a few selected comments.

- The faculty workload policy was glossed over in the CCOET report, yet it is a serious concern for faculty and academic staff, as shown in comments submitted to the CCOET web survey. It seems possible that CCOET may have glossed over this in anticipation of faculty pushback. Yet, this is clearly a sound, financially viable approach to addressing the budget imbalance, as evidenced by schools and colleges that have already changed their faculty workload policies. The University Committee should be tasked with developing a stronger policy and Deans should be held accountable for following the policy, e.g. all UWM faculty would teach a 2/2 load.

- We agree with the proposal to hold schools and colleges to a standard for workload. However, we also recognize that a flexible workload model can be helpful to align with the various strengths of faculty/staff related to both the teaching and research missions of the university. A flexible model would allow us to optimize productivity in all areas.

- The CCOET report does not propose a strategy for closing and/or merging programs that do not have adequate enrollments and/or are not fiscally solvent.

- Collapsing/merging/consolidating administrative, multicultural and/or student success units must be done thoughtfully rather than in a fit of diversion/deflection/desperation. Realignment is a viable and perhaps overdue option; however, it must be done strategically. How might restructuring diminish the benefits of current alignment? Would it be prudent to shift the Office of Undergraduate Research away from research and align it with all other High-Impact Practices (HIPs)? Forethought and planning must be priorities. Which student populations would be further marginalized by deep cuts or elimination of services? What effect would that have on recruitment and retention?

Conclusion

Our comments are deeply rooted in a commitment to the University's stated mission of instruction, research, extended education and public service. Since the bulk of the UWM's budget is invested in human resources, it follows that staffing will need to be reduced—either by attrition or non-renewal/layoff—in order to adequately address our budget shortfall.

The CCOET report appears to primarily deal with how to handle a reduction in staffing. What is needed now is a strategic plan to build broad consensus about how the campus organizational structure can be adapted to better support our mission, our changing economy and our diverse student population.
Dear Chancellor Mone,

We, as the chairs of the Academic Services and Advising Leadership Committee, Enhancing Advising Committee, and Advisors and Counselors Network at the University of Wisconsin Milwaukee would like to take the opportunity to provide feedback and factual corrections to the CCOET document.

We appreciate the large undertaking of work for this group and the openness of the Chancellor for the University community to provide feedback. The transparency of the process is imperative to achieve the highest levels of success for the final implemented decisions.

First, it is clear from the entire document that academic staff will carry the heaviest load of non-renewals and layoffs. This potential reduction in the number of staff that support students will have a negative impact on all student metrics including, but not limited to, enrollment, retention and six-year graduation rates.

There are suggestions in this document of changes to academic advising which are contradictory to suggestions made in the CEMAT approved Working Group on Undergraduate Advising (WGUA) Recommendations document. We are concerned that the lack of members of the advising community represented on the CCOET team created conflict between the recommendations of the two groups that will need to be reconciled.

The CCOET document section on position control states (Process, page 7), ‘The process for implementation of position control must ensure that practices align with the new budget model.’ The budget model rewards for the number of admitted majors. This could change how advisors interact with their students and the declaration of major. What was not revealed in the budget model was the ‘reward’ for undecided students or where they are housed. This would have a large impact on the distribution of positions as well as budgetary dollars.

Related to Section III: Gather all aspects involving a student’s academic trajectory under one administrative line, we have specific concerns.

We agree that clearer lines of communication need to exist to provide students the strongest support as they move through their academic career. Having many people involved who may give contradictory advice does not help a student progress or give them the sense of support. The concept of a coordinator of advising was supported by the WGUA’s recommendations and this recommendation was approved by CEMAT.

Further, we agree that the use of data from the Office of Assessment and Institutional Research and communications with Student Affairs partners is critical, however, we caution the methods suggested to achieve this goal. It appears that this document makes a push for a single centralized advising unit. It is the belief of these advising community groups that this move would have a detrimental effect on student success. The WGUA document supported the idea of decentralized student advising offices.

1. Advising in the schools and colleges allows for academic advisors to be experts in their specific areas. Many degree programs have specialized course sequencing and
accreditation requirements. To have general advisors for every area would water down the knowledge base of the advisors and potentially hinder a student’s progression. This expertise would include knowledge of graduate program requirements, job outlook, job shadowing requirements or necessary certifications. Every advisor cannot be knowledgeable of every degree and career outlook.

2. As stated earlier, the budget model rewards schools and colleges for declared majors as well as degrees conferred. Advising is inherently tied to the declaration of the major as well as the progression toward degree.

3. The creation of school/college clusters believes there will be a cost savings in shared services such as offices of student affairs. These savings will be negligible. Caseloads for academic advisors are much higher than NACADA, the national body for academic advising, promotes as standards of best practice. The synthesizing of offices will not reduce the number of academic advisors needed.

On page 30, there is mention that WGUA, referred to as “Advising Working Group” recommended centralized and consolidated advising for campus. The WGUA final recommendations do not state that advising be consolidated and centralized on campus. There are several references to centralizing advising functions across campus, utilizing shared notes systems, creating a central advising information resource, streamlining advisor professional development and training, but there was not mention of creating a central advising office. The research done by the WGUA members (in which it sought to understand and draw comparisons to similar-sized institutions) brought the group to the conclusion that advising should remain within the schools/colleges, but that in general, advisors should be supporting students similarly regardless of their school/college affiliation. Therefore, the reference made, as it within the CCOET document, is inaccurate. While there is support to have faculty advisors involved in the advising students receive, it is clear that there needs to first be an established expectation for the faculty advisor role and subsequent training and professional development for both faculty and professional advisors alike.

Therefore, we ask that the WGUA Recommendations be considered in conjunction with the CCOET document in order to make the best decisions possible to support student success. We believe these two documents are at odds with each other and cannot both be adopted unilaterally. We offer our services to the Chancellor and his administration to help make decisions to meet budgetary needs along with the needs of the students here at UWM.

Comment
By now I imagine you have heard an earful about the proposal to merge the Zilber School with the College of Health Sciences. This possibility has been on and off the table for years. It would have been something worth considering a couple years ago.

However, we are currently very close to the accreditation finish line and to seriously entertain this idea now would mean putting a stop to the process, cancelling our application and site visit....and then starting over on a much larger task. From my perspective, that would be foolish because it could kill our chances of having an accredited school and undermine our credibility with the community and future funders.

If there is any question about the facts about the accreditation requirements or processes, I strongly urge you to check with the accreditors directly - the information is publicly available on their website (http://ceph.org/)
I know that you have a very difficult task ahead of you....I am emailing to ensure that you have all the information you need at your disposal. Please feel free to call if you would like to discuss.

Comment
Dear University Committee,

Regarding the CCOET report, I would like to offer the following feedback, which is based on a single principle: we must consider sacrosanct everything that pertains to our ranking as an R-1 university. A higher ranking is good for both student enrollment as well as faculty recruitment and retention. With this principle in mind, I find the following areas discussed in the report as worthy of serious consideration:

1. Continuing Education: While Continuing Education is important, we cannot afford it in times of drastic budget cuts. Its removal will have no effect on our ranking and status. Either we shut down the program or we raise the fees to a level where it becomes self sustaining.

2. Credit Plateau: By increasing the undergraduate credit plateau to 13 credits, it is estimated we can generate additional $8 million to $9 million annually in tuition revenue.

3. Phone lines: As a campus we can switch to a VOIP system (I suggested this many years ago on ITPC but we weren’t granted the flexibility at the time by the state).

4. Close Campus over Winter Break: we can take this path as long as it doesn’t mean furloughs for everyone and the savings are realized from heating/electricity alone. Telecommuting can be added as an option during this period. This won’t affect our research standing adversely. The research units that request to remain open may be allowed to do so.

5. I would avoid a major restructuring of the university at this point because its effect on our research status is uncertain. Also, too many changes at once may result in unforeseen problems. If a reorganization is actively being considered, it must pertain to administrative consolidation with clear savings, not splitting existing units at this stage.

6. I would also advise against suggestions for removing/reducing course buyouts for faculty because it directly links with our research status. In the past I have myself benefited from campus fellowships that helped me complete research and writing projects, resulting in well-cited papers and books.

7. Centers and institutes enhance our research profile and visibility in the academy. Unless a center has been inactive in the past, we must be extremely cautious in making changes there.

8. International Student Enrollment: UWM may not be as competitive as Madison in getting out-of-state students but outside the country it’s the American brand that sells well. With Microsoft CEO as our alum, we can run TV ads in targeted countries. For example, I’ve noticed during my field research in India that many private universities run continuous ads during the enrollment season, and TV ads are much cheaper in places like India and Brazil.

9. Athletics may be asked to become completely self-sustaining. Changes here won’t affect our R-1 status.
Comment
I am offering some comments on the CCOET report based on my experiences and UWM and knowledge of present budget realities. As a member of the CCOET team, I recognize the work involved in developing the options under consideration. At the same time, with the advantage of a few weeks of time to reflect on the reports, I have some comments on to options offered.

The report suggests various options for cutting expenditures across the university in the face of unprecedented and immediate budget cuts, several years of frozen tuition and declining enrollments. The urgency means that the options should be assessed in terms of both cost savings and time to implementation.

Two recommendations seem to address this need:

1. Implement campus-wide position control for a couple years transitioning to unit-level transition to controlling salaries by budget control. This is critical since most of the university budget is for salaries. This essentially shrinks the workforce until our expenses align with our resources, after which strategic growth may be possible.

2. Develop shared services in areas in which savings can be realized while providing high quality services. This allows for economy of scale but will require care to provide service to distributed needs – perhaps begin with units with a physical proximity or similar needs. This strategy will probably take a year or two to implement but can be applied across a range of functions.

On the other hand, the various ideas for re-arranging academic units are rather sketchy. The savings seem relatively minor for the amount of disruption that they would entail once we move beyond the clustering of units for sharing services (a more structured version of the shared service idea). It may be possible to incorporate the two small new schools (SFS and ZSPH) into larger units (essentially schools within colleges) but more extensive changes are likely to take some time. The report does not consider the work done at the school/college level (or its value) to build partnerships and promote its programs outside the university. An over-consolidation would lose the uniqueness of many of these efforts, essential given the diverse audiences with whom the university interacts.

Unfortunately these measures seem unlikely to close our deficit (unless we get some modest tuition increases). This leads to the need to reduce the range of activities at the University. We must make all efforts to minimize faculty layoffs and the closing of departments. I recommend that deans be given flexibility to reduce funding to centers and college-level offices to preserve our academic program diversity, and that upper administration support these efforts. Although not addressed in the report, we also need to start discussions about how UWM would go about closing departments or programs in light of immediate budget shortfalls. This will clearly be contentious but we need to begin this discussion now.

Finally, I think that we are fully committed to UWM as an urban public research university that serves the community through its teaching and research activities. The University is strongly engaged in the community and has built an outstanding research profile (as reflected in the recent Carnegie ranking as a RI Research University). The report does not consider the impacts of the options presented on these activities.
Some specific recommendations (or non-recommendations) that appear to run counter to this vision of the university is:

- There is an urgent need to bring graduate assistantship stipends to levels that are competitive so that we can recruit strong students who are major contributors to both our teaching and research missions. The comment by the Committee of UWM Distinguished Professors (p. 53-55) makes this point, but the it is not addressed in the report.

- The suggestion to bring the Office of Undergraduate Research into a unit that is primarily concerned with student recruitment and retention (p. 13-14) fundamentally misrepresents the activities of that office. It is closely linked to students’ academic experiences and development as scholars, and it should remain within Academic Affairs. It can contribute to the recruitment and retention of students, but that is not its primary function.

- The recommendation to review the RGI is a good one, but I would stress that the full return on a given year’s investments is not known for 3-4 years. Also, funding for this program has been reduced for a couple years to help address the budget situation (as suggested on p. 29). This and other internal support programs should be regularly reviewed, but they should also be reconfigured to support research development for interdisciplinary and team science projects as well as inter-institutional research teams. (See TTRUTT and Research Excellence reports for more on this point.)

- The call to reorganize the Graduate School (p. 18-19) may appear attractive but essentially reverses a shared service that has made some real advances in recent years in areas such as international recruitment, development of an online application process that can accommodate programmatic differences (starting in April), etc. The argument seems to be that there is a current duplication of services – I would suggest exploring this issue to see if it can be addressed. The option of dispersing all the functions to each school and college would increase costs and require additional outlay from all schools and colleges (and probably lead to a move to once more consolidate these services).

Comment
Once again the preposterous notion of breaking out the functions of the Graduate School to the schools and colleges has been put on the table. I have been an employee of the Graduate School in varying forms. I have seen this issue come up again and again, and each time it appears to have been put forth by persons who have no real concept of the work that we do here, other than being annoyed by the fact that we are tasked with upholding the rules and regulations enacted by the Graduate Faculty Committee.

It’s especially interesting in this current version, how most of the CCOET recommendations involve combining university resources and departments, but the Graduate School is the only thing being considered for doing the exact opposite of that.

How does duplicating the functions of the Graduate School in every school and college save money? Talk about redundancy! If you ask the people we work with in the graduate programs on a daily basis, you will find that they rely heavily on the services we provide, and do not have the knowledge or personnel to add more duties to their already heavy workloads. Parsing out the Graduate School functions would require a lot of extra hiring to handle the work.
It would be a tremendous disservice to the university and the student body to dissolve the Graduate School. I urge you to not make that mistake.

**Comment**
Please be certain to continue to ask for staff raises.

**Comment**
Just spoke with Mail Services. Their best guess is all the separate USPS P.O. Boxes for UWM are about $12,000 - $15,000 a year. He just paid a few of them, but a large number are up for renewal the end of June. He says our mail P.O. Box 413 can handle the volume just fine now. In the old days, departments asked to get a quicker sorting to their mail bags by having their own P.O. Box. With volumes dropping the way they have, everyone gets their mail just as quick, having their own private box or through the main UWM Box 413.

He acknowledges that the box owners will have the expense of new letterhead with their change in P.O. Box, but he guesses in the long run that would be way cheaper than re-renting their private boxes every year. Especially since rental costs go up every year.

**Comment**
I’m sure it has been passed along already, but on the off-chance it hasn’t, I thought I would point out that Page 25 regarding the School of Continuing Education erroneously says:

**Continuing Education Building**
The lease for this building is an unnecessary cost. Additionally, main campus usage of Continuing Education is hindered from building strategic partnerships among faculty and staff by being so far away. What are the lease terms? Is it possible to back out? CCOET suggests looking into this and relocating Continuing Education units to other areas of campus.

In fact, the building is owned by the School (now Unit) and is not a lease that can be broken. I’m very surprised that this oversight was included in the report and also disheartened that upper level administrators continue to operate under this erroneous impression. On an editorial note, one could argue that a Unit that actually didn’t lose millions of dollars last year (and actually ended up a little ahead of break-even) is a little more “necessary” than others that did lose millions of dollars. Furthermore, most barriers to strategic partnerships are not due to location, but due to the reticence of the other Schools to centralize their continuing education efforts where they would be more efficiently administered, ie. The School of Continuing Education.

Again, I just wanted to point out the error about how the School of Continuing Education location has been described.

**Comment**
On page 27 of the CCOET report, 5th paragraph down, I did what the committee didn't do. I asked U.I.T.S. Telephone Services/Network Services THEIR suggestions for saving money:

If people have a departmental cell phone and a desk phone, eliminate the desk phone.

You may be able to save money by switching from a desk phone to a departmental cell, but cell plans vary. Call this number for cell plan information 229-7353.
A desk phone for $21 a month includes unlimited local calling. It does not include long distance or voice mail. Voice mail is $6 a month.

People who only get a few calls a day probably don't need voice mail, they can use an answering machine instead.

Departments interested in cutting back on land line phone usage, looking for suggestions, can contact Telephone Network Services at x5800.

**Comment**

Also on page 27, 3rd paragraph down. Guess what? The current UWM 2015-2016 Campus Directory IS the final copy. The new owner of the publishing vendor has ordered stopping the publication of all university directories nation-wide. 😁

What does this mean to UWM? University Relations rec'd a check for $10,000 yearly, which was the contract amount we were reimbursed by University Directories for the sale of advertising space in the book.

**Comment**

The new budget model does not count minors, double-majors, or certificates in its accounting practices. The effect of this is to not only discourage interdisciplinary academic programs, but to punish them in practice. Also, the subvention fund is heavily weighted to administration, to the detriment of revenue-generating academic programs.

**Comment**

I wanted to take a quick chance to comment on the CCOET report. This is my opinion, NOT the stance of my College.

I support the centralized position control. I helped to institute such a model at my last employer. If done correctly, it can be highly effective and help to allocate precious resources in a strategic manner. It also helps to have a neutral third party look at the competing interests and set priorities.

I am happy to help set up such a system at UWM if you like.
College of Health Sciences Statement Regarding CCOET Report

College of Health Sciences
Office of the Dean

DATE: March 8, 2016
TO: Chancellor Mark Mone
FROM: Staff, Faculty and Administration of the College of Health Sciences
RE: Statement Regarding CCOET Report

We in the College of Health Sciences (CHS) appreciate the calm and steady leadership you and your staff are providing during these unprecedented times. We are especially grateful for the time and attention Provost Britz has invested in us. His honesty, transparency, and willingness to communicate openly allows us to explore hope and possibility rather than dwell on uncertainty and doubt.

We reviewed the CCOET report and have discussed the opportunities within our College. As a College, we continue to evaluate options for efficiencies at the University, as the CCOET suggests. However, as plans begin to develop across campus regarding the reconfiguration of academic units, we want to clearly inform you of opportunities and risks in implementing the options that involve the CHS. Please see also the attached document which is a more detailed College of Health Sciences statement regarding the CCOET Report.

We have no objection to combining non-academic unit functions with other schools and colleges, such as sharing financial, personnel, informatics and research services. However, other options presented, such as Section III, Option III ("Combining of Current Schools and Colleges") or Option IV ("Advanced Departmental Restructuring") will degrade the quality of education that students of the CHS receive. Our clinical programs are laborious to operate, requiring intensive lab-based coursework. They also involve multiple clinical placements for each student that are legally complicated to arrange, and which must adhere to strict accreditation standards. Our clinical and professional programs face unique challenges that are not easy for others on campus to appreciate or even recognize. Because of the commonalities and synergies our programs share with each other, and in which we differ from other academic units, CHS cannot be arbitrarily merged or reconfigured.

The CHS is not simply a collection of "clinical programs." Our portfolio includes strong pre-professional programs as well as cutting-edge research. We have developed and continue to
progressively design and implement complementary academic offerings including non-clinical undergraduate and graduate degrees and certificates, flex degree options for working professionals, and continuing education courses. These carefully-curated offerings balance the inherent inefficiencies of our clinical programs with more revenue-friendly models. Without the synergies of these complementary programs we would struggle to balance our workloads effectively, and efficiency would quickly suffer. But more importantly we would risk destroying opportunities for undergraduate students in the region to succeed in our advanced programs: that we deem unacceptable.

The CHS delivers quality research and education, while maintaining operational solvency and providing surplus revenues to the University. We also provide large numbers of graduate students, both at the master's level and the doctoral level, which contributes to UWM's standing in academic and research rankings. Our success is the direct result of careful and purposeful work that has crafted the whole of the CHS to be greater than the sum of its parts. These are precisely the attributes that would be in jeopardy should we be merged with academic units that are financially weak. We believe our outstanding performance earns us the privilege of existing as a self-directed college.

Thus, we state clearly, emphatically, and in one voice: breaking apart our college, or merging it with units that do not have the appropriate infrastructure or culture, would have devastating consequences to the quality, national prominence, and perhaps accreditation of our various programs. We can think of no more sure or effective way to ruin the revenue potential of these programs than an arbitrary reconfiguration of the CHS. Given the potential of the College of Health Sciences for growth and advancement (our clinical programs have many times more graduate applicants than can be accommodated), we find this proposition untenable. We ask that you and the larger campus community respect what we've carefully built in the CHS and include us in any discussions that could unintentionally impair or destroy the successful programs of our great College.

We look forward to working with you, the Provost and your teams as we all continue UWM's ascent as a world-class University.

Our Staff, Faculty and Administration hereby sign this letter in support of the campus administration as well as commitment to a unified and forever strong College of Health Sciences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Moerchen</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/9/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke Slavens</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/9/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Stoffel</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/9/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinsung Wang</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/9/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee Mazurek</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/10/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Mayr</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/10/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricia Chirillo</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/10/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Zingler</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/10/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy Ryan</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/10/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ATTACHMENT
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
College of Health Sciences Statement Regarding CCOET Report
March 8, 2016

The CCOET report is commendable. It looks beyond mere cost-cutting into possible reconfigurations that would "right-size" UWM for our community and stage us for future growth and success. However, unfortunately some aspects of the report might be inadvertently biased towards the larger units on campus and against smaller units, such as the College of Health Sciences (CHS).

For example, the table on page 11 of the CCOET report appears to use SCH-weighted averages as "targets" for administrative efficiency. This approach presumes that the larger units are the better performing units; an erroneous assumption. An unbiased measure would be the median of admin costs per SCH (without any weighting), and would fairly identify which units are relatively "administrative heavy" and which are "administrative light".

Similarly, the opinions and preferences of the larger, more outspoken units appear amply represented, but those of the smaller, leaner units are lacking. To some extent under-representation of units such as the CHS is understandable; all of our faculty and staff are fully deployed or overloaded, thus precious few were able to be meaningfully involved in the CCOET process. Conversely, larger units, by virtue of their outsized bodies of faculty and staff were likely better able to contribute ideas and opinions.

Put plainly, the CHS Resources and Capacity Management Team, over these past several months, has focused on internal critical evaluation and restructuring to ensure that the College remains solvent through the current crisis and healthy into the future. Thus, we were unable to materially contribute to, or refute unfeasible ideas within the CCOET Report.

We are providing this supplemental information to help campus administration better understand the risks and opportunities of the CHS, as well as to help interpret which recommendations within the CCOET would have positive or negative effects on our College.

On review of the CCOET report, we are intrigued by the possibilities, but also dismayed at some of the options as presented. It is intriguing to contemplate and evaluate options for better efficiencies and synergies at the University. However, we believe that as experts in the applied health professions and underlying related sciences, it is our duty to clearly inform you of a number of opportunities and risks as viewed by the CHS.

The need for UWM to create a coordinated and unified approach to public health, health sciences, and clinical health professions around teaching, service and research on campus has never been more clear. This would undoubtedly make it easier for industry, government, and students to understand and approach UWM. We are similarly confident that there would be benefits from increased collaboration and cooperation across UWM's health-related programs, schools and colleges. The CHS has always openly pursued formal collaborations and we remain strongly committed to continuing to do so. With careful execution, combining certain aspects of health-related colleges has great potential, and is fully in the spirit of the CCOET report Section III: Options I, and III (p. 19-20).
However, several options that have been recently discussed around Section IV (p. 21) are certain to degrade the quality of education in the CHS and lead to the loss of exceptional faculty from CHS.

We stage our comments by first, describing the unique academic challenges and underpinnings of the CHS, depicting a culture different to that of other schools and colleges at UWM. We then specifically explain how several mergers or redistribution strategies would severely weaken CHS programs and most likely negatively impact its trajectory. Lastly, we make a few specific recommendations.

I. Important characteristics to understand about CHS and its applied health professions.

A. Our clinical programs are laborious to operate. All of our professional training programs must meet strict accreditation standards above and beyond campus and state frameworks. These standards dictate the operation of these programs. These programs require intensive lab-based coursework taught by certified, experienced clinicians; they cannot be taught by graduate assistants or research faculty. They require multiple, legally complicated, and difficult to arrange clinical field placements for each student, necessary for our students to practice as certified professionals upon graduation. The challenges these standards and the need for clinical placements place on the capacity of our programs is exemplified by our rehabilitation training programs. Each year, we have over 1500 applicants for less than 100 slots. While superficially it seems ludicrous to turn away so many applicants, we cannot admit more students because of the standards put forth by our accrediting bodies, which dictate space requirements, credentials of faculty, and faculty to student ratios. This demonstrates how difficult it is for others to understand the specific training needs inside CHS programs, its complexities, and needed ongoing investments.

B. Our community-connected partners. We maintain over 300 relationships and legal contracts with health related service providers in the greater Milwaukee region, and across the state, nation (and world). These partnerships are necessary to maintain the necessary clinical placement sites and to provide our students in the best fieldwork sites possible.

C. Our unique challenges for cultivating partnerships. Our clinical programs face unique challenges that are understandably easy for others on campus to under-appreciate or simply be unaware. In addition, we are forging new partnerships that would place UW-Milwaukee in a better position for providing students with learning opportunities and also generate revenue to more fully support and sustain our programs. For example, we have long-standing clinical partnerships such as off-site Community Audiology Services and on-site speech-language services as well as newer partnerships in our diagnostic imaging programs that provide a self-sustaining pool of patients and learning opportunities for our students.

D. Our health professions lead the fastest growing workforce career projections. Consistently, and for decades, CHS programs represent a large proportion of the U.S. labor projections for the most-needed or fastest-growing professions in the U.S. workforce (http://www.bls.gov/emp/ep_table_103.htm), and the most sought after jobs. (http://money.usnews.com/careers/best-jobs/rankings/the-100-best-jobs).

E. The CHS is not simply a collection of "clinical programs". We have a strong history of developing and implementing progressive and complimentary academic programs, and we continue to do so. The CHS academic array includes non-clinical undergraduate and graduate
degrees and certificates, flex degree options for working professionals, and one of the strongest continuing education programs in the nation. These carefully curated offerings balance the inherent inefficiencies of our clinical training programs and provide advanced opportunities for our regionally recruited undergraduates to be successful nationally, in competitive training programs. Without the synergies of these complimentary programs, we would struggle to balance our workloads effectively, and efficiency would quickly suffer. More importantly, we would risk destroying opportunities for undergraduate students in the region to succeed in our advanced programs. We deem that unacceptable.

F. Our interdisciplinary PhD in Health Sciences program graduates diverse students. Our PhD in Health Sciences is an interdisciplinary program housed in the college. It is designed to recruit and train a diverse student population dedicated to education and research of a diverse array of health-related questions. Our graduates have multiple options for post-doctoral fellowships or to directly enter into their career at some of the top institutions in the nation. The PhD program is successful despite limited funding and challenges of recruitment from clinical fields that often deter clinicians from returning for advanced education. The success of this program is dependent on the existence of a strong College of Health Sciences as an integrated, independent unit.

G. Our programs are competitive with the best universities in the nation. President Ray Cross says UWM cannot be compared with UW-Madison. He is right. Many of our applied health programs are larger and stronger than those at UW-Madison and regularly compete with top 10-20 universities in the nation for students and extramural funding. Many of our programs currently have the strongest, most respected faculty in the nation.

H. The CHS delivers efficient quality research and education while maintaining operational solvency and providing surplus revenues to the University. This is the direct result of careful and purposeful work that has crafted the whole of the CHS to be greater than the sum of its parts. We generate second most student credit hours (SCH) per instructional FTE on campus, second only to the School of Business. Please see Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Five-Year Average of Teaching Output by UWM School/College.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School/College*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter &amp; Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to insufficient data, excludes School of Freshwater Sciences and Zilber School of Public Health. Source: Office of Assessment and Institutional Research, 2014-15 Department Profiles.

I. From a strong CHS base, we consistently reach across units on campus. Our faculty and staff maintain instructional and research collaborations across virtually every other school and college. Moreover, our research partners and collaborators outside of UWM are even more
inclusive. From this position of strength, our faculty serve as presidents for national and international organizations and serve on national research boards.

II. Options that would likely cause a crisis in the College of Health Sciences.

A. Our clinical training programs should not be merged with another school or college. As discussed above, most do not understand applied health related professions. We have a longstanding national presence in the Association of Schools of Allied Health Professions (ASAHP). This governing body assures that accredited programs in the health professions meet standards. Our presence in ASAHP places UWM competitively with other programs nationally. An infrastructure within the CHS that understands its programs has enabled its success and its upward trajectories. There is no guarantee that this would continue by merging it with other units that do not understand CHS needs. In fact, there are numerous instances over the past decade that exemplify the weakening of successful schools of applied health professions when they have merged with Schools of Public Health or when embedded into medical schools. The radical differences in culture and “second-class” perspectives that emerge are devastating. This is exemplified by the historical terminology of such programs as “allied” health in this hierarchical perspective decades ago. Only relatively recently was this national bias overcome. This bias has again appeared as accredited Public Health Schools began taking over these applied health units and once again made reference to the “allied” health professions. A merger with another school or college would diminish our stature and our national recognition as a premier College of Health Sciences by subjugating the CHS into a structure that necessitated the other partner as listed first, or listed solely.

B. CHS programs should not be redistributed. An almost certain demise of programs would follow incorporation into other units. While at face value it may look sensible, UW-Madison serves as a close example of how the programs have struggled (or closed) when the School of Allied Health Professions was terminated and redistributed in the late 1980s. The infrastructure needs of similar applied health professions manifest an efficient and sensible organizational framework as a unit.

III. Suggestions that would likely result in a stronger CHS to better help the overall UWM mission and goals.

A. Continue our upward trajectory in impacting health careers. We will continue our blossoming trajectory through the encouragement and facilitation of cross-department and program inter- professional and interdisciplinary collaborations, to strengthen our partnerships across programs within the CHS. We remain independent in our Instructional programming and our research. Significant improvement qualitatively and quantitatively can be manifested, and increased efficiencies will enable further growth.

B. Remain a free-standing academic unit in partnership with healthcare and public health entities. As exemplified nationally, the strongest structural configurations for applied health professions has been as a free-standing academic unit, but one closely affiliated with medical schools and academic medical centers. We should invest in stronger relationships with the academic medical center in Wauwatosa and the Veterans Hospital as well as the health systems across the Southeastern Wisconsin region. This will take faculty and staff time, facilities and encouragement, but it will create an important expansion path.
C. **Advance our collaborations with external partners.** Large proportions of graduates from our programs work in school systems and in community programs. This is particularly true for our rehabilitation professions. Strategies to formally strengthen and encourage the relationships with city, county, and state programs that include school systems will stimulate the successful development of our applied health related professions and will strengthen the Schools of Education, Social Work, Arts and Architecture and Urban Planning. For example, we are exploring new opportunities for connecting our clinical programs such as audiology, imaging and rehabilitation and physical therapy sciences with community partners. These partnerships provide benefits to community agencies that value the state-of-the-art best practices of University involvement and further provide new sources of revenue to the University as well as a self-sustaining pool of patients and learning opportunities for our students.

D. **Translational and transformative research.** Regarding research collaborations, our partnerships with psychology, biology, engineering, and nursing are essential for the growth of our research endeavors. Again, these must be facilitated from a cohesive foundation from applied health sciences that is oriented toward generating the best next generation of health related professionals. We are socialized to be translational researchers at our root. This is where the relationship between teaching, research and practice must be inextricable linked, which cannot happen in our fields unless there is a strong unified base that engenders this approach in applied health sciences.

E. **Engage external consultants on internal and external collaboration opportunities.** We should bring in consultants from the strongest applied health professions schools in the nation to work with us to explore and identify how we might best help support campus and interact with all of its other schools and colleges.

F. **Create a unified Health and Human Service Professions consortium on campus.** Autonomous schools of health sciences, nursing, public health and social welfare will work collaboratively. With this approach we can be a more unified face to external partners as well as realize efficiencies through shared and integrated services. We are already working with other schools and colleges towards collaborative inter-professional education, outreach and research services.

In closing, we state clearly, emphatically and in one voice: splintering our clinical programs would have devastating consequences to their quality, national prominence, and perhaps, accreditation. We can think of no more sure or effective way to ruin the revenue-generating status and growth potential of these programs than an arbitrary break-up of the CHS. Further, we find this proposition untenable in the presence of such great opportunity for progress and improvement. We ask that you and the larger campus community respect what we've carefully built in the CHS and include us in any discussions that could unintentionally impair or destroy the successful programs of our great College. We believe that our past and current successes in teaching, research, service and community partnerships, and our continued status as a revenue-generating unit on campus, earn us the privilege to exist as a self-directed college.

We look forward to working with you, Provost Britz, and your teams as we all continue UWMs assent as a world-class University.

Respectfully submitted,

The Staff, Faculty and Administration of the College of Health Sciences.
Comment
I just received an email stating that today is the last day for submitting comments to your office about the COCET report. This email serves that purpose & intent.

I suppose it was coincidence that last Thursday afternoon, an org chart was presented at the Multicultural Network mtg. To say the least, I was quite surprised to see such a chart for the first time. Since then I’ve spoken to leaders to ascertain where the organizational chart originated and I was told it came from Academic Affairs. Therefore, the following respectful and hopefully constructive comments address the ‘proposed’ changes depicted in this organizational chart.

In short, the organizational chart treats the RHC in the same manner as it treats the other multicultural centers and we have NEVER been categorized in similar ways. We have not been treated similarly because;

--In 2015, the RHC [and its’ precursor, the Spanish-Speaking Outreach Institute] celebrated its’ 45-anniversary and in 2010, we had a large celebration for our 40th anniversary, where we launched our PALM Scholarship Fundraiser. I have provided Provost Britz with a copy of the DVD that was sent to chronicle the creation of the SSOI and which we screened for the first time at our 40th Anniversary. No other center has such a history, a history that is rooted in the Latino community of Milwaukee, for they were the impetus and force behind the creation of the SSOI and subsequently, the RHC. In my judgement, the community has a large stake in the viability & existence of the RHC and they should be afforded the opportunity to voice their concerns regarding the future—as depicted in the organizational chart--of the RHC at UWM.

--No other Center/office has a tenured faculty member as its Director—the most similar unit to the RHC on campus is the Black Cultural Center and this Center is not in the proposed organizational chart—e.g. similarly to the BCC, the RHC should not be in the proposed organizational chart.

--No other office/Center in the organizational chart is an academic program—we are the only ones—and no other Center currently reports to the Provost Office.

--No other office/Center in the organizational chart is responsible for teaching courses—we do and Latino Studies 101 has been taught since the Fall of 2006, averaging 45-students per semester, for a total of nearly 900-students. Yet, the RHC has never been given the tuition revenue from the course.

--No other office/Center in the organizational chart is responsible for the coordination of an academic program—the Latino Studies Certificate Program—whereas the RHC has this responsibility.

--No other office/Center in the organizational chart has established nor has raised funds for a scholarship program: now totaling nearly $140,000 in the endowment.

--No other Center has, nor has had, an community outreach mission that includes academic programs like the Latino Nonprofit Leadership Program, LNLP, which has graduated 11-classes, totaling 188 alumni, for this 8-month certificate program. A relatively large number of graduates
have pursued undergraduate, graduate, and/or professional degrees after completing the program.

--No other office/Center in the organizational has had a Director that has been so extensively engaged in community engagement and service efforts as has the RHC director.

-- No other office/Center in the organizational has had a Director that has been so engaged in university governance as has the RHC Director.

All of the above distinctive components of the RHC are delineated because individually, or as a group, have contributed to the recruitment, but particularly, the retention of Latino students on the UWM campus. The proposed organizational chart diminishes the contributions of the RHC and devalues the above efforts by treating it as if it is does the same things the other offices do. The above are quite significant and distinctive dimensions that have taken much time and effort to reach the level of accomplishments that the RHC has reached.

I understand that the university faces significant budgetary pressures and that we will and must operate differently than how we have operated in the past. I offer these comments in the spirit of making your decision a more informed one and one that encompasses the unique aspects of the RHC. My hope is that the above dimensions of the RHC are maintained in the new structure, for each and every aspect has positively contributed to the wellbeing and success of Latino students at UWM and to the development of the Latino community, as well as the broader community.

I hope and wish that I have an opportunity to discuss these proposed changes personally with you.

I thank you for the time, effort, and interest you afford my comments.

Comment

One other point in favor of the language of increases in net revenue rather than the language of cuts-- cuts are not necessarily gross revenue neutral, and may in fact result in a decrease in net revenue resulting in a death spiral as further cuts are required to accommodate the reduced revenue.

We are working on a death spiral equation to fit an extreme example (a switch from a 2-2 teaching load to a 5-5 teaching load) and will send it when finished. What we hope is to apply the equation to less extreme cases with an estimate of error.

Here is my Death Spiral Paper, part 1. The death spiral results from a single-minded focus on increasing net revenue from units by cost-cutting as opposed to increasing gross revenue. HiA is currently taking the path, quite successfully, of increasing gross revenue as a means of increasing net revenue. However, if HiA is forced in with a failing unit as part of reorganization, my expectation is that the administrative powers over HiA will focus on cost-cutting rather than increases in gross revenue due to the fact that attempting to increase gross revenue requires risk. In that case, HiA, and all its promise, will enter the death spiral described in the attached paper.

Introduction
A classic mistake in managerial accounting is sometimes called “death by accounting” or the “cost accounting death spiral” (see appendix A at end of this document).

The death spiral with which we are concerned is analogous to the classic scenario. In the present case we are concerned with a higher education organization that is subjected to a reduction in state-supported budget. Here the fundamental issue is to increase net-profits by either reducing costs, or by increasing gross revenue. We will first describe a scenario in which administrators are focused single-mindedly on cost-cutting. As we shall see, this single-minded focus on cost-cutting results in a death spiral scenario in which repeated reduction in costs results in organizational death.

The Facts of the Matter

Suppose that X and Y are units in a Research Level 1 institution, Z. Suppose X is an administrative cost center in the institution, and Y is an academic profit center. Suppose that Y actually makes a net profit. Suppose also that X requires revenue from Y to function. Y's gross revenue is tuition and fee revenue produced from the sale of student credit hours (SCH). Y produces gross tuition and fee revenue from which it pays its direct costs, and the net revenue or profit Y produces is used by X to pay its direct costs. Suppose heretofore some portion of X's direct costs were paid by state budget, and some by net profit produced by Y. Given a reduction in state budget, the amount X requires from Y increases so Y is told to decrease costs as a means of providing a larger surplus and thus more net revenue to X to make up what it has lost from the state.

In order for Y to produce its revenue, it has both variable costs and quasi-fixed costs. The variable costs are wages paid to part-time or ad hoc instructors. The quasi-fixed costs are the permanent faculty salaries; we term them only quasi-fixed costs since they may be reduced in extreme cases.

If quasi-fixed costs are not reduced (for example, by laying off permanent faculty), then the variable costs must be reduced. The constraint on this cost reduction is that it must be accomplished without reducing Y's gross revenue, else the goal of the cost reduction will not be realized, that is, no extra net revenue will be produced which X needs to pay its costs.

Suppose that the constraint is not satisfied, that is, the variable cost reduction does reduce gross revenue (e.g. course sections taught by ad hocs are eliminated.) It would then appear, from the point of view of an administrator focused single-mindedly on cost-cutting, that further cuts will be needed to support X. These further cuts, ceterus paribus, will result in further gross revenue reduction. The death spiral has begun and will continue until only the gross revenue supported by the quasi-fixed costs is produced. Again, from the point of view of an administrator focused single-mindedly on cost-cutting, reduction of the quasi-fixed costs, that is, layoffs of permanent faculty, must begin and then continue in a death spiral until the gross revenue produced is insufficient to support either Y or X. Assuming X is not able to begin consuming another academic unit W, and assuming that X is of fundamental importance to Z (and was worth all this trouble in the first place), the final result is organizational death of Z.
A Possible Solution that has been suggested but which Fails to Prevent the Death Spiral

One possible reaction to this case is to counter reduction in revenue resulting from decreased variable costs, by increasing revenue resulting from the quasi-fixed costs. However, as described below, this reaction will itself lead to a death spiral and organizational death. While other variable costs might be considered (e.g., telephone service), they are negligible.

Each reduction in SCH resulting from not hiring an ad hoc instructor must be balanced by a corresponding increase in SCH supported by the quasi-fixed costs. In short, if you layoff ad hocs, you require permanent faculty to produce more SCH. A straightforward manner of accomplishing this is to have the permanent faculty teach the sections formerly taught by the ad hocs who have been cut. A constraint on this solution is that the product capacity of the quasi-fixed costs is not limitless, that is, there is a limit to how many sections the permanent faculty can teach. The following describes one case demonstrating the limits of the product capacity, and increased net revenue generation, of the quasi-fixed costs. It is important to note that an assumption of this case is that the overall gross revenue remains flat, with an increase in net-revenue only realized by cost-cutting.

Permanent faculty efforts are distributed among teaching, research, and service in a traditional 40%, 40%, 20% workload allocation. Although permanent faculty are goal oriented and thus very often work a number of hours far greater than 40 per week, they are expected to work at least 40 hours per week. Accordingly, we use workload for a 40 hour week in this example.

The 40%, 40%, 20% workload allocation over 40 hours per week results in an hourly workload allocation of 16,16,8 hours each week. That is, the normal hourly workload distribution is 16 hours of teaching, 16 hours of research, and 8 hours of service each week.

Assume unit Y has 8 permanent faculty. Assuming that teaching a 3-credit course section requires a minimum of 5.3 hours week, the capacity of a single permanent faculty is work load for 3 sections per week or 3 sections per semester overall. Also assume that an ad hoc instructor is paid $4,000 per section. Suppose the current teaching load for permanent faculty is 4 sections per year (or workload effort of 2 sections per semester.) If we add 2 additional sections per year to the permanent faculty workload, there will be 16 additional sections per year taught by permanent faculty, and 16 fewer sections taught per year by ad hocs. Since ad hocs are paid $4,000 per section, we realize cost savings of 16 * $4,000 or $64,000 per year. Since we assume that overall gross revenue is flat, we have an increase of net-revenue realized by cost-savings of $64,000 per year. Thus, an additional $64,000 is available from Y to support X.

At this point, relative to the initial hourly workload allocation for permanent faculty, and the constraint that teaching a 3-credit course section requires a minimum of 5.3 hours week, the permanent faculty are at capacity. Any further variable cost reductions will require a change in hourly workload allocation for permanent faculty. But since the additional $64,000 net-revenue generated by the initial round of cost cutting is likely to be considered inadequate for X's
purposes, further cuts will be required.

At this point, permanent faculty are teaching 6 sections per year. Suppose that were increased to 8 sections per year, or 4 sections per semester. The faculty hourly workload allocation must be adjusted to account for this increase. Suppose it is deemed important to preserve research time for permanent faculty and service workload will be reallocated to teaching workload. The workload allocation is now (16 + 5.3 = 21.3), 16, (8 - 5.3 = 2.7), that is, each week the permanent faculty spend 21.3 hours teaching, 16 hours in research, and 2.7 hours in service.

After the required dismissals of ad hoc instructors, this reallocation results is a cost-savings of 16 * $4,000 or $64,000 per year. Again, since we assume that overall gross revenue is flat, we have a total increase of net-revenue realized by cost-savings through two initial rounds of cost cutting amounting to $128,000 per year. Let us suppose that the magnitude of reduction in state budget is great enough such that the additional $128,000 net-revenue generated by the two rounds of cost cutting is considered inadequate for X’s purposes, and further cuts will be required.

Let us assume that the service workload of 2.7 hours per week is a minimum. Further workload reallocation will require research workload to be reallocated to teaching workload. This will be possible without change to gross revenue only if Y’s revenue is not dependent on the research workload allocation. Let us assume this is the case. Suppose that the teaching workload of permanent faculty is increased to 10 sections per year. Assuming sufficient variable costs (ie., ad hoc instructors) remain to be cut or dismissed, we will see a cost-savings of an additional 16 * $4,000 or $64,000 per year. The hourly workload allocation for permanent faculty is now (21.2 + 5.3 = 26.5), (16 - 5.3 = 10.7), 2.7, that is, each week the permanent faculty spend 26.5 hours teaching, 10.7 hours in research, and 2.7 hours in service.

After three rounds of cost cutting, the total cost reduction (or net-revenue increase) is $192,000 per year. At this point faculty are teaching 5 sections each semester. Assume the normal load of an ad hoc is two sections per semester. We have eliminated 12 ad hoc instructors, since we have 48 sections per year formerly taught by ad hocs that are now taught be permanent faculty, and since $48/4 = 12.$

Suppose at this point we have dismissed all ad hoc instructors, that is, we have eliminated all of the variable costs. It seems reasonable that since X and Y are units in a Research Level 1 institution, Research workload cannot be reduced further, and we are at teaching capacity for the permanent faculty in Y. Any further cost cutting will require cutting quasi-fixed costs, that is, the elimination of permanent faculty. Assuming we do not lump all SCH into fewer sections, any such cut will require reduction in sections taught, and there will be a reduction in gross revenue. Unless the revenue from the sections eliminated is less than or equal to the quasi-fixed cost (salary) savings resulting from eliminating a permanent faculty person, there will be a reduction in net revenue available to support X. If the revenue loss equals the quasi-fixed cost savings, net revenue remain flat. Only if the revenue lost is less than the quasi-fixed cost savings will net revenue increase, though gross revenue decreases, and similar for any further cost cutting of quasi-fixed costs.
Since three initial rounds of cost cutting provided only an increase of $192,000 per year from Y to X, and supposing the magnitude of the reduction in state budget is great enough such that the $192,000 is considered inadequate for X’s purposes, such further cuts to quasi-fixed costs will be required.

Given the conditions required for the quasi-fixed cost savings to provide a net revenue increase, sections producing less revenue, which tend to be upper class or graduate level sections, will be cut. This continued spiral will then eliminate sections required for all but the undergraduate courses, resulting in elimination of graduate programs, and finally death of the Research Level 1 institution Z. It may, however, live on as some kind of non-research focused institution.

The problem with the forgoing attempted solution is that it emphasizes cost-cutting for Y in a single-minded approach. In a sequel, I will discuss an alternate approach that emphasizes net-revenue increases for Y through gross revenue increases for Y.

Appendix A

In cost accounting and managerial accounting, the term death spiral refers to the repeated elimination of products resulting from spreading costs on the basis of volume instead of their root causes. The death spiral is also known as the downward demand spiral.

To illustrate the death spiral let's assume that Product X is a simple, high-volume product that requires little manufacturing attention. If the accountant spreads the company's manufacturing overhead costs based on volume, Product X will appear to have high overhead costs. (In reality, Product X causes very little overhead cost especially when compared to the company's many complex, low-volume products.) If management responds to Product X's allocated high overhead costs and 1) seeks a price increase which causes the customer to move the production to a competitor with a lower price, 2) outsources the production, or 3) drops the product, then the company's manufacturing volume will decrease. If the company does not reduce its fixed overhead to correspond to the decreased manufacturing volume and the accountant continues to spread the overhead costs—including the cost of excess capacity—on the basis of volume, the remaining products will have to be assigned more of the overhead costs. If management again reacts to the new, higher, allocated costs by seeking price increases which cause a loss of sales, outsources production, or drops the products, the company's manufacturing volume will again decrease. If fixed costs are not decreased accordingly and the accountant again spreads the overhead on the basis of a new, even smaller volume, the entire company could die from the high fixed costs and a small volume of products being produced and sold.
March 7, 2016

Dear Chancellor Mone,

On behalf of the Department of Communication Sciences & Disorders (CSD), we would like to thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback regarding the report from the Chancellor’s Campus Organization & Effectiveness Team (CCOET). We recognize that there are great challenges facing the university and appreciate the work of CCOET in identifying potential solutions to the budget cuts. We also appreciate the administration’s transparency throughout the process.

One theme throughout the CCOET report was identifying potential synergies and efficiencies across the campus. We agree that there is great opportunity to bring together experts with similar interests and break down some of the institutional silos. One particular opportunity for greater synergy is in the area of health. Throughout the university, there are numerous faculty and staff conducting groundbreaking health-related research and training the next generation of healthcare providers and researchers. Finding innovative ways of bringing together these disciplines, in both teaching and research, may help to reduce redundancies and increase efficiencies.

One of the proposals in the CCOET report was merging individual units from the College of Health Sciences into the School of Education. We believe that this merger would not be in the best interest of UWM. On the surface, it may appear that CSD may fit within the School of Education, as some of our graduates work in the public schools and several faculty members collaborate with the School of Education. However, our discipline is much more firmly rooted within the Health Sciences. The alignment with communication sciences and disorders within the field of health sciences is also consistent with other universities throughout the United States. While the areas of specialization within CSD are diverse, they all have a central health focus. The clinical practice models that we use to train our students are based on the medical model, and are most aligned with the other health professions. Each CSD investigator has a health focus within her/his line of research and most federal funding is sought from the National Institutes of Health. In addition, the UWM CSD program has a long history of a health-related alliance. Our (then named) Department of Speech Pathology & Audiology was among the original units in the School of Allied Health Professions (now known as the College of Health Sciences) when the college was formed in 1975.

We look forward to doing our part to help UWM get through this challenging time. We are committed to working with other units and with the administration to identify efficiencies. In
addition to cost-saving, we also will work collaboratively to identify and implement programs to increase enrollments and generate revenue. Given the critical mass of health-related disciplines at UWM, there is a ripe opportunity for interprofessional clinics that have the potential to generate a net profit, while also providing critical real-world education and delivering a needed community service. This type of innovation in uniting education, service, and revenue generation is just one example of the many opportunities that are possible when we, the health-related disciplines, work together.

Sincerely,

The Faculty and Staff of the Department of Communication Sciences & Disorders

Tricia Chirillo  
Caitlin Croegart  
Kate Fernstrom  
Marylou Gelfer  
John Heilmann  
Dawn Marie Hennes  
Sabine Heuer  
Erin LeSage  
Shelley Lund

Kathryn Morgan  
Barbara Pauloski  
Paula Rhyner  
Stacy Ryan  
Carol Seery  
Kathy Wangerin  
Susan Yorio  
Heather Zingler

cc: Johannes Britz, Provost, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
    Ron Cisler, Dean, College of Health Sciences
March 3, 2016

Dear Chancellor Mone and Provost Britz:

I am writing to provide you with feedback on the two CCOET options for the Graduate School. As you already know, these two options are polar opposites from each other. The first calls for further decentralization of the graduate functions, while the second calls for further centralization. It is important to note that the main argument for both options is based on the premise of duplication of functions, but the alleged duplication is mostly perceived, not real. This letter summarizes the position of the Graduate School leadership in favor of the second option as we feel this is the best option for our students and the university as a whole. The attached documents provide supporting information.

After reviewing the CCOET proposal, we find the decentralization option flawed on the basis of mission, cost, quality and efficiency. This option is founded on the false premise of duplication. Our experience recommends the centralization option is a better fit to the research mission of the university and better match with organizational structures of other R1 Doctoral Research Universities with Highest level of research. In addition to being an integral part in achieving the mission’s stated goal “to become a top-tier research university”, all five Chancellor’s strategic priorities are positively impacted by the activities of a distinct Graduate School.

Although we support the centralization option, we would be remiss not to advocate for the main benefits of UWM’s current model, which centralizes some functions and distributes others. In this hybrid model, the Graduate School provides the proverbial “one-stop-shop” for graduate students, faculty, programs, and governance, while discipline-specific expertise is grounded in the units that host graduate programs. It is important to stress that the work performed in the programs is complementary to the work done in the Graduate School. Hence, the CCOET decentralization option, which would create multiple collegiate graduate schools in place of the university Graduate School, would not remove duplication, as none exists, but instead would create major costs, inefficiencies, and liabilities.

Our campus has already made great progress towards better efficiency with two major reorganizations of the Graduate School that were implemented in the 2010-11 and 2013-14 academic years. The most recent reorganization separated sponsored programs from graduate education through the creation of a new Office of Research. This major change allowed the new Graduate School leadership to focus solely on students and programs. We are rapidly building and acquiring new technologies to provide quality experience for our graduate students and faculty. These labor-saving solutions are streamlining essential student-, program-, and fellowship-related processes in the Graduate School and in the hosting departments, schools and colleges. The Graduate School strives for ongoing improvement in efficiency and quality. Indeed, we expect positive performance from our graduate programs.
when we conduct their periodic reviews on behalf of campus and system, just as we require high standards from our graduate students as they progress through their programs of study, passing their milestones on the way to graduation.

The Graduate School is an active participant in several key Chancellor’s initiatives: i) on the Chancellor’s Enrollment Management Action Team (CEMAT) we bring initiatives and lead discussion on all graduate-related action items, including the creation of our very first strategic enrollment management plan; ii) we are active participants in the Research Excellence and Successful Students Panther Teams; iii) on the Chancellor’s Budget Communication Task Force we support the campus advocacy agenda and are becoming UWM’s public face for graduate research and studies.

The new Graduate School is innovating in marketing, advocacy, development, and alumni affairs, areas that did not exist in the “old” Graduate School. With the very first Director of Development for Graduate Education, we have created a powerful Campaign Cabinet to assist with advancement and advocacy. After a hiatus of more than 20 years (since Dean George Keulks) the new Graduate School is bringing philanthropic support, for graduate students from all disciplines, in ways that are complementary to the development efforts in the individual schools/colleges. In addition, we created an annual Graduate Fellows Celebration to honor the latest recipients of state, university and philanthropic awards. The stories and experiences of these outstanding students are on the new materials used for domestic and international recruitment, produced professionally with University Relations, giving UWM a branded presence at graduate recruitment fairs. The same branded look permeates our presence on social media and defines the new Graduate School web site that is optimized for mobile devices. For the first time in our history we have an annual Graduate Open House, a campus-wide graduate recruitment event with an accompanying advertising campaign. The sign of the Graduate School is visible even in the Panther Arena. We would lose all of these advancements if campus were to decentralize the graduate school functions.

The Graduate School is a complex campus unit that empowers academic excellence and supports the significant contributions of masters, doctoral, and professional graduate students to quality research, scholarship, and professional education. It is also a substantial symbol and guarantee of UWM’s ongoing commitment to its doctoral research mission and to our community.

We understand that the university is facing major challenges, not least of which is how to support the sustainability and excellence of graduate education in an R1 research environment given our current fiscal state. Please do not hesitate to request further information that might be needed to make a considered decision.

Sincerely,

Marija Gajdardziska-Josifovska
Dean of the Graduate School

Attachment
Supplementary Materials

Current Structure of Graduate School: UWM’s current administrative model is a hybrid that has centralized and decentralized components. The Graduate School provides "one-stop-shop" for centralized support of programs, governance, and graduate student services, while discipline-specific expertise is grounded in the units that host graduate programs. This complementarity is effective and allows for economy of scale. For example, at the centralized Graduate School level, approximately 22 FTE support nearly 5000 graduate students, more than 130 doctoral, masters and certificate programs, and 4 standing faculty governance committees. The Graduate School protects programs from liabilities by ensuring consistent application of policies and fair treatment of all graduate students. It ensures compliance with system-mandated requirements, such as program reviews, and provides checks and balances for processes connected with student academic appeals and misconducts. It supports the primary mission of UWM to prepare high quality graduate students and to promote top-tier research. By creating the first Campaign Cabinet, the Graduate School raises the visibility of UWM’s graduate education and research in Milwaukee while fundraising for scholarships and fellowships. It presents the face of our R1, Highest Research Activity Doctoral University. The current structure is representative of the dominant organizational structures at peer and aspirational universities (Appendix 1).

Current Structure of Graduate Programs: The hybrid structure is practiced at most doctoral research universities, with the balance between centralized and decentralized functions dependent on the age and size of the university. At UWM all distributed functions reside in the graduate programs and are directed by graduate faculty who are appointed to serve as Graduate Program Directors. In most schools and colleges, including Letters & Science, the programs are hosted directly by departments and are sometimes assisted by office staff. A few professional schools, mostly of the non-departmentalized type, such as Business and Information Studies, have built centralized operations that are led by associate deans for research and/or graduate education and assisted by staff in the dean’s office. Engineering has departments, but the graduate program functions are performed at the college level because the college has umbrella programs (PhD in Engineering and MS in Engineering). The variability in the program administrative structures has generated some confusion about duplications, but those who are more closely involved with program functions know that the efforts on both sides are complementary.

Applications and Admissions: A second cause of confusion about duplication arises from the fact that UWM had been forced to use the UW System undergraduate application system for graduate students for decades. Because this system was designed only to handle uniform requirements, it did not enable collection of specialized materials required by certain graduate programs. Hence, it was necessary to collect any extra, specialized materials by the respective programs, while the Graduate School assembled all the uniformly required materials. To overcome the inefficiency of this system, the Graduate School has been
working indefatigably for three years to obtain permission from UW-System to procure and implement a separate online application system called Panthera. With the introduction of the new Panthera system designed for graduate applications, programs will no longer need to collect the additional materials in order to make admission recommendations. The Panthera system will be launched in April 2016, and the new system is already customized for each program. This development delivers the efficiency that CCOET envisions in its centralized option for graduate education, freeing resources in the departments, schools and colleges, while removing the source of misperception about duplication of effort in processing more than 6000 degree and 1000 non-degree graduate applications annually.

**Efficiencies through Technology:** Just as the commercial Panthera system will provide the much-needed efficiency of the graduate applications and admission process, other technological solutions are also delivering increased efficiency for the Graduate School and program staff. Notable recent examples include:

1. Home-built online system for recording and tracking of doctoral milestones;
2. Online submission of master’s theses and doctoral dissertations to ProQuest;
3. Online completion of the National Science Foundation Survey of Earned Doctorates;
4. Online nominations and applications for graduate fellowships for all three programs that are administered by the Graduate School: Advanced Opportunities Program, Distinguished Graduate Student Awards, and Distinguished Dissertator Awards;
5. Hobson’s Radius CRM system for recruitment of graduate students.

*These developments are enhancing graduate student experiences and creating seamless integration across the enrollment funnel, from prospects all the way to graduate alumni.***

**Cost of Decentralization:** We now look at the question of cost. CCOET rightly points that for Option 1 “Consideration must be given to how much it may cost to build-up graduate program services in schools and colleges that currently do not have much support structure.” In this decentralized option UWM would need to dismantle its central Graduate School and replicate it with 12 mini graduate schools (or the number of schools and colleges that emerges at the end of the CCOET reorganization; the following discussion will use the current names of the UWM schools and colleges). Experiences with this process at the University of Minnesota predict costs at three levels of magnitude: i) the largest costs will be associated with creation of centralized college-level graduate operations in L&S and PSOA, ii) the mid level costs will be associated with strengthening of small operations in professional schools/colleges, and iii) the smallest costs will be incurred in professional schools that have substantial central graduate administrative operations. For example, recent conversations with the deans of Education, Engineering and Business indicate that their centralized staff will need to be augmented to compensate for loss of services that are performed by the staff of the Graduate School. Moreover, the dean of L&S is very concerned about the costs to build a collegial graduate school de novo. Indeed, the only savings would come from minor reduction of staff if the Graduate School were to be transformed into a smaller Office of Graduate Studies, or Office of Graduate Education. *The net of expenses and savings is predicted to result in overall cost.*
A quote from the University of Minnesota’s Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, Hennig Schroeder, sums up the financial outcome as follows: “If the thesis is, ‘Decentralization is a very good way to save money for the University,’ the answer is ‘You can not make that argument!’”

The same conclusion is presented in a paper entitled “Case Study: Western Washington University: Comparing the Costs of Alternative Structures of Graduate Schools: Centralized vs. Decentralized.” by Mohib Ghali. He was Vice Provost for Research and Dean of Western Washington University at a time when they had ~750 graduate students. Decentralization was proposed with a goal of saving ~$250k. Four quantitative methodologies were developed to model the saving based on different assumptions about the decentralization. All methods predicted increased cost, ranging from ~$70k up to ~$590k.

Impact on Office of Research: In the past ten years the Graduate School was reorganized three times, in all cases with increased costs. In 2005/06 UWM hired its first Vice Chancellor for Research and Dean of the Graduate School. The research expenditures were increased, and new graduate programs were introduced after UW System lifted its 15-year ban on new degree programs. The attention required by sponsored programs and PIs, however, overshadowed the needs of the graduate programs and students. In the summer of 2010, the Graduate School was split for a short time. The split was reversed and divisional associate deans were introduced in 2011. Our most recent structure was created in Fall 2013, with separation of the Office of Research and completion of the search for Dean in January 2014. Campus leadership changes and budget cuts have precluded completion of the search for the leadership of the Office of Research. The close collaboration between research and graduate education enables use of shared services (budget, HR, purchasing, IT and data analysis). Hence, decentralization of the Graduate School would negatively impact the budget of the Office of Research by destabilization of the shared services.

Graduate Enrollment Management: The latest embodiment of the Graduate School is fully focused on the needs of the graduate students and programs. It is important to allow the current structure to function for a few years, especially at a time when we are developing strategic enrollment management plans. Strategic graduate enrollment management (GEM) would not be possible without a central Graduate School-like entity that focuses on students just as much as on programs. At the same time, over-centralization is incompatible with graduate education. We are already nudging our hybrid structure towards centralization, yet we must preserve its core philosophy: the hybrid model promotes quality for the academic programs and the graduate student experiences, benefiting from the economy of scale at the central level, and from the disciplinary know-how at the decentralized level.

Financial support for graduate students is a critical component of GEM. The Graduate School maintains template letters for appointment of graduate assistants and supports the Provost’s office to set graduate TA and PA rates. Competitive graduate assistantship and fellowship rates require advocacy by the Graduate School and the Office of Research to accomplish the goals endorsed by the faculty Senate and the Distinguished Professors. In addition, the Graduate School enables the allocation, dispersement and tracking of the graduate fellowships, McNair and Advanced Opportunity Fellowships that are allocated
centrally. It also strategically directs Chancellor's awards and Research Excellence Awards, to achieve targeted impacts. Most recently we have created an influential Campaign Cabinet to augment graduate advancement and advocacy through philanthropic scholarships for graduate students from all disciplines.

Public universities are facing increased competition from private non-profit and for-profit counterparts at this time of demographic pressures and declining state contributions to budgets. Active recruitment of quality graduate students, along with their retention to graduation and placement, are now becoming more important practices than ever. *It is important to have centralized strategic coordination of the graduate enrollment management efforts if UWM's graduate enterprise is to survive and thrive.*

**Support to Governance and Consistent Implementation of Policy:** The third, but equally important pillar of our structure, are the *graduate faculty governance* committees whose intensive work-load is supported by staff of the Graduate School. The faculty senate has the following graduate standing committees: Graduate Faculty Committee, Subcommittee on Graduate Courses and Curricula, Subcommittee on Program Reviews, Subcommittee on Graduate Fellowships. The three branches of our graduate education system provide the needed checks and balances that ensure consistent application of UW System mandates and university-wide policies. The Graduate School oversight of graduation reviews and of final appeals guarantees that student complaints (including grade appeals and academic misconduct appeals) are fairly heard at a final step removed from the programs themselves. Given the significance and complexity of graduate education at UWM today, oversight of graduate student issues is a major task that is essential to protect programs from liability. *Academic reputations take a long time to build, but can be destroyed easily, both for individuals and institutions.*
Appendix I
Study of Graduate Education Organizational Structure and 2015 Carnegie Classification
of Great Cities Universities
(February 22, 2016)

The University of Wisconsin Milwaukee reached its stated vision to become a top-tier research university by gaining the 2015 Carnegie Classification as **R1: Doctoral University with Highest Research Activity**. The Great Cities Universities are often used as a peer group for UWM. The doctoral graduate education component is an integral part of the R1 ranking. The following table of Great Cities Universities is organized in R1 and R2 cohorts and provides information about the centralized graduate structure at each institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan area</th>
<th>University*</th>
<th>Carnegie 2015</th>
<th>Carnegie 2010</th>
<th>Graduate Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Florida</td>
<td>Florida International University</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>University Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, Georgia</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>RU/VH</td>
<td>Graduate Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Temple University</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>Graduate Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham, Alabama</td>
<td>University of Alabama at Birmingham</td>
<td></td>
<td>RU/VH</td>
<td>Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>RU/VH</td>
<td>Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, Texas</td>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>RU/VH</td>
<td>Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td>University of Illinois at Chicago</td>
<td></td>
<td>RU/VH</td>
<td>Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milwaukee, Wisconsin</strong></td>
<td><strong>University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee</strong></td>
<td><strong>R1</strong></td>
<td><strong>RU/H</strong></td>
<td><strong>Graduate School</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond, Virginia</td>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>RU/VH</td>
<td>Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, Michigan</td>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>RU/VH</td>
<td>Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, Ohio</td>
<td>Cleveland State University</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>College of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, Indiana</td>
<td>Indiana University-Purdue</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>University Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Oregon</td>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>Office of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, Massachusetts</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts Boston</td>
<td></td>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>Office of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis, Tennessee</td>
<td>University of Memphis</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, Missouri</td>
<td>University of Missouri–Kansas City</td>
<td></td>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>School of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, Missouri</td>
<td>University of Missouri–St. Louis</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, Louisiana</td>
<td>University of New Orleans</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>Graduate School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excluding City College of New York which has M1 Carnegie classification
Memorandum

TO: Mark Mone  
Chancellor, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

FROM: Brett Peters  
Dean, College of Engineering & Applied Science

DATE: March 11, 2016

SUBJECT: Concerns about the Proposed Budget Model

After a recent Deans’ meeting with the Provost and your email to campus, I want to share concerns and provide feedback about the proposed budget model directly to you. I personally believe that the model is fundamentally flawed and have stated so on many occasions during the development process. In my view, it should be drastically reconsidered. My primary objections and concerns are noted below. At a minimum, however, adoption and implementation of the model should be postponed until other changes underway at the University, such as those suggested in the CCOET report or the integrated support services project, are better understood and absorbed and until a clear execution plan that addresses many of the lingering concerns with the proposed budget model can be developed.

As you have stated, our University is at a crossroads. Tradeoffs will be required. Difficult decisions must be made. These tradeoffs and decisions must be driven by a strategic process that reflects our strategic priorities and develops a plan to achieve them. Funding allocations should support these priorities and this plan. The budget model must directly reflect and support those strategic priorities. If not, we risk having the University transformed into something different from what was intended.

Given the current financial situation, the University may need to adopt a different approach, in the short term, to whether this crisis. However, this short-term need for crisis management should not morph our long-term budget model into an undesirable position.

The proposed budget model has two primary components: 1) create a base funding level for units by allocating a portion of tuition revenue using a formula and 2) create a subvention pool to serve as a vehicle for allocating resources towards strategic initiatives and for adjusting funding allocations based on evolving campus needs. This model structure is not bad, in and of itself, and has some attractive
qualities. However, how this model structure manifests in the current proposed budget model has many problems.

I believe this model structure works best when the academic units are almost entirely funded through the base funding allocation and the subvention pool is used in a limited way to truly target new strategic initiatives. However, this type of use is not what is being proposed. In the proposed budget model, the base funding allocation formula is not comprehensive enough as it narrowly focuses on a few factors and the allocation only provides a portion of the funding required by each academic unit. The Resource Allocation Group then uses the subvention pool to provide the remaining funding for each unit and must also use the subvention pool to fund other strategic initiatives for the University. The resulting proposed budget model creates several problems. I briefly highlight the main concerns below.

*Proposed model is not inherently strategic*

The formula for the base funding level considers only three metrics: student credit hours (70% weight), number of declared majors (20%), and number of graduates (10%). The formula does not focus on or incentivize our University's strategic priorities. Most notable, there is inadequate consideration of the research mission, particularly to support our R1 classification. As the default under this proposed formula, we will move toward being an advanced comprehensive university focused only on undergraduate education.

The Resource Allocation Group is expected to use the subvention pool to address the University's strategic priorities. Their starting point, however, has already been determined by a formula that is not strategic and only considers a small set of performance metrics. So the strategic priorities are not put first but rather left to the end of the process. Furthermore, the process by which the Resource Allocation Group will make decisions and allocations has not been specified. There are no performance metrics identified and no process or criteria for the RAG to follow. Thus, the key portion of the proposed budget model is opaque to the units, such that there is not clarity around what future funding will be nor is there confidence that units control their own destiny based on performance.

There are two specific issues left out of the formula and base funding allocation.
- Research is not considered in the base funding allocation and it is not specified how it might be considered by RAG. The only incentive for research is through indirect return, which is not sufficient to support the research mission. No performance metrics related to research activity are specified, and there is not a proportional allocation of base funding through the formula that considers contributions to the research mission. UWM has rightly argued that it should receive proportionally greater funding as a Research University than do the Comprehensive Universities. This same logic should extend to the units within UWM but is not explicitly considered by the model. Research and scholarly productivity metrics can be developed or patterned after similar approaches at other institutions. We cannot
conduct great research worthy of an R1 if it is not adequately supported and rewarded.

- Graduate education, particularly PhD education, is not explicitly incentivized in the model. Graduate education is only rewarded through the tuition premium that graduate students pay. There is no proportional funding to support growth of graduate education programs, which provide the foundation for our research enterprise. In disciplines where the programs must provide tuition support for the graduate students, the proposed budget model would encourage closure of those programs as they would be operating at a loss.

**Proposed model does not readily allow for strategic investments**

Each year the model re-computes the base funding level for each unit using the formula that does not capture the strategic goals and priorities of the university. Again, it is left to the Resource Allocation Group each year through the subvention allocation process to both supplement the base funding allocation and make strategic investments. Thus, with an annual reset, there is no ready mechanism to truly make long-term strategic investments.

- The base funding model does not recognize past strategic investments. For example, past DIN allocations that were targeted at specific areas are not accounted for in the proposed model. Those targeted allocations are effectively removed as the proposed model uses the formula to determine each unit’s base funding level.

- The model does not allow for future strategic investments, as allocations from the subvention pool do not change the future base funding level. Strategic investments can be made through the subvention pool funding allocation process. However, each year the proposed budget model will re-compute each unit’s base using the specific formula. This process will eliminate any past investments and require the unit to again be considered for funding through the subvention pool allocation process. Yearly reconsideration of strategic requests is not strategic and will not allow units to effectively plan. This will be particularly true when the composition of the RAG changes and their criteria shift. Furthermore, it removes much of the incentive for units to be innovative and creative as they no longer control their own trajectory of success but are at the mercy of the yearly subvention pool allocation process, which doesn’t even have clearly defined metrics.

**Proposed model does not consider the cost of delivery**

It is widely recognized that the cost of delivery for different types of programs and for different levels of student classification varies greatly. The proposed model does not recognize any of these differences but treats each student credit hour and each graduate as being identical. Many universities have models that explicitly account for these differences.

- For example, Texas universities use a matrix that provides different weights based on the area of study and the classification of the courses. This matrix is used to compute weighted student credit hours that are then used as part
of a funding formula. Such a weighting scheme also allows for differential
treatment of graduate education. See Figure 1.

- As another example, some schools use national studies, such as The National
  Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity, to provide the weights used in
  a weighted student credit hour computation. See Figure 2, which is an
  excerpt from the budget model recommended for use at University of
  Vermont. Many other such examples can be found.

Proposed model does not incentivize student success
The formula used in the proposed model has an overwhelming majority of the
weight on student credit hours. Programs are incentivized to focus on this metric.
Thus, investments in high-impact practices focused on retention and improving
graduation rates will yield a lower return than focusing on getting more students
into their courses regardless of the students' future success. While the revenue
stream is clearly tuition driven, the focus must be on graduating well-prepared
students and the model must directly recognize and support this key objective.

Proposed model discourages interdisciplinary collaboration
With the proposed formula, units are encouraged to have programs entirely within
their control and to require students to only take courses offered by their unit.
Collaborating with another unit to offer a program may result in reduced student
credit hours, sharing of majors, and thus reduced revenue, so it would not be
encouraged. Many exciting opportunities lie between the disciplinary boundaries
but the proposed model discourages exploration of those possibilities.

Proposed model encourages inefficiencies across units to be continued
By rewarding student credit hour production, units are encouraged to have
students only take courses offered by their unit. Thus, there is no incentive to
reduce course duplication or to promote cooperation across units to accommodate
the educational needs of different student populations for similar material.

Proposed model does not adequately reward entrepreneurial activity by units
The model does not allow for units to develop a plan that best fits their situation
and be in control of ensuring success with regard to that plan. As previously noted,
the proposed base funding formula leaves out many important strategic factors and
annually re-computes the base funding allocation for each unit. Any additional
funding must come through the subvention pool allocation process, which doesn't
have specified criteria.

- Growth that a unit experiences in student credit hours or success that a unit
  achieves in retention and improved graduation rates may not be rewarded.
  These "gains" in terms of the formula may be partially or fully removed in
  the subvention pool allocation process. That is, there may be a tendency to
  keep the unit's overall funding level the same so if the base increases
  through the formula the level of subvention allocated will be reduced. The
current budget model, for all its flaws, at least directly rewards successful
performance.
• Since not all strategic factors are included in the model, units may be penalized for not improving performance adequately after “investments” from the subvention pool. That is, if a unit is given additional funding through the subvention pool allocation process, there is likely to be an expectation that the unit will grow its performance, as measured by the funding formula, as a result of that “investment.” However, if the unit is focused on other strategic areas, e.g., building new research capability, increasing PhD production in important areas, etc., then the investment will not be reflected in the funding formula and thus may not be continued in the subvention pool allocation process. This will, of course, depend on the RAG, but that decision process is uncertain from the perspective of the academic units.

• As a specific example, adding undergraduate international students is not incentivized in the model. The ability to bring in international students is not equal across all of the units. Those units that have this capability must expend considerable resources to recruit, retain, and graduate these students. The direct recruitment expenses are significant, including time, travel, and perhaps scholarships. The additional advising workload is also significant, often 3x that of a typical student. The faculty workload, particularly in project-oriented courses, is also increased. However, the unit receives no proportional benefit from this increased effort and expense. The additional tuition these international students pay is added to the common pool, which can be a significant increase for the university, but the unit only benefits in terms of any additional student credit hours or graduates that result from these students. Thus, the added effort and expense of getting these international students is not directly rewarded or compensated and so it is not worthwhile for the units to pursue these international students.

The goals identified for the new budget model were laudable: flexible enough to adjust to the evolving landscape of higher education and the evolving needs of the UWM campus community; predictive to allow campus units to anticipate their future resource allocations and, subsequently, set long term goals; simple and easily understood by the campus community; incentivizing for desired behaviors and outcomes; inclusive of the viewpoints of campus leadership and governance groups; and strategic in nature. Unfortunately, I do not believe the proposed model has achieved these goals. As I have noted above, there are many concerns that the proposed model in its current form is not inherently strategic, does not incentivize desired behavior, is not fully transparent, and is not predictive to allow for long-term planning. While the goals may be difficult to achieve, we should not abandon them as key drivers for a new budget model.

Any new budget model will have a lasting impact on the University. Ensuring that it focuses on and supports the University’s strategic priorities should be paramount. Those key goals and priorities must be considered first, not last. The budget model has the potential to more drastically influence the structure and success of our academic units, and thus our University, than do other proposed
changes, including many of those in the CCOET report. Thus, the budget model must be driven by our key goals and priorities. It should not be modified or adapted just to make it “work” in the current financial environment to solve the current problems. In the short term, other measures to adjust budgets or control the allocation of funds can be instituted and used to manage through the current crisis.

For the long term, the proposed budget model needs to be reconsidered so that a comprehensive set of performance metrics reflecting our strategic priorities are guiding the base funding allocation process. This process should truly reward the desired behaviors and outcomes. The subvention pool can then be used for truly new initiatives or opportunities. It should be used sparingly but strategically. Reconsidering the budget model will take time, but it is imperative that we get it right.

Again, given the current financial situation, the University may need to, in the short term, adopt a different budget management approach to survive this crisis. However, this short-term need for crisis management should not unduly influence our long-term budget model, since that model is so critical to the future success of the University. I encourage you to carefully consider how to separate these short-term needs from the long-term model and enable the University to weather the storm and ensure that our University’s strategic goals and plans will not be compromised.
The Formula Matrix
2014-2015 Biennium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Lower Div</th>
<th>Upper Div</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th>Special Prof</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>21.82</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>17.34</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>15.76</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Science</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Training</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Training</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>22.69</td>
<td>36.52</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Admin</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>23.21</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optometry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34.48</td>
<td>50.88</td>
<td>5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Ed Practice</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Ed</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Example of Formula Funding Matrix (Texas) for weights

Proposed Algorithm 1: "The weighted 90/10" or "The weighted 85/15"

1. Every year, a tally of student credit hours (SCH) for the preceding 2 years and the number of majors are calculated by College (example – to plan for FY15, FY12 and FY13 are used). College of the SCH is based on the instructor of record.

2. Weighted SCH are calculated based on relative national costs of instruction by discipline (NCES CIP codes). The SCH national cost for each department within a College is obtained every 5 years (see below). The weight for an Honors College course is automatically set to 3.0. The closest disciplines to those in the UVM COM will be used to calculate a COM weight. The Continuing Education weight will be set based on the portfolio of courses offered.

3. Between 85 and 90% of the net tuition is allocated based on weighted SCH.

Both of the algorithms assume that the weighting will be largely based on national norms that take into consideration discipline-specific delivery costs. A reasonable approach would be to use all the universities included in the Carnegie Classification RU/H that participate in The National Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity compiled by the University Delaware. Limiting the sample to peer/aspirant universities creates challenges difficult to overcome. For instance, many UVM peers are private institutions that do not participate in "The Delaware Study". Also, a large sample size for average cost calculation is desirable and the number of peers is limited.

The discipline weight will be based on a cost per SCH set every 5 years for predictability. The subcommittee remained concerned about data quality and updating within "The Delaware Study".

Figure 2. Example of National Benchmark data as weights (U. of Vermont)
Comment
Attached is a draft phased retirement plan to induce faculty retirements that several of us on APBC have been tossing around. It's based on the UNC system model - formal retirement and then re-hiring with a fixed-term contract at 50% rate. The devil with this will be in the details (of course), but it seems consistent with state law. I've requested review of this by HR to get their thoughts regarding the legality.

Is this something that you would wish APBC to pursue? It probably wouldn't go into effect this spring, but would provide a structure going forward to ease the transition into retirement.

Phased Retirement Program for Tenured Faculty

I. Purpose

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Phased Retirement Program is designed to provide an opportunity for eligible full-time tenured faculty members to make an orderly transition to retirement. The goals of the Program are to promote renewal of the professoriate in order to ensure institutional vitality and to provide additional flexibility and support for individual faculty members who are nearing retirement. The Program is entirely voluntary and will be entered into by a written agreement between an Eligible Faculty Member and the institution.

Faculty members who enter the Phased Retirement Program retain the adjunct equivalent of their current professorial rank and the full range of responsibilities and rights associated with that rank as described in Chapter 5 of the UWM Policies and Procedures (with the exception of permanent tenure). In addition, departments and schools are encouraged to extend full departmental rights and benefits to faculty in the program on those matters not specified in Chapter 5. Enrolling Eligible Faculty Members may elect to begin receiving all benefits they have accrued under the Wisconsin Retirement System, but they are not required to do so.

II. Eligibility and Approval

A. The Program is available only to full-time tenured faculty members. Non-tenured and tenure-track faculty are not eligible for the Program.

B. Except as set forth in this Section II and Section III below, the Program is available to all full-time tenured faculty members who:
   1. Have at least five years of full-time service at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee;
   2. Are age 57; and
   3. Are eligible to receive retirement benefits through WRS.

C. The Program contemplates actual retirement and reemployment of participating faculty as an equivalent rank adjunct on a part-time basis for a limited period. For purposes of the Program, "normal retirement age" is 57 years of age for WRS members with 30 years of service. When a faculty member has achieved the above-listed age, he or she will have reached "normal retirement age" and, therefore, need take only the break in service prior to entering the Program as specified by Wis. Stat. § 40.26(5).

D. Tenured faculty occupying full-time administrative positions are not eligible to participate in the Program until they vacate such positions. Thus, only individuals under faculty
appointment involving teaching, research and service are eligible to participate in the Program.

E. Individual faculty members are responsible for providing to UWM all information necessary for it to determine their eligibility as to age, service at the Institution, and retirement benefit eligibility within WRS. For these purposes, the Institution shall determine an applicant’s age and service longevity with reference to the August 1st date that follows submission of an application for participation.

F. Eligible Faculty Members may elect to enter the Program for the number of years specified by the Institution for all participating faculty.

G. Despite the above, Eligible Faculty Members do not have an absolute right to participate in the Program. Rather, departments, schools or colleges may limit participation in the Program based on various conditions. One condition is that financial exigencies prohibit enrollment in the Program. The second condition is that further enrollment in the Program will substantially weaken academic quality or disrupt program sequence. Further, a department, school, college or the Institution may each establish a cap or limit on the number of Eligible Faculty Members who may enter the Program.

H. An application to enter the Program must be submitted to the Eligible Faculty Member’s department or unit head. It is subject to the conditions noted above, development of a mutually agreed upon "work plan", and final approval by the chief academic officer. However, if the limitations do not apply and a final "work plan" is agreed upon, the final decision to enter or not enter the Program rests with the Eligible Faculty Member.

I. Once made, a decision to enter the Program (signified by the Eligible Faculty Member’s signing and non-revocation of the Phased Retirement Application and Reemployment Agreement and Release) is binding.

III. Terms and Conditions

A. Phased retirement under the Program is subject to the following terms and conditions.

1. Phased retirement under the Program may be for a period of not greater than five years.

2. Upon entering the Program, Eligible Faculty Members give up tenure. Program participants must adhere to WRS valid termination requirements under Wisconsin Administrative Code § ETF 10.08 and break in service regulations as per Wis. Stat. § 40.26(5). They terminate full-time employment and contract for a period of no more than half-time (or equivalent) service to UWM at the equivalent adjunct rank once the required break in service has expired. Half-time responsibilities may vary among departments. Participants can work no more than 0.5 FTE and work no more than 20 hours per week in any given semester.

3. The enrollment period for the Program begins with the fall semester, with actual participation to commence at the start of the next academic year (provided an Eligible Faculty Member’s application is approved). Participants must formally terminate employment with UWM at the end of spring semester. Teaching, research and service assignments during the period of phased retirement are individually negotiated by the Eligible Faculty Member and the appropriate supervisors and/or personnel committee(s). The details of such half-time service (a "work plan") must then be set forth in a UWM Phased Retirement Program Application and Reemployment Agreement (the "Agreement").
4. In conjunction with the Agreement to be executed under the Program, an Eligible Faculty Member must also execute a waiver of rights and claims under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (the "ADEA") and other laws (the "Release").

5. After the Agreement and Release are drafted, the Agreement is signed by the appropriate administrators, and the Agreement and Release are delivered to the Eligible Faculty Member, the Eligible Faculty Member shall have forty-five (45) days within which to consider the Agreement and Release. Eligible Faculty Members are encouraged to carefully review the terms of the Agreement and the Release and to consult an attorney prior to executing such materials. However, Eligible Faculty Members may sign the Agreement and Release before the end of the 45-day period, if they so choose.

Once an Eligible Faculty Member signs the Agreement and Release, he or she also has the right under the ADEA (if he or she so chooses) to revoke the Agreement and the Release at any time within seven (7) calendar days of the date both documents are fully executed by all parties. Revocations must be in a writing personally signed by the Eligible Faculty Member and must be effected by personal delivery or posting by United States mail to the office or official to whom the prior application to participate in the Program had been submitted. An election to participate in the Program then does not become final until after the 7-day revocation period has passed without the Eligible Faculty Member's revocation.

If an Eligible Faculty Member elects to revoke the Agreement and Release within the 7-day revocation period, the Agreement is void. Moreover, in such circumstances, the Eligible Faculty Member will continue in his or her same full-time employment status as the Faculty Member held immediately prior to the execution of the Release.

6. Participating Faculty Members will receive a salary equal to their percentage employment (no more than 50%) multiplied by their nine-month full-time salary they received immediately prior to phased retirement.

7. Participating Faculty Members will remain subject to relevant UWM Policies and Procedures. In addition, without expressly or constructively terminating any Agreement, UWM may place a Participating Faculty Member on temporary leave with pay and/or reassign a Participating Faculty Member’s duties during or as a result of any investigation or disciplinary action involving the Participating Faculty Member. Such authority shall be invoked only in exceptional circumstances when the Participating Faculty Member’s department or division head determines that such action is in the best interests of UWM. Further, nothing in the Program or these guidelines shall in any way be interpreted to provide a Participating Faculty Member with greater rights, claims or privileges against UWM regarding continued employment than otherwise provided in the UWM Policies and Procedures.
B. Eligible Faculty Members who elect into the Program will retain their professorial rank and the full range of responsibilities, rights, and general benefits associated with it, except for tenured status.

Faculty Members participating in the Program are eligible to participate in the following employee benefit plans or programs:

1. Release from teaching duties during spring semester after signing agreement;
2. Lump sum payment of one month’s salary during Winterim (February 1 pay period) after agreement is signed;
3. UWM will cover employee portion of health insurance costs for the phased retirement period. For participating Faculty members who choose less than a 50% appointment, UWM will match Accumulated Sick Leave Conversion Credits used by the employee to fund health insurance dollar for dollar.
4. Faculty member will retain all current office and lab space for 5 year period or until faculty member terminates phase retirement.

IV. General Provisions

A. Nothing in the Program precludes a participating faculty member from terminating his or her phased retirement at any time upon the mutual agreement of the parties.

B. Eligible Faculty Members participating in the Program do not enjoy the benefits of tenure. They may not serve on committees that require members be tenured. Otherwise, participants have the same academic freedoms and responsibilities as other faculty members and have access to all grievance and appeal procedures available to non-tenured members of the faculty who are not participating in the Program.

C. Participating faculty members are expected to maintain high levels of professional commitment to their Institution.

Comment
Mark, Johannes, (Tim and Sandra),

These are a few of my thoughts, not only in response to the CCOET document, but also more generally with respect to the situation the School of Freshwater Sciences finds itself at this point in its evolution.

The School of Freshwater Sciences is new. We are small. We are also at the cusp of our growth potential in terms of how we can help UWM gain national recognition, enhance programs and diverse student outcomes, and expand enrollments campus-wide.

Most of the suggestions that I see coming from the CCOET discussions address potential cuts and efficiencies through consolidation.

SFS is already an efficient operation, but we also have untapped economies of scale that can be reaped, but only through expansion, not contraction.
A number of the suggestions enumerated within CCOET have to do with SFS joining other Schools and/or Colleges without much regard to programmatic alignment. This strikes me as too simplistic for several reasons:

- SFS is a Graduate Research School. There is no question that UWM’s elevation to Research 1 ranking was due in part to the SFS. Our faculty have the highest per capita research funding levels on campus and have held that position for many years. This is not a boast. This is our job, and if we were not at the top we would not be fulfilling our duty and expectations.
- SFS is functionally, physically and academically unique both within UWM and across academic institutions nationally. Our operation is the most complex of any comparable unit within the UW System. We operate a large research facility that runs around the clock, 365 days a year. We operate a research vessel on the Great Lakes year round. We have aquatic research and animal husbandry facilities that are unique nationally and that maintain continuous life support for 100’s of thousands of live organisms – many raised at “food quality” standards. And yes we have eaten our research. We are also 6 miles away from the main campus, but also in the city’s heart on the inner harbor.
- SFS does not have an undergraduate program. This means that any metric tied to SCH will put SFS in a different light, often a negative one.
- Our development office is young. Our alumni are younger, and few in number, but growing quickly. We are on the verge of launching a major $20M Capital campaign. Much of our appeal in this campaign relates to our uniqueness - the fact we are young as a school, the strength of our research, and the importance of our graduate training degree programs. No other institution of higher education within Wisconsin fulfills our mission. No other institution, period, - whether academic, private sector, governmental, or NGO – can fulfill this mission.

Lumping schools and colleges based upon whether they are ‘science’ or ‘letters’ or ‘health’ appears to me to be based upon current administrative structures and is very ill-defined. Realignments should be based upon programmatic alliances. We, for example, have far more in common with economics than physics, and as much in common with public health as with chemistry. To me realignment needs to be more granular. We should be examining the University at the level of programs, individual departments or parts thereof, and individual scientists and faculty. I have already had several discussions with individuals interested in making a move who have come forward without coaxing.

As you know, locally there are a couple of major federal initiatives around water that Milwaukee is pursuing and SFS must be in a position both perceptually and in fact to assist.

We have brought UWM and SFS to a position of prominence in freshwater and Great Lakes science. We have created a highly interdisciplinary environment, located within unique, first rate research facilities, and served by an outstanding staff. We have untapped instructional capacity that can make UWM a destination not only for graduate students, but for undergraduates as well, and appeal to a national spectrum of high school students, transfer students and summer students.

Here are a few examples of where we could grow UWM in reputation and enrollment.
Earth and Freshwater Science:

- For example, and this is only an example and not one in which we have engaged in any discussions, nor have examined in any detail as to its feasibility or interest. That said then, Geosciences, unlike SFS, has an undergraduate program and approximately 100 undergraduate majors. It also has a long and excellent track record in training hydrologists, largely as the result of less than a handful individual faculty who also have a long association with the WATER Institute and the SFS. This alliance could synch SFS with Geosciences (and possibly some in other departments) with a goal of doubling or tripling the number of undergraduate majors in Geoscience and recruiting more undergraduates in general to UWM. SFS could greatly augment the water side of the undergraduate curriculum, including using UG immersion experiences. This is an example of an alliance based upon programmatic enhancement rather than some poorly defined notion of administrative consolidation.

Undergraduate Immersion

- A hallmark of UWM and SFS is our location on Lake Michigan, and this represents a major competitive advantage in the recruitment of undergraduates when that location is teamed with an early experience in freshwater studies. Not only is this an attractive concept for students, but it also will assist them in picking an undergraduate major.

- Individual courses to semester long programs could provide a novel, but comprehensive curricula that would emphasize, e.g.: Basic freshwater science, the cultural history of the Great Lakes region, the formation of environmental policy, the valuation and economics of natural resources, and applied field work. Built with UWM undergraduates in mind who have not necessarily picked an undergraduate major. Possibly modeled after semester abroad programs.

Summer Institute

- Designed to attract students from around the country to participate in intensive field and laboratory courses. Taught singly or in pairs, courses would be shorter 3-4 weeks in duration allowing students to gain course credits quickly and flexibly. We have already initiated this with our first summer program in 2016.

Freshwater, Architecture and Urban Planning

- We have had several discussions with SARUP about this collaboration. This alliance would bring two strengths of UWM together programmatically for training and education, and allow the unencumbered flow of students between the two schools. Joint programming would bring additional students to both programs at both the undergraduate and graduate level. I do not see, however, a concatenation of the administrative structure of these 2 schools. They are very different. Interdisciplinary Areas of Interest could include:

  - Hydrology in the urban environment: understanding urban catchments, high density urban watersheds, water course management and design
- Rivers, lakes and waterfronts – shoreline and lakefront development
- Green infrastructure, storm water management, water conservation
- Aesthetics and design
- The dynamics of fluids
- Etc.

❖ A UW System-wide School of Freshwater Sciences

- Wisconsin has a long and respected tradition of environmental leadership and innovation, and programs within the University of Wisconsin System reflect the state’s commitment to an environmental ethic. Under the rubric of a “Freshwater Idea”, a parallel to the “Wisconsin Idea”, SFS could explore cooperative programs across UW System campuses, to give faculty members at those campuses with relevant research interests, both access to and advising responsibilities for graduate (PSM, MS and PhD) students through SFS, and expanded research opportunities. For these faculty, SFS represents a resource that has been largely untapped in terms of its true potential. Preliminary discussions that have already taken place, e.g. at UW-Green Bay, have been met with enthusiasm right to the top of the university’s administration. This “Freshwater Idea” can serve as the vehicle for the expansion of these types of interactions, in keeping with the call for the need for such broad based initiatives by the National Science Foundation, the National Ocean Partnership Program, the National Institutes of Health, and other national and international agencies.

- There are a number of excellent graduate environmental programs within the UW System that have freshwater ties. The majority offer a terminal degree at the Masters level and address portions of freshwater spectrum within their local area of interest. These programs have faculty with freshwater interests and expertise who could become engaged in the SFS doctoral program. Scientists at within the SFS have a long-standing interaction with many of the faculty within UW System, and students have been drawn to Milwaukee to take advantage of UWM’s unique resources for freshwater research, particularly the R/V Neeskay and our location on Lake Michigan. This “Freshwater Idea” could further enhance these opportunities, providing additional course work and field training experiences for graduate students, and synergistic graduate committee advising opportunities for faculty throughout the UW System.

Comment
Mark:
Thank you for the message today about the date change for the campus budget meeting. I know there has been a great deal of activity during the past few weeks as the stakeholder groups have processed the CCOET report.

The faculty at the Zilber School of Public Health have been engaged in a number of conversations about the CCOET report and how we can contribute to moving the campus forward. As a result, I have been asked to transmit the attached statement from the Zilber faculty to provide you with
additional information to consider in your decision-making. Please let me know if I can answer any questions or provide any additional information.

Thank you for your leadership during these challenging times. (see attached letter)
Joseph J. Zilber School of Public Health Faculty Response to CCOET Final Report
March 1, 2016

The recent establishment of UWM’s R1 designation acknowledges the substantial gains of the University, Milwaukee, and southeastern Wisconsin in national stature over the past few decades. With hard fought Faculty effort, resulting in a growing international reputation and increases in both the number and breadth of PhD programs and accredited stand-alone Schools and Colleges, UWM has been elevated to R1 status under the guidelines and evaluation of the Carnegie Classification system. Now, as one of only 115 degree granting entities to attain the R1 designation, we face two seminal and difficult goals to maintain and capitalize on our newly won R1 status:

First, UWM must rapidly monetize R1 standing through increased external revenue that will fuel continued growth and excellence. These increases must be founded on improved quality and quantity of student applications to both undergraduate and graduate programs; the continuance and acceleration of the UWM Faculty’s successes in securing external research funding; and aggressive development efforts.

Second, and highly correlated to the first, UWM must not lose its R1 status.

Maintaining UWM’s R1 status is a catalytic economic event for the University and establishes an elevated research, educational and innovation foundation for southeastern Wisconsin’s future economic growth. This has been thoroughly demonstrated in every R1 University’s impact on adjacent region’s economic robustness.

The establishment of the Joseph J. Zilber School of Public Health (ZSPH) in downtown Milwaukee had a positive impact on UWM achieving R1 status. ZSPH secured 25 nationally and internationally ranked faculty, established a 5-track Master of Public Health and 3 PhD programs, experienced year-on-year growth in both grant funding and research collaborations, and is now experiencing geometric growth in both graduate program applications and admitted students. These achievements are simply the beginning of ZSPH’s projected ascent to national and international prominence. In 2016-2017, ZSPH will complete its accreditation process to become one of less than 60 internationally accredited stand-alone Schools of Public Health in the world. Such status and the subsequent qualitative and quantitative advances in student applications and enrollment; faculty recognition and external funding increases; and additional PhD, MS and certificate programs will provide substantial additional momentum to UWM’s R1 standing and constitute key milestones for UWM’s monetization of its R1 status. With recent events highlighting the prominence and importance of public health readiness and research around the globe (e.g., the spread of the Zika virus, the Flint water crisis, the epidemic of childhood obesity), the impact of ZSPH on the University, the region, and the state of Wisconsin cannot be over-stated.

The CCOET’s proposal to join ZSPH with disparate programs (e.g., the College of Health Sciences or the School of Nursing) not normally included in accredited Schools of Public Health comes at a time that would be most damaging and disruptive for ZSPH’s ongoing
growth. Such a merger will undoubtedly severely negatively impact UWM’s efforts to monetize on and secure its R1 standing.

The substantive risk to ZSPH’s otherwise ongoing successes and accreditation and therefore risk to UWM’s R1 status must then be rationally and unambiguously balanced by the primary motivating outcome of any proposed cluster or merger between ZSPH and another school or college – operational budget savings. No secondary gains are described or rationalized in the CCOET report. The report acknowledges that the suggested cost savings are not based on a professional economic analysis. The CCOET’s own deliberations do not plausibly demonstrate any operational savings resulting from clustering or otherwise merging ZSPH with another school or college. Although one might imagine that the merging or clustering of two or more units into one might result in savings, this was not demonstrated by a rational economic analysis. Indeed, the typical outcome of such a merger is a dilution of the charge and objectives of the stand-alone units resulting from an artificial union of fields with little common educational, research or collaborative overlap.

Conclusion:

National prominence, managed deficits, and academic integrity are the most important factors in determination of the positive value and negative impact of merging or clustering.

We assert based on all available evidence, analysis and deliberation that the risk of merging or clustering to national prominence, academic integrity, and long-term maintenance of UWM’s R1 status are not justified or balanced by the potential ‘paper’ budget savings.

We urge that the UWM UC, UWM Administration, and UW System leadership, join with the ZSPH Faculty to oppose diluting the impact and value of ZSPH through merging or clustering.

We affirm the importance of UWM Administration continuing to advocate in Madison for a budget that will support UWM’s R1 standing.

Sincerely,

Paul L. Auer  Michael Lalosa  Xuexia Wang
Nicole Bohme Carnegie  Jenna M. Loyd  Lance Weinhardt
Young Cho  Hongbo Ma  Alice Yan
D. Phuong Do  Lorraine Halinka Malco  Cheng Zheng
Dave Edyburn  Todd Miller
Amy E. Harley  Emmanuel Ngui
Chiang-Ching Huang  Amanda M. Simanek
Amy E. Kalkbrenner  Peter Tonellato
Linnea I. Laestadius  Ellen M. Velie
Monday February 29, 2016

Chancellor Mone,

I attached the executive board’s thoughts and concerns about the CCOET document as part of the appendices. Another member of the Student Association, [redacted] an At-Large Senator, also wanted his thoughts to be heard. Below are his thoughts.

“The SA has made a commitment to enrich the student experience. This is the guiding principle in segregated fee charges and allocations. This supplies a level of attraction to the university providing unique opportunities and experiences for students. The Student Association, as acknowledged in the document, is the governing body in charge of segregated fees and over the past two years has been working to maximize efficiencies and lower cost for students. Career centers and cultural and inclusive centers are an institutional priority and should remain so. The Student Association is committed to working with the university to increase enrollment and create efficiencies but not through cutting back on programs that support our students and UWM community in need of such resources.”

Thank you for your effort to include shared governance in your decision-making.

University Of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Mark:

Thank you for the message today about the date change for the campus budget meeting. I know there has been a great deal of activity during the past few weeks as the stakeholder groups have processed the CCOET report.

The faculty at the Zilber School of Public Health have been engaged in a number of conversations about the CCOET report and how we can contribute to moving the campus forward. As a result, I have been asked to transmit the attached statement from the Zilber faculty to provide you with additional information to consider in your decision-making. Please let me know if I can answer any questions or provide any additional information.

Thank you for your leadership during these challenging times.
MEMORANDUM

Date: February 29, 2016

To: Chancellor Mark Mone
    Provost Johannes Britz
    Vice Chancellor Robin Van Harpen

From: University Committee
       University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Re: CCOET Report Comments and Suggestions

You asked the University Committee to provide comments and suggestions to the CCOET Final Report, as well as to act as a conduit for faculty to provide their comments, suggestions, and factual corrections to the CCOET report. This memorandum responds to that request. We have appended the verbatim responses that the UC received from faculty. Note, UC Chair John Reisel refrained from providing his input on the report, as he serves as a CCOET co-chair, and had ample opportunities to provide comments and suggestions during the creation of the report.

The goal behind the creation of CCOET was well intentioned, to give faculty and everyone else input. But because the process generated substantial opposition both procedurally and substantively, the report in the end falls short of an effective roadmap for immediate decision making. There are options and proposals, but as yet, no clear way forward. We can discuss why that is as appropriate.

We do not think there is much opposition to the three areas where steps should be taken, i.e.: Position Control, Administrative Organization, and Campus Organization. We are dubious about whether the possible processes outlined to deal with these issues are well crafted, and thus will work in practice. The responses we’ve received (see the Appendix) document many of those issues, particularly the neglect of prior experience with administrative reorganization, budget control and program development. Of paramount importance is the clear articulation of UWM’s strategic priorities, so each position eliminated can be weighed against these priorities. The priorities should be broken down into categories, including access, quality of education, and research.

There needs to be a comprehensive plan of how UWM will maintain R1 status that includes retention of faculty and the graduate student body.

We suggest that many problems could be overcome with strong leadership from the Chancellor and the Provost and with better understanding of where other administrators, for example, deans, have responsibility for implementation and systematic follow through. We suspect that decisions on position control and reorganization might best be handled at this level. It is also preferable if a process can be developed by which position control decisions should initially involve faculty consultation at the department or unit level and proceed up the chain to the deans and provost
with each step of the way being fully documented, transparent and overseen by the Chancellor and the Provost.

We note that the comments from the faculty were relatively few, which may reflect the short time frame for response. Going forward, thought needs to be given as to why there was so little response, and what may need to be done to better engage faculty.
University Committee Response to the CCOET Report

APPENDIX

The University Committee received a number of responses from faculty and faculty groups regarding the CCOET report. In addition to using those as input for its own response, the UC decided to include the responses verbatim. In that way, all faculty who submitted a response to the UC can be assured that their comments were directed to the CCOET sponsors.

Below are the responses that were sent to the UC by the faculty.
Comment
Dear University Committee,

I’m writing in response to the CCOET report’s recommendation to campus leadership to consider reorganizing the Graduate School, which, as I understand it, has now been circulated to governance groups for input. As you consider your response, I hope you can take some stock of our perspective at the department level.

I’m in one of the largest graduate programs in the College with about 150 students and 70 TAs. We have five different programs, each with a separate admissions committee and curriculum, at both the MA and PhD levels. We also have a certificate program and a coordinated degree. This is a lot to manage, and we do it with a single program associate who makes about $30K a year. She is incredibly efficient and among the most reliable administrative staff I’ve encountered anywhere on campus, but she’s busy all day every day just managing the details. The CCOET recommendation presumes that there must be substantial duplication of effort between the Graduate School and the departments, but I can’t think of a single function in our department where that’s true. In fact, the Grad School and the departments have divided the labor on key tasks in ways that seem to me extremely efficient already. Let me give you a few examples:

In admissions, the Graduate School receives and evaluates all transcripts, and collects all test scores and fees, which the department never has to handle. Conversely, the department receives all letters of recommendation and writing samples, which the Graduate School never has to handle. These are both big jobs, and we’ve sorted them out with no overlap or duplication already.

For graduation, the department tracks specific program requirements, while the Graduate School oversees the more general credit requirements pertaining to the MA or PhD. Each of these jobs requires careful work and good record keeping to avoid mistakes, but it’s different work with different records. We are not in fact evaluating the same things, but dividing the labor efficiently according to our areas of expertise to cover all the graduation criteria.

For recruiting, the graduate school centralizes important efforts such as data collection, the organizing of the Open House, and various training and networking opportunities, which grad reps like me can use in department-level efforts to improve applications rates, enrollment rates, and retention rates. This is an effective division of labor: data collection and event planning on this scale are simply beyond even large departments like English.

I could say similar things about other areas: fellowships and awards, requests for exceptions, policy revisions, credit transfers, grievance procedures. All these take a great deal of work, but we already have sorted out different roles efficiently. I cannot think of a single area in which UWM could gain even a small amount of cost savings over the long term by downsizing the Graduate School.

But I can think of several ways in which downsizing will hinder or harm graduate study. Downsizing will shift new burdens to departments, and if we can’t hire more staff to shoulder those burdens morale and efficiency will suffer, and administrative staff who already are overtaxed and underpaid (like mine) will simply leave. Downsizing will limit and perhaps end centralized recruiting and retention efforts, which I regard as a signal success of Marija’s leadership so far.
Downsizing will send a signal that an R1 university prefers to invest its resources somewhere other than research. And downsizing will require a period of chaotic reorganization that simply will not yield any financial gains, and may in fact entail surprising long term costs.

I’d be happy to talk more if you have any questions. Thank you for your hard work and careful attention to these difficult matters, in these difficult times.

Comment
Dear Drs. Arora, Schwartz, Brondino, Reisel, Anderson, McLellan, and O’Connor,

Thank you for serving UWM! Your role on the UC is especially needed these days.

Recently Chancellor Mone named the UC as a body to organize a response to the recent CCOET report.

The report recommended a merger between the Zilber School of Public Health and the College of Health Sciences.

Before UWM commits to such as merger, I recommend the following for the best outcomes to preserve the financial and access/research missions of UWM -

1. **The involved schools - Zilber and CHS, be provided decision-making authority** in vetting the pros and cons of the merger. The faculty of these schools are in the best position to propose consequences of the merger and act in the interests of their schools toward financial stability.

2. **The decision on whether to merge is based in part on sound financial projections, that include short-term and long-term impacts.** Given that the merger is motivated by expected cost-savings, the magnitude of the cost-savings should be calculated based on reasonable scenarios. In addition to any short-term impacts, long-term impacts should be included. Nuances that can be informed by the faculties (Zilber and CHS) should be fully accounted for. One example is that a free-standing School of Public Health may have better ability to recruit and retain students, which has long-term financial benefits. Another example is that a School of Health Sciences and Public Health may suffer (versus a free-standing School of Public Health) in the important accreditation (by CEPH) that is instrumental in obtaining governmental grants and student applications. I am sure that the College of Health Sciences faculty can speak to other nuances that must be anticipated when considering financial gain and loss.

3. **The financial projections are weighed against any deleterious consequences on the research and access missions of UWM** and the specific missions and visions of the Zilber School and the College of Health Sciences.

Thank you for considering my recommendations.

And it is my understanding that the Zilber faculty are together organizing for a collective response to the suggested merger.

Comment
Hello, it seems that moving tasks out of departments and colleges to graduate school makes sense and allows the graduate school to better support our graduate programs.
Comment
Thanks for reminding us to send comments. I agree with what Johannes said: any structural reorganizations should be approached with great caution and with consultation. Most of the reorganizations of long-existing structures are not likely to yield much savings and are on the contrary likely to yield a lot of squabbling.

With regard to the budget model, this is off topic, but cross-listing can be encouraged by funding above 100%. The proposal was to share the SCH, but better still would be share a larger pie. This would incentivize co-operation. (e.g. rather than 75%-25%, use 75%-30%).

Comment
Reorganization of schools and colleges
The Lubar School of Business should remain a single unit. The Lubar School has both the lowest administrative cost on campus (as noted in the CCOET report), as well as exceptional comparative productivity in terms of cost per credit, average section size, student credit hours delivered per instructional faculty, and both undergraduate and graduate degrees produced per instructional faculty. Therefore, the Lubar faculty does not see how any efficiencies would be gained, nor does it recognize any logical synergies that would come from a merger with any other units (those suggested in the report or otherwise). Indeed, as the most efficient school on campus, combining our unit with another could actually reduce our efficiencies.

Equally important, we have great concern related to how a merger would diffuse our mission, complicate our accreditation, affect school culture, and impact faculty and staff morale.

Related to productivity and efficiency, we suggest that campus administration consider the following:

1. Campus should regularly conduct a cost/benefit analysis with schools and colleges to review academic programs and individual courses for possible restructuring or elimination. In this fiscal environment, these difficult and unpopular decisions are ultimately necessary business decisions.

2. Campus should encourage schools and colleges to move to non-departmentalized models, where possible, to gain maximum operational efficiencies. As noted in the report, the Lubar School has the lowest administrative cost on campus, in part due to our non-departmentalized organizational structure.

3. Decisions about any possible reorganization should consider recommendations from the Shared Services Project, which is currently examining opportunities for efficiencies in human resources, accounting & finance, purchasing and technology.

Shared services
While there may be some operational efficiencies to be gained in certain areas of shared services, the Lubar School is strongly opposed to a shared services environment that would compromise the needs of our students. Specifically, we oppose centralized career advising and centralized academic advising.
Career services: Preparing students for successful careers in business is a central element in our mission. The Lubar School is in the best position to serve the discipline-distinct internship and placement needs of our students through a staff of dedicated career advisors who have well established connections with our business faculty, employers, and alumni. In addition to providing traditional business school career services, the Lubar Career Center staff teaches major-specific sections of our Business 300: Career and Professional Development course, among other school-specific career activities and initiatives. A business school-based career office – a best practice within quality business schools -- is critical to serving our students and preparing them for business careers.

Academic advising: Especially as student success and retention are increasingly important topics on our campus, business school-based academic advising allows for “expert” advising, meaningful advisor-advisee relationships, a sense of “place” for students, and a more personal and focused advising relationship, rather than an impersonal “one stop shop” that may not address the student’s distinct needs within their major. It is extremely important to note that many of our programs offer specific state or national certification, and our advisors’ knowledge of CPA, CFA, SAP, and other certification requirements cannot be easily translated by centralized advising staff that need to have knowledge of many programs. We can advise to the unique needs and programs of our business students most effectively through a dedicated business advising staff, and move our students through to graduation most efficiently by retaining academic advising within the unit.

Comment
Dear University Committee,

I would like to contribute feedback regarding the final report of the CCOET advisory group to the Chancellor, particularly with regard to options for academic reorganization (part III). I appreciate the thoughtfulness that went into the preparation of this report. I note that CCOET members correctly identified a number of reasons for caution about top-down reorganization (p. 17), including potentially severe impacts on campus climate.

In my primary role as a faculty member in the College of Letters & Science, I am concerned about the restructuring options that would define artificial separations between the natural sciences, social sciences and humanities, while undermining academic and research excellence. As a workhorse of liberal arts education, L&S has been an anchor of interdisciplinarity on our campus. I would be alarmed to see the natural sciences subtracted from this pool of collaboration.

I have welcomed students from biology, geosciences, global studies and other fields into my classroom. My participation in interdisciplinary NSF-funded and other extramurally funded team projects working with natural and applied sciences has helped bring overhead into the university, and helped train environmental studies students in useful qualitative methods. At the same time, my collaborations with colleagues in the humanities has been tremendously productive for my research. Environmental studies requires interdisciplinary conversations that stretch across not only the natural and applied sciences, but also the humanistic sciences, arts and humanities.
A strong STEM education must not be a straitjacket. Our students will be better equipped to innovate, take on leadership roles and solve the problems of the twenty-first century if they have access to a whole range of disciplines to support development of creative and critical thinking skills. The current structure of L&S does this very well.

I strongly applaud the CCOET report’s recognition that "academic reorganization is most likely to be successful if it grows from a grassroots faculty level", and hope that many of my colleagues will recognize the importance of cross-fertilization between the natural and social sciences, as well as the humanities. If L&S undergoes major structural changes, we will need to put additional funding into interdisciplinary research centers to ensure that this continues.

My experience with administrative duties over the past year supports some insight into options put forward on graduate education at UWM. In particular, I have been impressed with the importance of checks and balances that ensure the consistent application of UW System mandates and university-wide policies determined through shared governance processes.

Because different graduate programs are variously hosted, some in departments, some in schools/colleges, there is variety in how graduate grade appeal and academic misconduct processes are handled at the lower levels. The Graduate School oversight on "step 3" student academic appeals and academic misconduct appeal hearings does a good job of guaranteeing that student complaints are fairly heard at a step removed from the programs themselves.

In the event of a decentralization of GS functions, large colleges such as L&S might absorb the "Step 3" processes without incurring potential conflicts of interest, but thought must be given to how it would be handled in smaller schools, such as the professional programs where "Step 2" is currently done at the school/college level already. Shifting this workload directly to our legal office or academic affairs could be the most natural solution, but it might also be an expensive one. Faculty oversight should be maintained, since first-hand understanding of the distinctive conditions, standards and experiences associated with graduate education and graduate mentorship is essential to interpret many sensitive cases.

Similarly, the required graduate program reviews and university governance processes benefit from the presence of dedicated leadership as well as coordination by trained staff. Shifting these responsibilities into SecU, for example, would add significant extra workload requiring further investment in that support unit. The costs associated with these functions would be moved between units, rather than reduced.

Since SecU is not set up to handle management of graduate fellowships, Chancellor’s awards, REA, etc. that are allocated centrally, not all governance and administrative processes could be easily moved there. If these were shifted back to the Office of Research, it would amount to a partial reversal of the recent reorganization that divided graduate education from research just two years ago.

On a campus with nearly 5,000 graduate students, oversight of graduate student issues is a significant task that goes well beyond the more uniform "student services" associated with undergraduate education, because graduate students are integrally involved in our multifaceted research and teaching mission.
Any reorganization plans must reflect and enhance our new "Research 1" Carnegie institution rating, because we can ill afford to throw away the advantages that this confers. The CCOET report was produced before the 2015 rankings were released, and the document does a thin job of recognizing many things we are currently doing well. It has taken us 50 years to build vibrant PhD programs and vital infrastructural support to research activities that have put us in the top tier of schools across the nation. We should be safeguarding these infrastructures and enriching a culture of academic excellence to attract strong and capable students to our campus. Anything else would undermine student experience, and our mandate as a doctoral urban research university that can adequately serve the needs of Milwaukee and southeastern Wisconsin.

Thank you for your efforts to put all of these comments together for the consideration of campus leadership.

Comment
Graduate Faculty Committee Statement Regarding CCOET and the Graduate School
Having considered the CCOET report’s comments on the possibility of downsizing and decentralizing graduate services, the Graduate Faculty Committee comes down strongly on the side of maintaining a strong and effective Graduate School. To support our view, we offer the following three comments.

First, we understand the urgency of the budget situation. If there are situations where actual and substantial duplications of effort are occurring, we support improved coordination between the Graduate School and schools, colleges, or departments. As for the Graduate School itself, recent reorganizations seem to have succeeded. From the perspective of this committee, the Graduate School is more efficient and well-coordinated than ever before.

Second, we are not aware of a precedent here or elsewhere in which decentralization resulted in cost savings. Other institutions that have pursued decentralization, such as the University of Minnesota, have seen costs increase significantly. While we understand in theory how centralization can save costs, we remain unconvinced that decentralization typically does so. We expect downsizing of the Graduate School to increase rather than decrease duplication of effort, and hence costs.

Third, given that UWM recently was designated an R1 research university, and given that our Chancellor recently affirmed the university’s research mission, we regard a strong and effective Graduate School as a key to future research innovation and growth.

We urge the University Committee, other governance bodies, and the Chancellor and Provost to support the Graduate School and to maintain its current structure, both because it already functions efficiently and effectively, and because it will provide the research leadership and infrastructure UWM needs to build for the future.

Comment
Excerpt 1
Of these possibilities I think option II is unworkable so I won’t say anything more.

Lumping SFS with Engrg and Architecture (option III.) would be counterproductive because there is no real overlap with architecture and the culture of engrg. is quite different from sciences. This would be a difficult marriage.

Option IV is getting better, but again joining with Engrg and natural sciences would be difficult. A different flavor of “School of the Environment” might be the best. I would leave SARUP out (they are a strong school in their own right) and fold together various units across campus that are actually environmentally focused. This has the capacity to grow UWM as a whole by attracting more students to our already strong water/environment focus.

Excerpt 2
This is an idea that comes up time and time again and is a disaster waiting to happen each time. If service units are forced to pay for themselves they ALWAYS die. Could any of us afford to put the full cost of our machine shop on a grant? No way. How will we maintain our research vessel and all the other facilities if every little thing needs to be back charged? To me this is EXACTLY the reason that the University charges 47% overhead on external grants.

On my last machinist-intensive project I partnered with a colleague at the U Washington in Seattle which has a self-sustaining model for their machine shops. They wanted over $100K just to do the necessary machining and that did not account for the trial and error design work that goes along with building one-off research instrumentation. The SFS machinists built essentially all of it for the cost of materials and in addition, I did not have to hire a design engineer to make CAD drawings.
February 22, 2016

RE: CCOET Report

Dear Members of the University Committee:

I write, in accordance with the Chancellor’s February 15th announcement, to provide some feedback on the CCOET report, especially regarding its proposal (s. III, pp. 18-19) to consider reorganizing the Graduate School. Most of what I have to say is stated in a letter I sent to the co-chairs of CCOET on January 16 in response to the penultimate draft of the report. The final report urges that considerations be given to costs of decentralization, consistent with some of the concerns expressed in my letter. Nevertheless, I never received any acknowledgement of receipt, nor was my letter included in the appendices attached to the report. So I’m attaching it here in the hope that someone will read and consider what it has to say.

I have a few additional remarks, now that I have read the final report.

The report seems to lack any deep or specific analysis of budgets, resulting in large ranges in possible savings (achieved at other universities). I know, for example, that no specific budget modeling was done for the Graduate School and graduate operations.

Insofar as reorganizational proposals do engage with specific details at UWM, they sometimes appear to rest on false assumptions. For example, the report advises leadership to pay attention to “functions that are duplicated at the Graduate School and the unit levels” (p. 41) – the assumption being that there is significant duplication of functions. But this is simply false as a general assumption: while it is true that some professional, non-departmentalized schools (such as Lubar School of Business and SOIS) have developed centralized graduate operations, these operations perform functions that are complementary to graduate school operations. In addition, most departmentalized units (such as PSOA and L&S) have no centralized graduate operations and no duplication of graduate operations at the departmental level. Since L&S has far more enrolled graduate students than any other unit, proposing changes based on assumptions that do not apply to L&S is odd, to say the least.

If specific UWM data were not used, one might be forgiven for worrying that what drove some of these proposals is hearsay about the Graduate School’s past negative history. Now it can hardly be denied that Graduate School operations during prolonged periods prior to 2010-2011, when Graduate School leadership was often irresponsible, left a lot to be desired and warranted a negative perception. But as part of a team that worked hard to successfully build the Graduate School back up since then, I find it depressing that we are now returning to the same old complaints.

Of course, it might be argued that the situation has entirely changed since 2011 and a new look at things is warranted. Agreed, UWM’s financial state has changed terribly. However, the same
operations are still needed for the nearly 5000 graduate students and more than 130 graduate programs. Other changes, such as our achievement of Carnegie RI status, make it imperative that we consider very carefully whether dismantling the Graduate School is not a very bad way to go about maintaining that status — especially since the benefits to be gained, if any, are highly questionable. But I stop here, since these matters are addressed in my attached letter.
January 16, 2016

Dear Bob, John, Kyle, and Paula:

I write to raise some concerns about the CCOET recommendation to eliminate the Graduate School and downsize it to a “Graduate Programs Office”. Having had 4 years of administrative experience in the Graduate School/Office of Research (including 2 periods without a UBR assistant dean when I played a significant role managing HR and budget for the unit) as well as several years of shared governance experience (including serving on both of the 2012 work groups mentioned below), I feel I have a good understanding of the history, internal workings, current state, and mission of the Graduate School – and of the impact of a proposed elimination – and I offer these comments based on that understanding. I regret that I was unable to get these comments to you by your January 14 deadline but hope you will look at them before finalizing your recommendations.

I begin with some history. Between 2009 and 2012 three working groups were tasked to review the structure of the Graduate School and submit recommendations to the Chancellor based on input from governance and administration. The 2009 report recommended that graduate education and research remain integrated. In 2012, two large working groups composed of faculty, academic staff, and administrators revisited the question of the organizational structure. The first group closely examined the pros and cons of 14 different organizational models based on a review of best practices nationwide and of data drawn from a review of 12 peer and aspirational institutions (including Carnegie and Great Cities Universities classifications) and proposed 4 models for further review by the second group. The second group closely reviewed the 4 models and recommended the current model, which was adopted by Chancellor Lovell and Provost Britz (see attachment).

Several of the 14 organizational models included varieties of decentralized Graduate Education similar to that recommended by CCOET, with an Office of Graduate Studies instead of a Graduate School. These decentralized models did not survive the winnowing process, and it is important that CCOET understands the reasons why, since they continue to be relevant, even in our current financial crisis. These reasons are:

1. **Mission**: UWM is Wisconsin’s only public urban research university, a doctoral research university that provides access to undergraduate and graduate students with diverse backgrounds. The Graduate School is not merely a functional organization but also a symbol of the university’s doctoral research mission. CCOET should consider whether its elimination will signal to all constituencies that UWM is forsaking one of its two core missions.

Moreover, there has already been considerable downsizing from a combined Graduate School-Office of Research organization under a single Vice Chancellor for Research/Dean of Graduate School in 2011 to the current model with a Vice Provost for Research and a Dean of the Graduate School. Further downsizing is likely to send a negative message both to the external
academic world (including prospective graduate students) and to the faculty, staff, and students at UWM about the relative importance we place on Graduate Education and Research.

Faculty members of the 2012 working groups were very concerned about mission. They found that the graduate education mission is foundational to our research mission and requires both dedicated advocacy for graduate education and close collaboration with shared governance. Attempts to increase GA stipends to competitive rates over the past 5 years show how crucial such advocacy is: while progress on this goal has been slow given budget constraints, the modest progress there has been is almost entirely due to the advocacy of the Dean of the Graduate School and the Vice Provost for Research and to the commitment of their own funds to increase stipends for those groups of graduate students (GS fellows and research assistants) over which they have control. Without that kind of advocacy and leadership, I believe, the Graduate Education and Research components of our mission will be seriously jeopardized.

2. Functionality and Logistics: The working groups in 2012 carefully considered the impact of decentralizing Graduate Education in the context of UWM. That kind of model has worked best at institutions with a long and stable track record of established graduate programs. At UWM, by contrast, our graduate programs have very different ages, requiring very different levels of centralized engagement, and demographics and current trends indicate that it is imperative that we grow graduate education in strategic areas. For expository purposes, it is useful to distinguish two groups of functions executed in the Graduate School: graduate program functions dealing with the initiation, implementation, and development of new programs and with the maintenance and periodic review of programs; and graduate student functions dealing with recruitment, applications and admission, fellowships and appeals, and graduation of students. Graduate program functions are governed by UWS and Graduate Faculty (via the GFC) policies and procedures; graduate student functions are governed by Graduate Faculty uniform minimal requirements. The policies and procedures are intended to ensure (via faculty review processes) the overall academic integrity of graduate education. It is easy to underestimate the complexity of those policies and procedures and the foreseeable difficulties that are likely to attend transitioning away from the current common systems that are in place. Any kind of model that eliminates the Graduate School will have to implement a delicate balance between functions and expertise centralized in a Graduate Studies Office and functions and expertise distributed across other units. If CCOET proposes to eliminate the Graduate School, it should include guidelines that take into account these facts and complexities.

3. Budget and Savings: The Graduate School budget, especially the salaries budget, as it appears in standard UWM institutional documents, can be very misleading. Salaries and fringes of ~$4.6M include, for example, fellowship stipends/fringes, research excellence award stipends/fringes, and RA supplements for the transitional implementation period of new RA rates. When those student stipends/fringes are removed, the remaining staff salaries are relatively modest – at ~$1.4M for 22.5 FTE.
Suppose the Graduate School is eliminated, with its marketing, recruitment, admission, retention, advising, and graduation functions distributed to other units, and its remaining functions (program review, new program initiation and implementation, coordination with Office of Research, governance work, development, strategic initiatives, etc.) centralized in a Graduate Studies Office. It is still likely that, in order to have the appropriate levels of advocacy and centralized coordination, a Graduate Studies Office will need to be led by a faculty administrator (a Vice Provost for Graduate Studies, e.g.). It is also likely that, to manage distributed functions in a common system, existing staff will need to be substantially retrained and/or reassigned.

Most of the staff will be needed to maintain functionality – either distributed to other units or kept in the new Graduate Studies Office. While many professional schools already have some centralized graduate education and research operations in their deans’ offices, these would need to be enlarged if the Graduate School is downsized. The College of Letters and Science and the Peck School of the Arts would need to build centralized college-level graduate administration operations from the ground up at a substantial additional cost. The resulting savings (primarily in the Dean’s office that would transform into a Vice Provost office) could be quite small (one estimate I ran had it in the order of $75k), especially given the inevitable disruption to functions that would, at least temporarily, result. Moreover it should be noted that the current Graduate School and Office of Research split 50-50 UBR and IT services, in a sharing services model that seems to be working very well since 2013. Since merging and sharing appear to be key concepts guiding CCOET’s recommendations, it is ironic that the proposal to eliminate the Graduate School will also undermine a working shared services arrangement. I urge CCOET to look carefully at these budgetary considerations.

In addition to the above, I have a few other concerns:

4. **UWS Constraints**: Many institutions (e.g. Minnesota) have gone back and forth from centralized models to decentralized ones and back to centralized models. If UWS rules create serious obstacles to our ability to later reverse the elimination of a School, we need to be very careful and to be very confident that a decentralized model is what we truly want.

5. **Timeline**: If UWM moves to a decentralized, distributed Graduate Education model, the transition will need to be phased to minimize disruption. CCOET should attempt to provide guidelines for timing those phases.

6. **Office of Graduate Studies**: I recommend replacing all occurrences of “Office of Graduate Programs” and similar language in the CCOET document to the more standard “Office of Graduate Studies”.

I hope you will consider these concerns before finalizing your recommendations.
February 18, 2016

Dear University Committee:

We were extremely disappointed and alarmed by the inclusion in the Chancellor’s Campus Organization and Effectiveness Team report of a proposal to consolidate the College of Health Sciences and the Joseph J. Zilber School of Public Health. We are writing as the first two faculty hired at the level of assistant professor who have successfully made it through the promotion and tenure process. As such, we have tremendous knowledge of the history of the school’s development and the University’s goals for our school. Furthermore, we are two leaders in the school who have worked tirelessly to position the Joseph J. Zilber School of Public Health for its national accreditation, acting as the Masters of Public Health Program Director (Harley) and Graduate Program Committee Chair (Laiosa).

The bottom line is we believe such a consolidation at this time would be catastrophic for the goal of developing a nationally accredited School of Public Health at UW-Milwaukee. While placing a College of Health Sciences together with a School of Public Health is not conceptually incompatible, the process of doing so must be done thoughtfully and strategically in order to combine both missions and maintain the integrity of any relevant accreditation requirements in both schools.

Of critical importance, the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH), which is the accrediting body of Public Health training programs, is explicit in their
requirements that accredited Schools of Public Health must be independent and autonomous academic units. As such, we view a merging of the Zilber School and the College of Health Sciences (CHS) as jeopardizing this accreditation requirement for the School of Public Health. We are required in our accreditation documentation to provide evidence of our "autonomy and authority" in a number of areas. For your convenience, at the end of this letter we have appended guidance from CEPH as background on how our accrediting body defines autonomy.

As to the question of why accreditation is so vital for the health and long-term sustainability of the Zilber School, it should be noted that without accreditation, our school would not be able to attract enough students over time to survive in the local/regional market. Moreover, access to important resources reserved only for accredited schools and programs would be lost. As an example, we recently gained access to a national application system that has tripled the number of student applications we received (many of which are out of state) and we would lose this applicant pool if our accreditation was placed in jeopardy.

To be credible to potential new faculty, administrators, and students and to be recognized nationally, we must be accredited. This designation is important to Milwaukee and the state of Wisconsin as we are one of just a few states without an accredited School of Public Health. Currently there are 54 accredited Schools of Public Health in the country, 11 of which were accredited since 2010. The fact that about 20% have been accredited in the last six years attests to the growing value of high quality education in public health for the communities served by these schools.

Beyond the critical importance of accreditation, we note that the Zilber School owes a significant part of its existence to a very generous gift of an $11.5 million dollar facility in the heart of Milwaukee. We believe the proposed consolidation could have a chilling effect on future donations to UWM of this magnitude. It is noteworthy that in addition to supporting our classes, staff, and faculty research space, our donated building also hosts a number of public health related community groups from the City of Milwaukee for meetings, conferences, and networking events.

As two leaders in the school, we fully acknowledge that our development has not been at the pace originally hoped for. We are aware that our growth has appeared messy to some on the outside. However, it is a fact that we have experienced significant student growth and that growth is being fed primarily from students who earned their undergraduate degrees outside of UWM. While we are eager to open our doors for UWM alumni wishing to pursue a graduate degree, we
believe our student demographics demonstrate the potential for the Joseph J. Zilber School of Public Health to grow the overall student base at UWM. Becoming a nationally accredited program is the only way to sustain our growth and we are very close to achieving that.

We advise the University Committee, the Provost, and the Chancellor to not follow the recommendation to merge the College of Health Sciences and Joseph J. Zilber School of Public Health, at least until the issues raised above are more fully vetted and until it becomes clear that potential cost savings would be substantial without risking accreditation, future growth and sustainability.

Thank you for your consideration,

Appendix I: Background accreditation information from the Council on Education for Public Health on requirement for Autonomy and Authority.

"The school shall be an integral part of an accredited institution of higher education and shall have the same level of independence and status accorded to professional schools in that institution. Interpretation. An accredited institution of higher education is one that is accredited by a regional accrediting agency recognized by the US Department of Education. Independence refers to the ability of the school to maintain the integrity of its programs through autonomous and well-informed decision making regarding matters such as budgeting and resource allocation; personnel recruitment, selection and advancement; and establishment of academic standards and policies. Status refers to the stature within the institution and the position it holds within the institution because of the organizational arrangement. For purposes of accreditation, CEPH views the terms school and college as synonymous if they both refer to the highest level of organizational status and independence available within the university context. Independence and status are always viewed within the context of the institutional policies, procedures and practices, but in general the school of public health should have the same degree of independence accorded to other professional schools." (Available at: http://ceph.org/assets/SPH-Criteria-2011.pdf; section 1.3, pg5)
Appendix II: Considerations for accreditation in merged Schools of Public Health and related academic units:

With respect to the CCOET Report, it should be noted that the vast majority of accredited schools are independent Schools of Public Health (SPH). However, there are 5 Schools of Public Health that are School/College of Public Health plus another professional domain. In each of these five cases, the academic unit is called the "School/College of Public Health and [the other domain]." In two cases Public Health is combined with Health Professions (SUNY-Buffalo and University of Florida). At Oregon State, it is Human Sciences, while at University of Massachusetts - Amherst it is Health Sciences. Finally, Florida International is the Robert Stempel College of Public Health and Social Work. A sixth school, St. Louis University College for Public Health and Social Justice, was created through the combination of Schools of Public Health and Social Work.

As noted, in all of these cases the unit is the "School of Public Health and X." This distinction is important and would indicate that for Zilber to merge with the College of Health Sciences, and to be considered for accreditation, the School of Public Health would need to be listed first and take the lead on the administrative structure for the overall enterprise.
Notes on CCOET Final Report -- N. Fleisher, 2/18/16

* Background: Role/scope of CCOET

From a governance perspective, CCOET is an extension of the Chancellor. Though the committee includes members from various campus governance groups, its membership was selected by the Chancellor and it reports to a set of administrative sponsors. While the inclusiveness and transparency of CCOET are to be commended, the recommendations that emerge in the final report must be understood as administrative recommendations, not recommendations that are the product of a shared governance process. In particular, any recommendations affecting academic matters must be subject to the faculty’s primary responsibility in this area.

* Faculty role in assessing CCOET’s recommendations

The faculty have primary responsibility for academic matters; we should take this as a guiding principle in assessing CCOET’s recommendations. CCOET’s charge is to find long-term savings for the campus. Its recommendations towards that end sometimes involve administrative changes, sometimes academic changes, and sometimes both. We can establish a typology of proposals and what the appropriate faculty role is in each:

1. Administrative change, no academic change. Proposals that involve purely administrative changes and efficiencies could be implemented without significant faculty involvement. The faculty should be consulted, especially to ensure that no unforeseen ill effects on students have been overlooked, but beyond that the faculty role is minimal.

   Examples: Administrative Organization and Balance proposals (sec. II).

2. Administrative change and academic change. Proposals in which an administrative change is tied to an academic change should be carefully vetted by the faculty. This includes proposals that affect program size and staffing, with carryover effects on campus mission and students’ education (e.g., position control).

   Examples: Campus Academic Reorganization proposals (sec. III), position control (sec. I).

3. Academic change, no administrative change. Proposals that consist purely or primarily of academic program changes must be vetted and approved by the faculty, which has primary responsibility for academic matters. Such proposals are largely absent from the CCOET report, due to CCOET’s self-imposed limitation against proposing program changes outside of larger reorganizational proposals.

   Example: Moving Natural Sciences departments from L&S to CEAS (p. 19, option IX).

* Additional principles for assessing CCOET recommendations:

There should be demonstrable, well-documented savings calculations attached to any proposal that moves forward. In particular, there should be no zero-sum reorganizational moves.

Proposals should be assessed with an eye toward permanent/ongoing savings (so, e.g., “symbolic” administrative salary savings are preferable to sale of assets).

What emerges from the process should be guided by a vision of what must be saved in order to maintain our campus mission and identity. The CCOET report stresses the importance of keeping a vision for the campus in mind, but the report does not expressly advocate such a vision itself.
February 29, 2016

University Committee
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
P.O. Box 340
Milwaukee, WI 53201-0340

Dear University Committee,

The Exercise Science & Health Promotion unit within the Department of Kinesiology has examined the CCOETT report and would like to provide feedback specifically on the variety of reorganization options that are listed, as they pertain to our unit. We have been engaged in discussions for the past few months regarding what is an optimal alignment of our unit within the university structure, and we welcome the opportunity to engage in these discussions with campus.

Our unit, which represents the BS/MS/PhD Kinesiology and BS Nutritional Sciences degrees, are academic disciplinary degrees. We have large primarily pre-professional undergraduate programs and research-focused graduate programs, similar to departments in Letters & Sciences. In addition, our research profile and some academic programs have commonalities with the Zilber School of Public Health that could benefit from such an alignment. There are very successful models of Kinesiology across the country existing both within colleges of Letters & Sciences and Schools of Public Health. Without knowing the details of any potential realignments, we cannot comment on our preferred alignment at this time. However, we welcome the opportunity to have such discussions.

There is one suggested alignment in the COETT report that we argue strongly against. While it is true that the current Department of Kinesiology derived about 30 years ago from physical education in the School of Education, the current department bears no resemblance to the department at that time. We do not have any academic or research programs that have obvious alignments with the School of Education, and we believe that such a move would be detrimental to our mission.

While we cannot speak for our colleagues across the college, we would like to note that the optimal alignment in the future may be different for each department and that it should not be assumed that CHS would join in its entirety with another unit. It may be better to address the unique operating needs of each unit/department.
Dear John,

My apologies for being later than you would have preferred with this. I've finally had a chance to read through the CCOET report, and here are a few comments:

1. The potential benefits of position control are clearly defined. As stated in the "Implementation" section, there will be a need for "clear guidelines for position control and exceptions...". Prior to development of these guidelines, there will be a need to develop a strategy that clearly defines the academic areas in which UWM intends to develop strengths and priorities with regard to undergraduate education, graduate education, and research. The current UWM Mission Statement provides some very general guidelines, but more specific guidelines will be required when deciding how a vacant position is allocated (or not).

2. With regard to administrative reorganization, greater consolidation of administrative programs related to student success seems logical. Likewise, greater efficiencies (reduced bloat) in senior level administration is also justified. Prior to Chancellor Mone taking on his leadership role, the university pursued an aggressive growth agenda that resulted in growth in the number of administrative staff. The timing was poor, as this has clashed with the reduction (albeit, unforeseen) in state support.

3. With regard to academic reorganization, I believe the best approach, at least for the near future, is the formation of clusters that will allow units to retain their identities while facilitating collaboration in education and research and eliminating teaching and administrative redundancies. It would be unwise to lose the identities and reputations of some units that are relatively small, but which have broad public recognition and support (e.g., ZSPH and SFS). Along these lines, I strongly agree with the need to develop a new model for allocating students credit hours and tuition. The structure of the current model actually inhibits inter-unit collaboration, promotes duplication, and restricts student access to courses.

4. To the list of "Suggestions for further study", I'd like to add the suggestion (as a revenue generating initiative) that we consider including a larger fraction of graduate student tuition costs in our research grant budgets.

5. I noted that there was a suggestion that there could be immediate savings if the Research Growth Initiative Program was cancelled for 1 to 2 years. I don't follow the logic here. If the purpose of the program is to improve UWM's ability to bring in external funding, then stopping the program for 1-2 years will have a negative impact, if not immediately, then 2-4 years into the future. I agree that there is a need for regular review of this program and of the individual awards it provides, but my personal experience is that it has definitely enhanced my ability to compete successfully for external funds.
CCOET Committee Report Comment and Strategy for Address our Budget Deficit

The Introduction of the Report describes the process that the Committee used to arrive at its recommendations. Nowhere is it indicated that a strategic vision guided the process or was used to evaluate suggested budget cuts. No reference is made to the UWM draft Strategic Plan and its focus on top-tier research university, successful students, and community impact.

In Administration Organization and Balance, the statement is made that metrics should be developed to measure UWM’s progress towards its mission of... “student success; development of an educated workforce and engaged citizenry; growth in research and development enterprise; UWM’s contribution to enhanced social well-being; and telling/selling the UWM story.” While vaguely related to UWM’s Vision Statement and Strategic Plan, which focused on top-tier research university, successful students, and community impact, this reader did not see either specificity or recognition of UWM as a research university in the discussion. Without that type of overarching guidance, it is not possible for CCOET to assess outcomes of proposed budget cutting tactics by outcomes other than that they may contribute to bringing our budget into balance.

In this unfortunate situation, I return to the Distinguished Professors’ statement of principle directed to the CCOET committee and the upper administration, which was supported by the Faculty Senate and numerous academic units, as a starting point for concretely testing the reasonability of any particular budget cutting tactic (see below). The statement not only makes the case that the academic program of UWM should not be cut (and this is even more obvious now that we have attained R1 status), it also implies that it is only through supporting the R1 version of UWM that we can hope to address our budgetary mess.

At best, the CCOET document offers a large variety of possible cuts that might be taken. It does not point out except in understatement that cuts, for example to academic programs of the magnitude needed to bring the budget into balance will likely kill graduate research programs at UWM and, thereby, toss us back into a quasi-comprehensive university. Without revenue generation to off-set the cuts, R1 will be dead before we have even celebrated its arrival. Therefore, I suggest the following:

Elements of a strategy to survive the 2015-17 budget cuts,

- Bridge to 2017-19 when System President Ray Cross has stated to the Distinguished Professors that UWM will receive an increase in its GPR budget. The increase needs to be significant.
- The bridge would include using UWM’s remaining ca. $60,000,000 reserves to handle the current shortfall in support and making non-academic cuts where possible.
- During the bridge, UWM would undertake a remake of its image to students, external stakeholders, and legislators/Governor so that it accurately portrays UWM as a highly attractive destination campus for academically strong and motivated undergraduate and graduate students. In turn, that would be connected to a highest intensity all campus initiative to build our undergraduate student body by at least 1,000 students. The R1 status and the debacle in Illinois public higher education should facilitate this project.
- In 2017-19, with more GPR and more students and tuition, we should be able to move forward once again.
Statement of the UWM Distinguished Professors to the CCOET, Chancellor Mone, and UWS about Research and the Budget Cuts

We Distinguished Professors come to you as members of a remarkably strong faculty that has taken root at UWM despite the historical lack of state support. As a group, we are officially charged with actively promoting and encouraging the research and creative activities of all UW Milwaukee faculty, which is what provides students at all levels with cutting-edge course work, and also charged with promoting undergraduate and graduate student recruitment. Budget cuts coupled with tuition freezes over the last several years have already made both research and recruitment difficult. UWM lags far behind its peers in support for research, faculty and staff salaries, and stipends for graduate students, which means that it loses faculty, staff, and students to universities in other states where support for public education remains stronger. Thus many of the best and brightest, who could help Wisconsin prosper in the knowledge economy of the present and future, either leave or never come to Wisconsin in the first place. The latest round of budget cuts makes this situation even worse, and they hit UWM just as it is trying to build research infrastructure in many areas of immediate concern to the state and its citizens.

UWM serves as a key intellectual and creative force for our state and community, providing an irreplaceable resource for the social, economic, environmental, and cultural prosperity of Milwaukee and the surrounding area. Its faculty, students, staff, and alumni address and solve problems and issues with local to global dimensions, and we graduate more Wisconsin residents than any other campus in the state. The Distinguished Professors Committee of UWM has thus endorsed unanimously the following statement of principles and recommendations to guide the budget allocation process of 2016 and beyond, and allow UWM to retain its key role.

Principles

In this time of severe budget compression, it is paramount that the preservation, sustenance, and elevation of UWM’s academic core be the central goal of the budget and related strategic planning. Only through a vibrant academic program can the campus Strategic Vision be fulfilled: “We will be a top-tier research university that is the best place to learn and work for students, faculty and staff, and that is a leading driver for sustainable prosperity.” As faculty at UWM who have spent our careers advancing knowledge, and who have brought millions of dollars in grants and contracts into the state to support the university and its students, we know that research and creative activity is what drives the whole academic enterprise, as seen in the figure below:

Although they are more difficult to quantify than student tuition dollars, research and creative activity provide the dynamic foundation and structure for excellent student learning experiences at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and are thus the ultimate source of those tuition dollars. Working with their teachers and mentors at the frontiers of knowledge, UWM students become well prepared for the 21st century knowledge-based society. Moreover, research infuses community engagement with expertise, allowing a broad range of community and business concerns to be addressed through powerful partnerships. Local, regional, institutional and private support grow as residents, organizations, and businesses understand that UWM is a powerful research university critical for their future that educates students for excellence.

The only way to continue these benefits is to retain and strengthen the superb faculty and staff who make research and creative activity and the education of students possible. This will also provide the only way to meet the Strategic Initiatives in the draft Strategic Plan, including: the development of a top-tier research environment that promotes growing research impact; the creation of a “Milwaukee Experience” to make UWM a destination campus that engages students and supports their development; the improvement of pathways for partnerships/collaborations with the local community and businesses; the
delivery of relevant, innovative, engaging and distinctive academic programs; strengthening and expanding UWM's support within the region and across the state.

**Recommendations**

1. We urge the CCOET to develop its budget recommendations, and Chancellor Mone and UW-System to make decisions about the budget, based on the understanding that UWM is a research university and that all we do as an academic institution flows from that identity and its expression in the sciences, humanities, arts, and professions. Concretely, this means sparing the academic core of the university from budget cuts in order to preserve UWM's future, as cuts in the core would lead to an impoverished research base from which to pursue innovation and progress. Thus, all cuts must come from units that do not directly handle the core academic teaching and research mission, or through administrative reorganization that will shrink the budget, and may, in fact, enhance possibilities for research by allowing faculty and graduate students to work across what are now artificial boundaries rather than be stymied by them.

2. We urge the CCOET, Chancellor Mone, and UWS to strengthen UWM as a research university by raising the stipends of graduate teaching assistants to the national averages of their respective fields so that we can attract uniformly high quality graduate students in sufficient numbers to sustain and grow UWM as a research university. This is our first priority for budget enhancements.

**Competitive stipends will solve several problems:**

- They would provide the quality and numbers of graduate students needed to restore and then develop our graduate programs. Right now we are in a death spiral because programs cannot compete for such students, and we have a much-reduced ability to recruit bright minds to bolster Wisconsin's economy and pursue innovation and progress.
- High quality graduate students will encourage top-flight faculty to stay and commit to UWM, as well as to consider coming to UWM in the first place.
- An improvement in graduate student quality will lead to increased extramural funding and academic recognition for UWM.
Comment
Hello University Committee:

I read the CCOET report in full when it was first released and declined to send reaction because the report is so undigested and inconclusive that there was nothing to react to in a constructive or positive way.

It seems to be a collation of ideas that were discussed, with a superficial breakdown of the "plusses" and "minuses" attached to the various ideas. Nowhere was there a breakdown of realistic savings or advantages for the ideas in a comparison table or chart or graph. Everything was hypothetical and detached from actual people or actual results. The data was suspect (in the sense that some departments had to get the committee to make corrections to the data because it had been done incorrectly).

I don't have faith that the numbers are correct or that the CCOET has done much beyond collating various penny-pinching ideas that can be used as cover by the administration when actual policy is made and implemented ("See, it is in the CCOET recommendations, and everyone was invited to participate!!"). However, it fails to provide any view of strategic planning that would help the institution shape its future.

When primary savings are made by simply not filling positions of the faculty and staff who retire, move to a better job, or are fired, you don't end up with a strong, resilient institution. You end up with whatever is left after the blood letting.

Comment
Dear UC members,

I am writing in response to the CCOET report and the recommendations put forward by the committee. My work is interdisciplinary by design and personal propensity. I am also engaged in the American Indian Studies program, the Honor's College, the Master's of Liberal Studies, and the Center for International Education. My research and publications records have benefited from a CIE Fellowship, two C21 Fellowships, and another C21 transdisciplinary Fellowship. All of this is to say that my trans/interdisciplinary engagements were a direct result of the many creative and innovative thinkers on this campus that do not conform to the general representation of a silo constrained university (page 16). The CCOET report relies too heavily on the
misrepresentation of a few. I have witnessed how the disciplinary and research center structures have enhanced broad and collaborative scholarship at this university. I firmly believe that the proposed fracturing of L&S will not reap the financial benefits that CCOET suggests will materialize with reorganization for two main reasons. 1. The realignment will take time and money while creating greater uncertainty and antagonism. 2. The presumed benefits are based on numbers that reflect indeterminate projections rather than actual projections from verifiable sources. The proposal for promises of incentives (page 18) for faculty and staff venturing into the restructured [clusters and realignments [pages19-21]] university may benefit them. But those rewards pose the risk of being interpreted as punitive measures against faculty and staff who continue to see value in the current structure. CCOET has noted many of the potential liabilities for restructuring (page 17) but their focus on “revenue” (page 16) does not take into consideration the symbolic capital that a liberal education brings to our students as well as the benefits to the reputation of our research university. CCOET emphasizes the “values” of the university as paramount to any decision going forward. I do worry when one of those values is “revenue”. It becomes more troubling when that “value” is calculated on a student hour basis (page 18) as though all courses, all students, all classes can be assessed equitably with this model.

I am also deeply concerned about the proposed restructuring of the Graduate School (page 18). As an R1 institution we need the Graduate School to continue their hard work of making all graduate programs address a standard of professionalism and quality research training while promoting a university-wide program of excellence in discovery and innovation. It may seem to be more efficient to dissolve the Graduate School in favor of silo solutions (page 19) but such a strategy cannot foresee the extra work involved in coordinating across disciplinary requirements and maintaining standards of excellence across the university. The current structure assures all of us at the university that all graduate programs follow a unified vision of graduate training, research, and professionalism.

I have one other major concern. I am dissatisfied about the approach CCOET has taken toward diversity. I was somewhat encouraged by the sentiment that the minority cultural advising centers will remain as separate entities (page 30). I agree with the CCOET report that those advising centers affirm the importance under-represented minorities place in finding comfort in a familiar and welcoming environment. However, I do worry that the rhetoric of targeting under-represented minorities for admission to the university may stray from a worthy exercise in “inclusion and access” and drift toward a “cash cow” strategic enrollment revenue machine (pages 33-36). I would also like to see a more concerted effort to attract diverse faculty. Perhaps the Global Inclusion and Engagement office can have (or affirm) a primary goal of cultivating, maintaining, and enhancing diversity (page 31). If so, we may find that “target of opportunity” strategies are beneficial to students, faculty, staff, and the university. I fear the suggestion to break up GIE in favor of silo solutions to promote diversity is doomed to fail. I believe a university-wide mandate to promote diversity is necessary for success.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the CCOET report.

Comment
The idea to keep 10 schools and 4 clusters. The logic of why the clusters are constituted the way they are for combined services was not explained. I do not believe it was intentional to suggest there is no logic to the specific clustering.

Reviewing the centers makes sense. Clear guidelines should be in place to indicate the merits for
change.

Do not mess with the Credit Plateau - We can not stick it to students any more. They are financially under strain, and we make our offering even worse, given the neighboring states sweetening their deals.

Global Inclusion and Engagement - The chancellor's cabinet can be reduced. This is a valuable suggestion that will save money without significant impact on the core mission on the university (as expressed int he doc.)

Comment
Dear University Committee,

Regarding the CCOET report, I would like to offer the following feedback, which is based on a single principle: we must consider sacrosanct everything that pertains to our ranking as an R-1 university. A higher ranking is good for both student enrollment as well as faculty recruitment and retention. With this principle in mind, I find the following areas discussed in the report as worthy of serious consideration:

1. Continuing Education: While Continuing Education is important, we cannot afford it in times of drastic budget cuts. Its removal will have no effect on our ranking and status. Either we shut down the program or we raise the fees to a level where it becomes self sustaining.

2. Credit Plateau: By increasing the undergraduate credit plateau to 13 credits, it is estimated we can generate additional $8 million to $9 million annually in tuition revenue.

3. Phone lines: As a campus we can switch to a VOIP system (I suggested this many years ago on ITPC but we weren't granted the flexibility at the time by the state).

4. Close Campus over Winter Break: we can take this path as long as it doesn’t mean furloughs for everyone and the savings are realized from heating/electricity alone. Telecommuting can be added as an option during this period. This won’t affect our research standing adversely. The research units that request to remain open may be allowed to do so.

5. I would avoid a major restructuring of the university at this point because its effect on our research status is uncertain. Also, too many changes at once may result in unforeseen problems. If a reorganization is actively being considered, it must pertain to administrative consolidation with clear savings, not splitting existing units at this stage.

6. I would also advise against suggestions for removing/reducing course buyouts for faculty because it directly links with our research status. In the past I have myself benefited from campus fellowships that helped me complete research and writing projects, resulting in well-cited papers and books.

7. Centers and institutes enhance our research profile and visibility in the academy. Unless a center has been inactive in the past, we must be extremely cautious in making changes there.
8. International Student Enrollment: UWM may not be as competitive as Madison in getting out-of-state students but outside the country it’s the American brand that sells well. With Microsoft CEO as our alum, we can run TV ads in targeted countries. For example, I’ve noticed during my field research in India that many private universities run continuous ads during the enrollment season, and TV ads are much cheaper in places like India and Brazil.

9. Athletics may be asked to become completely self-sustaining. Changes here won’t affect our R-1 status.

Comment

Dear Members of the University Committee,

As the campus considers the possibility of cutting or otherwise altering the place of centers on our campus, I write to advocate for continuing UWM’s commitment to sustaining the Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies.

The Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies is a United States Department of Education National Resource Center, the only such center on the UWM campus. In 2015, CLACS celebrated its 50th century of continuous funding from the U.S. Department of Education through Federal Title VI funding. This Title VI funding puts UWM in an elite group of 22 research universities that possess a federally supported National Research Center with a focus on Latin America.

CLACS is unusual in that it serves students and faculty from 5 different professional schools and 19 different departments, from the humanities and social sciences to the natural sciences and the business school. CLACS engages undergraduate students through its Certificate in Latin American and Caribbean Studies and B.A. in Latin American, Caribbean, and U.S. Latin@ Studies (LACUSL). A B.A./M.A. (3-2) degree program in Latin American and U.S. Latin@ Studies & Translation is projected to start enrolling students in Fall 2016.

CLACS annually distributes tens of thousands of dollars in fellowships, scholarships, and grants to UWM undergraduate and graduate students. Without CLACS, UWM students would not be able to qualify for Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) Fellowships in Brazilian Portuguese and Quechua, which are funded by the U.S. Department of Education to support the study of lesser-taught languages. (Students at UWM and UW-Madison are the only students in the UW System who qualify for FLAS Fellowships.)

In terms of public outreach, CLACS provides a vital link between our campus and the growing Latin@ communities of Milwaukee and greater Wisconsin. Annually, CLACS organizes more than thirty-five educational and public programs ranging from events geared toward K-16 teachers to UWM’s Annual Latin American Film Series, which will mark its 38th anniversary this April.

Support for the teaching and research mission of faculty takes many forms including course development grants, faculty research/travel grants, and study abroad programs. The existence of CLACS at UWM was one of the principal reasons why I accepted a position as an assistant professor of history and global studies at UWM in 2001. The support I received for my research through CLACS was essential for the completion of my monograph and subsequent tenure as an
associate professor. Participation in community outreach and K-16 outreach/teacher training has been central to my mission as an educator and scholar at UWM, and a source of much joy as well. As a CLACS faculty member, I have presented to MPS students, teachers from across the state, and hundreds of attendees at Milwaukee’s "Mexican Fiesta" on topics ranging from the history of chocolate and pictographic writing to the contemporary politics of migration. I simply cannot imagine a future at UWM as a scholar and teacher concerned with Latin America without the support of CLACS and its staff members, who are legendary for their professionalism and leading figures in the world of Latin American and Caribbean Studies on both a national and international level.

If UWM is to remain a thriving university in the early 21st century, we cannot afford to turn our backs on our state’s and our nation’s growing Latin@ population. The beautiful public celebration of CLACS’s 50th anniversary in December 2015, which was hosted in the Zelazo Center, was a powerful reminder of the deep connections that CLACS has forged between UWM and the city’s diverse communities of people of Latin American and Caribbean descent and more broadly among students, scholars, and community members who care deeply about the future of the Americas.

CLACS is a unique resource for UWM—a tradition of which we can be justly proud, and a source of crucial support for students, teachers, and researchers that we cannot afford to squander at a time when our connections to the wider Americas are becoming ever more vital for our success as a university, city, state, and nation.

Comment
Hi UC Faculty Representatives,

Some input I would like to make about the CCOET report:

I do not think the number of colleges should be considered as important a concern as the ratio of administrative roles per employees. When I first began work at UWM (more than 2 decades ago), business-financial management and HR administrative processes for the employees were shared across several colleges (e.g., for the 3 colleges located in Enderis Hall). So it wouldn't necessarily require a reduction in the number of colleges, to make a decision to merge administrative services across the colleges. ** But ** these colleges have grown considerably in employees over the years. So it would appear especially appropriate to consider what type/extent of administrative work is associated with the management/administration needed for the employees, and figure out what the optimum ratio of administrators-to-employees would be in order to accomplish the necessary work to manage their business/HR processes. Do we have knowledge about what faculty-to-administrator ratios could be most efficient and effective?

On a similar note, what metrics are being examined to consider what faculty-to-student ratios are sustainable? Certain professional schools and graduate education of course will need to operate with higher ratios, but how are such metrics being considered in the decisions about positions and faculty/staff hires? The particulars of educational objectives / learning outcomes to be attained certainly impact across-program differences in what faculty-to-student ratios are appropriate, but also it would seem there must be information out there about what faculty-to-student ratios are typically sustainable for business practices in higher education?
IV. Advanced Departmental Restructuring

This arrangement is similar to arrangement III, but with more individual department relocation or reformation in the process. • School of Health Combines ZSPH, CON, and elements of the CHS • College of Education and Human Development Combines SOE (reducing from 5 to 3 departments), adds Kinesiology, Communication Science and Disorders, Health Informatics and Administration, and Bioinformatics program from CEAS • College of Science, Technology, Engineering, & Math (STEM) Combines, CEAS, SFS, and L&S Natural Sciences • College of Urban Public Policy Combines HBSSW, and Departments of Public and Non-Profit Administration and Educational Policy and Community Studies • College of Liberal and Fine Arts Combine PSA, L&S Humanities and Social Sciences Department • College of Business Combines School of Business and SOIS • School of the Environment Combines SARUP with environmental studies programs from across campus

In response to the highlighted part of the report,

The faculty of Ed Pol and Community Studies have not had a chance to have detailed discussions around this issue of a move out of SOE. There appear to be two views, currently.

While some faculty feel strongly that moving the Ed. Pol department out of SOE will dilute foundations of Education knowledge and understanding of multicultural awareness for students across the SOE; other faculty feel fairly positive towards the idea of a move out of the SOE to be part of a College of Urban Public Policy.

However, as I said, we have not had a chance to discuss this in detail as yet.

Comment

Critical Research Investments for UWM

Report of the Research Excellence Panther Team

February 2016

Preamble

UWM is Wisconsin’s urban, public research university. It serves the region through its educational programs, research activity, and engagement with the community. Its underlying strengths as a research university are critical to its larger mission because research excellence attracts the scholars who bring the insights that inform outstanding instruction and the depth of understanding that drives effective engagement. Research includes a broad range of creative activities throughout the university; all share an underlying commitment to scholarly excellence.
The recent Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education placed UWM among the Doctoral Universities-Highest Research (R1) Universities. This recognition reflects the University’s success in developing an exceptional research profile with national and international recognition. This accomplishment was the result of sustained, exceptional work across our research spectrum and institutional investments in research support.

In the face of ongoing budget challenges, the institution must prioritize its future investments to continue to advance its research mission. To slow progress at this point could fundamentally change the course of the university and negate the commitments and accomplishments of literally decades of work. Chancellor Mark Mone asked an ad hoc Research Excellence Panther Team to recommend key investments for advancing UWM’s research infrastructure and productivity. The team included members of the Top-Tier Research University Thematic Team (TTRUTT) from the campus strategic planning work, augmented by other faculty and staff members (Appendix A). In developing its recommendations, the team reviewed past research plans (Appendix B) and discussed current needs for sustaining and enhancing the University’s research activities. The team met twelve times between August 2015 and February 2016.

Past reports identified about 75 potential actions, and the TTRUT team highlighted about twenty (see reports listed in appendix B). This report identifies the most critical actions in which UWM needs to invest its time and resources to enhance its research activities.

Recommendations

The team identified six recommendations. All are important, but the most critical is to increase graduate student stipends to competitive levels.

1. Increase graduate student stipends to competitive levels

National data indicate that the average stipend levels for both teaching assistants (TA) and research assistants (RA) are approximately $15,000 (50%, 9-month rate), and considerably higher in some programs (particularly in natural sciences and engineering disciplines). Many of our students are initially supported on TA positions with current salaries of $11,838 (master’s) or $13,732 (doctoral). The Chancellor Graduate Student Awards were designed to help mitigate this gap, but are not sufficient to bring stipends to competitive levels. The result is increasing difficulty in attracting high-quality students. This threatens both our instructional and research success because of the critical role of graduate students in these activities.

The team’s primary recommendation is to implement the recommendations of the 2012 study on graduate assistantships. The major points are to:

1. Establish a base stipend rate for all assistantships of $15,000 (50%, 9-month rate);
2. Make stipends equivalent for all assistantships (TA, RA, PA) within a program;
3. Recognize that some programs will require additional resources due to competition with other universities (this can be implemented through a salary increase or a supplementary fellowship), and that the supplements need to be based on national data;
4. Review stipend levels every 2-3 years to ensure that we are competitive with national averages; and
5. Provide fellowship funds to all programs for recruiting outstanding students.
The team recognizes that RA stipends were adjusted in 2013 and TA stipends increased (most recently for Fall 2015), but strongly recommends the full and immediate implementation of the recommended changes. The estimated cost is $1.25 M.

Three additional recommendations emerged from discussions:

1. The “Program Assistant” or PA title should only be used when a student is providing intellectually and disciplinarily appropriate administrative or academic support to a unit. Graduate students performing largely clerical or other work that could be done without an advanced level of expertise should be employed through other mechanisms (such as student hourly or limited term employee appointments).

2. Tuition paid by graduate assistantships should be distributed to the units in the same manner as other tuition payments, as envisioned in the new budget model.

3. A tuition rate of $4000 per semester should be adopted for graduate RAs and PAs to be collected from external awards or the appointing units (if the students are not funded by a grant). Once implemented, tuition increases should be indexed to changes in the in-state (instructional portion) graduate tuition. We are undecided about whether (a) tuition for graduate TAs should be treated in a similar way or (b) graduate TA tuition should be waived.

2. Reconfigure and increase funding for internal support programs

Several past internal studies have highlighted the need to develop larger research programs at UWM, including both interdisciplinary topics and “team science” projects. These are difficult to support because they generally span academic units and require sharing of resources. At the same time our internal support programs are almost exclusively used for projects with one or two PIs.

The team recommends reconfiguring the internal support programs to address this campus need and to increase funding over the next several years. The proposed array of internal programs (including two new ones) would be:

- Faculty Research Travel (currently restricted to Arts and Humanities, $25-30k/yr): increase funding to make this available to all faculty and research staff. Target level: $200-400k/yr to provide travel support on an annual or biannual basis.
- Research and Creative Activities Support (currently $225k/yr due to short-term budget cuts): increase to $360k/yr to support approximately 20 projects.
- Research Growth Initiative (currently $1.6-2M/yr due to short-term budget cuts): retain for projects with 1-3 PIs with an ongoing funding of $3M to support about 30 projects.
- Collaborative Grant Development (new): support for developing large multi-investigator proposals, including those with regional collaborators. Funding would ramp up to $250-400k/yr to support development of about 10 proposals.
- Research Center Growth Proposal (new): support to develop selected teams and centers in critical areas with the potential for sustained research excellence. The goal would be to initiate two teams per year for 3-5 years at the level of $200-500k/yr, so approximately $3M/yr would be needed when fully implemented (which would take 3-5 years).

Fully implemented, these programs total about $6.6M compared to $3.7M allocated in the current budget (if short-term budget cuts cease). The recommendation is to reconfigure the current funding, and phase-in additional support over several years if the new programs are successful.
3. Assess our research progress and investments using a clear set of campus metrics

The University lacks well-developed processes or mechanisms for assessing its research progress over time or the impact of investments. This is not unusual. UW-System, for example, has traditionally counted external research funding as its sole metric. Increasing calls for more accountability have led to broadening in metrics that measure university performance, as reflected in the current effort by UW-System to develop an expanded set of performance metrics. Beyond these pressures, UWM needs a more robust approach to monitor its progress over time and to assess how we use our resources.

The team recommends the adoption of a set of campus-wide research metrics that balances both inputs (RAs, funding) and outcomes (publications, creative activity, graduated students). The metrics need to capture the breadth of research activity that occurs on our campus. A draft list of basic metrics on the quantity and impact of research activity is presented below. (See the TTRUTT report for a fuller discussion of metrics related to research outcomes.)

Basic metrics of research activity (both inputs and outputs)

- Number of articles, book chapters, books, conference publications, exhibits, live performances, recorded work, and original creative works
- Number of citations
- Number of publications in “top journals” (and similar)
- Number of PhD and “thesis” masters students graduated
- Number of patents, licenses, and startup companies
- Dollar amounts of research and public service expenditures from external support
- Number of faculty and scientists
- Number of national academy members and faculty awards
- Number of post-docs and RAs
- Number of undergraduates involved in research
- Research-based community metrics (needs development); possible examples are
  - Number of community partners (particularly those lasting for five or more years)

The team notes that some of these metrics will require a campus commitment to report information (such as number of articles, books and creative performances), and to put systems in place to gather other data (such as citations).

4. Increase funding to the Library

UWM’s scholarly activity depends heavily upon Library and information resources, and these resources are increasingly in digital formats. Our current acquisition budget is approximately $3.4M; this should be increased to $7-10M, the level of peer urban research universities. This should include expanded access to online resources and building base collections in areas of new or expanding research activity.

5. Change HR policies to accommodate more flexible research positions

UWM needs policies and process to allow more flexibility in hiring researchers. Three needs that are difficult or impossible to satisfy under our current HR systems are:

- The ability to hire researchers on 3-5 year appointments in a timely manner.
- The appointment of research positions primarily funded by external awards (“soft money”).
• The adoption of a “Research Professor” title (actually an academic staff position) for researchers whose responsibilities are limited to research. It could be used as a “working title” aligned with Scientist appointments. We recommend this because the research professor title would have a broader application than in the sciences, is widely recognized within academia, and would be more defined (and thus attractive) to potential hires. Performance reviews would focus on research preeminence due to the expectations related to such a position.

We recommend developing or changing current policies and procedures to meet these needs. A working group may be needed to determine if there are additional issues related to research appointments.

6. Reconfigure post-award activities

The current arrangement of post-award grant management places the responsibility on the PIs and their local budget office. This has resulted in a variety of problems because of the complexity of grant expenditure requirements, and the potential mismatch of available staff support to research needs (consider a PI who receives the first federal award in a unit).

The team recommends developing a shared service model for post-award budget support that retains the distributed nature of local support with a centralized office that can shift staff time as needed, provide more uniform processes and training based on best practice, and provide better service for investigators. We recognize that other changes will be required, including (1) development of a common grant management tool for campus-wide adoption, and (2) better controls on the use of Purchase-cards linked to award budgets.

Implementation

The Research Excellence Panther Team strongly recommends establishing a team to facilitate implementation of these recommendations. The implementation team should also consider the other key recommendations of the TTRUTT report on improving the research infrastructure at UWM and how they could be implemented.

Members of the Research Excellence Panther Team would like to form the core of the implementation team because of their background in developing the recommendations and the broad perspectives represented by the members.
Appendix A: Members of the Research Excellence Panther Team

Ewa Barczyk, UWM Libraries
David Crass, Research Cyber Infrastructure
Sheila Feay-Shaw, Music
Marija Gajdardziska-Josifovska, Physics and Graduate School
David Garman, School of Freshwater Sciences
Mark Harris, chair, Geosciences and Office of Research
Hemant Jain, Business
Katherine Kober, Office of Sponsored Programs (Office of Research)
Kathleen Koch, Research Initiatives (Office of Research)
Michael Liston, Philosophy
David Petering, Chemistry
Nigel Rothfels, Office of Undergraduate Research
Rachel Schiffman, Nursing and Office of Research
Brian Thompson, UWM Research Foundation
Cindy Walker, Educational Psychology
Dietmar Wolfram, SOIS and Research Policy & Advisory Committee

Appendix B: Internal UWM reports

The team members drew upon their collective experience and those of colleagues. Many had participated in past internal studies that provide some of the background for the team’s recommendations. Some are listed below (with the sponsoring agent). These reports can be accessed through the Office of Research website http://uwm.edu/officeofresearch/osp/research-resources/

2005 Self-Study Report (for UWM Accreditation – see section on Criterion 4: Acquisition, Discovery and Application of Knowledge
2006 Research Growth Strategies (Graduate School, Provost)
2011 Strategic Planning for Research (Graduate School)
2013 Report of the Research Futures Study Group (Provost)
2014 Report of the Top-Tier Research University Thematic Team
2014 UWM Strategic Plan (draft)
The Committee on Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research, Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy (2004) report *Facilitating interdisciplinary research* provides a useful definition: “Interdisciplinary research is a mode of research by teams or individuals that integrates information, data, techniques, tools, perspectives, concepts, and/or theories from two or more disciplines or bodies of specialized knowledge to advance fundamental understanding or to solve problems whose solutions are beyond the scope of a single discipline or area of research practice.”

This metric speaks to the university’s ability to recruit and retain the most competitive faculty members. The memberships and awards capture a range of disciplines: American Council of Learned Societies Fellows, Beckman Young Investigator Awards, Burroughs-Wellcome Fund Career Awards, Cottrell Scholars, Fulbright Scholars, Getty Scholars in Residence, Guggenheim Fellows, Howard Hughes Medical Institute Investigators, Lasker Medical Research Awards, MacArthur Foundation Fellows, Mellon Foundation Distinguished Achievement Awards, National Academy Members, National Endowment for the Humanities Fellows, National Humanities Center Fellows, National Medal of Science, National Medal of Technology and Innovation, Newberry Library Long-term Fellows, NIH MERIT (R37) Awards, NSF CAREER Awards, Pew Scholars in the Biomedical Sciences, Presidential Early Career Awards for Scientists and Engineers (PECASE), Robert Wood Johnson Health Policy Fellows, Searle Scholars, Sloan Research Fellows, Woodrow Wilson Fellows.
Thoughts to add to our discussion of best strategies and the CCOET report:

Any mergers, splits, or rearrangements that require physical movement of faculty and offices and labs will LOSE money from our budget and time from our research and teaching. That does not seem a good strategy. It is important to stay realistic about the immediate costs of moving in $ and down time, as well as the gamble on outcomes that will take several years to access, when we consider organizational change as a solution to budgetary limits.

Administrative structures tend to proliferate over time. Is this a good time to trim these back? Can essential needs be met with fewer layers? Is this a good time to re-assess what those essential needs are? Would it be useful to set a $ cap or $ ratio on how much can be spent on admin per # of faculty/students/staff coordinated?

Splitting L&S seems the worst of the suggestions. One of the valuable core ideas of University is that a well-educated college student can understand and appreciate perspectives of natural science, social science, and humanities. We need that ability in our voting citizenry.

Many of us in the social sciences do research that bridges natural science and humanities; suggesting a split into Letters versus Science ignores that reality.

We should avoid false dichotomies in our thinking. It is possible to hone our students abilities to think critically and creatively and speak and write effectively AND to build knowledge and skills in particular subfields AND prepare them for careers, all without converting the goals of a University into something else.