a. **What is the DT committee make up and function?**

The CEAS Advisory Committee on Differential Tuition (ACDT) will be appointed annually by the Milwaukee Student Association and the Dean of the College of Engineering and Applied Science. Membership will include three CEAS students selected by the Student Association, two representatives selected by the Dean, and non-voting ex officio members as appropriate. The advisory committee will establish priorities, solicit and review proposed projects, and make recommendations to the Dean regarding the use of funds generated by the differential tuition. Utilization of revenues from differential tuition would be reported annually to the Student Association Senate.

b. **Describe the process of allocation proposals before the DT Committee?**

The process for allocation of funds is outlined in the *ACDT Administrative Policies and Procedures* documents (Attachment 1). Below is an excerpt from that document:

The committee's evaluation of proposals for funding is made in the context of projected revenues available for disbursement in the subsequent academic year. As a rule-of-thumb, the committee does not recommend funding projects in excess of 90 percent of estimated funds available for the subsequent academic year. However, the committee may make secondary recommendations for project funding at the end of a budget year based on final revenue accounting information.

The committee reviews proposals during the spring term of each academic year. All proposals are distributed to committee members in advance of meeting and making recommendations to the Dean on its preferences.

Members evaluate proposals on four dimensions: compliance with defined appropriateness, technological need, College impact, and operational efficacy. The committee may decide to conduct preliminary evaluation and assessment ratings of proposals in advance of meeting to deliberate and prioritize proposals. Proposals deemed inappropriate are excluded from consideration. All remaining proposals are ranked according to a majority vote of committee members' preferences for those proposals.

c. **Describe the process and how a decision of the committee is made?**

The procedures for making decisions are outlined by the *ACDT Operational Policies and Procedures* document (Attachment 2). Below is an excerpt from that document:
Recommendation Procedures
A. Funding requests shall be evaluated on four dimensions, as outlined in the Administrative Policies and Procedures.
   i. Compliance with defined appropriateness
   ii. Technological need
   iii. College impact
   iv. Operational efficacy, including matching funding from outside sources.
B. ACDT shall vote on the level of priority for each request, requiring a simple majority.
C. The final prioritization of requests must be approved by a 4/5 majority of the voting members before being sent to the Dean.

d. Describe the makeup of this student majority committee, (please give committee member names)?

   Bradley Schwoerer (Student – Chair)
   Andrew Hable (Student)
   Benjamin Hansen (Student)
   Dev Venugopalan (Associate Dean)
   Dan Beller (CAE Lab Director)
   Todd Johnson (Director of Students Services, ex-officio)

e. How are meetings recorded? May we have a copy of minutes?

   Meeting minutes have been recorded by the ex-officio member. Attachment 3

f. What type of time frame is there on the actual acquiring of the items from the final decision of the committee?

   Since this was the start-up year, several laboratory modification projects were selected over the summer and items were ordered within weeks of the decision. A second round of proposals will be solicited during the fall semester. It is anticipated items will be purchased in time for the spring semester.

   The normal procedure will call for proposals in the spring semester for purchases to be made for the following academic year.

g. How are items brought up in the committee?

   Funding proposals are submitted to the Dean’s office and forwarded to the committee.

h. How much money has the Differential Tuition acquired for the given school?

   It is anticipated that DT funds will be $120,000 (2004-05), $240,000 (2005-06) and $360,000 (2006-07) and $480,000 (2007-08)
i. How are students contacted to be on the committee?

The Student Association appoints three CEAS students to the committee.

j. Who is on the committee?

A. There shall be five voting members on ACDT.
B. Two voting members shall be appointed by the Dean of CEAS.
C. Three voting members shall be appointed by the Student Association Senate.
D. Ex-officio members may include, but are not limited to, CEAS Senators of the Student Association and the Dean of CEAS, and their designees.

k. When does the committee meet (time, place, etc.)? How were priorities set in the decision of the DT Committee?

It is anticipated that the ACDT will meet several times each semester. In the fall semester, the committee will assess the progress of projects from the previous year, establish priorities for future funding and solicit project proposals for the next year. In the spring semester, the committee will evaluate proposals, make recommendations to the Dean, and prepare an annual report.

Since DT was approved late in the spring 2004 semester, this years meeting schedule was altered. The committee had an organizational meeting in May. The CEAS Dean’s office solicited proposals from the departments in June. The ACDT evaluated proposals and made recommendations at meetings in July and September. All of these meetings were held in the EMS building and lasted 2 to 3 hours.
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ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON DIFFERENTIAL TUITION
Administrative Policies and Procedures

1. Introduction

The Advisory Committee On Differential Tuition [ACDT] is charged with the responsibility of soliciting, evaluating, recommending, monitoring, and annually assessing allocation of funds collected from the implementation of a differential tuition. These funds are to support the enhancement of the CEAS instructional laboratories. In addition, a portion of differential tuition generated from 700-level and above courses may be used to support the instruction of graduate courses. The following policies and procedures stipulate the procedural processes members of the ACDT will use in discharging the committee's various obligations.

The final authority, and responsibility, for the appropriate expenditure of the differential tuition revenues rests with UWM campus administration. The committee's role is to initiate and guide the process of decision-making, significantly contribute to decisions, and monitor and report on the consequences of decisions that are implemented. Committee responsibilities are subsumed under two broad categories of action: recommendations on funds allocation, and accountability assessment of dispersed funds. Each category requires separate activity cycles defined by coherent procedures guiding committee actions.

2. Fund Allocation
2.1 Overview

The process of funds allocation involves budgeting, solicitation, evaluation, and recommendation of proposals submitted by CEAS departments regarding laboratory enhancements and graduate courses. The primary goals underlying the expenditure of the differential tuition revenue is to enhance the hands-on laboratory experience and to offer more graduate level courses on leading edge research topics.

While the goals can be reached through various paths, the overarching priority for the expenditure of the differential tuition is demonstrable breadth and depth of impact on the student body that is afforded through any given use of the funds. In general, the allocation of differential tuition is inappropriate for funding (in whole or part): routine supplies, laboratory consumables, equipment used primarily in research, and standard graduate courses.

2.2 Solicitation of Proposals for Laboratory Enhancements

The Dean, in consultation with the committee, will annually solicit (in the fall term) proposals from CEAS departments for laboratory modification projects. Proposals should be submitted on the CEAS Laboratory Modification Project Request Form. Departments with multiple proposals must prioritize them before submitting to the committee.
2.3 Submission of Proposals for Laboratory Enhancements

2.3.1 Proposal format
Proposals should be submitted on the CEAS Laboratory Modification Project Request Form and include the following:

I. Project Description. A clear and complete narrative that describes the type of project and how it will be implemented.

II. Expenditures. A complete budget summary table based on information provided in item V Describe equipment requirement, item VI Describe remodeling and installation requirements, and item VII Describe personnel duties.

III. List the courses that will be improved by this project. Indicated whether the course is required or a technical elective, how often the course is offered, and the average enrollment in the course.

IV. Describe how the project enhances the student laboratory experience.

V. Equipment requirements. A description and itemized list of all equipment expenditures.

VI. Remodeling and installation requirements. A description of all remodeling and installation needs and an itemized listing of their costs.

VII. Personnel duties. A description of all personnel duties and a basis for their cost calculation.

VIII. Needs of students with disabilities. Proposals shall include a written plan explaining how the technology will be made equally accessible to students with disabilities. Proposals for which this consideration may not be applicable will require a statement of justification detailing why the technology will not need to be made equally effective for students with disabilities. The Committee will evaluate both the written plan for intent and the statement of justification for project appropriateness. When the justification is in question, the Committee shall confer with the UWM ADA Coordinator.

IX. Timetable. A brief timetable that outlines the milestones of the project should include, where appropriate, the time frames for ordering equipment, installing, and a starting date for the delivery of service to students.

X. Maintenance/upgrades. This item must include an estimate of the longevity of the project and its impact; identification of the unit assuming responsibility for maintaining oversight authority for the project; and the long-term financial implications and responsibility for the project’s maintenance and upgrades.

XI. Project Assessment: All implemented proposals must be assessed to gauge the fidelity of their impact. A standard assessment cycle of up to five (5) years is required of all proposals. Proposals not intended to have impacts of maximum duration must stipulate so in their rationale and be justified with respect to their length of impact. The unit charged with the responsibility of implementing a supported project must submit an annual CEAS
Laboratory Modification Projects Form B Project Assessment Report (see Accountability/Assessment section 3, pg. 4).

2.3.2 Multi-year proposals.

If funds are being requested for a multi-year project, each item on Form A should include an annual breakdown that clearly identifies the expenditures, project goals, and assessment for each of the proposed project years. Please note that due to the desire to not commit funds beyond the current funding cycle, multi-year projects are less likely to be viewed favorably by the committee.

2.3.3 Requests for continued support of funded projects.

Departments requesting funding for continued support of previously funded projects must submit an interim report detailing the current status of the project, why additional funding is being sought, and any other information that will assist the committee in determining if additional funding is warranted.

2.4 Solicitation of Proposals for Graduate Course Support

The Dean, in consultation with the committee, may solicit (if adequate differential tuition funding is available) proposals from CEAS departments for graduate courses on cutting edge research topics. Preference will be given to topics that are interdisciplinary in nature.

2.5 Submission of Proposals for Graduate Course Support

2.5.1 Proposal format

Proposals should be submitted with the following information:

I. Course title and description
II. Course objectives
IV. Topics covered
V. Instructor
VI. Students who are expected to enroll in course
VII. Expected enrollment

2.6 Evaluation of Proposal

The committee's evaluation of proposals for funding is made in the context of projected revenues available for disbursement in the subsequent academic year. As a rule-of-thumb, the committee does not recommend funding projects in excess of 90 percent of estimated funds available for the subsequent academic year. However, the committee may make secondary recommendations for project funding at the end of a budget year based on final revenue accounting information.
The committee reviews proposals during the spring term of each academic year. All proposals are distributed to committee members in advance of meeting and making recommendations to the Dean on its preferences.

Members evaluate proposals on four dimensions: compliance with defined appropriateness, technological need, College impact, and operational efficacy. The committee may decide to conduct preliminary evaluation and assessment ratings of proposals in advance of meeting to deliberate and prioritize proposals. Proposals deemed inappropriate are excluded from consideration. All remaining proposals are ranked according to a majority vote of committee members' preferences for those proposals.

2.7 Evaluation Report and Approval

The committee forwards a report of its evaluation of all proposals to the Dean. While it is understood the Dean will make a final decision on the disposition of proposals, the committee acts as a significant source of input into that decision. The Dean is expected to consult with the committee on deviations between the Dean’s and committee's decisions regarding either the final approval or level of funding for proposals prior to the commitment of funds to any project or purpose.

The Dean will provide to all Department Chairs and the Student Association a list of the proposals funded. Proposers of non-funded projects will be notified, in writing, that their project will not be funded and the rationale for the decision. Proposers of funded projects will be notified, in writing, that their project has been funded, the stipulations on the use of the funds, the accounting procedures to be followed, and the forms and deadlines for submission of project reports.

3. Accountability/Assessment
3.1 Overview

The committee is charged with monitoring and annually reporting on the use of differential tuition funds. A report is made annually to the Dean and Student Association regarding the committee's assessment of all projects funded through differential tuition revenues in the preceding five years. Policies, procedural process, and guidelines for accountability assessment are outlined below.

3.2 Project Accountability Reporting

All differential tuition supported projects are expected to submit a CEAS Laboratory Modification Projects Form B Project Assessment Report on the use and/or continuing impact of funds over as long as a five year period of time. Departments must submit an annual report to the committee by August 1 of each subsequent project year. Failure to provide a report may have a negative effect on future funding opportunities for the department. Project reports should contain the following information:

I. Project description. A description of the project (indicate if this description is different than the one proposed and why).

II. Expenditures. Completed budget summary table.
III. Discussion

A. Project Assessment: Including demonstrable (preferably measured) effects of funded project and explanations for differences in anticipated versus observed outcomes.

B. Purchase orders and/or final accounting ledger. Purchase orders and/or final accounting ledger that provide a detailed accounting of the project expenses.

C. Maintenance/upgrades. An estimate of the longevity of the project and its impact; identification of the unit assuming responsibility for maintaining oversight authority for the project; and the long-term financial implications and responsibility for the project's maintenance and upgrades. Please note if this description is different than the one proposed and explain why.

The committee receives and reviews all project reports. It may return any report for additional information deemed necessary.

Concurrent with the timing of project reports, the committee receives from CEAS administration an annual accounting and budget analysis report that includes a summary of fee revenues and verified project expenditure histories (including notations on problematic activities observed for any project).

3.3 Annual Report

The committee submits an annual report to the Dean and Student Association prior to the end of each fiscal year. The contents of the report include: committee evaluations on the status of each funded project, recommendations for actions to be taken in the event of a project's unacceptable performance or administration, recommendations for the disposition of any encumbered but unspent revenues, recommendations on future needs/priorities, and recommendations on changes to the committee's composition, charge, policies, procedures, or administrative support.
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ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON DIFFERENTIAL TUITION
OPERATIONAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

II. Definition
The College of Engineering and Applied Science Advisory Committee on Differential Tuition (ACDT) is defined by the Administrative Policies and Procedures of ACDT.

III. Funding Principles
A. Allocations of differential tuition funds may only be made to enhance the hands-on laboratory experience and provide additional sections of graduate courses within CEAS.
B. ACDT shall not make decisions regarding the allocation of future differential tuition funds.
C. The decisions of ACDT must conform to the Administrative Policies and Procedures.

IV. Membership
A. There shall be five voting members on ACDT.
B. Two voting members shall be appointed by the Dean of CEAS.
C. Three voting members shall be appointed by the Student Association Senate.
D. Ex-officio members may include, but are not limited to, CEAS Senators of the Student Association and the Dean of CEAS, and their designees.
E. Duties of the Chair
   i. The chair will be elected by ACDT voting members by a simple majority.
   ii. The chair shall preside over all meetings of ACDT.
   iii. The chair shall schedule meetings and determine their agendas.

V. Funding Requests
A. Requests for funding shall be received by the Dean and forwarded to ACDT.
B. The committee may schedule each department chair or designee for a hearing regarding their funding request before ACDT.
C. Individuals involved with the requests made from departments may not attempt to influence ACDT members outside of meetings.

VI. Recommendation Procedures
A. Funding requests shall be evaluated on four dimensions, as outlined in the Administrative Policies and Procedures.
   i. Compliance with defined appropriateness
   ii. Technological need
iii. College impact
iv. Operational efficacy, including matching funding from outside sources.

B. ACDT shall vote on the level of priority for each request, requiring a simple majority.
C. The final prioritization of requests must be approved by a 4/5 majority of the voting members before being sent to the Dean.
The meeting was called to order at 12:05 PM.

1. Administrative Policies and Procedures Document

   It was moved (Hable and Schwoerer) to approve the ACDT Administrative Policies and Procedures. The motion passed 4-0

2. Operational Policies and Procedures Document

   It was moved (Hable and Schwoerer) to approve the ACDT Operational Policies and Procedures. The motion passed 4-0

   B. Hansen joined the meeting.

3. Laboratory Modernization Project Proposals

   The following recommendations were unanimously approved:

   A. Fund Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept.</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Funding Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAE</td>
<td>Application Server</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>Permeability Apparatus</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Replace E280 PCs</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Ergonomics &amp; Methods</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME Experimentation</td>
<td>22,370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   B. Request Additional Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept.</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Computer Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE/ME</td>
<td>Controls Lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Senior Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Fluid Mechanics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Do Not Fund Project At This Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept.</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAE</td>
<td>Support Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAE</td>
<td>Software License</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>Water Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>Mechanics Lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Unix Lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>AFS for Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>OrCAD Software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Optical Engineering Lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Digital Storage Scope</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 PM
CEAS Advisory Committee on Differential Tuition
Meeting Minutes
September 28, 2004

Present: A. Hable (Student), B. Hansen (Student), B. Schwoerer (Student-Chair), D. Venugopalan, D. Beller, T. Johnson (ex-officio)

The meeting was called to order at 2:05 PM.

4. The meeting minutes of the July 23, 2004 meeting were accepted as written.

5. D. Venugopalan gave an update on the projects recommended at the last meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept.</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual (to date)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAE</td>
<td>Application Server</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>5,533</td>
<td>Project completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>Permeability Apparatus</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>9,992</td>
<td>Project completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>Project completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Replace E280 PCs</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>34,889</td>
<td>Project completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Ergonomics &amp; Methods</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME Experimentation</td>
<td>22,370</td>
<td>15,700</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. D. Venugopalan gave an update on the 2004-05 Lab Modification budget:

| State Lab Modification Funds | 155,000 |
| Differential Tuition        | 120,000 |
| Total Budget                | 275,000 |
| Total Budget                | 275,000 |
| Committed Funds             | 95,000  |
| Available Funds             | 180,000 |

7. Unfinished Business - Laboratory Modernization Project Proposals

The following recommendations were unanimously approved:

A. Fund Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept.</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Funding Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE/ME</td>
<td>Controls Lab</td>
<td>9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Senior Design</td>
<td>15,278*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Recommended funding level increased to $17,278 (2 additional computers) if laboratory capacity can be increased.
B. Do Not Fund Project At This Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept.</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Computer Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Fluid Mechanics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Solicitation of New Project Proposals

The committee recommended procedures for the solicitation of new project proposals:

Funding for 2004-2005 - Departments should submit proposals using the current format by October 21, 2004.

Funding for 2005-2006 - Departments should submit proposals for 2005-06 funds by early December. The committee plans to review the proposal format for possible changes.

9. The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 26, 2004 in EMS 588

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 PM