MEMORANDUM

Date: March 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 UWMs 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.
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 the Associate Chair for Graduate Study in English, 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 with MLIS. 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. Best,

Jason Puskar

Jason Puskar
Associate Professor of English
Director of Graduate Studies
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
423 Curtin Hall • 414-229-4637
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.

Best regards,
Amy Kalkbrenner

Amy E. Kalkbrenner, PhD MPH

Assistant Professor
Joseph J. Zilber School of Public Health
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.

Thanks,

Bhagwant

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Bhagwant S. Sindhu, Ph.D., OTR/L
Associate Professor
Department of Occupational Science and Technology
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
V-Mail: (414)229-1180
Fax: (414)229-5100
From John Boyland – Electrical Engineering and Computer Science Department:

Dear John,

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%).

Best regards,
John
Comments on the CCOET Final Report
from the Executive Committee of the Sheldon B. Lubar School of Business

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.
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.

As an environmental anthropologist, I have long been affiliated with our successful Conservation and Environmental Studies program, and 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.

In my secondary role as the Associate Dean of the Graduate School, my short but intense 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.
Best, Tracey Heatherington

Dr. Tracey Heatherington
Associate Professor of Anthropology
Associate Dean of the Graduate School
University of Wisconsin Milwaukee
414-229-4893
http://www4.uwm.edu/letsci/anthropology/faculty/heatherington.cfm
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.
From Tim Grundl, School of Freshwater Sciences and Geosciences Dept.

Excerpt 1

Below, three examples are offered of what final arrangement of units may look like. These are not the only possible arrangements, but are provided to suggest three types of scenarios.

II. Extreme Consolidation.
This model consists of two colleges, each headed by a dean.

- College of Letters and Sciences
- College of the Professions

III. Combining of Current Schools and Colleges.
Most schools and colleges merge in their current form. The sample arrangement can be modified if it is deemed more appropriate to keep a particular unit separate. Naming rights from individual college could be carried forward in each of these colleges.

- College of the Arts and Humanities
  Consists of current Arts and Humanities programs from L&S and PSA
- College of Engineering, Architecture, and Sciences
  Consists of CEAS, SARUP, SFS and Natural Sciences from L&S
- College of Health
  Consists of CON, CHS, ZSPH
- College of Education and Social Welfare
  Consists of SOE, HBSSW, appropriate Social Sciences departments from L&S, and
  Consists of LSB and appropriate Social Sciences departments from L&S

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 SCE (reducing from 5 to 3 departments), adds Kinesiology, Communication Science and Disorders, Health Informatics and Administration, and
  Biominformatics 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

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.
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.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Michael Liston
Professor, Philosophy
Former Graduate School Associate Dean
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.

Respectfully,

[Signature]
Michael Liston
Professor of Philosophy
Former (2011-2014) Associate Dean, the Graduate School/Office of Research

Cc: Marija Gajdardziska, Dean of the Graduate School
Mark Harris, Interim Vice Provost for Research

Appendix: Graduate School Task Force Report, 2012, chaired by Mark D. Schwartz
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,

Amy Harley, Ph.D., M.P.H., R.D., and Michael D. Laiosa, Ph.D.
Associate Professors in the Joseph J. Zilber School of Public Health

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.
* 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.

Sincerely,

Department of Kinesiology- Exercise Science & Health Promotion Unit
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.

Regards,

Harvey

--
Harvey Bootsma, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Graduate Program Representative
School of Freshwater Sciences
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
600 E. Greenfield Ave.
Milwaukee, WI, 53204
Tel: (414) 382-1717
Email: hbootsma@uwm.edu
Web: https://pantherfile.uwm.edu/hbootsma/www/
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.
- High quality TAs mean enhanced undergraduate teaching and research, in which TAs commonly provide some supervision. The outcome will stimulate our primary aim to provide excellent education for all of our students.
- As both the research excellence and quality of our graduating undergraduate and graduate students climb, UWM will secure its key aim to be recognized by students/parents and the public as a destination campus. This realization will stabilize student numbers, an absolutely critical outcome, and stimulate donations from institutions and private donors.

Providing an increase in graduate assistant stipends is essential to maintaining our position as a research university rather than a comprehensive. Limiting a research mission to one public university, and that not in the state’s major metropolitan area, will place Wisconsin in the lowest tier of states, disastrous in today's knowledge economy.
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.

Best,

Lisa Moline
Art & Design
Dear UC members,

I am writing in response to the CCOET report and the recommendations put forward by the committee. I am a tenured faculty member in the department of anthropology. I have a PhD in anthropology, a Master of Architecture, and a Bachelor of Fine Arts degree. My work is interdisciplinary by design and personal propensity. I am also engaged in the American Indian Studies program (I am American Indian), 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,

Respectfully yours,

Bernard C. Perley
Associate Professor
Department of Anthropology
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 in the doc.)

kind regards, Jacques

-----------------------------
Jacques du Plessis (Member SA Akademie)
President, National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages
UWM Ombuds Council
School of Information Studies
(414) 301.3369
about.me/jacquesdup
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.

Thanks,

Aneesh

-------------
A. Aneesh
Interim Director, Institute of World Affairs
Associate Professor of Sociology and Global Studies
Garland Hall 114
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Milwaukee, WI 53201-0413
414 229-7308 (Garland Hall)
414 229-2234 (Bolton Hall)
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.

Sincerely,

Aims McGuinness

Aims McGuinness
Associate Professor
History Department
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
smia@uwm.edu
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?

Regards, Carol
Carol H. Seery, Ph.D., CCC-SLP
Associate Professor & Department Chair
Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
PO Box 413, Enderis 853, Milwaukee, WI 53201-0413
Office: 414-229-4291  Fax: 414-229-2620
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.

Thank you,

Raji Swaminathan

Raji Swaminathan
Associate Professor & Department Chair
Department of Educational Policy & Community Studies
515 Enderis Hall
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Phone: 414-229-6740
email: swaminar@uwm.edu
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.

Jean Hudson  
Associate Professor, Anthropology, University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee  
Undergraduate Advisor, Department of Anthropology  
Adjunct Curator, Anthropology, Milwaukee Public Museum