Academic Planning and Budget Committee
2003-04 Annual Report

The Academic Planning and Budget Committee (APBC) is comprised of 16 members: 11 faculty (appointed/elected reps from the four divisions; a rep from the UC; chairs of GFC and APCC); 3 academic staff members; and an ex-officio rep from the Academic Deans Council, plus the Provost or designee. The functions of the APBC are to make recommendations to the faculty and to campus administration regarding (a) short range and long range academic plans for the campus that are consistent with the mission of the campus, and (b) budgetary implications of those plans.

The Committee met 19 times during the Academic Year 2003-04. The meetings were held on Thursday mornings, from 8 to 9:30 am, generally every other week. Minutes for each meeting are available on the APBC website (http://www.uwm.edu/Dept/SecU/apbc/index.html).

APBC met with the following deans and associate deans to review the teaching, research, and service missions of their units: Mark Harris, Natural Science area of L/S; Chuck Schuster, Arts and Humanities area of L/S; Sally Lundeen, CON; Kanti Prasad, SBA; Dale Jaffe, The Graduate School; Randy Lambrecht, CHS; Nancy Frank, SARUP. APBC also met with Ewa Barczyk for GML. APBC intended but was unable to meet with deans from the Social Science area of L/S and the College of Continuing Education, and with the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Affairs. The purpose of such visits is for APBC to better familiarize itself with the mission of the units, so that it can make more informed recommendations regarding budgetary matters affecting the campus.

APBC met with the following representatives of the campus committees that are preparing the self study report for the upcoming North Central accreditation site visit: Rita Cheng, Dave Petering, Mark Harris. Matters of general policy and oversight were typically discussed, as well as how APBC can contribute to the self-study report.

APBC endorsed the creation of Center for Biotechnology and Environmental Genomics.

APBC regrets that the Senate did not take ultimately take action during the 2003-04 year on Faculty Document 2419, concerning proposals to restructure departments, schools, or colleges. The Committee recommends the University Committee report to the Senate why a relatively simple legislative matter has not been accomplished in a timely way, as the material in question was submitted to the Senate early in the 2003-04 year.

APBC reviewed the differential tuition proposals for 4 units on the campus. The proposals were supported by the Student Association, and were generally targeted for undergraduate education. APBC noted that the proposals set a precedent for funding policy that may be applied to other units on a campus, or indeed on different campuses, and that it would be useful to ensure some consistent application of the differential tuition policy. The proposals were eventually adopted by the Board of Regents.

In a continuing discussion of themes introduced by former Chancellor Zimpher, APBC spent much of Semester 2 reviewing the possibility of selectively investing in designated campus programs, for the purpose of enhancing their national recognition as well as that of the campus.
generally. In this regard, the Academic Deans’ Council had outlined 6-8 possibilities during the summer months of 2003. These possibilities were discussed during the fall months of 2003. In its review, APBC thought campus interests would be better served by a more comprehensive process that started at the level of the departments. In keeping with this process, the campus decided to pursue a plan whereby units would submit proposals for both recurring and nonrecurring funds. The proposals would serve to enhance national recognition and provide for enhanced student support, in three broad categories: Building Quality, Maintaining Momentum, and Building for the Future. The proposals could be new, or remaining elements from earlier exercises. Possible sources of funds included marginal tuition revenue and monies from unfilled personnel lines. Campus administration urged APBC to respond quickly, as the state was likely to sweep up funds on the books in May, or before the end of the fiscal year in any case. The proposals filtered up from the units, and APBC responded positively and constructively, critically evaluating them in light of the campus criteria. APBC made its own set of recommendations to the campus administration by the end of April. Inquiry to the campus administration in July indicated that the monies had not yet been spent. Subsequent discussion revealed that Chancellor Santiago was discussing the possibility of focusing the expenditures in a slightly revised set of target areas, with the hope of securing as much as $2M in additional funds from UWS. However, APBC had not been informed of the discussions between campus administration and UWS, which had been going on since June.

Discussion of the expenditures continued during the summer months of 2004. At a meeting on July 27 that included the University Committee, ADC, and Academic Staff Committee, Provost Wanat and Chancellor Santiago indicated their wishes to frame the request to UWS for additional funds in four principal areas: (a) strengthening health care delivery, (b) cultural and built environment, (c) support for research, and (d) student success and access investments.

In conclusion, APBC remains committed to working with campus administration in a proactive way, rather than simply a reactive way, in the areas of academic planning and budgetary implications. In this regard, an important consideration from the perspective of APBC is to have a thorough audit of how the funds have been spent in the last 5 years, and what has been accomplished through the expenditure of these funds, so that the campus has a clear picture of what it has accomplished and what it needs to do next. This sort of audit seems critical if the campus is to meet expectations for self-assessment and to advance to the next level, for example, through the strengthening of certain of its programs. The programs would be selected for strengthening on the basis of their current standing, their opportunity for growth, and their ability to generate revenue. As reductions in state funding loom large in the future of UWS campuses, it is likely that the support for such moves on the UWM campus would have to be supported through reallocation, rather than an increase in net funding. APBC had suggested an audit be part of the Investment Plan retreat in Jan, 2003. An audit at this time would have prepared the campus for a variety of moves, including the strengthening of selected programs through reallocation. However, the Campus Administration demurred, saying such an audit was premature. APBC now looks forward to an audit as part of the preparation for the upcoming NCA review. The sentiment of APBC is that assessment processes are an important component of campus governance, and an audit can no longer be viewed as premature.