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Charter:
Functions/ Responsibilities:

A1.05 Academic Planning and Budget Committee

(1) Membership. Sixteen members as follows: five faculty appointed by the University Committee, one from each of the four divisions including at least one of whom shall be a senator, and one member of the University Committee; one faculty elected by each of the four divisions; the chair of the Academic Program & Curriculum Committee; the chair of the Graduate Faculty Council; three members of the Academic Staff, two elected by the Academic Staff and one member of the Academic Staff Committee; and ex-officio, an academic dean and the Provost or designee.

(Document 2169, 12/17/98; UWM Administration, 12/30/98)
(Document 2277, 5/15/01; UWM Administration, 6/12/01)
(Editorially revised per Codification Committee, 4/26/02)
(Document 2377, 3/27/03; UWM Administration Approval, 04/12/03)
(Editorially revised, 8/24/06)
(2) Functions. Makes recommendations to the faculty and to campus administration regarding (1) short range and long range academic plans for the campus that are consistent with the mission, and (2) budget implications for these plans.

a) Reviews long range plans regarding academic interests that are consistent with the mission of the schools and colleges and the campus;

b) Advises faculty on issues related to budget and its impact on academic program quality, student retention, and development;

c) Recommends and evaluates planning for new programs that are not the province of a single academic unit;

d) Represents the interests of the faculty to the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor and Provost regarding both short range and long range plans for the academic units and the budget implications of these plans;

e) Examines those actions taken by the Board of Regents, campus administration, or individual units on campus that impact the overall short range or long range plans for other academic programs on campus and the budget for the academic units;

f) Makes recommendations for faculty action;

g) Reviews university policies that impact the academic programs of the academic units and long range plans for these units;

(Document 1977, 5/11/95; UWM Administration, 6/14/95)
(Document 2169, 12/17/98; UWM Administration approval, 12/30/98)
(Document 2187, 4/15/99; UWM Administration approval, 5/1/99)

Meetings:

APBC charter and membership are described on the prior pages. APBC generally meets every other week during the 9-month academic year. In addition, the APBC chair generally reports to the UWM Faculty Senate at its monthly meetings.

Semester 1, 2009-10

APBC began meeting on Sep 3, 2009. At that meeting, Professor Anderson announced her resignation as chair and from the Committee entirely. She stated that she felt that she could not function as chair in light of her inability to assure APBC that it would have timely access to information from campus administration on budget and administrative initiatives within the committee’s purview. Of particular concern was intention of campus administration to form working groups to pursue off-campus development projects, which effectively by-passed faculty review to set an agenda for the campus. Professor Moore was then elected chair.

A major topic of APBC business during the fall semester was review of two important matters pertaining to campus growth and development: the various capital expenditures of the Milwaukee Initiative (MI) and the Campus Master Planning effort (CMP). The MI was a proposal to promote scholarly activity and physical plant growth developed by the campus and submitted to UWS and the state. The CMP was commissioned by the state Dept of Administration in connection with the MI. The Physical Environment Committee (PEC) was designated as the lead governance committee to review and
oversee CMP, but APBC strongly believed it should be focally involved as well, in light of the budgetary implications of these initiatives. To this end, APBC representatives served on the PEC and committees/working groups involved with the pre-design phase of building projects that were contemplated under the initiatives. APBC meetings during the fall semester included regular updates and discussion of progress in these areas.

Of particular interest to APBC was the extent to which faculty academic input was being taken into account in these various initiatives. Some reports from working group members indicated that the campus administration was not appropriately taking that input into account, for example, in discussions of the location of the School of Public Health (SPH), the School of Freshwater Science (SFS), and a proposed Innovation Research Park in Wauwatosa. APBC pressed throughout the semester to be sure faculty input was taken into account in the planning and budgeting process.

The CMP and the MI are separate though related aspects of campus growth and development. With regard to these initiatives, the campus administration repeatedly emphasized to faculty, staff, and students that it would not re-allocate existing campus funds to pursue the initiatives—that the state would need to support the initiatives financially for them to go forward, although private sector partnerships were also required by the state and the campus intended to pursue them as well. In addition, the campus administration repeatedly emphasized that the initiatives were driven by academic mission, not donors or other extraneous concerns.

In rough terms (amounts here are rounded for ease of communication; exact figures are available elsewhere), the MI was associated with $240 M in capital expenditures for projects both on and off the Kenwood campus. The $240 M included $60 M in state funds previously set aside for the purchase of Columbia-St. Mary’s facility and $60 M in new state funds (general fund supported borrowing), for a total of $120 M in state funds. In addition, the campus proposed to raise $60 M through program revenue; upon approval of the campus plan to raise these funds, the state would then make the $60 M available to the campus through a bonding mechanism (program revenue supported borrowing). The campus would be responsible for paying back the principal and servicing the debt for this source. Finally, the campus proposed to raise $60 M in gifts and grants. Thus, there was a total of $120 M that the campus proposed it would raise itself, in a match of state funds.

The contemplated projects in both MI and CMP were an interdisciplinary research center (IRC) for the Kenwood campus, expansion of existing facilities at the Harbor-Greenfield site for the new SFS, and a new research vessel for SFS. Support for the new SPH was also considered to be an implicit part of the overall proposal. However, the exact nature of how the campus was going to support SPH was unclear for several reasons: The acquisition and remodeling costs of CSM were uncertain, no GPR funding was available to acquire and remodel CSM in any case, and some uncertainties existed about the generous pledge to support SPH from Milwaukee philanthropist Joseph Zilber. The uncertainty about campus support for SPH struck members of APBC as somewhat odd, given that SPH had been formally approved as a significant new academic unit yet the campus administration had not provided for its physical location. The campus
administration was also very much interested in developing a research park in Wauwatosa to promote entrepreneurial activity on the campus as a means to generate revenue and benefit the state’s economy. Much of the financial arrangements for off-campus sites would be implemented by a subsidiary of the UWM Foundation, the UWM Real Estate Foundation. Professor Levine of the UWM Center for Economic Development published an extensive report outlining the massive liabilities many campuses in the same position as UWM typically incur when they try to develop a research park. Professor Levine’s report paid critical attention to the problems UWM was likely to encounter, and forcefully questioned whether the plans of the campus administration to pursue an entrepreneurial agenda were cogent. When a member of APBC asked the campus administration about Professor Levine’s conclusions, the campus administration declined to respond, other than reiterate its interest in developing a research park. In any case, the state did look favorably on the campus $240 M proposal during the fall, although many further steps had to be taken before the campus actually had the money to spend.

APBC received periodic reports from the campus administration regarding state and system budgetary outlook for the upcoming year, DIN planning, and a more broadly based Commission on Student Life and Student Academic Experience. The Commission consists of faculty, staff, and students. It is examining ways to enhance student life and academic experience, for example, through additional faculty and additional advising. The Madison campus was successful in generating funds through a surcharge on tuition, and other campuses, UWM included, will likely propose similar means to increase fees and/or tuition. The importance of student involvement was continually emphasized.

Midway through the fall semester, the members of APBC assigned themselves to 4 subgroups to review the first draft of the CMP. The objective was to provide a preliminary report to the UWM Faculty Senate on the CMP from a governance group, as campus administration had been proceeding without formal input from a governance group. Indeed, the MI had not previously been vetted through any campus governance group. The 4 APBC subgroups focused on (a) Kenwood campus, including CSM and an IRC; (b) Wauwatosa Innovation Research Park; (c) SFS and WATER Institute; and (d) SPH, possibly at the Pabst Brewery site or possibly at CSM. The reports were presented to the Faculty Senate in Dec. The reports were conceived as the first stage of a two-stage review process. The second stage would focus on the final report, which was expected early in Sem 2. The reports were very brief, owing to the time constraints. Of particular interest in this stage was how well the draft reflected faculty input. However, so much was undecided or uncertain, such as funding, that not many conclusions could be drawn. There seemed to be no cost-benefit analysis of the moves being proposed, nor did there seem to be much thought given to how the various projects would be sequenced, since they couldn’t all be undertaken at once. Questions about long-term resolution of parking and transportation problems were also particularly acute, especially if the campus was expected to increase in size and enrollment.

Semester 2, 2009-10
In Dec of 2009 and Jan of 2010 the Board of Regents (BOR) took steps that decisively influenced campus growth and development. The BOR enumerated state funds for an IRC for Kenwood and for an expansion of SFS, thereby enumerating all state funds from the category of general fund supported borrowing. The BOR also enumerated the acquisition and remodeling of CSM for $31 M through program revenue supported borrowing, in accordance with the original campus proposal. Finally, the BOR enumerated a research vessel for SFS for $20 M, to be paid for through gifts/grants, again in accordance with the original campus proposal. These actions enumerated a large percentage of the previously authorized $240 M, leaving only something on the order of $20-30 M in the program revenue category and $30-40 M in the gifts/grants category available and unenumerated for the campus. In light of the actions of the BOR, it was unclear how a Pabst site for SPH or a Wauwatosa site for a research park continued to be viable, if indeed either ever had been, as costs for those projects clearly exceeded funds remaining from the $240 M. In response to APBC questions, the campus administration was not able to identify how it was going to raise program revenue for the already enumerated acquisition and remodeling of CSM, let alone its ambitions relating to Wauwatosa or Pabst. Moreover, APBC received no information from campus administration about whether any of the proposed $60 M in gifts/grants had been raised to that point, or whether there were realistic prospects for raising funds in that category, as it had indicated it was going to do. It seemed that even though authorizations for CSM and a research vessel were important steps in campus growth and development, the authorization could have no immediate effect, as no funds from the proposed sources (program revenue, gifts/grants) were available. Finally, no word was available from campus administration regarding the UWM Real Estate Foundation and whether it had secured funds that could possibly be applied to contemplated projects, such as Wauwatosa or Pabst. In recognition of these serious and prevailing problems, APBC posed a series of questions to campus administration regarding how it planned to proceed. These questions are below. Regrettably, the campus administration did not provide answers to these questions before the spring semester concluded.

APBC questions re CMP and Milwaukee Initiative Capital Expenditures

1. A. In what ways have the discussion and subsequent action by the BOR on Jan 8 changed the priorities of the campus administration regarding the Milwaukee Initiative/CMP?
   B. In what ways have the discussion and subsequent action by the Faculty Senate in Sem 1 changed the priorities of the campus administration regarding the Milwaukee Initiative/CMP?

2. At present, precisely how much gift/grant revenue is actually in the accounts of the UWM Foundation or either of its two subsidiaries (Real Estate Foundation, Research Foundation) to support the existing and remaining projects in Milwaukee Initiative/CMP, and specifically the new Neeskay II for WATER, the acquisition of Tosa/County Grounds, and the development of SPH, apart from questions of where SPH is eventually located?
3. A. Specifically for Tosa/County Grounds, what is the contractual arrangement with the County for acquiring this property for eventual use by UWM? How does the campus administration give direction to the Real Estate Foundation regarding its acquisition?  
B. Specifically for Pabst Bldg 29, what arrangements exist for UWM acquiring this property for eventual use by UWM? Is the Real Estate Foundation involved in the acquisition? If so, how does the campus give direction to the Real Estate Foundation regarding its acquisition?  
C. Specifically for WATER, what contractual arrangements are necessary to acquire the adjacent land for expansion? Is the Real Estate Foundation involved in the acquisition? If so, how does the campus give direction to the Real Estate Foundation regarding its acquisition and eventual use by UWM?  
D. It seems that the BOR didn’t actually take Wauwatosa or Pabst off the table and that its narrative on those items actually reaffirmed their status as ongoing projects. Nevertheless, the BOR didn’t allocate GFSB to these two projects, in the way they did SFS/WATER. In the view of campus administration, how specific are the building plans under the pre-design phase to Tosa/County Grounds and Pabst Bldg 29? We did sign a contract for $500,000 for consulting services re buildings that campus administration wants to put at these sites (and WATER), even though there exists widespread concern among campus governance groups regarding the Tosa and Pabst sites. Have we now paid for plans for buildings specific for the Tosa and Pabst sites, even though acquisition of the sites is not imminent, was never highly endorsed by campus governance groups, no GFSB funds are available, and acquisition may in fact not actually be supported in the future by the BOR?  

4. What specific revenue sources (current or projected) is the campus administration prepared to apply to the CSM project and academic programs housed there (e.g., percentage of current/projected dorm revenues, differential tuition, etc.)? For generating program revenue during the balance of the 2009-11 biennium more generally? For generating program revenue during the 2011-13 biennium more generally? Does the campus need to raise the full $60 M in program revenue before it proceeds with any plans for CSM, or can it proceed as portions become available?  

5. What priorities has the campus administration identified regarding the academic uses of CSM, specifically concerning academic programs associated with (a) STEM and (b) SPH, on the basis of the CMP? To what extent does the feasibility study from 2004 regarding CSM remain applicable? Specifically, to what extent does the campus administration view SPH as located at CSM, rather than Pabst Bldg 29? In light of the action of BOR supporting the acquisition of CSM and not allocating any GFSB to Pabst and the extensive remodeling costs associated with Pabst Bldg 29? If plans exist for locating SPH in CSM after it is acquired, what then are the plans of campus administration regarding the acquisition of Pabst Bldg 29?  

6. What priorities has the campus administration identified regarding the academic uses of Kenwood IRC-I, specifically concerning academic programs associated with (a) STEM and (b) SPH, on the basis of the CMP? To what extent does the campus administration view an enhanced CEAS associated with entrepreneurial activity as located on the Kenwood campus (Kenwood IRC-I) and possibly USRB (Capitol-First), rather
than Tosa/County Grounds, in light of the action of BOR that did not allocate any GFSB to Tosa?

7. How do Kenwood IRC-I and CSM relate to the ongoing planning cycle (e.g., plans submitted by the deans in response to requests from campus administration) for academic programs for the balance of the 2009-11 biennium? For the 2011-13 biennium?

8. What are the plans of campus administration for dealing with a budget cutback in the second year of the current biennium, should one occur, or even in the 2011-13 biennium, should one occur, in light of our requirement to generate program revenue to support projects in Milwaukee Initiative/CMP? What specific priorities does the campus administration want to observe?

9. Can funds raised through gifts/grants and program revenue be applied to projects not enumerated by BOR on Jan 8 (e.g., Tosa/County Grounds, Pabst Bldg 29)?

10. What action does the campus administration contemplate regarding neighborhood associations if CSM is acquired and the campus decides to generate revenue/leverage with this asset through student housing? What other revenue generating activities are contemplated regarding CSM?

11. The Chancellor emphasized proximity to third-party partners as the driving force behind much of the activity associated with the Milwaukee Initiative. He stated that third-party partners were necessary to support interdisciplinary activity, in his opinion/experience. What proportion of current campus interdisciplinary activity actually depends on third party partners? Of projected interdisciplinary activity?

The final report of the CMP, which APBC was prepared to address in the second stage of its review process, did not appear early in Sem 2 as promised. The brief information APBC periodically received indicated that the master planning team was still working on the report, wanting to get it right, developing the rationale for site selection and proposals, and so on. When APBC asked about the continual delays, campus administration continually stressed that the CMP exercise was ultimately a matter for the state, not the campus. Nevertheless, it appeared to many APBC members that the campus administration was inserting itself into the CMP, to have CMP favorably reflect the view of campus administration rather than an objective view of the possibilities for long-term growth and development on the campus.

The state had not supported the campus DIN for 2009-11, in light of the state’s budget problems. The campus administration proposed to re-submit the DIN for 2011-13, with only slight modifications. APBC endorsed this plan, although the state’s budget problems persist and prospects are not clear.

Much of APBC business in Sem 2 continued to address CMP and MI. APBC noted that deadlines passed without action concerning Wauwatosa, even though the campus administration repeatedly stated that progress was being made and announcements were forthcoming. No progress was apparent to APBC. In light of the actions of the BOR in
Dec and Jan, it appeared that if an Innovation Research Park project was to go forward, it would have to be supported virtually entirely by private funding, such as some sort of partnership with the private sector through the UWM Real Estate Foundation. APBC raised the question of how faculty were involved in the actions of the Real Estate Foundation. APBC was concerned because the Foundation was acting on behalf of the interests of the campus and its academic programs. However, faculty have primary responsibility for academic and educational activities under Chapter 36 of Wisconsin Statutes, not campus administration or an independent real estate subsidiary of the UWM Foundation. The role of faculty and staff input in decisions about physical plant, when those decisions further affect academic programs, financial commitments, and budgeting, remained a matter of considerable discussion. For example, on the one hand some argued that although it certainly would be desirable for the Foundation to seek input from the campus, there appears to be no formal requirement that they consult governance (or faculty) per se. On the other hand, faculty and staff do have responsibilities for academic and educational programs, and the physical locus of those programs is surely relevant to those responsibilities. Questions about whether the campus would incur any long-term financial responsibilities under plans developed by campus administration were also raised. The campus administration did not respond.

APBC also devoted considerable attention to whether SPH is better located at Pabst or CSM. The campus administration continued to hold the view that numerous reasons compelled consideration of the Pabst site and not CSM for SPH, even though BOR had formally enumerated CSM for acquisition and remodeling and had not even enumerated any funds to be used for a Pabst site. Some members of APBC expressed considerable reservations about the position of the campus administration. In response to a Senate motion that would suspend activity aimed at locating SPH at Pabst and focus instead on CSM, APBC held discussions examining both sites. However, in light of uncertainties about acquisition and remodeling costs, APBC ultimately decided not to express any formal opinion at this time to the Faculty Senate on its preference for one site as opposed to the other. The Faculty Senate formed a special committee to examine the question of the uses of CSM, should it be acquired, analogous to the pre-design working groups for other elements of CMP/MI. The special committee anticipates continuing its work over the summer. In addition, another special committee was formed after discussion in the PEC to examine costs/benefits of locating SPH at Pabst, CSM, or alternative site(s).

The campus administration similarly continued to hold the view that numerous reasons compelled consideration of either alternatives to or additions to the Harbor-Greenfield site for SFS, even though (a) BOR had formally enumerated funds for expansion of SFS, and (b) SFS faculty had unanimously voted in favor of the Harbor site. The campus administration was particularly interested in a site on Reed St as a “front door” to SFS and the visible, scenic promotion of Milwaukee as a hub of water technology in the 21st century. The possibility of securing private sector support for a Reed St site also loomed large, in that no other funds (e.g., state GPR, campus program revenue) had been identified for a Reed St facility. As with the Pabst site for SPH, some members of APBC expressed considerable reservations about the position of the campus administration and the wisdom of a Reed St site. At the close of the academic year, APBC had received no further information about Reed St.
For all three points of discussion—Wauwatosa for an Innovation Park, SPH at Pabst rather than CSM, and SFS at an alternative to the Harbor site—questions remained as to just how these initiatives would be reconciled with the continued insistence of campus administration that the initiatives would be driven by academic plans not private sector concerns. No funds from any source seemed to be available to support these projects. Further, many on APBC continued to express concern about conflicts of interest and the traditional independence of a university if we were to enter into consortial arrangements with the private sector. At this writing (June, 2010), no announcement has been made on progress in these areas, although mention has been made of continued discussion over the summer.

UWS proposed an ambitious Growth Agenda during Sem 2, the ultimate objective of which was to increase the number of college graduates in the state. All campuses would contribute some percentage to the increase. For UWM to meet one proposed target, we would have to increase overall enrollment from current levels of around 30,000 to perhaps as high as 38,000. Possibilities for increasing overall enrollment include increasing transfers and increasing retention. The latter seems the most likely scenario. The campus administration stated that any increase in enrollment would not be undertaken without an increase in capital funds, estimated to be $25 M at least. Whether these plans and the required increase in capital funds are realistic remains to be determined. The semester closed without any further action or discussion of any specific features associated with the Growth Agenda.

The Commission on Student Life Academic Experience continued to meet during Sem 2, but no proposal for action was brought to APBC.

APBC also approved in principle a proposal to re-organize the structure and function of The Graduate School. Dean Scanes reassured the Committee that only a minimal reallocation of funds would be necessary for the reorganization, if any funds needed to be reallocated at all.

Various news reports were released during Sem 2 in which campus officials portrayed certain stances re campus initiatives. Unfortunately, these reports did not reflect faculty views of those initiatives. APBC inquired of campus administration how those reports came to be released, in light of faculty having primary responsibility for academic and educational activities under Chapter 36, but failed to receive suitable answers.

The final report of the CMP was eventually released at the end of Sem 2, rather than earlier in the semester as anticipated. The semester terminated before APBC had a chance to critically examine it and report to the Faculty Senate, in the second stage of its review process. Indeed, at the close of Sem 2, at least three formal recommendations remained undecided: (a) CSM or Pabst or elsewhere as a site for SPH, (b) a site such as Reed St as an alternative to or in addition to the Harbor site for SFS, and (c) Wauwatosa as a site for Innovation Research Park. The financial implications of the above decisions were particularly uncertain, and remain to be clarified for 2010-11. The CMP also remains to be critically examined by APBC.
APBC remains supportive of efforts to increase campus scholarship, increase student achievement, and contribute to the metro Milwaukee area and the state. Numerous studies indicate that communities benefit from having a great university. Great universities facilitate and promote the efforts of students, who by pursuing curricular interests acquire both general and specific skills that will serve them well throughout their lives. Great universities also facilitate and promote the efforts of faculty and staff, who provide the opportunities for students to grow and develop and who contribute to their communities. Great universities make it possible for faculty and staff to do their jobs, and for students to pursue curricular interests, with a minimum of difficulty. Great universities contribute to their communities by providing a well-educated work force and by benefiting the common good. UWM has a remarkable opportunity to make progress, in light of the authorization to spend as much as $240 M in support of faculty, students, staff, and community. Although a common theme at universities is the need for more resources, it remains incumbent on universities to make the best use of the resources they have been given. APBC joins with the campus administration in seeking to make UWM a great university.

Professor Garrison was elected chair for 2010-11.