



# LIBRARIES

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

## **Minutes of the regular meeting of the Executive Committee of the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin: July 16, 1969. 1969**

Madison, Wisconsin: Board of Regents of the University of  
Wisconsin System, 1969

<https://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/RQYWOYGVMZFOA86>

Copyright 2008 Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System

The libraries provide public access to a wide range of material, including online exhibits, digitized collections, archival finding aids, our catalog, online articles, and a growing range of materials in many media.

When possible, we provide rights information in catalog records, finding aids, and other metadata that accompanies collections or items. However, it is always the user's obligation to evaluate copyright and rights issues in light of their own use.

MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
OF THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Madison, Wisconsin

Held in Room 1820 Van Hise Hall

Wednesday, July 16, 1969, 2:03 P.M.

President Nellen presiding

PRESENT: Regents Nellen, Pasch, Renk, and Ziegler (members of the Committee); also present Regents Pelisek, Sandin, and Walker.

President Nellen stated that in accordance with the notice of the meeting, the purpose of the meeting is to discuss the impact of the contemplated budget on the University, and that in his opinion the situation is quite critical. He stated that if the budget is adopted as now contemplated, curtailment and reductions in University activities will have to be performed. He stated that the purpose of the meeting is not to determine such changes at this time, but to become knowledgeable about what the probable or anticipated changes might be, and for that reason the chancellors had been asked to appear and advise as to the possible measures which might have to be undertaken. He continued that one doesn't have to be an expert in fiscal matters to realize that the University cannot exist over the next period of the budget with no additional funds for 12,000 additional students, without lessening the quality of the education of these students; that this would be a situation similar to taking on an enrollment the size of an institution such as the University of Oshkosh, without funds to finance it.

President Harrington stated that we often face crises, but that this is a crisis of such a magnitude that the Regents will have to talk about the limitation of enrollment if the current budget situation outlook does not improve. He pointed out that the governor had recommended an increase of \$60,000,000 in general purpose revenue appropriations over the \$180,000,000 in the last biennium; that the Joint Finance Committee had cut this increase to approximately \$20,000,000, which the Regents felt was too great a decrease and the Board so resolved. The State Senate then raised the increase to slightly over \$40,000,000, and while that is substantially below the governor's recommendations, it, together with increases in fees, represents a level at which the University could move forward, and the Senate passed the budget in that form. However, the Republican

caucus in the Assembly and the Joint Finance Committee in reconsidering the matter, sent back to the Assembly a budget with even more of a cut. The Joint Finance Committee recommendations earlier were low, but the present discussion in the Assembly is lower by \$3,500,000. They have eliminated the appropriation for additional fringe benefits for the faculty, including assistance for a better retirement program, and have reduced the supplies expense and capital budget by a million dollars. He stated that the proposed budget means that we are asked to operate the institution with 12,000 more students with less resources than we now have. He pointed out that 98% of these students are in-state students, and that therefore the statement that out-of-state enrollment should be further limited is not valid. He continued that we face the situation of teaching these students with actually less than present resources when the inflationary factor is considered; that the proposed budget does not provide the funds for custodial services for new buildings; and that the situation is grievous. With respect to the argument that the professors should do less research and more teaching, he pointed out that the research money comes from outside sources and that if we take a professor off research and make him do additional teaching, that we would have to provide the additional teaching funds necessary from the state budget.

President Harrington called upon Chancellor Henry Ahlgren for his comments, which are attached as EXHIBIT A.

President Nellen inquired of Chancellor Ahlgren as to his procedure on cutting down activities within the Extension Division if the present budget proposal is passed. Chancellor Ahlgren stated that the Extension Division has already started reducing their music programs for young people, have eliminated entirely the Junior Academy of Science program, eliminated five positions in health-science units, reduced all programs in continuing education programs, eliminated direct study foreign language programs, would be unable to expand the graduate program in engineering, and the reduction of emphasis on new and revised correspondence courses. He added that the program for the disadvantaged in the inner core in Milwaukee would have to be eliminated, and that other reductions would be required if the Assembly budget is approved.

Chancellor H. Edwin Young's remarks are attached as EXHIBIT B.

In response to a question from President Nellen, Chancellor Young stated that all commitments with respect to out-of-state students have been made but that the Madison Campus has always had the policy of trying to let in any eligible Wisconsin student as long as there is time to process his papers. In response to a question from Regent Pasch, Chancellor Young advised that practically all contemplated new programs that were designed to keep up with the advance in education will have to be put aside. He added that if the program to attract black studies departments is approved by the Regents and the Coordinating Council, the personnel will have to come from existing positions; that they will be primarily joint appointments; and that he is asking departments if they have an opening to appoint someone who has qualifications in both areas. Regent Renk questioned the possibility of having to limit the enrollment of resident students by raising the standards for admission. Chancellor Young replied that this might have to be considered for the second year of the biennium, but it is the last thing that he would do. President Harrington stated that this is the heart of

the problem, and the reason we need the Senate budget as against the budget now before the Assembly, because the difference is the denial of educational opportunities to young Wisconsin students. Chancellor Young added that if we take more than we can handle they will in effect be getting a third-rate education. President Nellen stated that he assumed that the policy matter of spreading out the faculty among a greater number of students or reducing the number of students would be presented to the Regents for their consideration.

Chancellor J. Martin Klotsche's statement is attached as EXHIBIT C.

In response to a question from Regent Pasch, Chancellor Klotsche stated that the proposed budget will hurt the program for the students in Milwaukee who work full time and attend evening classes, and that cutbacks would have to be made in library services, computer services, the number of sections to be offered, and new programs, thus the entire operation of the University will be affected. In reply to Regent Sandin's question as to the effect of the cutback on the five-year program, Chancellor Klotsche stated that this is particularly undesirable because the program has been effective, with 80% of the students, who are high-risk students, meeting University grade point standards, and it would be a difficult decision to make to scale down or reduce the scope of this program. With respect to the dropping of 50 sections in Fine Arts and 160 sections in Letters and Science, Chancellor Klotsche stated that it would be necessary to increase the size of existing sections of courses, which would mean that students would have to defer taking those courses and would result in their being unable to take their degree requirements in the sequence desired.

With respect to the question by Regent Ziegler as to the loss of "matching" money, Chancellor Young stated that this is a particularly serious matter because new programs come forward which require matching money from the State, and if the State does not furnish the matching money, we must forego the gift or grant for the new program. President Harrington stated that the administration is concerned about this matter, and if the budget cut is maintained, it will not enable us to put up the money necessary to use funds from foundations and other donors.

Chancellor L. H. Adolfson's comments are attached as EXHIBIT D.

Chancellor Irvin G. Wyllie's comments are attached as EXHIBIT E.

Chancellor Edward W. Weidner's comments are attached as EXHIBIT F.

Chancellor Young advised that as of July 15, the Madison Campus had issued almost exactly the same number of permits to freshmen as one year previously, the difference being that there are 10% more residents of Wisconsin, and 30% fewer non-residents. He stated that we will have more juniors than last year because there were more sophomores the year previous, so that the only way the enrollment could really be reduced next year would be to revoke permits already issued to freshmen.

President Nellen stated that further statements from the audience would be limited, due to the time factor, but that written statements to the Secretary of the Board or to members of the Legislature would be welcome.

Regent Walker stated that there was a question in his mind as to whether or not the Senators and the Assemblymen realized the damage the proposed Assembly budget would cause, and questioned whether there had been any effective penetration of their minds by the administration and by the Regents thus far. He stated that there should be some dramatic means of calling to their attention the seriousness of the position they have taken. Regent Sandin observed that there is perhaps a credibility gap, that they don't believe that things are as bad as they appear. President Nellen stated that he assumed that all of the information had been presented to the Legislators in one form or another and had been brought before the appropriate committees. Regent Ziegler stated that he felt it was perhaps not a credibility gap but rather a lack of understanding, because it is a very complex budget and that, therefore, there is probably a combination of a credibility gap and a lack of know how. He recalled that when the budget was presented to the Regents there were long lists of new programs presented by each chancellor and that the Regents had reduced about 2/3 of such requests; the budget was reviewed by the governor and his staff, they took a responsible attitude toward what the State could afford, and put together a budget which was considered a minimum budget to maintain the quality of the school. The Senate took an equally responsible approach and came up with a reasonable budget, but the disturbing thing is that after the governor and the Senate studied matters as carefully as they did, the Assembly and Joint Finance took an arbitrary attitude that there must be further cuts without any real good reasons. He stated that if we must educate additional students without additional funds, the quality of the instruction has to suffer. In response to his question as to the comparative treatment of the University of Wisconsin and the State Universities, Assistant Vice President Donald Percy advised that the State Universities had fared better than the University of Wisconsin in both funds to cover the cost of increased enrollments and for physical plant maintenance. Regent Ziegler also pointed out that the loss of the 2% pickup in retirement would result in the civil service employees being treated differently than the faculty employees, and inquired as to the status of the faculty employee retirement system compared with other Big Ten universities. He was advised by Vice President Clodius that this puts us at the bottom of the level of compensation in the Big Ten, and that we are below the California State College at Los Angeles, the University of Georgia, the University of San Diego, and San Diego State College, etc.

Regent Walker stated that we should search out the various potential damage that lies before us, ten or twelve major points, which should be publicized in the newspapers, on television, and on radio stations, sent to members of the Legislature, and to the governor and his staff.

Regent Pasch made the following statement: "As a member of the Board of Regents, I have a general interest and concern in the budget. As chairman of the Educational Committee, I have a direct and specific concern in the budget. I have followed the budget since it was before this Board for consideration. As a member of the CCHE, I was involved again in the budget. I have followed its progress in the Legislative halls. My concern has become greater as the consequences of the budget become more and more apparent.

"I am particularly disturbed by the clear anti-Madison Campus bias evident in either Joint Finance version of the biennial budget. The absolute

denial of funds to teach additional students and operate new buildings strikes me as disastrous.

"What began among the faculty as a growing concern over budget cuts early last year following the CCHE reductions has now enlarged to a question of confidence in the commitment of this State to continue its laudable and beneficial support of a great institution. Faculty members do not easily grow restless, but when they do we had better look to the causes of that restlessness and certainly the latest round of budget reductions and the delay in passing any budget are major ones. Our faculty's promotions, new appointments and merit increases are officially delayed for the most part until some kind of budget is passed. The students have been apprised of the portending fee increases and are sophisticated enough to recognize that the acceptance of additional students without additional teaching, library and student service resources means they will be 'getting less for more' in a very real sense. Our administrators, criticized from without and within, most often without basis, are being wooed by other institutions and other professions. In short, these are perilous times in which the 'right decisions' must be made.

"Our extension program--acclaimed by many as the best in the country--has received no recommended increases in State support beyond those for merit increases to existing staff. No State funds for off-campus instructional programs and no support for improved public service programs in the prospect we now face.

"It is a sad picture. It is a sordid picture, one which does not fit the image and reputation of our great University of Wisconsin which is and will continue to be a vital part of its more than 70,000 degree holders in Wisconsin and its 65,000 degree holders outside Wisconsin."

Regent Renk stated that he felt that he had a special responsibility because he had made the motion to accept the original budget to the Board. He regretted that the people in power in the Capitol were not present to hear the statements made by the Chancellors, the President, and the Vice President. He stated that we have cut out-of-state enrollment, and that it would be disastrous if we had to cut in-state enrollment, deny some of the young people the chance for a better education. He stated that no one could deny what the University has done for the agriculture of this state; it has made Wisconsin agriculture the envy of agricultural programs world wide, and that what the University has done for agriculture is true for business, industry, labor, banking, education, medicine, pharmacy, engineering, and many other professions. He stated that we have a tremendous investment in the University and that the Board of Regents must quickly get the story of the budget, what it is going to do to the University and the new campuses, to the members of the Legislature. He stated that he sincerely hoped that we can at least come out with the Senate budget, if not the governor's budget.

President Nellen stated that he has rightfully been accused by the papers of being a conservative, and admits he is a fiscal conservative, but that the original budget that the Regents approved was justifiable; that the duty of the members of the Board of Regents is to recommend what is best for the

University; and that the people who presented the budget to the Regents had valid reasons for suggesting that budget. He continued that the Regents did not say then or now that the University has to have this money to exist, but that if it is going to exist as a great university, it has to have more money than they are considering appropriating at this time. He continued that ultimately the Regents will be blamed for the University losing its position of excellence; that it will take a period of time before lessened quality and lessened excellence becomes manifest, the faculty will be depleted gradually, the courses will become less excellent; and so while we are determining the fate of the University at this time, it won't be manifest for a few years, but that he would like to go on record at this time that the Board of Regents had recommended a budget, but whether the University maintains its position of excellence depends on someone else's acts, and we cannot be responsible for that.

Regent Ziegler moved adoption of the following resolution:

As members of the lay citizen body charged with the responsibility for governing and sustaining this highly complex and highly acclaimed institution of higher learning and service, we call on the Legislature to provide additional funds sufficient to allow us to meet our unavoidable and continuing increased responsibility in the 1969-71 biennium. We strongly urge, at a minimum, a return to the 1969-71 budget level for the University of Wisconsin recommended by the State Senate.

The motion was seconded by Regent Pasch and carried unanimously.

The Executive Committee went into a closed Executive Session and, without announcement, adjourned at 3:58 P.M.

J. S. Holt, Assistant Secretary

Statement by Henry L. Ahlgren  
Chancellor, University Extension  
July 16, 1969

Meeting of Executive Committee of The Board of Regents

I wish to preface my remarks this afternoon by saying that:

- 1) There has never been a time in our history when the need for and ready and continuing access to continuing education opportunities have been greater than they are today;
- 2) We have been confronted with more serious problems that have a direct bearing on our future which demand solution. I would mention as examples the preservation of our water resources, the deterioration of the quality of our environment, and problems in our major cities.
- 3) The farmer, businessman, lawyer, doctor, engineer, housewife, young and old, the disadvantaged, skilled and unskilled need access to opportunities for continuing education programs tailored to their needs and interests--programs that will assist in assuring a place for them in the mainstream of American life.

Because of all this, we devoted much more than the usual amount of time, thought, and effort to the preparation of our budget request for the 1969-71 biennium. After careful consideration, we were led to the conclusion that if we were to deal adequately and in a manner that could have a significant impact on increased educational needs, we would need as a very minimum an additional appropriation of state funds of approximately \$6,000,000. This request--along with all others--in the budget of the University of Wisconsin--has passed five separate review levels--The Regents, CCHE, the Governor, the Joint Finance Committee, and the State Senate. It is currently before the Assembly for further debate and resolution by that body.

At each review level, the amount of increased funds we requested was reduced substantially and our only real consolation is that we were not unique in that respect.

The Executive Budget prepared by the Governor included a modest sum for program improvement and for increased support for: 1) off-campus degree credit, and 2) off-campus continuing education.

The budget approved by the Senate deleted support for program improvement but provided some increased funding for off-campus degree credit and off-campus continuing education.

The budget now before the Assembly contains no additional funds--excepting for salary increases--for University Extension--beyond those available during the second year of the biennium just completed. In addition, the proposed freeze on unfilled positions would further limit our effectiveness in service to the people of Wisconsin.

EXHIBIT A



In summary--if the Assembly version of the 1969-71 biennium budget is enacted into law:

- 1) No new programming that can have any substantial degree of impact or significance will be possible.
- 2) We will be forced to retrench and reduce many of our current offerings because of increased cost of doing business.
- 3) We will need to slant our program offerings increasingly to those who have the ability to pay--rather than base them on educational needs.
- 4) No innovative teaching methods will be possible.
- 5) Members of our faculty may seek and accept opportunities elsewhere because of lack of resources here.

Impact on the Madison Campus of the  
Most Recent Proposed Joint Finance Committee Budget  
July 10, 1969

The budget adopted by the Assembly Republican caucus and accepted by the Joint Finance Committee would, in simplest terms, require that the University handle the demands of the 1969-71 biennium at a level of State funding no greater than was budget to us in 1968-69.

If this could be done as a temporary measure without lasting damage to the University or the State, the question could be viewed differently. The fact is that most of the economies proposed or required to handle a larger load with no increase in State funds will create cash costs or other penalties that Wisconsin will find itself paying for years to come. Some of the more significant of these costs are pointed out in the following statement.

Enrollment Money for Additional Students.

Projections for the Madison campus show that we can expect about 1,100 more students this Fall than we had in 1968-69, and an additional net growth of 1,900 more students the following year. Current estimates are as follows:

	<u>Undergraduates</u>	<u>Graduate &amp; Professional</u>	<u>Total</u>
1968-69 (actual)	24,617	10,053	34,670
Increase	682	427	1,109
1969-70 (proj.)	25,299	10,480	35,779
Increase	1,289	620	1,909
1970-71 (proj.)	26,588	11,100	37,688

Normally it would be expected that about \$3.3 million would be added to the budget to provide for the necessary teachers, laboratory supplies, library books and services, and other facilities. In fact, the impact of the proposed Joint Finance Committee budget is to require a net cut of about \$900,000 in the Madison campus teaching budget for 1969-70 below the allocation for 1968-69. Denied additional enrollment funds for the second year of the biennium, the situation will continue to worsen. This is obviously more of a problem than can be met simply by a freeze on new positions or on the filling of vacancies. The equivalent of nearly 90 full-time teaching positions would need to be cut to cover the deficiency, and this in the face of increased student numbers. It will give some idea of the size of this reduction to point out that it could not quite be accomplished by eliminating the entire teaching budget for the Law School, or all teaching positions in the Schools of Pharmacy and Nursing combined.

A restriction on enrollment is one obvious possible answer. It is an unsatisfactory one for many reasons. At the freshman and sophomore levels, the Madison campus teaches at a per-student cost so low that shifting students elsewhere would mean no economies to the Wisconsin parent or taxpayer. In addition, fee losses through reduced numbers would cancel out much of any saving made. Finally, no one wants to give up easily the University of Wisconsin tradition of keeping its doors open without restriction to every qualified Wisconsin student.

Dismissing staff would be a last resort fraught with serious legal complications. Staff cuts would inevitably fall most heavily on younger and lower-paid Assistant Professors without tenure and on lower-paid non-faculty and civil service employees.

The only other source of cuts is in the allocation of supply and expense money for the teaching programs of the various Colleges and Departments. These budgets are already inadequate, and inflation has seriously eroded what they will buy. A cut of 7-8% in an already inadequate supply allocation would be felt at once in the quality and content of courses (especially in laboratory courses) and in library and other student services (which because they depend heavily on student help would already be crippled by cuts in that item).

The possibility of increased teaching loads for existing staff has been thoroughly explored, and there is almost no chance to add classes without adding staff. Wisconsin's teaching loads are at least as heavy as at any other University of high quality. Except in fields where staff have substantial research assignments (such as agriculture and some areas of medicine), most faculty members already have full-time teaching responsibilities. It would be false economy to propose moving medical, agricultural, and other research staff in large numbers from the laboratory to the classroom. First, they are not necessarily prepared to teach in the courses where more teaching staff is needed. Second, the research they are doing is needed and the Federal and State support that makes it possible are evidence that these governments want it continued. Third, few shifts in duties could be made without the loss of the outside funds which support the research worker to do what he is now doing. There are no gains in reassigning a research man to teaching duties if it is then necessary to find additional teaching salary money to support him.

Class size and student-professor contact are the thing most likely to suffer by failure to add teaching funds to handle additional students. This is unfortunate. It contradicts the best judgment as to what direction Universities should move, and it threatens to make even more difficult the already serious problem of student-faculty communication.

It should be remembered that quiz, laboratory, and discussion sections are for the most part now handled by graduate student Teaching Assistants. Contact with the professor occurs in lecture courses, and there are nearly 2,000 individual lecture classes or lecture sections in Letters and Science College courses at any given time. Only about 15% of these are classes with more than 100 students enrolled--but that 15% account for more than half of all student class registrations in the Letters and Science college. A quarter of all these registrations are in classes of 250 students or more.

To handle increased student numbers without increased money will mean that these classes will be even larger. It means that the few professors who now meet with quiz, laboratory, or discussion sections will no longer be able to afford that luxury. It means that almost all small-group, face-to-face contact between students and teachers on this campus will occur between students and Teaching Assistants. No matter how effective the capable Teaching Assistant is, we are deeply concerned about a budget that means fewer and fewer professors meeting regularly with small groups of students. The student is entitled (and

so is the professor) to more chance to work in small classes where individual needs can be better met and teaching can be done more effectively. A budget that works against this hurts the quality of education Wisconsin young people receive.

#### Physical Plant.

In the coming biennium the Joint Finance Committee budget would put the Madison campus \$3.1 million below the level of funding it needs to maintain the physical plant at present levels of service.

Wisconsin has never set extravagant levels of maintenance for its public buildings. University building maintenance is based on a formula set by the State itself (one custodial or janitorial employee to take care of 16,000 square feet of building space; 1% of the building's value each year to maintain it and keep it in repair).

Wisconsin chose those ratios as the minimum that would protect against health and safety hazards in buildings, guard against premature deterioration, and forestall the need for early replacement or costly accumulated repairs. These are exactly the kind of costs that will be incurred if we fail to provide necessary physical plant funding.

Two major new buildings are being put in service on the Madison campus during the biennium; these make the problem even more acute. One of the two, the History-Art-Music building, is the largest the State has ever built at an educational institution. If the proposed budget is adopted, either the full use of these new buildings will be unnecessarily delayed or service will have to be reduced in existing buildings to give them janitorial service, repairs or maintenance, water, electricity, and other utilities.

For 1969-70 alone we estimate that the current budget proposal would fall this far short of paying for present levels of building upkeep and service:

Maintenance and upkeep	\$402,000
Janitorial service	447,454
Water and sewer	50,665
Electricity	159,020

Deficiencies at or above that level would appear again in 1970-71.

#### State-Wide Computer Utility.

The proposed Joint Finance Committee budget would reduce needed State funds for the Computing Center by \$1.9 million over the biennium. To this must be added a loss of well over \$2 million in user charges and grant funds from non-State sources that would not be available if the Computing Center program and facilities were cut in the way this budget would require.

This has unfortunate effects that extend to other units as well as the Madison campus. The Computing Center is key to state-wide plans for economical development of computer services in education.

In most States, every university or college or vocational school or high school must necessarily develop its own independent and free-standing computer facility. This is costly in almost every way. Equipment, programs, and staff cannot be shared. Idle time cannot be pooled, and capacity has to be developed to handle peak periods instead of a steady work load. Economies of scale are lost. Unwise or unsatisfactory equipment choices are sometimes made, with heavy replacement costs.

In Wisconsin the Governor's Task Force proposed to deal with these problems by a "computer utility" plan that has gained nation-wide attention. All major educational institutions were to share time on a single computer facility, with direct access by terminals on each campus. The University of Wisconsin system, the Wisconsin State Universities, the Vocational-Technical schools, and even some high schools could benefit financially from such a pooled effort.

This plan requires one unit to take the leadership in planning its equipment and staffing to make the utility concept possible. The Madison campus Computing Center had accepted that assignment.

For 1969-70 the University had asked \$450,000 in State funds as partial cost of leasing two pieces of Univac 1108 equipment. It had also sought \$472,000 for course-related instructional computing. These sums, together with other State and grant and user funds, would enable us to meet the \$3.8 million cost of maintaining the computer facility planned for the Madison campus during 1969-70.

If the \$922,000 mentioned above and the additional \$1 million needed for 1970-71 are cut from the budget, we will have to turn to smaller, more limited, and less economical kinds of equipment and "hardware" systems. A substantial reduction will have to be made in academic and civil service staff operating the Computing Center. This will mean less adequate computing capacity and thus less income from users who have outside funding to cover the full cost of the computer service they get.

Poorer computing service for Madison faculty and students is not the greatest damage resulting from these cuts, however. Educational institutions all over Wisconsin will have to recognize that the Madison campus is moving toward a different kind of equipment and staff than would be needed for the state-wide computing utility. Each will then be faced with staffing and equipping itself to meet independently its own computing service needs.

Even within the current biennium this could easily produce expenditures of State funds or other public funds far exceeding what the proposed Computing Center cuts would save. In the long run the added cost to Wisconsin education through short-sighted economy now is almost incalculable.

#### Staff Quality and Morale.

The University of Wisconsin has demonstrated that it can recruit and hold a faculty of national reputation without being fully competitive in salary levels and fringe benefits. The latest proposed Joint Finance Committee budget, however, combines some unfortunate effects that will make this increasingly difficult.

In holding present faculty and recruiting replacements we should face the fact that:

- Wisconsin's salary level continues to be below that of most other Universities of comparable quality.
- Wisconsin's retirement program is one of the least satisfactory at any major University, public or private. This was brought home to us again recently when the accrediting team which visited the campus singled out the retirement program for special criticism.
- If the Legislature rejects the proposed 2% pickup, there will be little basis for telling potential faculty members that any improvement in the retirement program is likely.
- The absence of a paid sabbatical leave program continues to hurt this University competitively.
- Pressure for professors to teach larger classes, and reduced opportunities to work with students in small groups or individually, will be unattractive to the very kind of teacher we want most to recruit or to hold.

Madison--The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and its students are being badly shortchanged in the proposed budget of the Assembly, UWM Chancellor J. Martin Klotsche told the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents Wednesday.

UWM expects 1,500 more students this fall than a year ago, but the Assembly budget provides additional funds for less than one-third of the increase, the chancellor said.

"The result is that we would have to drop many sections of courses the students want and need, reduce services such as library hours, and cut back drastically on new programs such as police education," he said.

Klotsche spoke at a special meeting of the Executive Committee of the Regents in Van Hise Hall called to discuss the grave impact of proposed cuts in the University's 1969-71 budget. The Assembly is proposing to cut \$3,500,000 more than the \$41,000,000 which the Legislature's Joint Finance Committee previously recommended be cut from the budget of \$525,000,000, proposed by Governor Knowles.

UWM this fall will have more than 18,000 students, Klotsche said. The budget request was based on this estimate and represents 500 more students than were budgeted for last fall. Actually, last fall's enrollment exceeded the budget estimate by nearly 300 students, and indications are that this fall's enrollment will exceed the predicted 18,057.

The main effect of the budget slashes will be the inability to open sections of courses. Some students will be unable to take required courses because not enough sections can be offered; others may be forced to delay completion of degree requirements. In the School of Fine Arts, for example, over 50 sections affecting 1200 students would have to be cancelled. In the College of Letters and Science at least 150 sections in high enrollment courses in English, Mathematics, and Chemistry would have to be eliminated.

These cutbacks in classes will also hit hard the adult student taking late hour classes.

Services to the students would also have to be cut, Klotsche said. The library, for example, would have to reduce its hours. The number of students employed there also would have to be reduced, thus lowering the level of service which the library provides, and also making it difficult for some students to continue their education for financial reasons.

Courses in the computer sciences, which are required for students of applied science and engineering, in business administration, and many other fields, would have to be curtailed because of their heavy dependence on the Computer Center.

The new Criminal Justice program, a degree-granting program for police, corrections and judicial workers, and one which has already attracted national attention, would have to be curtailed and operated on only a skeleton basis. The master's program in engineering also would be a victim of the budget cuts.

The Experiment in Higher Education program, in which disadvantaged youths are given special help in their college careers, would be held back because of budget limitations. This would be particularly unfortunate, Klotsche said, since the program has proven so successful, with 80% of the students achieving a C average or better last year.

The proposed budget cuts are particularly harmful because during the past fiscal year UWM did not have the use of between \$350,000 and \$400,000 originally budgeted for the campus. This includes \$230,000 in capital, and supplies and expenses deferred because of a freeze due to the tight fiscal situation. The expectation was that those necessary items could be deferred until the new fiscal year. The Assembly budget not only does not restore these funds but also requires a reduction in the previously existing base.

Also, the State Board on Government Operations in another cutback did not release some \$20,000 to which UWM was entitled because of increased enrollment last year. Also, the Assembly budget does not include additional funds for the unexpected 25% increase in the summer session enrollments of this year.

Further complicating the picture is the restriction of freezing all open positions, as of May 1, 1969. This prevents us from using these limited funds for additional instructional personnel already committed for the coming year.

The budget cuts proposed by the Assembly, coming on top of the already acute budget problems created last fiscal year, would jeopardize the quality of education which UWM is providing the community, Klotsche told the Regents.

July 15, 1969



UNIVERSITY CENTER SYSTEM

STATEMENT ON PROPOSED 1969-71 ASSEMBLY BUDGET  
TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE REGENTS

July 16, 1969

The implications of the budget recently proposed by the majority caucus in the Assembly have to be viewed in the context of a background of less support in 1968-69, the second year of the last biennium, and the drastically reduced level of support for new students and additional needs for the 1969-71 biennium.

During the past academic year, the Center System enrolled 374 students beyond the number for which budgetary provisions were made. Since the Board of Governmental Operations did not fund the additional students as in similar overages in past years, the following adjustments were required:

- (1) \$60,000 of the allocation for Program Improvement was diverted to provide instruction at the existing level. Program and curricular improvement scheduled for the second semester was scrapped because of the diversion.
- (2) Instructional supplies and expenses ordinarily required for supporting instruction of these 374 students were unavailable, straining the Supplies and Expenses budget beyond the limit.
- (3) Finally, there was created an obligation to continue instruction for these 374 students in 1969-70, though their funding was not in the base that went forward. (In short, any increase for 1969-70 must provide for these students as well as new students enrolling in 1969-70, approximately 600.)

In addition to the adjustments made necessary by the failure to provide additional workload funds for the additional 374 students, the Governor's freeze of capital funds in 1968-69 captured a substantial amount earmarked for instructional capital which was needed to improve instruction at all Center Campuses. The completion of new facilities at Waukesha and Marathon during the 1968-69 fiscal year required additional outlay in maintenance and limited staffing for which no budgetary increases were provided. Nor was there any budgetary provision for necessary increases in Student Services.

It is in light of this background that the effect of the stringent budget proposed by the majority Caucus must be viewed. If the recent version is approved by the Legislature, the effects upon the Center System for the biennium are as follows:

- (1) A definite possibility that we will have to breach formal offers to instructional personnel made and accepted earlier in the spring on the basis of less than 50% support to be drawn from tuition increases. (This level of support for new FTE students would be about \$500 as contrasted with a need, developed by the CCHE, of approximately \$1,400);

EXHIBIT D

- (2) Limiting sophomore programs at new campuses, probably crippling the Baraboo-Sauk County and Washington County Campuses;
- (3) Critical cutback in library purchases for the biennium; risking a level of support unacceptable for accredited institutions;
- (4) Curtailment of student services, jeopardizing seriously academic counseling, high school relations, and student activities;
- (5) Reduction in level of support for the lectures and fine arts programs;
- (6) Reduction in support, if not actual elimination of, intra-Center System faculty travel which is required for the coordination and development of academic programs;
- (7) Elimination of the Faculty and Curricular Development program;
- (8) Reduced support for instructional innovation and the use of instructional media (capital) to improve learning;
- (9) Cessation of support of programs for the disadvantaged already "seeded" by Student Development funds;
- (10) Reduction in student help and financial assistance for students;
- (11) Delaying some curriculum additions in Centers requiring additional sophomore courses;
- (12) An increase of teaching loads to levels, particularly in 1970-71, that will make faculty recruitment and retention difficult;
- (13) Substantial reduction of the Summer Program, and in some cases, its elimination;
- (14) Diversion of at least \$185,000 from instruction (nearly 20%) for the biennium to provide funds to absorb the maintenance costs which counties now provide, if bills currently in the Legislature are approved without appropriations;
- (15) Reduction of general service and administrative provisions while needs increase.

Other factors will aggravate further the pressures on our 1969-71 budget, such as:

- (1) Inflationary increases in prices of services and materials over the biennium;
- (2) Additional physical plants to be completed in the biennium which will require an additional \$150,000 to staff and maintain;

- (3) The loss of the 2 percent pickup for faculty retirement will present an additional morale problem and make even more difficult the recruitment of faculty devoted to excellence in teaching.

If the budget now proposed is passed, the Center System may be faced with several difficult alternatives:

- (1) Close one or more Centers during the second year of the biennium;
- (2) Give notice to selected personnel that 1969-70 will be their terminal year in order to reduce costs;
- (3) Reduce the sophomore programs and selected academic specialties in specific campuses;
- (4) Curtail drastically all supplies and expense expenditures and in consequence reduce the support of academic instructional programs as well as instructional coordination.

If any of these alternatives is implemented, it is our opinion that it will have a "domino" effect which could lead to the end of an effective University of Wisconsin freshman-sophomore program of instruction for the people of Wisconsin. We are not convinced that this is the peoples' wish.

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY OF CHANCELLOR IRVIN G. WYLLIE, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-PARKSIDE, BEFORE THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE UW BOARD OF REGENTS, JULY 16, 1969, ON THE SUBJECT OF THE BIENNIAL BUDGET

---

The Regents and the public should understand that two vitally important things are at stake in new campus funding in the 1969-71 biennium:

1. The public credibility of UW-Parkside and Green Bay as campuses of the University of Wisconsin.
2. The academic and general institutional credibility of the new campuses when they are reviewed for accreditation by the North Central Association during 1971-72.

The levels of funding proposed by the Governor and the CCHE, and endorsed by the Senate, provide a basis for establishing Parkside and Green Bay as campuses of the University of Wisconsin, and a basis of hope for accreditation. The Assembly caucus proposal, which reduces the new money needed for launching new campuses by one-third (from \$7.2 million to \$4.8 million in the case of Parkside), will not launch these campuses at the level of quality and service expected of the University of Wisconsin, and will jeopardize their prospects for accreditation.

In 1965 the Legislature assigned the new campuses to the University for development. That was in keeping with the wishes of the people of the northeastern and southeastern Wisconsin who, at considerable cost to themselves, contributed campus sites to the state and to the University in the expectation that they, their children, and future generations would receive a University of Wisconsin education in these important and growing areas of the state. Phenomenal enrollment growth at Parkside and Green Bay testifies not only to the need for new campuses, but to the extent of public confidence in them. The Senate version of the budget justifies this confidence and supports public hopes and expectations. The Assembly caucus version of the budget does not.

The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools has served notice that it will review Parkside and Green Bay for accreditation during 1971-72. Success in that review process will depend on the resources made available to the new campuses during the 1969-71 biennium. The institutions will be judged on what they have in the way of staff, programs, facilities, library resources, and service to students, not on what may be in prospect. What they have will depend on what they get from the Legislature in the summer of 1969. It would be extremely embarrassing to the State of Wisconsin if the new campuses should fail in their bid for accreditation by reason of deficient funding. The Assembly caucus version of the budget represents a level of funding that puts new campus accreditation prospects in jeopardy.

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS OF ENROLLMENT GROWTH AT UW-PARKSIDE

Enrollment growth has been spectacular, exceeding the CCHE forecast by 25% in the fall of 1968:

<u>CCHE Projection</u>	<u>Actual Enrollment</u>	<u>EXcess</u>	
1436	1796	+360	25%

Instead of the normal drop-off, Parkside experienced an unprecedented 10% gain between the first and second semesters of 1968-69:

<u>Fall Semester</u>	<u>Spring Semester</u>	<u>Gain</u>	
1796	1976	+180	10%

As a result of these gains CCHE raised its estimates for the fall of 1969:

<u>Original Estimate</u>	<u>Revised Estimate</u>	<u>Increase</u>	
2117	2746	+629	30%

Summer enrollment, which set an all-time record in 1968, virtually doubled in 1969:

<u>Summer, 1968</u>	<u>Summer, 1969</u>	<u>Increase</u>	
975	1811	+836	86%

Permits to enroll for the fall of 1969 are running 70% ahead of last year. This points to the possibility that the 3000 level of enrollment predicted for 1970 may be achieved one year early, in September, 1969.

Without restoration of the enrollment and start-up money recommended in the Senate version of the budget (approximately \$2.4 million), instructional quality will be eroded and service to students will be seriously curtailed. The student-faculty ratio, which stood at 20-1 in 1968-69, could rise to 25-1 or 28-1. (CCHE recommended a 16-1 ratio to maintain quality and generate the staff required for the introduction of majors.)

Parkside will not be able to implement 10 of its 21 CCHE-approved majors this fall because of staff shortages if the Assembly caucus version of the budget prevails.

#### The Greatest Budget Deficiencies (UW-Parkside)

1. In direct instructional needs Parkside is short more than \$500,000 for 1969-70, and more than \$1 million for the biennium--for faculty, laboratory technicians, clerical support of instruction, and student help.
2. In the area of student services a minimum of 10 academic counselors is needed, but the budget provides for only 5--one for every 550 students. This is a deficient level of counseling service for a new campus that must advise its students in regard to a completely new academic program.
  - a. Other student service operations--Registrar, Admissions, High School Relations, Financial Aids--are too thinly staffed to serve the expanding enrollment through the biennium.
3. The Library is seriously underfunded in the positions and services that contribute to user service and satisfaction. The 1967-69 Library budget covered purchases and processing, but not service to patrons. If restorations are not made students and faculty will suffer from restricted hours, cataloguing backlogs, staff deficiencies (in circulation, reference, documents, serials), and lack of sufficient part-time student help.
4. The Assembly caucus version of the budget provides that any position open on May 1 cannot be filled during the biennium. If that holds, the campus will

not be able to operate because many key leadership positions would fall under a ban--A Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, two academic deans, an Assistant Chancellor for Student Affairs, seven divisional chairmen, a Registrar, a Director of the Learning Center, and many others.

5. The campus desperately needs an adequate security force, but the proposed budget does not provide it. Five watchmen and five fully-equipped, fully-trained police officers will be required to provide minimum protection for campus buildings, capital equipment, and personnel.
  - a. Thieves have broken into the Kenosha campus three times in the last year, most recently two weeks ago. They have raided the vending machines, and in the latest intrusion, completely smashed them.
  - b. The dispersed buildings on the new site have been repeatedly invaded by persons who have carried off everything from furnaces to wall paneling, and from light fixtures to toilet seats.
  - c. The Chancellor's office has been broken into twice. The first episode led to the loss of \$2200 worth of office equipment. The Chancellor discovered the most recent break-in a week ago Monday when he returned to his office at 10:30 P.M. and found his tape recorder missing, his briefcase opened and disturbed, and a door leading from the basement to the office area forced open and splintered.
  - d. With no security force to protect the new buildings, newly-arrived personnel, and several hundred thousand dollars worth of capital equipment and furnishings, the campus is extremely vulnerable.
  
6. The same deficiencies appear in the physical plant budget, where at least ten additional men will be required to clean and maintain the new buildings, maintain the grounds, service other scattered buildings on the site, make repairs, operate the heating and chilling plant, maintain and operate campus vehicles, and perform other essential services.
  - a. Increased utility costs for the new buildings alone will amount to \$25,000 during 1969-70.
  - b. The University's share of operating and maintenance costs at the Kenosha Campus will increase by \$4,000 during this fiscal year.
  - c. Supply and capital items in the physical plant budget--everything from pails and mops to tools and snowplows--are short by about \$60,000 during the first year of the biennium.
  
7. Overall the campus suffers from capital equipment deficiencies. Less than \$400,000 was available through construction funds to equip all classrooms, labs, and lecture halls with office equipment, scientific instruments, laboratory supplies, and other instructional apparatus. Because it is new, Parkside has no backlog of used equipment on which to draw for its new operations.

8. The weakest feature of the Wisconsin employment package is fringe benefits (retirement, medical insurance, etc.). The abandonment of the 2% state pick-up on fringe benefits in the Assembly caucus version of the budget further impairs the University's position in competing for new staff, and bears down especially hard on new campuses, which need every possible advantage in competing for quality personnel.

The foregoing summary merely highlights the major negative effects of the proposed Assembly budget. A full accounting would reveal other substantial deficiencies.

Can flexibility in allocation and spending compensate for the \$2.4 million budget deficiency? The recital of specific needs usually elicits the claim that within the total dollars the campus administration can set its own priorities, and can proceed in a flexible way to cover the most critical needs. There is no way through flexibility or good management to stretch the remaining dollars over all of the critical needs. The same dollar cannot be spent in three or four places. The dollar that is spent for an instructor cannot also be spent for a circulation librarian, an academic program advisor, or a night watchman. The campus needs all of these people, and needs them simultaneously.

The magnitude of the budget deficiency (\$2.4 million), which amounts to one-third of all the new money recommended by the Senate, the Governor and the CCHE, rules out flexibility as a solution. In launching a new campus there is no way through flexibility to make \$4.8 million do the work of \$7.2 million. The only solution is in restoration.

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS

EDWARD W. WEIDNER, CHANCELLOR  
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-GREEN BAY

UWGB AND THE 1969-71 BUDGET

The budget bill which is being considered by the Assembly this week has extremely serious consequences for the program of the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay and each of its four campuses. At the time the bill originally was reported out by the Joint Committee on Finance some months ago, I described the consequences of the proposal as disastrous for UWGB. The bill which is now before the Assembly provides even less money. Under either version, many of our activities and programs would have to be cut out completely or would have to be cut below a bare minimum of adequate service. The cutbacks in our budget would affect every phase of our operations. There is no part of our activities that could rise beyond the bare minimum of adequate service under the proposed budget bill. The areas which fall below minimum standards or which represent the programs or activities that have been eliminated completely under the proposed budget are as follows:

1. The areas in which students major at UWGB have had to be restricted in size severely. In particular, we have had to adopt a maximum number of junior-senior courses that will be permitted in any one area of major. For the 1969-70 school year we have had to limit the number of junior-senior courses in each area of major to seven per semester. For the 1970-71 school year we have had to limit the number of courses each semester to a maximum of ten.
2. We have had to limit or restrict the number of majors, beyond the guidelines approved by CCHE. Thus we have cut back in the area of the performing arts, especially in regard to certain areas of music and the dance. Also, we have had to cut back in the areas of German, Spanish, and French. In a number of instances this has meant turning away students who would otherwise have majored at UWGB.
3. There will be no student health service of any kind at UWGB during 1969-70. There will be only the most minimal student health service provided in 1970-71.
4. The advising of students who have not already selected the area in which they are going to major is an area of inadequacy on the Green Bay Campus. While we expect to have around 1,500 students who have not selected a major next fall, we have only two advisers.
5. We have had to restrict the number of faculty severely. Whereas originally we were programmed for a 16-1 student-teacher ratio, in fact, we have a 20-1 ratio on a student body count basis, and more than 18-1 on the basis of full-time equivalent. In a new campus, it is particularly essential to have a low student-teacher ratio, since new junior and senior courses will be offered, and it can be expected that the first time such courses are offered that enrollment will be both on the small side and rather unpredictable.

EXHIBIT F



6. Our custodial help has been cut back well below the standards set by the State of Wisconsin for custodial services. This may eventually give us some labor problems. However, our custodial help has had to take cuts just as every other part of our personnel and our budget. Generally speaking, we are 20% under-staffed according to the custodial help standards used by the State of Wisconsin.
7. The secretarial help for our teaching staff will be almost non-existent. It will be necessary for around a dozen professors to use a single typist under the proposed budget bill.
8. Our remedial work and our new opportunities programs are severely under-staffed. For all practical purposes, we have only a skeleton remedial program and no new opportunities programs whatsoever. Remedial work is especially important in our area in connection with some high school graduates that come from rather remote areas. They need additional help to make an effective beginning in college work. Our new opportunities program is especially geared for the American Indians in our region who frequently suffer from substantial cultural disadvantage in trying to enter college.
9. We have not provided an adequate staff and expenses for the intramural program at the Green Bay Campus for the biennium. We will add 1,000 students to our Green Bay Campus in the fall of 1969 and another 1,000 in the fall of 1970. There will be no increase in any of the intramural or physical education programs despite the near tripling of the student body.
10. We have made no provisions for a special fund for start-up supplies in the area of the laboratory sciences for the 1969-70 school year. This is particularly serious because we start with no built-up inventory of supplies. For example, we do not have sulphur on the shelf in our new laboratory. Nor do we have sulphuric acid or any other chemical or laboratory supply. It is our estimate that approximately \$80,000 is needed for such start-up supplies for the new buildings.
11. We have made no provision for start-up equipment in the area of the visual and performing arts. This is particularly serious in such an area as music, where we are in desperate need of pianos and other basic equipment. It is estimated that we would need approximately \$55,000 for such basic start-up equipment.
12. We have been able to make no provision for office rental for our added staff for 1970-71. We have no space whatsoever for the 70 additional professional staff members that will join us in the fall of 1970. Facilities that we own will be filled to capacity in the fall of 1969.
13. Because of the inadequacy of the funds at the Joint Committee on Finance level we have been unable to provide for any 1970 increase in the budget of the Business Office, the Physical Plant, Chancellor's Office, Secretary of the Faculty, the Development and University Relations Office, and the Marinette, Manitowoc and Fox Valley campuses. The only increase in budget level from 1969-70 to 1970-71 will occur in the instructional departments and the instruction-related departments. This is true despite the fact that we will have over a 1,000 student increase--an increase of approximately 25%.

14. We have been unable to staff our Office of Physical Facilities Planning adequately. Therefore, a single person will have to concern himself with the entire \$19-\$20 million building program authorized by the legislature for the next biennium, plus making advance plans for self-financing projects and the 1971-73 biennial projects.
15. The budget is so inadequate that we will have to have substantial student fees to cover costs at the 1968-69 level of activity in intramural and other athletics, the lecture-concert program, and all phases of student activities. On a per capita basis, the fees for these purposes at all four UWGB campuses will be far in excess of fees for similar purposes on the Madison and Milwaukee campuses. Even with this special fund for the lecture-concert program, we have had to adopt a substantial schedule of admission fees for lectures, films, and concerts at all four campuses.
16. The bill includes a provision that all positions open or vacant as of May 1 are frozen. For a new campus this is an impossible situation. If this provision stands, we could not effectively open our campus. A new campus by definition requires additional personnel. Because the legislative process has been so slow moving, we have not been able nor have we thought it appropriate to hire all employees against an uncertain budget. To be told that we then cannot hire against a vacant position defeats the whole purpose of the legislative appropriation process.
17. The bill also eliminates the biennial adjustment for UWGB and other campuses in the area of administration. Specifically, this would affect some five positions in our Business Office and at least another seven positions in the Chancellor's office and University Relations work. If we lost these positions, we would be unable to follow any sound business practices because we would not have our personnel who make out the payroll, we would not have the telephone switchboard operator, and we would not even have a purchasing assistant to help in regard to orders of supplies and equipment. It would be impossible for us to put out any catalogs or other explanatory material about our University for the use of students and high school counselors and parents. In short, it would cripple us on each of our four campuses.
18. No additional money has been given to UWGB for the university's share of maintenance costs for the new buildings on the Marinette Campus.
19. In comparison to the Senate version of the budget bill, the version that is before the Assembly provides for no money to have the state assume the full cost of maintenance of the two-year campuses at Marinette, Manitowoc, and Fox Valley.

A new campus has particular urgent needs which an existing campus does not have. We start with no backlog of personnel, supplies, equipment, or space. We cannot "tide ourselves over" from the last fiscal year or previous operations. Consequently, the restrictions in the budget bill currently being considered are particularly harsh in their impact on new campuses.

Equally harsh is the abandonment of the idea of relating appropriations to enrollment. New campuses increase their enrollment proportionately at a far greater rate than existing campuses. Therefore, the consequences of abandoning actual

enrollment figures by level of student as the basis for making most appropriations for operations is a distinct and severe problem for the new campuses. It may eventually force us into substantial enrollment restrictions.

It is impossible to meet the needs outlined above through diversion of funds from other programs for one simple reason: not a single one of the programs or activities within the four campus UWGB system is financed beyond a bare minimum level. Thus the list of unmet needs is a net list, not a gross list. In addition, it is essential that we have authority to move ahead for the next biennium as soon as possible, since at a new university one must order a heavy amount of new supplies and equipment. Students are going to be with us on September 2. It takes some weeks to order this type of equipment and some of the necessary supplies. We cannot order these on the level that would assure adequacy until a budget bill has been acted upon.

In summary, we are in a situation where programs have had to be eliminated, quality has been eroded, and still there are not enough dollars. It is truly a disastrous situation that we contemplate this week.