



LIBRARIES

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

Minutes of the regular meeting of the Executive Committee of the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System: February 21, 1975. 1975

Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System, 1975

<https://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/SEEMH22OCELNK8A>

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.

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
of the
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

Held in Room 2000, First Federal Plaza Building,
250 East Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Friday, February 21, 1975, 9:30 A.M.

President Pelisek presiding.

PRESENT: Regents Fish, McNamara, Neshek, and Pelisek (Also present, Regent Zancanaro, not a member of the Committee.)

ABSENT: Regents Hales, Kopp, and Lavine (Regent Lavine participated in the discussion via telephone hookup in the Office of the President in Van Hise Hall, Madison, Wisconsin.)

Also present in the Van Hise Hall Conference Room were the following: Senior Vice President Smith; Vice President Lorenz; Associate Vice Presidents Arnn and Cammack; Provost Thiede; Chancellors Birnbaum, Connor, Dreyfus, Evans, Field, Fort, Haas, Lindner, Meyer, Swanson, Ullsvik, and Weidner; Vice Chancellor Shain; and Assistant Chancellor Komsi.

President Pelisek noted that the purpose of the meeting was to consider the adoption of the 1975-77 Annual Budget Policy Paper AB.-1.0 (Target Capacity Funding Rationale for Resource Allocation and Related Academic Planning Principles), dated February 19, 1975 (EXHIBIT A attached). The document as shown has been amended to delete the words "River Falls" on page 5. item 2.c., and insert the same words in item 2.a. on page 5. The statistical tables 2a. and 2b. have also been revised with respect to River Falls to transfer the figures under the 1975 target and the 1976 target to the 1975 Regent Approved and 1976 Regent Approved columns.

President Weaver requested that Senior Vice President Percy explain the policy changes. Senior Vice President Percy made the following statement: "I would like to summarize briefly the four-page boiled-down version of this proposal (EXHIBIT B attached) to afford the perspective that we felt was necessary. A few of the main points. Recall that in the 1950's the Coordinating Council periodically investigated the desirability of centralized student admissions, but the Boards of Regents traditionally supported the 'open market approach' for undergraduate student enrollment.

"In recent years the 'open market' has led to some uneven growth across the System and there is the criticism that some campuses feast while others suffer famine. It has been difficult for some citizens and elected officials to understand why we simply don't manage enrollments among institutions with similar core missions in order to avoid fiscal emergencies, empty dormitories, and unbalanced facilities utilization. But the Regent and public policy has been that, as long as the state provides its share of funding and facilities were available to accommodate the additional students, the 'open market', should continue. More recently, in the early 1970's, there have been restrictions on that state funding. First, you will recall the state limiting funding for graduate students on the former WSU campuses. Now we are faced with the Governor's 1975-77 proposal not to fund any additional students although 6,000 head-count more are expected to enroll in the next two years.

"Over the years, there has been concern over the size of the Madison Campus and it has on its own been examining need for enrollment limitations at the undergraduate level; recall that at the graduate and advanced professional level there have been limitations in effect for some time. Finally, in at least three legislative studies, there have been suggestions that we make more effective and balanced use of our facilities and campus capacities in various locations.

"In summary, there has been the feeling for sometime that the System should do something about directing enrollment growth and controlling campus size. We had planning efforts underway to bring proposals to you; however, they have been placed in abeyance in order to respond to the latest directive from the Governor which directs us to study on a long-term basis of phasing down or out certain institutions of the System, reducing the scope of the System. The problem this paper addresses is not that study; the language of AB.-1.0 makes it clear that this approach can be set aside if found to be in conflict with the long-range goal ultimately approved by the Legislature. Therefore, this proposal described what we do in the short range with the 6,000 additional students and no money.

"Page 2 of this summary outline notes that it boils down to a choice between two options--should we simply allow continued operation of the 'open market' for the 6,000 additional students, knowing that substantial numbers will seek to enroll without state funding at campuses already operating at what we judge to be full service capacity given their budget at a minimum of educational quality threshold; or should we devise a plan that provides three things: (1) that existing students who are presently enrolled can continue; (2) that, without

restriction, the normal number of 30,000 new freshman, graduate, and transfer students who come to replace graduating and transfer outs can enroll; and (3) that the 6,000 additional students would be guided to the targeted campuses when relatively higher budget support capacity will allow them to be taught more effectively.

"It is important to stress that neither approach will sustain present service quality levels and #2 seeks to hold deterioration to the minimum possible. The provision of enrollment funding, rather than denial, would at least sustain the present quality levels.

"We in Central believe that the only viable, short-term response to the realities of budgetary retrenchment in the face of increasing numbers of students is the second option being proposed--to distribute (a) the additional 6,000 students; and (b) the budgetary retrenchment requirements in such a way as to hold quality deterioration to a minimum and give the students the best service possible.

"This will be accomplished in two ways: First, we will determine the existing relative budgetary support capacity among the degree-granting campuses. We have devised a single index which, for the first time, seeks to reflect relative support levels. You will recall that we are having enrollment funding formula that uses twenty-four discipline/level categories. These have been compressed into a single index. You will note on page 3 the composite index stated in terms of cost per weighted student credit hour. You can see from the table what would have happened without some target being established. Please bear in mind that what might look like a modest 10¢ difference, when multiplied by a very significant number of student credit hours, becomes very significant.

"If there are no controls on enrollment growth and if retrenchment savings were simply distributed across the board, columns B and D would have changed--and we feel that campuses like Eau Claire, LaCrosse, and Stout would have suffered a further dilution of their quality support capability. To avoid this kind of disproportionate relative deterioration one campus to another, we suggest an enrollment target at present level at four campuses, and high enrollment targets for those to which we wish to guide 6,000 additional students. Once this is done, we can apply selectively the required retrenchment savings, which is the main purpose of Paper AB.-1.0.

"In closing, let me say we are trying to change the budget/student equation by first selectively increasing the denominator by adding more students (moving the 6,000 students a little differently) and then adjusting the budgetary numerator by selectively applying the retrenchment requirements. We shoot for the targets shown in the paper. It seems to us this is the only reasonable short-term response to the situation. It means that five out of six students (30,000 out of 36,000) who will be enrolled for the first time on a University of Wisconsin Campus in the next few years will be admitted exactly as their predecessors have--there will be no restraints on their access.

"We will not limit commuters or deter minority/disadvantaged programs. Let's look for a moment at how the four campuses with ceilings might operate under

it. Let's suppose that student admissions reached the ceiling at campus X. The first student over the threshold would be contacted immediately, informed that he can't be accepted at this campus, and if he or she has indicated a second choice, urged to contact that campus. If he did not indicate a second choice, we will refer him to our HELP program to locate another campus offering the desired academic program and arrange for a contact and routing of the papers to that campus. These decisions represent the first time in Wisconsin public higher education that we have sought as System policy to limit enrollments on certain campuses. It is true that we will be limiting enrollment as we reach the threshold on four campuses; but there will still be 22 campuses, many of them with compatible programs for accommodating students.

"You have been furnished here in this room, and copies have been made available in Van Hise, from a representative in the LaCrosse area his second press release on this subject which indicated that, after conversations we have had, his view is that a better solution would be to move faculty to the various locations rather than lose students. Now, we did consider this alternative. There are three problems that Senior Vice President Smith may be able to identify. Here are some of the reasons we rejected that plan.

"The first is what I call the 'fit' problem--the new students tend to enroll in the areas of highest program demand where we are already overworked and there is a shortage of staff, with no funding to hire new, while faculty being laid off on other campuses are in fields that are not compatible in terms of their disciplines. There is simply no way we can take a historian from Eau Claire and have him teach business at LaCrosse, for example. That is the first problem.

"The second is you don't know until the second week of classes what your actual demand is going to be. There is no way under the current personnel rules that we can modify the contract of an employee (and move him and his family to another campus) without advance notice. There is a third problem exemplified by Eau Claire. Eau Claire has had to limit enrollment for sometime due to saturation of on-campus and off-campus housing. To place a limit there simply recognizes an existing constraint; and unless we are ready to build more dorms at Eau Claire, an enrollment ceiling seems logical. So that, in summary, is our presentation; and we are prepared to handle questions."

President Weaver noted that it is the intention of the Administration to go to the Joint Finance Committee of the Legislature with a very urgent plea for the restoration of those funds not recommended in the Governor's budget, which relates to cost for 6,000 additional students which the System anticipates in the coming biennium. He stated that, if we should be successful in getting all or any of that normal state support for new students, we would then come back to the Board with a revision of this enrollment education plan. He stated that we have to move forward at this point, planning the annual budget based on the presumptions that our plight will be no better than the Governor's recommendations.

Regent Neshek inquired if it is the intention of Central Administration to have the Board pass on the criteria for limiting enrollment. Senior Vice President Percy responded that it is our proposal to negotiate with the four campuses on the general guidelines which are set forth in the document, and that criteria will then be prepared for the procedure by which we will reach the cut-off point for various applications. He noted that it is conceivable that non-commuting applicants (students coming into the area to take up residence) would be cut off when the dormitories are saturated and the local housing market is saturated. Commuter admission would tend to be left open to the last minute. He stated it was not our intention to bring back, for more than information, a specific campus plan. We could, if the Board wished, bring back the specifics of the plan on each campus.

Regent Lavine stated that he assumed, whether or not they were approved by the Board or brought back for reporting, that the Board policies that we have put into place already would continue to apply; that we continue to have programs for minority and disadvantaged students; and that the Board, either in a reporting sense or before-they-go-into-place sense, be able to determine whether any rare horizontal cutting of programs (that is right across the board) that would undermine the quality of the programs was planned. He continued that, in line with Board policy, we should look at cutting vertically to insure that we don't have a crippling of all programs, but rather that we insure that the quality of the remaining programs remains high.

Senior Vice President Smith urged that the delegation for admissions policy be left with the campuses. He noted that Budget Policy Paper AB-1.0 indicated some of the standards which would not be considered to be consistent with the purposes of the System or with Board policy, and that Central Administration will be developing interaction with those campuses needing to put on enrollment control procedures to reach agreement that we do have procedures that are consistent with Board policy. He continued that he felt it is appropriate that we report to the Board how this is managed; but that this could turn out to be a different problem for different campuses, because the accounting has to be made by the campus in terms of collegiate enrollments--ranging for example from Madison where some limits are already fixed and can be predicted with crude accuracy, to places where capacity is a different problem for the campus. He concluded that the report should be made to the Board, but it would be a mistake to try to write admissions policy for the entire System at the Board level.

Regent Neshek stated that it was not his intent that we try to write the enrollment policy at the Board level, but that this is such a drastic change from our previous policy and of such great significance in terms of public policy, that the Board should retain the option, at least, of acting on the criteria each campus may want to recommend.

Chancellor Haas pleaded for an operational procedure such as Senior Vice President Smith suggested. He stated that, amidst all of our other fiscal problems, we are going to be in a very sensitive area and will find it necessary to be sensitive not only to the applications as they come in, but also the balances that have been spoken of on a campus. He called attention to the fact

that, as one of the campuses which has had problems with a ceiling, these problems must be faced in July--this is the time when the overload comes in and all of this has to be settled during the month of orientation, etc. At that time, the campus has to observe very carefully what is happening; because at that point, several hundred students, who have indicated they were going to come to the campus, have already withdrawn from that campus and sought entrance elsewhere.

Regent Lavine stated that he was concerned not only with the four campuses that are putting on limits, but with the rest of the campuses. He stated that all campuses will have to look at the vertical rather than horizontal cuts, simply to maintain the quality of the programs that are there. He stated he would not be happy unless he got a report that looks across the System at the effect of this paper. He stated he did not feel it necessary to know in advance how it is going to operate, as long as our policies are adhered to; but he would like to see if results are bad. If some campus were to go outside those policies, we might have to point that out and have them make some adjustment.

Senior Vice President Percy pointed out that the result of this procedure is primarily a budget result. Senior Vice President Smith will be discussing with the Chancellors a report to the Board of Regents which we hope to bring you at the next meeting--a preview of the 1975-76 budget related to this: where cuts will fall and what policies of the Board, if any (e.g. affirmative action or minority/disadvantaged), will be affected. He noted that we have asked the Chancellors not to take over their responsibilities, but to preview with us so we can report to the Board at the next meeting the general areas of base reduction. He noted that one must understand that they have just received their allocations and can only give the Board a very general picture next time.

On the matter of "vertical reductions", he stated that is not a matter for the next year or two years--that's a four-year effort. He continued we cannot simply take the easy way out and do it across the board. He stated that the trouble with the vertical kinds of cuts is they take a long time to produce dollar savings. He stated we had to look at short-range ways of producing these dollars; and for some campuses, the number of dollars to be produced is very sizable. Regent Lavine stated that what bothered him on just a program quality basis was that we would continue to cut across the board each time because that was the only thing we could do that year and in the long run cripple everything. Senior Vice President Percy agreed that across-the-board cuts are never a good long-range solution.

Regent McNamara stated that he would strongly support the recommendations made by Senior Vice President Smith and Chancellor Haas. He stated that the impact of this changed policy appears to be necessary though regrettable and would have a very substantial impact on every campus to tend to move in the direction of regional schools. He noted that it was his judgment that we do not have the data necessary to make a policy decision, so he would propose that it be done pragmatically--give the Chancellors discretion to solve the problem. He noted the budget policy paper itself already provides broad basic control, and we can examine as we go along on an ad-hoc basis. He stated it was obvious to him that what

we have done is foreclosed the opportunity of many potential students to continue on to college. Many of the minority students whose families are not able to get the extra money to send them on to the University will be seriously affected. Those students who have to depend on part-time employment or summer employment will be seriously affected. Those of lower and middle income people who are already economically strapped sending their students to school in their own locality may now have to send them to another school. All these people are going to be affected, and we may find the problem solved for us by just the inability of students to go to the University, even though many of them want to go very badly. He continued that he did not like this approach, yet he could see no viable alternatives to maintain quality higher education. He noted that we have been given a number of contradictory mandates by state government. We cannot meet all of them and maintain the kind of education we ought to.

Regent Fish stated he was concerned as to the "time frame" for doing this. He noted it was pointed out by President Weaver, and correctly so, that, if some relief was given in Madison on funding of the increased enrollment for 6,000 additional students, that would severely moderate and possibly eliminate this program. He noted that rightly or wrongly we are going to be accused of developing a plan to put additional pressure on the Legislature for this program. He questioned why it is necessary to bring this in now, rather than a little bit further down the road.

Senior Vice President Percy stated that he had considered the matter for a long time, but that one ought to take every step of the budget process seriously; and you cannot do anything in your planning that anticipates a better outcome in the Legislature. He stated that, in order to do that, Central Administration talked about enrollment ceilings; but that was but one step of the planning. He noted we had to find a planning base for allocating or de-allocating money next year. This seemed a reasonable way to proceed and to identify, at this point, the budget levels we are allowing the Chancellors to build their annual budget in the next two months and to allow involvement of the faculty in that process.

He stated it seemed reasonable to identify these targets now and try to judge what will provide the best protection against major quality deterioration on hard-pressed campuses. He stated we could have conceived a plan that really would have "put pressure" on the Legislature just by unilaterally doing something that would create more noise. He continued we tried in this case rather to do it in a studied way. He noted that five out of six of the new students planning to enroll for the first time will not have their plans affected at all, and that the real question is the control of the threshold which will come in June or July. He noted it is important for the campuses to know that now as they are planning and staffing a timetable for their course offerings.

He stated we are facing, in the next five years, increases in enrollment; in a longer-range planning context, we are facing declines in our enrollments. This is a plan now to accommodate 6,000 additional students in a way we can teach them most effectively. He continued that he had thought a long time about deferring the matter, but that would necessitate deferring the annual

budget planning allocations. He continued that it seemed that, among the series of undesirable alternatives, this would be best. He noted the Chancellors wish to know now what the plan was if the Governor's budget passes. He stated that, if we are able to get some restoration of funding, we can moderate this approach.

President Weaver stated he was conscious of the fact that it may seem to be an effort to try to pressure the Joint Finance Committee, but that he felt that the Legislature ought to have before them a clear indication of the implications of the decision that it may be called upon to make. He stated that it is not a pressure game as far as he was concerned, but what is represented today is an honest educational appraisal of what the effects of the budget recommendations now before the state seem to have on the University.

Regent Fish stated that he was referring to what the "interpretations" would be. He stated we are not evaluating any special situation, but are actually looking at a rather drastic formula systemwide. Senior Vice President Percy stated that, as President Weaver implied, the Joint Finance Committee has asked us to bring some computations on how we are going to respond to things. We have other things, for example; "how are we going to distribute the \$3.9 million fee increase requirement for graduate students?" On this and other aspects of the Governor's budget we have been specifically advised by some Joint Finance Committee members, "Don't come in there and tell us you are waiting to see what we do--tell us exactly how you plan to do this and get Board approval if it requires that. If you are going to come in and tell us that you are waiting, hoping that we will restore the money, don't waste your time."

He stated this is, in our best judgment, how we would do it; and the best educational way to do it. He stated that, if we are going to have to bring you some judgments (and the time is running short) on how we propose to handle budget reallocations and retrenchment, he felt we needed a policy and strategy context for such judgments.

Chancellor Lindner stated that there are some very practical considerations in knowing as soon as possible whether or not this program is going to be adopted; and in order to plan the staffing for next year, it is really important that it be known as soon as possible whether or not the campus is going to be at this year's level of enrollment or at the level projected with open enrollment.

Chancellor Swanson stated that he would like to leave his funding as is specified in this policy paper, but not restrict his enrollment, and also consider moving some faculty from other institutions to his. He stated he believed that denying students admission to Stout may well move some of them out of the System--it won't necessarily increase the enrollment of the other campuses. He stated he knew about the difficulty of moving faculty members, but that he felt Stout has a unique situation.

He continued the campus had never had majors in English, for instance, so Stout was not experiencing a drop in their English enrollment. He noted that, in their technology program of 130 credits, only 40 credits are in technology, all the rest are in liberal studies. So that, if Stout gets more students in their technology programs, the demand for English and History professors is

increased. He noted that this year the campus has a tenured lay-off English faculty member from Platteville, and the campus had hired three other one-year contract people in English, and that the campus could just as well take additional English faculty members and to some extent in Social Sciences. He stated his budget procedures have come in with target amounts roughly equal to what is in the paper, but with the Regent approved enrollments originally, so that, if that is changed now and the enrollments dropped, he has a different situation.

He stated that his campus was somewhat like the River Falls Campus with respect to the Minnesota Compact--that is, if a student is planning to come to Stout from Minnesota, he did not believe the student would be going to Oshkosh or Whitewater, if he is denied admission to Stout. He requested that his budget allocation be left as is with no restrictions on enrollment and consideration of moving some faculty and their dollars to Stout.

Senior Vice President Percy made the following response: "Let's look back for a minute to the Minnesota Compact. We have a very interesting situation here. It seems we are in a situation now where Wisconsin is saying that, if you are a Wisconsin student and go to school here, the UW System won't get any funding; but, if you go to Minnesota under the compact, you will have full funding because we pay that. From the other side, for a Minnesota student choosing to go to school in Wisconsin, the State of Minnesota sends supporting money to the State Treasury; but under the Governor's policy, it does not go to support that student's education."

He stated this is one of the many inconsistencies and contradictions that Regent McNamara alluded to. He stated that, in terms of raising enrollment controls and shifting faculty, he found it quite interesting that Stout will have a demand for English and History professors. He continued that he did not have any recollection of that and did not know of any request to his office for assistance, or Mr. Karges telling him this has occurred. He inquired of Chancellor Swanson if what he was telling him about meant that he was now prepared to accept more students as long as he got faculty members and the money--as long as he got enrollment funding. Chancellor Swanson responded in the affirmative.

Senior Vice President Smith stated he found this distressing in several respects. He noted that we have made clear that we will not put limitations on the unique programs at Stout, and we are not talking about a limitation on enrollments at Stout so long as it can accept and teach students at a quality level, for those programs which are uniquely available only at Stout. He stated we do have concern about the transfer of funds and staff from other institutions when we are distributing poverty across the System. He stated that what Chancellor Swanson was actually proposing was that the entire base budget now be re-examined for all institutions with fund transfer and personnel transfer to Stout; and that he found that extraordinary. He continued he also found that, under the personnel rules that we now have, this would require the transferring institution to go through fiscal emergency to lay off people to create the kind of environment in which it would still take a year, if a person did not want to go, for

this to be accomplished. He stated he felt this was a chaotic rather than a reasonable response to the kind of situation in which we find ourselves.

Senior Vice President Percy stated there is another problem in that Stout is the second lowest in the index that has been devised; and if we had a way for money to follow students in the traditional way, we would not have a problem as long as you had the facilities capacities to absorb them. If we allow this to happen and the money does not follow students, this will create still a further problem with the index. He stated he could see no way in the next one or two years to make the kind of funded personnel shifts that Chancellor Swanson was talking about.

He noted we have a task force looking at the long-range problems; and we have a request as we approach Joint Finance for an ongoing retraining program. He noted that we are faced with the problem of what to do next Fall when we have 6,000 additional students without funding. We cannot shift faculty whose salary is eliminated for productivity to Stout because Stout has no money to pay them. Regent Neshek inquired if Chancellor Swanson was proposing to pay for existing faculty from his base budget. Chancellor Swanson responded that he believed there are excess faculty members in institutions now, and it would be an option to transfer them and their dollars.

Chancellor Dreyfus stated that there is a key issue on this point; mainly that he has some excess faculty members and would be delighted to pay for their plane trip to Stout, but the problem is "with their dollars". He stated that is the reason he has excess faculty, the reason they are on lay off, and the reason he was in fiscal emergency. He stated he has the faculty and he doesn't have the dollars for them. He stated that, if he had the dollars, he wouldn't have to lay them off, obviously; and they would not be excess.

Chancellor Dreyfus stated that he came out exactly where Chancellor Lindner came out and for exactly the opposite results and reasons; i.e., that he was in a state of low cost, low index, but declining enrollment; and that he has to know now whether or not he must go for fiscal emergency in 1976-77. He stated, if this plan is going to change enrollment projections in any way, resulting in 100 or 200 more students, you are talking about five to ten positions. He stated we need to know when this is going to begin having some effect on enrollment and must know this as soon as possible.

Senior Vice President Percy stated that Chancellor Swanson's proposal would work if there was funding; but it is precisely because there is no funding that this policy is needed.

Regent Neshek stated that we would be remiss if we did not tell the Joint Finance Committee the effect their budget is having on us. He continued that, certainly, if our budget is finally approved and they had no idea that a plan like this was raised, we would be accused of withholding information. He stated he felt it was imperative that the plan be brought before the Board at this time so that the Joint Finance and the Legislature can know specifically what is going to happen if the budget, as presented by the Governor, is approved.

Regent Fish stated that he was asking specifically for the reasoning why the matter could not be held for eleven or twelve days so that it could come before the full Board of Regents. He noted there is no question that it was quite a problem for the campuses and that we will find other problems. He stated he was trying to identify how critical those exact problems would be.

Senior Vice President Percy stated that the main problem is at the campus level, having to do with personnel notice. The Chancellors must know something about the budget planning parameters, and it was the intent of the Administration that this be gotten to them before March 1. He stated another item is the requirement of the rules relating to consultations related to fiscal emergency. Those consultations have to begin this month, and they must proceed on some basis. We cannot let that go until a budget is out of the Legislature, which may be in July, August, or September.

President Pelisek stated, for the record, that, although this is a meeting of the Executive Committee, all the other members of the Board were contacted by phone and not only invited but urged to attend. He indicated that he had been in telephone contact with Regents Barkla, Kopp, Sandin, and Solberg, all of whom had an opportunity to review the document and indicated their acquiescence in what appears to be, at least to them and him, the best solution to a very serious and difficult problem.

Regent Neshek moved adoption of the following resolution, and the motion was seconded by Regent McNamara:

That, upon recommendation of the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the 1975-76 Annual Budget Policy Paper #AB.-1.0 (Targeted-Capacity Funding Rationale for Resource Allocation and Related Academic Planning Principles) dated February 1975 (EXHIBIT A attached), be approved.

Regent Fish inquired as to the exact effect the passage of this resolution was going to have. Senior Vice President Percy stated this represents what he would characterize as a "contingency plan" upon which we will proceed with provisional budget planning and related personnel actions. He continued that, if the Legislature, in its wisdom, alters some of this--and it could get worse rather than better--, we will probably have to come back with some modifications; but that we do have the flexibility required when it comes to campus planning. He noted that, in the first year, this is going to have to be very flexibly administered; and therefore, the exact effect of the resolution is to give us the basis to proceed with the annual budget planning at this time and personnel actions which must commence as early as March 1.

Regent Fish stated that he was disturbed about the necessity of making this an effective working paper. He stated that he had some grave reservations, as everyone else does, about the rather radical alteration of the University of Wisconsin higher education system as presented by this document. He stated he would be comfortable if the document was a drawback position or an emergency measure position; but that he was not very comfortable with it as a resolution, because, when a resolution is made on a matter, it is a concrete, definite proposal that is going to be implemented.

President Weaver stated that it was felt that this was our best educational judgment as to how we would proceed, or how we would have to plan the annual budget if the Legislature does not change the executive recommendation now before us. He stated that, if we should receive any enrollment funding from the Legislature, it would be our intent to return to the Board with the annual budget based on that circumstance; and this would permit us to consider some modifications. Regent Lavine stated that we must pass it as a plan now; and if it changes, it is very unlikely that it is going to change much of anything for the upcoming school year.

Regent Fish stated that this is a rather radical and drastic alteration that deeply concerned him; because as stated, it becomes University policy. He stated he would be more comfortable by adding after the word "approved" the words "as amended for campus planning subject to Central Administration and Regent re-evaluation."

Regent Fish's suggestions was accepted by the maker of the motion and the second, so the resolution now reads as follows:

Director
Lindner

Resolution 954: That, upon recommendation of the President of the UW System, the 1975-76 Annual Budget Policy Paper #AB.-1.0 (Targeted-Capacity Funding Rationale for Resource Allocation and Related Academic Planning Principles) dated February 1975 (EXHIBIT A attached), be approved, as amended, for campus planning subject to Central Administration and Regent re-evaluation.

Chancellor Lindner stated that he would feel more comfortable with the amendment, because he did have grave concern about the direction this is going. He would like to think that, if indeed the Legislature would give enrollment funding, it would be reviewed; and we would all stand to move back into the free and open enrollment posture. President Pelisek stated that the amendment clearly codifies the general intent of the resolution and is in keeping with the overall intention of the action that Central Administration has proposed.

Senior Vice President Percy pointed out that the Chancellors are planning until the Regents act on the annual budget, so what the Regents are saying is that any time between now and the time they act on the annual budget they can choose to re-evaluate; but the Chancellors can go ahead now--this is the basis for their plans.

Regent McNamara stated for the record that he approved the amended resolution, recognizing the need for action in view of the rather tight time limit, but that he had approved it in view of the assurances that we have had from the concerns expressed by Chancellor Swanson, Senior Vice President Smith and others, that there would be maximum flexibility of application.

President Weaver stated that he wished to ask a question on behalf of the Chancellors who are going to, on the basis of this planning document, send notices to personnel. Are they going to be in any increased jeopardy in court some day, if this Board takes only "provisional" action today? He stated that

he did not want to ask the Chancellors to move on what is a very legal problem unless the action of the Board gives them a sufficiently solid foundation.

President Pelisek stated that it was clear to him that what the addition to the resolution does is merely to restate authority that exists with the Board at any time to re-evaluate and reconsider any form of decision they had made. He noted this is really an annual budget policy paper, from which the Chancellors and Central Administration have appropriate authority to proceed; and that the actual formal adoption of the budget does not come until after the Legislative approval of our biennial request. It is only at that time that the Regents take final and definitive action on any annual budget. He noted this policy and planning document gives the Chancellors adequate basis for proceeding with the appropriate termination notices that they may feel required to give.

Regent Fish stated that, without the addition, it would appear that this is a Regent policy of desire rather than a Regent policy of emergency; and that he believed it indicates to the Legislature and to the other Regents, the faculty, Chancellors, and students that this is an emergency situation and it was necessary for campus planning. If the situation should change, there are other ways that we would have of accomplishing the deliverance of higher education to the citizens of Wisconsin.

Regent Neshek stated that he could see no legal effects of this, because the Board members have, in interpreting this motion, indicated that the Chancellors do have the authority to take the positive steps to send the letters and notices to the faculty; and that the minutes should be quite precise as to what interpretation the Regents are giving to this particular motion.

President Pelisek stated the record would show that this is an historic action providing for the first time some form of enrollment limitation.

The question was put on Resolution 954, and it was voted unanimously.

Regent Lavine requested that the record show that he supported the action taken.

The meeting adjourned at 10:55 A.M.

2/26/75

J. S. Holt, Secretary

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM
1975-76 ANNUAL BUDGET POLICY PAPER # AB-1.0

February, 1975

SUBJECT: Targeted-Capacity Funding Rationale for Resource Allocation and Related Academic Planning Principles

Changed fiscal and policy conditions inherent in the Governor's 1975-77 budget proposals render prior resource allocation rationales for the University System inoperative. This paper sets forth a new, interim rationale of "Targeted-Capacity Funding." It seeks to guide enrollment growth, in the absence of additional resources for such growth, toward campuses with relatively higher current and projected per student budget support levels. The effect would be to stabilize unit costs at such campuses, and to avoid further depression of the per student resource base at campuses with lower levels of budget support.

A. BACKGROUND

Since merger and in line with initial Regent policies, a continuing effort has been made to determine a resource allocation methodology which facilitates the objectives of the University System and appropriately supports the missions of the campuses under conditions of limited fiscal resources.

This effort resulted in CA Analysis Papers 2, 2.1 and 2.2 which served as interim approaches, under then-current budget and policy conditions, to be used in the University Cluster until a more refined methodology could be developed. Precise determination of the latter methodology has been hampered and altered by a series of unanticipated changes in fiscal prospects and state policies.

Most recently, the Governor's 1975-77 budget and policy recommendations (on which basis our annual budget planning must proceed pending final Legislative action) pose dilemmas of such significance as to dictate the need for a substantial change in University System resource allocation rationale and for still another interim methodology. The Governor's denial of funding for additional students, his productivity savings requirements six times greater than initially indicated, and his additional base budget retrenchment requirements seriously complicate effective planning efforts.

In responding to these potential difficulties it is necessary also, to allocate resources to University System campuses in such a way as to accommodate increasing enrollments through the end of this decade without severely limiting their flexibility to adapt to levels in the 1980's which approximate those in 1970.

This uncertain situation is further complicated by the fact that enrollment increases as presently projected are uneven across the System and, unless something is done, further growth will occur on campuses least able--given steady or declining resources inherent in the Governor's recommendations--to accept them and still maintain minimum quality service levels.

B. THE NEED

We must now devise ways to provide access at some point in the U.W. System for additional students in 1975-77 and to accommodate them without the additional resources that have historically been provided by the state. (We continue to hope for legislative reversal of the enrollment funding denial.) In an environment of fixed and declining resources, coupled with continuing increases in numbers of students to be served, there is the need to direct enrollment workload in such a way as to hold quality deterioration to a minimum.

Acknowledging the need for adequate protection of the rights of presently-enrolled students and the right of new students to select individualized academic and career plans, a policy and procedure must be designed *to orient the projected additional students in the direction of campuses where existing per student budgetary support levels are relatively higher and away from campuses where the unfunded influx of still more students will seriously impair relative quality service and support levels.*

The goal is to achieve the closest possible "fit" between Institutional capacity, given fixed or declining resources on the one hand, and probable student demand and societal need on the other. Of all the alternatives examined, the directed growth approach comes closest to meeting the goal without a major disruption of people, programs and services. The rationale for adopting this approach is:

1. To serve students as effectively as possible through a systematic attempt to maintain access to programs of their choosing somewhere in the U.W. System, while minimizing the debilitating effects of continuing base budget losses on quality of programs.
2. To control costs through planning and allocation methodologies that take into account relative marginal program capacity and scarcity.
3. To attempt to minimize subsequent disruption within the System when (and if) enrollments settle back to levels presently projected for the 1980's.
4. To facilitate campus personnel and program decisions in a four to six-year planning context by defining enrollment targets and likely funding levels.
5. To insure the appropriate distribution of resources relative to workload among Institutions, while protecting and sustaining select and special mission differentiations.

C. THE APPROACH: TARGETED CAPACITY FUNDING FOR EACH INSTITUTION

An approach to resource allocation based on the concept of targeted capacity funding requires a critical examination of the profiles of the campuses on the following dimensions:

1. Enrollments must be examined relative to existing budgetary resources. A judgement is necessary to determine the enrollments which can be accommodated at a quality threshold possible within the resource base available in 1975-77.
2. Designated enrollment targets must make provision for students now enrolled to continue their programs. Admissions of new freshmen and transfer students must be monitored in such a way as to achieve the best fit feasible between projected available resources and anticipated changes in pressure for admission to programs in the University System. The Institutions are grouped into a) those campuses which have achieved the maximum enrollments feasible without either considerable expansion of budget resources, or erosion of quality, 2) those campuses with relatively high costs which can absorb some enrollment growth within the current level of budgeted resources available without seriously eroding quality.
3. Institutions at or near targeted capacity will develop criteria for limiting growth. These criteria must not deter students whose access to higher education depends upon being able to commute. Further, the criteria selected should not lead simply to altering the admission threshold based on academic aptitude. These criteria must not discriminate against minority or disadvantaged students.
4. Since a major objective of the targeted capacity funding is to provide a more stable planning environment, budget adjustments will not be made during the first year (1975-76) if targeted enrollments are either not realized or are exceeded. Adjustments in the 1976-77 annual budget will not reward institutions for exceeding the targets and will be such as to not seriously disrupt the planning at campuses which may have been unable to achieve the targets in one year. Established Regent policy authorizing pilot projects at Oshkosh and Superior will remain in effect.

D. IMPLEMENTATION

1. Composite Support Index: A Methodology for Determining Relative Enrollment Support Capacity Under Fixed/Declining Funding Conditions

A special analysis of the relative enrollment support capacity of each Institution was undertaken using a new methodology which more accurately reflects campus differences in programming, level and discipline mix than did the methodologies of Analysis Papers 2, 2.1 and 2.2 used for 1973-75. The new methodology yields a single *Composite Support Index* stated in terms of *cost per weighted student credit hour (CWSCH)*. Here's how it is established:

- (a) FTE students, for all terms (semester, quarter and summer session), are converted into annual student credit hours;
- (b) The SCH are then *weighted* by the six discipline categories in each Cluster according to ratios of costs among the discipline categories (e.g. credit hours in higher cost disciplines have a greater weight to reflect the fact that one campus could have a very high proportion of its SCH concentrated in the higher cost disciplines, where another campus's SCH are concentrated in lower cost disciplines).

(c) The SCH are also weighted by class level mix (e.g. upper division credits weighted more heavily than lower division credits).

The resultant Cost/Weighted Student Credit Hour becomes the COMPOSITE SUPPORT INDEX upon which relative enrollment support capacity judgements can be made.

Using this approach, 1974-75 budget support levels (including all* costs except Physical Plant maintenance and operations which are treated separately) for each Institution were translated into a "cost per WSCH" which is the single Composite Support Index.

The Cost/WSCH figures were arrayed as shown in Column 2, of Table 1 (1974-75). Taking into account economy-of-scale and fixed or declining funding for 1975-77 due to suspension of enrollment funding, and other retrenchment factors, it was determined that Cost/WSCH funding for 1975-76 and 1976-77 should be established, *based on the academic planning principles outlined in Section E*, through a combination of targeted enrollments and productivity/retrenchment savings distributions which placed a relatively lighter burden on those campuses whose Composite Support Indexes were lower relative to others.

The targeted enrollments are explained in 2. below and the productivity/retrenchment savings requirements and other major budget changes are detailed in 3. below. Academic planning principles underlying these changes appear in Section E.

THE RESULTANT TARGETED COMPOSITE SUPPORT INDEXES FOR 1975-76 AND 1976-77 ARE DETAILED IN COLUMNS 4 and 6 IN TABLE 2.

TABLE 1
COMPOSITE SUPPORT INDEX
1974-75/1975-76/1976-77

| INSTITUTION | (Actual) | | (Targeted Index) | | | |
|---------------|----------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
| | (1) 1974-75(2) | | (3) 1975-76 | (4) | (5) 1976-77 | (6) |
| | WSCH | Cost/WSCH | WSCH | Cost/WSCH | WSCH | Cost/WSCH |
| Madison | 1,782,270 | \$36.41 | 1,794,216 | \$35.80 | 1,792,802 | \$35.85 |
| Milwaukee | 884,040 | 39.27 | 899,338 | 37.60 | 914,941 | 36.97 |
| Oshkosh | 359,760 | 41.75 | 366,040 | 39.70 | 362,019 | 40.05 |
| Eau Claire | 337,650 | 36.36 | 334,768 | 37.62 | 334,912 | 37.66 |
| Stevens Point | 282,420 | 39.10 | 283,007 | 39.16 | 281,589 | 39.32 |
| Whitewater | 263,700 | 41.29 | 266,528 | 40.51 | 267,065 | 40.40 |
| La Crosse | 254,760 | 39.01 | 253,580 | 39.49 | 255,877 | 39.17 |
| Stout | 228,870 | 39.32 | 230,250 | 39.09 | 231,816 | 38.87 |
| Center System | 186,690 | 49.90 | 189,808 | 48.34 | 191,987 | 48.80 |
| Platteville | 151,770 | 43.16 | 152,577 | 41.96 | 151,524 | 42.21 |
| River Falls | 148,320 | 44.08 | 150,741 | 43.03 | 153,360 | 42.37 |
| Parkside | 128,310 | 54.49 | 136,900 | 48.44 | 144,495 | 45.99 |
| Green Bay | 127,440 | 56.44 | 135,605 | 51.88 | 144,070 | 48.95 |
| Superior | 99,240 | 53.12 | 97,217 | 51.52 | 96,722 | 51.70 |

* In the University Cluster, the modest and unevenly classified amounts for research and public service are folded into cost calculations.

2. Revised Enrollment Targets

The Composite Support Index trends in Table 1 are partially induced by revised enrollment targets described in Tables 2A and 2B. They reflect the following campus-by-campus decisions on enrollment targets given fixed and declining funding prospects for the System:

- , River Falls Correction
- a. Green Bay, Parkside and Platteville will continue to grow at least to the levels currently projected *without additional state funding*, thus reducing their Composite Support Indexes
 - b. Oshkosh, Stevens Point, Superior and Whitewater will have new, higher-than-current enrollment projection targets in anticipation of altered student flow; this growth is to occur *without additional state funding* thus depressing their Composite Support Indexes
 - c. Eau Claire, La Crosse, ~~River Falls~~ and Stout will have new, Correction enrollment targets *approximately at 1974-75 levels*, thus protecting against any decline in already relatively lower Composite Support Indexes
 - d. Within the Doctoral Cluster, Madison (undergraduate and graduate) enrollment targets will be set *approximately at 1974-75 levels*; Milwaukee's undergraduate enrollments will continue to grow at the currently projected rate *without additional state funding* and its graduate enrollment set *at approximately the 1974-75 level, with allowance for growth in urban mission programs.*
 - e. Center System campuses' enrollments will follow current projections with additional growth possibly occurring due to altered student flow under a. - d. above.

3. Distribution of Productivity/Retrenchment Savings Requirements

The second step necessary (in combination with enrollment target adjustments) to induce the trends and attain the institutional Composite Support Index levels for 1976-77 listed in Table 1 was selective application of productivity savings and retrenchment requirements. Other prescribed base cuts (e.g., Green Bay, Parkside and Superior physical plant cuts) were also taken into account.

Relying on the academic judgments spelled out in Section E. below, the Governor's \$9.5 million productivity savings cut was (a) distributed proportionately among the Doctoral, University and Outreach clusters and (b) selectively within the University Cluster. Proportionately larger savings were required of Green Bay, Parkside, Superior and Whitewater in order to relieve Eau Claire whose Composite Support Index is the lowest in the System, Stout (second lowest CSI campus), and Oshkosh as support for major calendar reform.

The productivity savings cut was distributed proportionately to campuses in the Doctoral Cluster, University Extension, and the Center System consistent with the rationale in Section E.

These adjustments are summarized in Table 3 along with memorandum entries regarding base cuts in other categories.

TABLE 2A
 UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM
 REGENT APPROVED PROJECTIONS AND NEW ENROLLMENT TARGETS
 FALL 1975 AND 1976
 HEAD COUNT

| Campus | 1974 Actual | | | 1975 Regent Approved | | | 1975 Target | | | 1976 Regent Approved | | | 1976 Target | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|---------|----------------------|--------|---------|------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------|--------|---------|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| | U.G. | Grad.* | Total | U.G. | Grad.* | Total | U.G. | Grad.* | Total | U.G. | Grad.* | Total | U.G. | Grad.* | Total |
| Eau Claire | 8,902 | 532 | 9,434 | 9,227 | 660 | 9,887 | 8,850 | 532 | 9,382 | 9,473 | 731 | 10,204 | 8,850 | 532 | 9,382 |
| Green Bay | 3,773 | 170 | 3,943 | 3,977 | 255 | 4,232 | 3,977 | 255 | 4,232 | 4,150 | 355 | 4,505 | 4,150 | 355 | 4,505 |
| La Crosse | 6,881 | 692 | 7,573 | 7,175 | 875 | 8,050 | 6,900 | 700 | 7,600 | 7,373 | 927 | 8,300 | 6,900 | 700 | 7,600 |
| Madison | 26,126 | 10,789 | 36,915 | 26,635 | 10,810 | 37,445 | 26,300 | 10,810 | 37,110 | 27,234 | 10,834 | 38,068 | 26,000 | 10,834 | 36,834 |
| Milwaukee | 20,934 | 4,487 | 25,421 | 21,269 | 4,693 | 25,962 | 21,269 | 4,590 | 25,859 | 21,541 | 4,894 | 26,435 | 21,541 | 4,696 | 26,237 |
| Oshkosh | 8,632 | 2,034 | 10,666 | 8,546 | 2,206 | 10,752 | 8,850 | 2,206 | 11,056 | 8,442 | 2,386 | 10,828 | 8,850 | 2,206 | 11,056 |
| Parkside | 5,260 | --- | 5,260 | 5,531 | 100 | 5,631 | 5,531 | 100 | 5,631 | 5,725 | 140 | 5,865 | 5,725 | 140 | 5,865 |
| Platteville | 3,717 | 224 | 3,941 | 3,768 | 235 | 4,003 | 3,768 | 235 | 4,003 | 3,745 | 245 | 3,990 | 3,758 | 245 | 4,003 |
| River Falls | 3,616 | 597 | 4,213 | 3,808 | 642 | 4,450 | 3,700 | 600 | 4,300 | 3,993 | 637 | 4,630 | 3,700 | 600 | 4,300 |
| Stevens Point | 7,309 | 733 | 8,042 | 7,167 | 783 | 7,950 | 7,300 | 750 | 8,050 | 7,064 | 823 | 7,887 | 7,300 | 750 | 8,050 |
| Stout | 4,977 | 482 | 5,459 | 5,250 | 513 | 5,763 | 5,100 | 482 | 5,582 | 5,472 | 563 | 6,035 | 5,100 | 482 | 5,582 |
| Superior | 2,153 | 460 | 2,613 | 2,071 | 470 | 2,541 | 2,150 | 460 | 2,610 | 2,023 | 480 | 2,503 | 2,150 | 460 | 2,610 |
| Whitewater | 6,415 | 1,939 | 8,354 | 6,361 | 1,999 | 8,360 | 6,500 | 2,000 | 8,500 | 6,399 | 2,006 | 8,405 | 6,550 | 2,000 | 8,550 |
| Center System | 8,057 | --- | 8,057 | 8,220 | --- | 8,220 | 8,220 | --- | 8,220 | 8,313 | --- | 8,313 | 8,313 | --- | 8,313 |
| Indistributed Enrollment | | | | | | | 590 | 521 | 1,111 | | | | 2,060 | 1,021 | 3,081 |
| TOTAL | 116,752 | 23,139 | 139,891 | 119,005 | 24,241 | 143,246 | 119,005 | 24,241 | 143,246 | 120,947 | 25,021 | 145,968 | 120,947 | 25,021 | 144,968 |

* Includes Law and Medicine.

NOTE: The provision for undistributed enrollments of less than 1% in 1975-76 and about 1.5% in 1976-77 reflects the fact that actual student choices of campuses under the new plan are difficult to predict without some experience. Funding for the graduate portion of these undistributed enrollments is being provided for through withholding of \$200,000 to be used in support of unique and cooperative programs.

TABLE 2B
 UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM
 REGENT APPROVED PROJECTIONS AND NEW ENROLLMENT TARGETS
 FALL 1975 AND 1976
 F.T.E.

| Campus | 1974 Actual | | | 1975 Regent Approved | | | 1975 Target | | | 1976 Regent Approved | | | 1976 Target | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| | U.G. | Grad.* | Total | U.G. | Grad.* | Total | U.G. | Grad.* | Total | U.G. | Grad.* | Total | U.G. | Grad.* | Total |
| Eau Claire | 8,695 | 235 | 8,930 | 8,989 | 292 | 9,281 | 8,621 | 235 | 8,856 | 9,199 | 323 | 9,522 | 8,593 | 235 | 8,828 |
| Green Bay | 3,216 | 89 | 3,305 | 3,399 | 133 | 3,532 | 3,399 | 133 | 3,532 | 3,555 | 186 | 3,741 | 3,555 | 186 | 3,741 |
| La Crosse | 6,696 | 271 | 6,967 | 6,949 | 341 | 7,290 | 6,681 | 273 | 6,954 | 7,153 | 362 | 7,515 | 6,692 | 273 | 6,965 |
| Madison | 24,878 | 9,184 | 34,062 | 25,382 | 9,203 | 34,585 | 25,055 | 9,203 | 34,258 | 25,965 | 9,222 | 35,187 | 24,759 | 9,222 | 33,981 |
| Milwaukee | 16,676 | 2,246 | 18,922 | 16,949 | 2,346 | 19,295 | 16,949 | 2,297 | 19,246 | 17,230 | 2,445 | 19,675 | 17,230 | 2,350 | 19,580 |
| Oshkosh | 7,986 | 755 | 8,741 | 7,850 | 819 | 8,669 | 8,115 | 812 | 8,927 | 7,722 | 886 | 8,608 | 8,082 | 812 | 8,894 |
| Parkside | 3,562 | --- | 3,562 | 3,761 | 38 | 3,799 | 3,761 | 38 | 3,799 | 3,933 | 53 | 3,986 | 3,933 | 53 | 3,986 |
| Platteville | 3,746 | 104 | 3,850 | 3,808 | 109 | 3,917 | 3,796 | 106 | 3,902 | 3,786 | 114 | 3,900 | 3,787 | 111 | 3,898 |
| River Falls | 3,629 | 269 | 3,898 | 3,827 | 294 | 4,121 | 3,827 | 294 | 4,121 | 4,022 | 322 | 4,344 | 4,022 | 322 | 4,344 |
| Stevens Point | 7,005 | 319 | 7,324 | 6,863 | 341 | 7,204 | 6,990 | 327 | 7,317 | 6,771 | 358 | 7,129 | 6,996 | 327 | 7,323 |
| Stout | 5,479 | 354 | 5,833 | 5,734 | 377 | 6,111 | 5,510 | 353 | 5,863 | 5,985 | 414 | 6,399 | 5,522 | 353 | 5,875 |
| Superior | 2,240 | 214 | 2,454 | 2,152 | 219 | 2,371 | 2,222 | 212 | 2,434 | 2,101 | 223 | 2,324 | 2,221 | 212 | 2,433 |
| Whitewater | 6,126 | 711 | 6,837 | 6,084 | 722 | 6,806 | 6,208 | 720 | 6,928 | 6,118 | 730 | 6,848 | 6,254 | 720 | 6,974 |
| Center System | 6,137 | --- | 6,137 | 6,239 | --- | 6,239 | 6,239 | --- | 6,239 | 6,308 | --- | 6,308 | 6,308 | --- | 6,308 |
| Undistributed Enrollment | | | | | | | 721 | 250 | 971 | | | | 2,187 | 481 | 2,668 |
| TOTAL | 106,071 | 14,751 | 120,822 | 107,986 | 15,234 | 123,220 | 107,986 | 15,234 | 123,220 | 109,848 | 15,638 | 125,486 | 109,848 | 15,638 | 125,486 |

* Includes Law and Medicine.

NOTE: The provision for undistributed enrollments of less than 1% in 1975-76 and about 1.5% in 1976-77 reflects the fact that actual student choices of campuses under the new plan are difficult to predict without some experience. Funding for the graduate portion of these undistributed enrollments is being provided for through withholding of \$200,000 to be used in support of unique and cooperative programs.

TABLE 3
GPR/FEE FUNDED GENERAL PROGRAM OPERATIONS BUDGET (A)
(Excluding Fringe Benefits, Utilities, Debt Service and
Other Specialized Appropriations)

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| | 1974-75 Printed Budget | Programmed Adjustments (b) | Governor's Recommended Base Cuts (c) | 1974-75 Enrollment Supplement | Sub-Total Adjusted Budget Base | Even Productivity Related Reduction: 1.5% of Col. 5 | Relief and Additional Retrenchment | Sub-Total Net Productivity Adjustment | Other Governor's Budget Changes (d) | Allocation for 1975-76 GPR/Fee Gen. Prog. Op. Budget | Change From 1974-75 Printed Budget |
| Madison | \$ 95,583,380 | \$ 266,000 | \$ -347,100 | \$ 821,000 | \$ 96,323,280 | \$ -1,443,200 | | \$ -1,443,200 | \$ 983,100 | \$ 95,863,180 | \$ 279,800 |
| Milwaukee | 38,481,336 | 390,200 | -55,400 | -775,812 | 38,040,324 | -569,900 | | -569,900 | 264,900 | 37,735,324 | -746,012 |
| Total Doctoral Cluster | 134,064,716 | 656,200 | -402,500 | 45,188 | 134,363,604 | -2,013,100 | | -2,013,100 | 1,248,000 | 133,598,504 | -466,212 |
| Eau Claire | 12,863,711 | | -4,700 | 563,700 | 13,362,711 | -210,000 | \$ 260,000 | 50,000 | 74,900 | 13,487,611 | 683,900 |
| Green Bay | 7,643,800 | | -209,000 | 74,300 | 7,509,100 | -110,500 | -98,400 | -208,900 | 73,600 | 7,373,800 | -270,000 |
| La Crosse | 10,614,319 | | -100 | 501,800 | 11,116,019 | -165,800 | | -165,800 | 74,500 | 11,024,719 | 410,400 |
| Oshkosh | 15,697,550 | -710,520 | -1,900 | 249,000 | 15,234,130 | -228,300 | 70,000 | -158,300 | 103,700 | 15,179,530 | -518,020 |
| Parkside | 7,979,313 | | -266,800 | -49,700 | 7,662,813 | -113,100 | -250,000 | -343,100 | 69,700 | 7,389,413 | -589,900 |
| Platteville | 7,299,531 | -270,900 | -3,500 | 251,400 | 7,276,531 | -107,700 | | -107,700 | 128,900 | 7,297,731 | -1,800 |
| River Falls | 7,492,787 | | -600 | 138,200 | 7,630,387 | -113,800 | | -113,800 | 42,600 | 7,559,187 | 66,400 |
| Stevens Point | 11,683,436 | -264,200 | -7,200 | 461,800 | 11,873,836 | -177,100 | | -177,100 | 74,200 | 11,770,936 | 87,500 |
| Stout | 9,517,480 | -100,500 | -23,900 | 447,000 | 9,840,080 | -146,700 | 30,000 | -116,700 | 63,200 | 9,786,580 | 269,100 |
| Superior | 5,803,420 | -177,000 | -101,300 | 41,200 | 5,566,320 | -82,400 | -40,000 | -122,400 | 38,800 | 5,482,720 | -320,700 |
| Whitewater | 11,596,823 | -101,100 | -5,900 | 248,600 | 11,738,423 | -174,000 | -30,000 | -204,000 | 69,300 | 11,603,723 | 6,900 |
| Total University Cluster | 108,132,170 | -1,624,220 | -624,900 | 2,927,300 | 108,810,350 | -1,629,400 | -38,400 | -1,667,800 | 813,400 | 107,955,950 | -176,220 |
| Center System | 10,293,952 | | | | 10,293,952 | -154,300 | | -154,300 | 83,800 | 10,223,452 | -70,500 |
| University Extension | 14,462,126 | 42,587 | -886,400 | | 13,618,313 | -203,400 | | -203,400 | 105,400 | 13,520,313 (e) | -941,813 |
| Central Administration | 3,251,852 | | -23,200 | | 3,228,652 | -48,400 | -48,400 | -96,800 | 11,800 | 3,143,652 | -108,200 |

- NOTES: (a) Pending further analysis, this table does not reflect probable tuition revenue losses in the Doctoral Cluster resulting from increased graduate student charges proposed by the Governor.
- (b) Repayment of Doctoral campus funding, return of one-time relief to the State, deletion of non-recurring capital support, and technical adjustments such as releases of escrowed funding during 1974-75.
- (c) Indirect Cost reimbursement offset of GPR (GPR cut) spread in proportion to institutional fund 150 budgets, physical plant reductions at Green Bay, Parkside, and Superior, and reduction in GPR support for Extension's continuing education.
- (d) Full financing for classified pay plan adjustments, student minimum wage increases, new building openings, medical education enrollment funding for UW-Madison (\$278,500), criminal justice program in Law School (\$16,800), and debt service on dorms converted to academic use at UW-Platteville (\$74,500).
- (e) Includes Fund 119 (WHA & WHA-TV).

E. Academic Planning Principles For Targeted-Capacity Funding

The impact of productivity cuts in the annual budgets of the University System Units has been distributed according to the following principles and judgments:

1. that the policy of Cluster budgeting be continued;
2. that each Cluster bear the responsibility for its proportionate share of the productivity cuts;
3. that where targeted enrollment levels are prescribed, an inter-Cluster student flow from Doctoral to University Cluster campuses may produce some ameliorating impact on the Doctoral campuses;

Doctoral Cluster - That by reason of current composite support index levels, and the more comprehensive nature of Doctoral University academic missions, UW-Madison and UW-Milwaukee be exempted from inter- or intra-Cluster adjustments and be specifically directed to move ahead with resources available to them after productivity cuts to fulfill the provisions of their respective Cluster and Select missions.

Accordingly, Doctoral Cluster Universities are asked to absorb their proportionate shares of the productivity cuts and to consolidate and to direct their continuing resources in ways which will produce quality academic opportunity for Wisconsin students consistent with their respective missions.

University Cluster - Unique problems in the University Cluster campuses associated with differential growth patterns and a relatively wide range of composite support index levels have been considered according to the following principles and judgments:

1. Since the Cluster and all its Institutions face a reduction in their 1974-75 budget base, efforts to reinforce the budgets of Universities facing critical conditions of underfunding cannot be generally sustained. Similarly, efforts to reallocate funding from Universities with higher composite support indices, in order to reinforce funding elsewhere, should be limited since those Units are already losing dollar support by reason of the productivity cut.
2. Under the pressure of budget cuts, some additional budget reductions should be required from Institutions whose composite support indices are above average, and some relief should be provided for the Institution already operating at the composite support index farthest below the average.
3. *Implicit in these judgments is a rejection of the position that homogenization of Unit costs in all Universities is desirable, or a tenable goal, or that any average support level is an "adequate" quality support standard. The System will always have some differences based on mission differentiation; should strive to avoid the destruction of planned differentials achieved; and should avoid erosion of the established mission capability of any Institution by formulary budget cuts in the absence of an approved change in the Unit's mission.*

On the basis of these judgments, the decision was made that a "larger than average" reduction should be sustained by UW-Superior, UW-Green Bay, UW-Whitewater, and UW-Parkside and from the funds thus assembled, substantial relief should be provided for UW-Eau Claire and some mitigation of the effects of the productivity cut for UW-Stout and UW-Oshkosh.

These decisions are based on the following reasons:

1. The need to supply some relief for UW-Eau Claire was based on the fact that this University now has the lowest composite support index in the University Cluster; has maintained an effective program with wide student appeal despite extraordinary budgetary pressure; but clearly cannot absorb further retrenchment without irreparable damage to its quality. Based on the judgment that UW-Eau Claire has little fiscal resiliency remaining to absorb the increased demands on an already Spartan operation, relief from the productivity cut is recommended and the allocation of a \$50,000 adjustment to its base budget. This will halt a further decline in the composite support index and improve the University's relative position slightly in the University Cluster.
2. The larger than average cut in the base budget of UW-Superior is based on the calculation that its composite support index is the highest of all University Cluster Institutions. The financial retrenchment recommended for UW-Superior is judged to be the largest that can be absorbed without excising whole colleges. Academic Affairs is not sanguine that the cut made may not result in serious erosion of the ability of the Institution to carry out its established mission at the quality level presiously achieved. The University has faced the twin burdens of productivity cuts and budget erosion resulting from declining enrollments for the past three years. Nonetheless, UW-Superior must be asked to meet not only the financial obligation of its proportional share of the productivity cut but also a modest additional decrement (\$40,000) to permit some relief to other University Cluster Units as noted previously.
3. The cut at UW-Green Bay is, like that at UW-Superior, based on the relationship of its composite support index to those of others in the Cluster. Academic Affairs makes the judgment that UW-Green Bay's funding, prior to any cut, is not disproportionate to the academic mission, needs and accomplishments of this Institution. Unit costs at UW-Green Bay have been higher than those of University Cluster Institutions other than UW-Superior. They are not higher than those of comparable experimental Institutions in other states. These costs have given the UW System a unique undergraduate college, with an institutional focus on interdisciplinary education appropriate to an understanding of ecology from a social, humanistic, and scientific perspective. UW-Green Bay provides one of the few successful alternative models for liberal arts education available in the United States which is relevant to problems and prospects of modern society. For its investment, the State of Wisconsin realizes:
 - a. a significantly different form of educational opportunity for its people;
 - b. an Institution which has given national and international leadership in the development of curriculum and instruction;

- c. an Institution which has produced outstanding strength in community outreach through public television, mini-courses for the elder population quartile, and an ACTION program involving students in community-centered projects;
- d. an Institution which has developed uniquely its resources in the evaluation of instruction and curriculum; and
- e. a research capability in educational development which is outstanding in Wisconsin and provides regional and national leadership.

The UW System can ill afford erosion of these resources which give strength to the System and to higher education as a whole. As with UW-Superior, the "more than proportional" cut taken in the UW Green Bay budget will seriously affect some of what has been built, but the Academic Affairs recommendation is intended to constrain its level so that quality achievements will not be completely or permanently eradicated. UW-Green Bay is asked to absorb its share of the productivity cut and an additional decrement of \$60,000 for reallocation within the University Cluster as described previously.

In addition, the second installment of 1974-75 enrollment funding was withheld (\$38,400).

- 4. UW-Oshkosh presents a distinctly different situation. Its developmental pattern, until recently, was that of a Normal School evolving through the successive stages of teachers college and state college to a traditional, regional, state university. Declining enrollments produced an erosion of quality in broad undergraduate, and modest graduate, curricular offerings which made necessary a full-scale overhaul of existing administrative and academic programs and delivery systems. The University has embarked on a bold scheme designed to streamline its administrative service areas, develop alternative approaches to higher educational objectives, and attune academic programs to student needs while emphasizing individual faculty development to upgrade the quality of instruction. The task of non-traditionalizing a traditional university, breaking precedent with the past, is in many ways a more exacting challenge than conceptualizing and implementing a new university model as did UW-Green Bay. Only months old, the all-University plan, which flows from an academic calendar revision, is at a delicate stage. Faculty and students have closed ranks as never before behind the innovative plan. However, severe budget reductions would clearly compromise the vitality needed to significant innovation. The annual budget recommendation for UW-Oshkosh recognizes the University's need for support at this vulnerable stage of its turn-around operation.

UW-Oshkosh must contribute a substantial portion of its share of the productivity forced savings but not be asked to trim further its composite support index, second highest among the larger Institutions in the University Cluster, but only slightly above UW-Stout, UW-Stevens Point and UW-La Crosse. The faculty and students are looking for tangible evidence that the System is backing their very considerable efforts to move to a new university model. To give substance to Academic Affairs endorsement of the Oshkosh plan, the recommendation is made that the University receive relief in the form of a \$70,000 adjustment to the proportionate productivity cut for the express purpose of aiding implementation of the all-University academic calendar plan.

5. The budget recommendation for UW-Whitewater is made from the perspective of its position as the University with the highest composite support index among the six largest Institutions in the University Cluster. UW-Whitewater is asked to sustain its proportionate share of the productivity cut and a further modest decrement (-\$30,000) which will move its composite index toward the level of UW-Oshkosh.
6. UW-Parkside presents a complex situation. Operating in essentially a traditional liberal arts curricular mode, with direct instructional costs comparable to other smaller Institutions in the Cluster, it is only the disproportionate high costs of academic and student services, and general operations at UW-Parkside which drive up its composite support index to a problematic level. The University has achieved notable success in its library, media and computer center supporting operations. It is to be hoped that these achievements, due in part to start-up funding and in which the University takes justifiable pride, will remain as quality supporting programs given the limitations of a decreased ongoing support budget. The University is assigned its share of the productivity cut based on its 1974-75 base budget and an additional amount to realign downward its composite support index. The latter amount (-\$230,000) will be used, with other decrements already noted in the budgets of UW-Superior, UW-Green Bay, and UW-Whitewater, to provide relief from the productivity cut for UW-Eau Claire, modest dollar offsets to the full effect of productivity cuts for UW-Stout and UW-Oshkosh and to improve the composite support index for UW-Eau Claire.
7. While UW-Stout's budget support level has not decreased to the degree that UW-Eau Claire's has, nevertheless its situation is grave. With the second lowest composite support index among the largest Units in the University Cluster, a special academic mission with the least curricular overlap of any Unit in the System, the least possibilities among the larger Universities in the Cluster for economies due to larger enrollment (it is the smallest of the six), and the certainty that even the modest enrollment increases designed into the new targeted enrollment levels will drive support indices even lower, UW-Stout has a convincing argument for some relief from the full effects of the productivity cut.

It is recommended with reluctance that UW-Stout absorb a substantial portion of its proportionate share of the productivity cut. However, it is further recommended that this amount be offset, in part, by a \$30,000 adjustment to mitigate the full impact of the productivity give-back.

Outreach Cluster - Recommended assignments of necessary budgeting cutbacks in the Outreach Cluster have been made in accordance with these planning concepts:

1. UW-Extension

- a. recognition that UW-Extension's obligations to serve Wisconsin citizens increase in a time of economic stress rather than diminish;

- b. a provision in the Governor's budget recommendation for the UW System would significantly reduce UW-Extension's non-credit continuing education capability by reducing GPR support for continuing education by \$1,000,000 and assuming an equivalent increase in Program Revenue by reason of fee increases. It is unlikely that this increased revenue assumed by the Governor's budget can, in fact, be realized.
- c. UW-Extension has been delegated increased coordinative and monitoring responsibility for instructional activity beyond the borders of the state, and for some aspects of off-campus credit instruction;
- d. a number of underfunded activities are administered through UW-Extension and mandated by the Regents. Examples are: 1) leadership in implementing the university outreach plan; 2) service to Criminal Justice programming via its newly formed Criminal Justice Institute; and 3) applied research and consultative services to the state business and industrial communities.

In consideration of these judgments, UW-Extension is asked to sustain only its proportionate share of the productivity cut, in addition to the requirements of item b. above, and to direct its resources as appropriate to activities such as joint programming and appointments to campuses with higher targeted enrollments.

2. UW-Center System

- a. The 14 campuses of the Center System have reduced their respective composite support indices very substantially in the past two biennia and several Centers are now at or near the minimum configuration of liberal arts course offerings consistent with the mission of the Center System;
- b. UW System Information Paper No. 2 established the 1975-1976 threshold of Board of Regents review of "...per student instructional/support cost..." at an individual Center at not more than 20 percent of the average cost of a non-UW comparison group of "comparable" Institutions for two consecutive years. In effect, this policy allows the Center System until 1976-1977 to meet the standard of comparative costs;
- c. In the past two years, the Center System has undergone a change in leadership, become a part of the recently organized Outreach Cluster headed by a Provost, and achieved a "merger-within-a-merger". There is need to offer such assurances in the annual budget as are possible with respect to disproportionate budget reductions, or changes in mission or organization to permit stabilization of the current 14-Center model.

The Center System must absorb its proportionate share of the productivity cut but should be permitted to continue until 1976-1977 without an additional decrement applied.

SUMMARY OF U.W. SYSTEM ENROLLMENT TARGET PROPOSAL FOR 1975-77

RECEIVED

FEB 24 1975

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
SYSTEM
Secretary of the Regents

A. Historical Perspective

While the Coordinating Council for Higher Education periodically investigated the desirability of centralized student admissions for Wisconsin's public universities, the Regents have traditionally supported the "open market" approach for undergraduate student enrollment.

In recent years the "open market" option has led to uneven growth across the System and engendered criticism that without some control over admission, a few campuses will "feast" while others suffer "famine." It has been difficult for some citizens and elected officials to understand why we don't simply manage enrollments among institutions with similar core missions in such a way as to avoid: fiscal emergencies, empty dormitories and unbalanced facilities utilization.

Regent and public policy, however, have maintained that, as long as the state provides its share of funding for additional students, and facilities were available to accommodate them, the "open market" for enrollment should continue. More recently, there have been increasing restrictions on state funding for additional students. First, during the early 1970's, funding for additional Wisconsin graduate students on the former Wisconsin State Universities campuses were withheld or provided grudgingly after two years' delay. Second, and most recently, the Governor's 1975-77 budget proposal includes a decision not to fund any additional students during the next two years, although 6000 more are expected to enroll.

For a number of years there has been growing concern over the size of the largest campus in the System, UW-Madison, and it has been examining on its own the need for enrollment limitations at the undergraduate level. (Limitations in one form or another have been in effect in graduate and advanced professional schools at UW-Madison for a number of years.)

Finally, a number of legislative actions in the last two biennia have implied that the University System should make more balanced and effective use of its campus capacity in various locations.

Thus, there has been for sometime the feeling that the System should do something about directing enrollment growth and controlling campus size.

Planning efforts underway since merger have been placed in abeyance in order to respond to the latest directive from the Governor asking Regents to study possible means of reducing the size and scope of the U.W. System as it moves into the 1980's. This crash basis study of long-range planning alternatives will not help the U.W. System cope with the short-range problem of accommodating 6000 additional students without additional funding and with a base budget retrenched from its 1974-75 level.

B. Short-Range Planning Dilemma

The University System must assume for immediate annual budget and planning purposes that the Governor's recommended retrenchment requirements and denial of enrollment funding might be sustained; at the same time we intend to work hard for restoration of enrollment funding.

EXHIBIT B

In light of this, and bearing in mind that any interim, short-range efforts to cope with these realities may eventually give way to longer-term solutions, the System faces the following dilemma in planning for 1975-76 and 1976-77:

1. Shall we simply allow continued operation of the "open market" for the 6000 additional students (over 1974-75 levels) with the knowledge that substantial numbers will seek to enroll (without state funding) at campuses already operating at full service capacity and a minimum educational quality threshold, thus diluting further the quality of service to new and continuing students?

or

2. Shall we devise a plan whereby: (a) existing students can continue without interruption on the campuses where they are now enrolled; (b) all campuses can plan without restriction to enroll new freshman, graduate and transfer students to replace graduating and transfer-out students as long as their total enrollment is approximately current year levels (see targets); and (c) the 6000 additional students will be guided to targeted campuses where relatively higher budget support capacity will bellow more effective teaching?

Important Note: Neither approach will sustain present service quality levels systemwide and #2 seeks to hold quality deterioration to the minimum possible. Provision (rather than denial) of enrollment funding would protect existing quality levels.

C. Proposal

The Central Administration is recommending in Annual Budget Policy Paper AB-1.0 that option #2 under B. above be selected as the only viable, short-term response to the realities of budgetary retrenchment in the face of increasing numbers of students.

We propose to distribute the additional 6000 students and the budgetary retrenchment requirements for 1975-77 in such a way as to hold quality deterioration to a minimum and give the students the best service possible under these circumstances. This is to be accomplished in the following way:

1. Determine existing relative budgetary support capacity among the degree-granting campuses

While no single index of support level or capacity can reflect the essence of a university, some reasonable proxy is needed to identify relative educational support levels among campuses.

We have constructed from 1974-75 budgetary and enrollment data a Composite Support Index for each campus in the form of a single, composite weighted student credit hour cost figure. It reflects relative support levels taking into account student credit hour mix by discipline and class level. (Recall that the Student Credit Hour has been in recent biennia the basic unit of workload upon which budgetary support has been provided and we have used as many as twenty-four separate variables rather than a single, composite index.)

The 1974-75 Composite Support Indexes in AB-1.0 are reproduced below (for University Cluster campuses) along with projected indexes with and without targeted enrollments. This gives some idea of why targets are needed.

| | (A) | (B) | | (C) | | (D) | | (E) | |
|---------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|----------|-------------------------|----------|-------------------------|----------|-------------------------|----------|
| | Actual 1974-75 Index | 1975-76 Composite Index | | 1976-77 Composite Index | | 1976-77 Composite Index | | 1976-77 Composite Index | |
| | | w/o Targets* | Targeted | w/o Targets* | Targeted | w/o Targets* | Targeted | w/o Targets* | Targeted |
| Oshkosh | 41.75 | 40.30 | 39.70 | 41.65 | 40.05 | | | | |
| Eau Claire | 36.36 | 35.21 | 37.62 | 34.26 | 37.66 | | | | |
| Stevens Point | 39.10 | 39.77 | 39.16 | 40.39 | 39.32 | | | | |
| Whitewater | 41.29 | 40.98 | 40.15 | 41.25 | 40.40 | | | | |
| LaCrosse | 39.01 | 37.67 | 39.49 | 36.30 | 39.17 | | | | |
| Stout | 39.32 | 37.35 | 39.06 | 35.58 | 38.87 | | | | |
| Platteville | 43.16 | 41.80 | 41.96 | 42.18 | 42.21 | | | | |
| River Falls | 44.08 | 41.70 | 43.03 | 39.33 | 42.37 | | | | |
| Parkside | 54.49 | 49.95 | 48.44 | 47.42 | 45.99 | | | | |
| Green Bay | 56.44 | 52.57 | 51.88 | 51.54 | 48.95 | | | | |
| Superior | 53.12 | 53.57 | 51.52 | 54.81 | 51.70 | | | | |

* Estimated

If there are no controls on enrollment growth and if retrenchment savings requirements are simply applied as in Indexes in Columns (B) and (D) of the above table, campuses at Eau Claire, LaCrosse and Stout, would have suffered a further dilution of quality support capability, while campuses with higher indexes would remain relatively high.

2. Avoid disproportionate deterioration of relative quality support levels in the University Cluster (a) by establishing new enrollment targets, and (b) by selective application of retrenchment savings.

Central Administration judges that campuses with relatively lower Composite Support Indexes ought to be shielded from major influxes of additional, unfunded students lest their relative indexes and quality of service drop even lower. It is therefore proposed, in line with specific academic planning principles outlined in AB-1.0, (that enrollments at Eau Claire, LaCrosse, ██████████ and Stout be held at approximately the current 1974-75) levels for the next two years. It is further proposed that Eau Claire, with the lowest index be relieved of any productivity savings requirement and actually receive a modest budget augmentation and that Stout, second lowest, be given partial relief.

At the same time campuses, whose indexes are relatively high, and in most cases would go still higher under present enrollment projections (including projected declines), ought to bear a greater productivity savings requirement and ought to have a major portion of the projected enrollment increases guided in their direction. Again, factoring in the academic planning principles in AB-1.0, it is proposed that Green Bay, Parkside, Platteville, Oshkosh, Stevens Point, Superior, River Falls, and Whitewater be permitted to increase enrollments to present or new projected levels and that productivity savings and retrenchment requirements be distributed among them selectively to produce a significant adjustment in relative Composite Support Indexes by 1976-77.

3. Within the Doctoral Cluster, selected enrollment limitations will apply

The Madison Campus targets for 1975-76 and 1976-77 will be set at current year levels and the Milwaukee Campus undergraduate enrollments will grow in accord with present projections. Graduate enrollments at UWM will be held at present levels except in urban mission areas. Productivity savings will be distributed on the same basis on each campus.

4. Center System campuses will follow current projections and remain subject to the Regent-prescribed performance targets for 1976-77

In December, 1973 the Regents established a three-year program to bring Center System campuses in line with specified cost/performance targets. That program runs its course during the 1975-77 biennium and the future of any campus not meeting the target will be reconsidered by the Board.

In light of this earlier plan, any restriction on Center System growth at this time would be inappropriate.

D. Implementation

Following Regent approval of the proposal, there will be immediate negotiations with the four campuses whose enrollments are to be held at the 1974-75 levels and they will be asked to establish a procedure for cutting off admissions when the threshold is attained. Special care will be exercised to avoid disruption of attendance by currently-enrolled students and to assure that commuting students are not deterred from attendance. Criteria for cut-off must not lead simply to alteration of academic aptitude thresholds nor must they discriminate against minority or disadvantaged students.

(It should be noted that a campus such as Eau Claire, for example, has had to limit enrollments in recent years due to a saturation of on-campus and off-campus housing facilities. To allow growth to continue unrestrained would lead to the need for construction of additional dormitories, a step hardly wise in light of availability of excess dormitory space, already constructed, on other campuses with similar program offerings.)