
2017-2018 ACADEMIC STAFF ASSEMBLY
12:30 PM - 1:45 PM ON September 26,
2018
UC 264

1. **Priority Business**
 - a. Review/Approval of September 12, 2018, Minutes
 - b. Janelle Crowley, Chief Human Resource Officer
 - c. Parking; NOTE: Please read the attached DRAFT resolutions prior to the meeting.
 - d. Program Review; NOTE: Please read the attached UW System policy and *Inside Higher Ed* article prior to the meeting.
2. **Chair's Report**
3. **Vice-Chair's Report**
4. **Academic Staff Committee Reports**
 - a. Awards (Weber)
 - b. Economic Issues (Rivers)
 - c. Elections (Villancencio)
 - d. Government (Flanagan / Kriska)
 - e. Instructional Promotions (Fragola)
 - f. Outreach (Weber)
 - g. Professional Development (Fragola)
 - h. Review (Tumbarello)
 - i. Rewards and Recognition (Tumbarello)
 - j. Titling (Weber)
 - k. Title Appeals (Fragola)
5. **Updates/Announcements/Other Business**
 - a. Transportation & Logistics (LaValley)
 - b. Employment Educational Assistance Program Policy (Tumbarello)
 - c. Sustainability Council (LaValley)
 - d. Open Floor

**2018-2019 ACADEMIC STAFF ASSEMBLY
MINUTES
12:30PM - 1:45PM ON SEPTEMBER 12, 2018, UC-264**

PRESENT: Patricia Fragola, Curt Weber, Mike Flanagan, Abbie Windsor, Carmen Rivers, Huckleberry Rahr, Nadine Kriska, Terry Tumbarello, Carl Fox, Mike Gorman, Andrew Cole, JP Villavicencio, Annie Weberpal LaValley (guest), Heather Rasmussen (recorder)

EXCUSED: Katie Rutenbar, Nadine Kriska

1) Urgent/Priority Business

- a) Minutes of May 9, 2018 (First Meeting), approved on motion from Rahr and a second by Flanagan. Abstention by Villavicencio and Windsor.
- b) Minutes of May 9, 2018 (Second Meeting), approved on motion from Weber and a second by Tumbarello. Abstention by Villavicencio and Windsor.

2) Chair's Report

- Human Resources & Diversity – Fragola has met with new Chief Human Resource Officer, Janelle Crowley, who will attend our next meeting. Discussions centered mainly around issues affecting Academic Staff. Specifically mentioned was the issue of NetID for staff who had been students.
- By-laws Subcommittee – Consists of Fragola, Weber, Tumbarello, Gorman. Met over summer and continue working on redrafting the current by-laws, and all is up for discussion. Deadline for feedback from subcommittee is September 14. A document will then be created for ASA review and comment. The final revised document will go to the Provost for approval. This will hopefully be completed before the end of the Fall 2018 semester.
- Personnel Rules – Fragola is meeting with Janelle Crowley later in September to start the project. HR's role process will be important and should be discussed prior to starting. After Fragola is meeting with Crowley, an action plan will be developed.
- University Technology Committee – Met September 11, 2018. Elizabeth Watson (CSD) announced upcoming changes to how software accessibility issues will be handled when purchasing. A report of LTC activated was circulated among ASA members.

3) Vice-Chair's Report

- Committees – Weber will continue filling vacancies on ASA committees.
- Title and Total Compensation Advisory Council – Timelines are fluid. Approximately 1,800 job titles will be included in approximately 750 classifications. Project will hopefully be completed by end of academic year but doesn't look promising.

4) Academic Staff Committee Reports

- a) **Awards:** None
- b) **Economic Issues:** None.
- c) **Elections:** None.
- d) **Government:** Our last speaker, Mandela Barnes, Deputy Director of Strategic Engagement at State Innovation Exchange (SiX), is now a candidate for Lieutenant Governor of Wisconsin.

- e) **Instructional Academic Staff Promotions:** Official notification of result were sent from the Chancellor to last year's applicants. The call for applications for this year will go out.
- f) **Outreach:** None.
- g) **Professional development:** None.
- h) **Review:** None.
- i) **Rewards and Recognition:** None.
- j) **Titling Committee:** No issues. The backlog is being cleared up.
- k) **Title Appeals:** None.

5) Updates/Announcements/Other Business

- a) Transportation & Logistics (LaValley): Met over summer. The committee is an information sharing/advisory body, not decision making that meets monthly. Grace Crickett is ultimate decision maker.
 - The Amazon locker is still in the process and is questionable, would be outside Visitor's Center.
 - Stationless bike share is no longer an option. Other options are being considered.
 - A shuttle bus runs between the Whitewater campus and the UW-Whitewater at Rock County campus Monday through Friday with three stops (Visitor's Center, Van Galder in Janesville and the Rock County campus) at this time. Weekend routes will be added once a driver is hired for that time. Wi-Fi will be available on the bus, and there will be an app for tracking which will be paid by Admin Affairs. The bus is owned by UW-Whitewater.
 - Parking meters are being replaced with a system to pay by an app. There are questions regarding duration, the ability to add time.
 - Parking fines were discussed. The new system is tiered. For those parking without a permit, the first offense is a \$50 ticket, the second is \$100, and the third is \$100 and towing. Fines will be waived if an appropriate pass is purchased.
- b) Employment Educational Assistance Program Policy (Tumbarello): None
- c) Sustainability Council (LaValley): Stamm will be replacing LaValley on committee. Fragola will be back up to Stamm.
- d) Mission Statement (Fragola) – The revised UW-Whitewater Mission Statement was discussed. Other than grammatical, consistent use of the Oxford comma, no issues were raised.
 - Motion to approve the UW-Whitewater Mission Statement by Weber, (Flanagan, second). Approved unanimously with one abstention.
- e) Fragola and Weber gave recap of current committee assignments. The process to fill all vacancies continues.
- f) By-laws Subcommittee (Fragola) – Covered in Chair's Report.
- g) Personnel Rules (Fragola) – Covered in Chair's Report.
- h) Report on Math Department Meeting (Rahr) – Efforts to engage and inform AS in Math Department were discussed.
- i) Open Floor – Rock County staff was assigned a NetID but didn't know it for months.

The meeting adjourned at 1:35 on a motion from Windsor (Tumbarello, second).

**UW-W Faculty Resolution for an
Equitable Parking Fee Structure
for Faculty and Staff**

Whereas the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater is committed to the equitable treatment of all administrators, faculty and staff;

Whereas senior members of the administration at UW-W earn salaries well in excess of \$100,00.00 per year;

Whereas staff members at UW-W earn salaries as low as \$31,200.00 per year;

Whereas limited term employees earn salaries as low as \$23,920.00 per year;

Whereas all UW-W employees are expected to purchase parking permits at the same cost;

Whereas the Transportation and Logistics Committee, appointed by the Chancellor, is responsible for setting the cost of parking permits;

Be it therefor resolved that the Transportation and Logistics Committee take steps to develop a tiered structure for campus parking permits that is reflective of the salaries of UW-W administrators, faculty, and staff.

S17-18:10

Submitted By: Sen. Kudy
Sen. Ostermann
Sen. Kosma

Sponsored By: Sen. Schulgit
Sen. Wenzel

Parking Services Oversight Act

WHEREAS, Whitewater Student Government (WSG) serves all students at the University of Wisconsin Whitewater, and;

WHEREAS, on July 9, 2018 UW-Whitewater Parking Services sent out an email regarding the quadrupling of fines for parking regulation violations, and;

WHEREAS, WSG felt inadequately informed about the pricing change, and;

WHEREAS, stated by Wisconsin State Statute 36.09 (5):

The students of each institution or campus subject to the responsibilities and powers of the board, the president, the chancellor, and the faculty shall have primary responsibility for advising the chancellor regarding the formulation and review of policies concerning student life, services, and interests. Students in consultation with the chancellor and subject to the final confirmation of the board shall have the responsibility for the disposition of those student fees which constitute substantial support for campus student activities. The students of each institution or campus shall have the right to organize themselves in a manner they determine and to select their representatives to participate in institutional governance, and;

THEREFORE, WSG deems UW-Whitewater Parking Services a “student service”, and an “issue concerning student life”, concludes that parking is a service that the university provides, even if through an auxiliary enterprise, and;

WHEREAS, the UW-Whitewater Strategic Plan states:

The values statements describe what we believe in: diversity and opportunity, collaboration, integrity, service and social responsibility, learning and academic excellence, and shared governance, and;

FURTHERMORE, UWS 36.11(8e) states:

Institutions are authorized to collect such fines together with moneys collected from the sale of parking permits and other fees established under par. . (a), to be used for the purpose of developing and operating parking or other transportation facilities, or campus safety or transportation-related programs, at the institution at which collected or for enforcing parking rules under par. (a)., and;

WHEREAS, WSG concludes that UW-W Parking Services is the entity that the institution, via the chancellor, has authorized to do this task, and;

CONTINUALLY, since UW-W Parking Services is authorized by the institution, thus the chancellor, and Wisconsin State Statute 36.09(5) states that shared governance primary responsibility is “for advising the chancellor regarding the formulation and review of policies concerning student life, services, and interests”, and;

WHEREAS, WSG does not feel that the current Transportation and Logistics Working Group has invested adequate time concerning parking issues, and;

WHEREAS, the university provides this service, then shared governance and student input should be factored into these choice development decisions, and;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, WSG deems it necessary to, and strongly advises the Chancellor to, re-establish the Parking Oversight Committee, formerly known as Parking Committee, and;

THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the members of the committee shall consist of the following:

- One Member of Faculty Senate
- One Member of the Academic Staff Assembly
- One Member of the Whitewater Student Government
- One Member of the University Staff Council
- One Member of Residence Housing Association
- One Member of UW-Whitewater Athletic Staff
- Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs or their Designee
- Vice Chancellor of Administrative Affairs or their Designee
- Chief of UW-Whitewater Police, Chair and;

THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Parking Oversight Committee shall meet monthly, and their approved minutes will be communicated to all shared governance groups by the chair, and;

THEREFORE BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, the Parking Oversight Committee must hold their first meeting before October 1st, 2018.

AYES _____

NAYS _____

ABSTENTIONS _____

TABLED UNTIL _____

PRESIDENT'S SIGNATURE _____

CLERK'S SIGNATURE _____

PASS _____

FAIL _____

DATE _____

Title: Program Productivity Monitoring

Original Issuance Date: [Fill in Date]
Last Revision Date: [Fill in Date, if applicable]

1. POLICY PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to establish protocols for monitoring degree program productivity by UW System institutions as permitted by Wis. Stats. 36 and in accordance with Regent Policy Document (RPD) 4-12 and <http://wisconsin.edu/regents/policies/academic-program-planning-review-and-approval-in-the-university-of-wisconsin-system/>. This policy also delegates authority for program reviews to UW System institutions and provides the parameters under which this delegation may be used. The policy outlined in this section is intended to define academic degree program productivity monitoring as determined by the University of Wisconsin System Administration (UWSA) and the Board of Regents (BOR).

2. RESPONSIBLE UW SYSTEM OFFICER

Associate Vice President for Academic Programs and Educational Innovation

3. SCOPE

By statute the responsibility to review and monitor academic programs rests with the UW System Administration and UW System institutions. This policy sets parameters for all UW System institutions for monitoring the productivity of degree programs. This policy applies to UW System institutions for monitoring all undergraduate and graduate degree programs according to established criteria. New programs will be monitored under this policy after the sixth year of implementation.

Chapter 36, Wis. Stats., codifies responsibilities for system-wide array management, such as monitoring academic quality, and establishing and maintaining access to educational programs. Regent Policy Document (RPD) 4-12, Academic Program Planning, Review, and Approval in the UW System, delineates the program-planning framework. UW System Policy 102 elaborates on RPD 4-12 and represents the principal policy guiding the UWSA and the UW institutions in operationalizing all activities related to system-wide array.

4. BACKGROUND

Reviews of academic programs are guided by accreditation standards from the Higher Learning Commission as well as RPD 4-12 <https://www.wisconsin.edu/regents/policies/academic-program-planning-review-and-approval-in-the-university-of-wisconsin-system/>. These policies require the institutions in the UW System to regularly review programs. Guidelines for monitoring low producing degree programs were incorporated into UW System Administrative Policy SYS 102, Section 6.3 on July 1, 2016. Criteria for elimination of programs are also outlined in SYS 102 3.4.1. The revised policy maintains the productivity expectations, sets the frequency to monitor productivity every year, and accelerates the timeline in which Provosts are encouraged to consider alternative solutions to delivering low-degree producing programs.

5. DEFINITIONS

Academic programs-majors approved by the Board of Regents

Program monitoring-system and institution level process to examine an academic program guided by a set of criteria and institution and UW System policy

Criteria-indicators of expectations and standards for monitoring and reviewing programs

Eliminate-discontinue an academic program that has been approved by the Board of Regents

Low productivity programs-academic programs that do not meet the criteria for program productivity

Suspend-discontinue admission to an academic program until a decision is made to eliminate or continue the program;

6. POLICY STATEMENT

The program monitoring process will:

- 1) Identify low productivity degree programs more quickly than through an institution's program review cycle
- 2) Allow timely actions to strengthen a program
- 3) Identify programs that have low numbers of graduates
- 4) Initiate processes to either eliminate low productivity programs or appeal elimination using an appeal process
- 5) Ensure the efficient use of the institution's resources in support of its mission, vision and priorities.

Criteria:

The UW System Administration has the responsibility to monitor productivity for all academic programs annually in order to identify those academic programs that do not meet the following criteria as indicators of program productivity.

Criterion: Graduates-number of students awarded degrees in a given period of time.

Bachelor's degree programs

An average of 5 degrees awarded each year over the last five years.

Master's degree programs

An average of 3 degrees awarded each year over the last five years.

Doctoral degree programs

All doctoral programs will be monitored annually for specific criteria established by the doctoral granting institutions.

Program Productivity Monitoring Process:

UWSA Responsibilities

In order to facilitate the UW System program productivity monitoring policy, UW System will:

- Establish and publish criteria related to program vitality to be used across the System
- Provide data to institutions each year for all programs
- Notify institutions about suspension and elimination deadlines
- Track institutions' responses about institution action plan related to program productivity
- Track institutions' appeals for programs to continue
- Facilitate program review workshops

Program review process:

The Office of Academic Programs and Educational Innovation (APEI) and the Office of Policy Analysis and Research (OPAR) will monitor all programs in the UW System program inventory based on the criterion each academic year.

1. APEI will submit data about low producing programs to each institution by August 31 each year.
2. The institution will identify their programs on the list from System and the institution will submit a plan of action to remediate the low producing program by December 31 of the same year. If an institution does not report on its action plan within the specified time frame, UW System will communicate with the institution to begin the governance process for program elimination with the institution per SYS 102 3.4.1.
3. After receiving the monitoring data from APEI, the institution may decide to eliminate the program by the end of the academic year following policy SYS 102 3.4.1. Alternatively, the institution may decide to suspend admissions to the program following policy SYS 102 3.3, Suspending Admissions to an Academic Degree Program. An institution may also decide to proposal an appeal to keep the program despite low enrollment.
4. If the institution decides to continue the program and make changes to the program, the institution will implement its plan of action and report to APEI at the end of three academic years about the effectiveness of the changes and results. The institution will communicate with APEI about the program status as a part of the annual program report.
5. If at the end of three years, the program still does not meet the criterion, the institution must eliminate the program through its governance process using criteria provided by this policy and SYS 102 3.4.1. The institution must submit written notification to Academic Programs and Educational Innovation with the intention of eliminating the program indicating the description of the program to be eliminated, potential impact on students and faculty, confirmation that the appropriate governance bodies have completed their review processes, and the effect date. In the event that there are students currently enrolled in the program, the institution will be responsible for developing a teach-out plan for the current students.

Institutional Actions to Be Taken After Program Is Identified as Not Meet Criteria:

After UWSA provides the institution with relevant data, the institution will conduct a program continuance review to identify one or more of the following possible action steps (from Aug. 31 to Dec. 31). The institution will have one semester to submit a plan of action to UWSA after notification by the UW System of a low productivity program (due Dec. 31). Possible action steps to increase program productivity include the following.

1. Retain the curriculum with specific strategies to increase enrollment with additional resources
2. Redesign the curriculum to make it more responsive to market demand; more appealing to students
3. Change the delivery model
4. Redesign curriculum by combining it with another program/department within the institution.
5. Collaborate with another institution to offer the program.
6. Appeal the program status as outlined below

The institution will have three years to implement this planned action at which time the institution will report on its progress through the APEI annual program report in June of each year. If after three years, the productivity of the program does not improve, UW System will communicate with the institution to eliminate the program using its governance process and criteria outlined in **SYS 102 3.4.1**.

Appeal Process

There are two types of appeals for the degree monitoring process. UWSA will evaluate an institution's appeal for one or two-year extensions for elimination of low productivity programs by examining the probability that a program will meet its graduation goals. UWSA will also evaluate an institution's appeal to keep an academic program that is considered critical to the institution's mission. The institution should address the following components in an appeal process:

- The quality of the program in the areas of teaching and learning, and the contributions of its faculty in research, creative activity, and service;
- The contribution of the program to the mission and strategic plan of the institution, the overall quality of academic offerings, and the strategic plan of the institution;
- The resource implications of retaining or eliminating the program;
- The uniqueness/redundancy of the program within the institution and across the UW System;
- The impact of program elimination on system-wide array and student access to programs.

7. RELATED DOCUMENTS

Within the scope of Chapter 36, Wis. Stats. the BOR, the UWSA, and the UW institutions have specific roles in program planning, approval, delivery, implementation, reporting, and review. Chapter 36, Wis. Stats., gives the BOR the authority to "ensure the diversity of quality undergraduate programs." In fulfilling this statutory role, the BOR has oversight over the UWSA and the UW institutions "to ensure that these entities meet their respective roles and responsibilities." As a steward of the UW System's overall resources, the BOR is also responsible for ensuring a balance between access to education and cost-effectiveness in the development and maintenance of programs. The BOR requires the UWSA and the UW institutions to follow the specific principles, guidelines, and practices described in RPD 4-12. SYS 102 operationalizes these principles, guidelines, and practices.

8. POLICY HISTORY

SYS 102 Section 6.3

SYS 102 Section 3.3

SYS 102 Section 3.4

ACIS 1.1 and ACIS 4 ACPS 1 and 1.1

Guidelines for Academic Program Suspension, November 2009

Monitoring Low-Degree-Producing Programs, July 2010

Principles for Academic Program Consolidation and Elimination, April 2003

9. SCHEDULED REVIEW

[Denotes date of scheduled review, typically 5 years from approval date]

Review policy in January 2021

APPROVED BY:

SYS [Fill in # & title of policy]

Raymond W. Cross
President
University of Wisconsin System

DRAFT



(<https://www.insidehighered.com>)

Another controversial policy proposal in Wisconsin would eliminate all programs based on number of majors

Submitted by Colleen Flaherty on September 11, 2018 - 3:00am

Just a few years after rewriting the rules on program cuts and related faculty layoffs ^[1], the University of Wisconsin System is again seeking to limit faculty -- and even institutional -- say in academic matters.

According to a circulating system draft policy ^[2] on "monitoring degree program productivity," institutions would have just three years to increase enrollment in "low-productivity" programs or be forced to cut them.

The monitoring policy, which is based on less decisive, existing system guidelines on program reviews, bluntly defines low-productivity programs as those that fail to produce at least five bachelor's degrees per year over five years and three master's degrees over the same period, on average. Doctoral programs would be monitored based on criteria established by individual institutions.

Again, similar productivity expectations already are in place for program reviews, which are overseen by individual institutions. But the revised administrative policy would require annual monitoring at the system level and speed up the timeline by which "provosts are encouraged to consider alternative solutions to delivering low-degree producing programs."

Faculty leaders say that the proposal could arbitrarily kill programs that play important roles in general education, and that it uses a single metric to assess program success.

Wisconsin's central Office of Academic Programs and Educational Innovation and the Office of Policy Analysis and Research would monitor all programs, submitting data to each institution by the end of August of each year.

Institutions, in turn, could simply decide to eliminate their low-productivity programs by the end of the academic year. But more likely, they could submit to the system a "plan of action to remediate" targeted programs by the end of December -- just four months later. Failure to meet that deadline would trigger the "governance process for program elimination."

Possible remediation actions include:

- Retaining the curriculum while developing strategies to increase enrollment with additional resources
- Redesigning the curriculum to make it more "responsive to market demand; more appealing to students," or combining it with another program or department on campus
- Changing the delivery model
- Collaborating with another institution to offer the program

After three years of remediation, institutions must report back to the system about results, the draft policy says. ("Tracking" and communication with the system office would also be required annually.) In the event that a program still failed to meet the standard of five bachelor's or three master's degrees annually, on average, over five years, "the institution must eliminate the program through its governance process." A teach-out plan must be provided for any programs with currently enrolled students.

Two types of appeals are allowed: a one- or two-year extension, with the system assessing the probability that the program will meet its graduation goals; or an appeal based on the idea that a program is “critical to the institution’s mission.”

Appeals must include information, including that about the “quality of the program in the areas of teaching and learning, and the contributions of its faculty in research, creative activity and service.” The system alone assesses these appeals.

A spokesperson for the system initially referred requests for comment to Greg Summers, provost at the Stevens Point campus [3] and architect of its new plan to eliminate 13 programs, including English, history, philosophy, political science, sociology and Spanish. Via email, Summers said he supported the policy and its inclusion of shared governance and an appeals mechanism. Hesitant to comment in much detail on something that is still in draft form, Summers said that “carefully monitoring program enrollments has always been a fundamental responsibility of the [Wisconsin] system.”

That’s “relatively uncontroversial when enrollments are growing and funding is readily available,” he added, “but it becomes more difficult, obviously, when budgets are tight and demographic pressures have eroded the population of prospective students.”

Noel Radomski, managing director of the Wisconsin Center for the Advancement of Postsecondary Education at the Madison campus [4], said the draft monitoring policy comes at a time of intense distrust between campus faculty and staff and system administrators, following changes to tenure [5] and program discontinuance policies over faculty objections, and, a bit later, the controversial transition of state colleges to branch university campuses. [6]

Beyond that, the proposed policy timeline sets faculty members up for failure, he said. A comprehensive program remediation plan would take at least two semesters to design, not one, especially at regional campuses where professors carry heavy teaching loads. Similarly, deciding the fate of a program after just three years is too fast, he said.

“People want to speed things up at universities just like they want to speed things up at a widget factory,” Radomski said. “But that’s like comparing apples to meat loaf.”

Nick Fleisher, associate professor of linguistics at the Milwaukee campus [7] and president of the state conference of the American Association of University Professors, said that the system is proposing to use a “single metric -- the number of graduating majors over five years -- to assess the importance of programs.” No one metric can do that, he said, “and this one is particularly bad,” since “it ignores a program’s course enrollments, and it puts smaller campuses at a disadvantage since the same numerical bar is used systemwide. It completely disregards the educational value of the programs themselves. It’s a blunt budget-cutting instrument, not an educational policy.”

Calling the policy a “major shared governance problem,” Fleisher said there is “no acceptable automatic trigger for program elimination.” The system should withdraw the draft, he said, encouraging it to share strategies for program growth and development instead of “seeking ways to shut programs down.”

Bob Atkins, CEO and founder of Gray Associates, a higher education consulting firm, said that “when you start to see across-the-board cuts like this in colleges or in business -- when numerical rules are imposed -- it generally means there’s been a breakdown in communication or trust between the organization and its leadership.”

Noting that he recently worked to help another, unnamed institution cut 80 programs, Atkins said “a healthier process can be done -- and we do it in schools all the time. You sit down with the data and you’re clear that, ‘We gotta cut a bunch of programs.’ But you put that responsibility on the people on the front lines who know what these things are.” (Note: An earlier version of this paragraph contained an erroneous reference to the University of Akron.)

He added, “In our experience, when you ask them to take on that responsibility, they do.”

Beyond shared-governance issues, Atkins said that using an arbitrary number as a trigger for program cuts could have unintended consequences. While some have guessed that the proposal will disproportionately hurt regional campuses, a preliminary analysis by Atkins based on federal data on completions found that Madison would suffer some 70 program cuts and Milwaukee about 30, out of about 120 total program cuts across the system.

Foreign language programs across campuses would suffer, and Atkins suggested that the system would have to designate a center of excellence somewhere -- not necessarily a bad idea, he said. But education, including several science and special education programs, would be cut across Wisconsin, as would numerous programs in ethnic and women's studies. Smaller but potentially valuable science programs would be caught up in the cuts, too, he said, as could programs funded by donors. Moreover, he said, most programs are cost-neutral or cost-generating in terms of instruction, if not overhead.

"You can make some silly mistakes in cutting programs that are attracting students at very little to no cost."

Source URL: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/09/11/another-controversial-policy-proposal-wisconsin-would-eliminate-all-programs-based?width=775&height=500&iframe=true>

Links:

- [1] <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/03/11/u-wisconsin-board-regents-approves-new-tenure-policies-despite-faculty-concerns>
- [2] https://www.dropbox.com/s/g660qv9pvh1zjca/7-13_18_%284%29Revised%20Policy_102_6.3%20Program%20Monitoring.pdf?dl=0
- [3] <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/03/13/faculty-members-wisconsin-stevens-point-react-plan-cut-13-majors>
- [4] <https://www.insidehighered.com/college/240444/university-wisconsin-madison>
- [5] <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/06/01/wisconsin-faculty-incensed-motion-eliminate-tenure-state-statute>
- [6] <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/10/13/wisconsin-merger-plan-stokes-controversy-some-see-upside>
- [7] <https://www.insidehighered.com/college/240453/university-wisconsin-milwaukee>