



28 January 2005

Representative Joan Ballweg
State Capitol
P.O. Box 8953
Madison, WI 53708

Dear Representative Ballweg:

You are aware that Representative Kreibich has proposed that the two-year UW Colleges' campuses be merged with regional four-year university campuses. No one has asked any of the Colleges' campus executive officers their opinion about this, so we will collectively take this opportunity to let you know that we are unequivocal in our belief that this is a damaging idea for higher education in the state of Wisconsin.

Only Rep. Schneider was in the legislature from 1969-72, when a so-called "nucleation" of the two-year campuses with the four-year universities actually took place. It did not work. Under that model, the two-year campuses failed to receive the support by the larger parent campuses that was requisite for the effective teaching and learning process for which the Colleges has now come to be seen as our State's leader. In some cases, the campuses were even raided for their resources, leaving them with substandard equipment and supplies for serving local students, a situation that has finally been remedied only through careful planning and efficient use of resources since we became a single institution.

The campuses have made light years of progress since 1972 when we became the single, cohesive, 13-campus UW Colleges. Our progress has taken place in no small part because we have had our own chancellor and provost sitting at the same tables as equals with their peers, making certain that the needs of those Wisconsin students who choose to start their university education at the two-year-campus in their own communities are not marginalized.

Our institutional office has efficiently centralized certain services (such as Human Resources, Payroll, IIT, Registrar, etc.) needed by students and staffed by employees at each of the four-year campuses. We continue to provide direct student services on each of the 13 two-year campuses. Technology *has* allowed for greater efficiency and faster service, but we are dealing with real people with real needs, people who will not enroll at a campus where they need to wait a week for a traveling service person, or interact on-line. Further, to suggest that the four-year universities would just place their people on the road to advise students, to register students, to collect their tuition dollars, to clean the floors and the offices, and to represent the university in the Colleges' campus communities suggests that those people on the four-year-campus are currently underutilized (and ripe for administrative cut-backs), and/or that the students and faculty on the two-year campuses deserve less than the full attention that these services provide.

If we are merged with the four-year campuses, and the positions are eliminated as suggested by Rep. Kreibich, the progress of the last 33 years will cease. The larger parent campuses are not going to spend the time, nor will they invest themselves in our communities as we have.

As campus deans, perhaps the most visible representatives of our campuses within our local communities, we know firsthand the importance of that effort. Collectively, we sit on nearly 100 community boards (with no compensation). Through our efforts, we have raised millions of philanthropic dollars to construct facilities that would otherwise have been paid for by the taxpayers. Each of our campuses also has its own independent foundation that raises local, and sometimes not-so-local philanthropic money for scholarships, faculty and staff professional development, and faculty-student research and presentation. No one of these foundations has any state-funded personnel assistance.

Representative Joan Ballweg
28 January 2005
Page two

But for your purposes, what is most important is that the attachment of the two-year campuses to the four year universities **did not save money then**, and **will not save money now**. All of the campus positions that Rep. Kreibich has suggested could be cut by such a merger *existed* when nucleation was a reality because these represent essential services needed on a daily basis by students.

Furthermore, and perhaps even more significant in these times of state budgetary crisis, the UW Colleges is the **most efficient** and the **least costly** institution of higher education in the state. Attached is information on the costs to educate UW Colleges' students compared to that of two of the comprehensive UW institutions most similar to us in number of employee positions (UW-La Crosse) and number of students (UW Oshkosh). The numbers clearly show that we are more cost-effective. For example, you can see that UW Oshkosh and the UW Colleges both have about 12,000 students. If the 12,000 UW Colleges' students were to be educated instead at the cost incurred at UW Oshkosh, the taxpayers would spend *an additional* \$7,344,000! Conversely, if all 4,630 UWO freshmen and sophomores had enrolled at a UW Colleges campus the state would have *saved* \$2,823,560. So, if one wanted to use the logic of cost alone, that logic would dictate that the comprehensive university campuses should reduce their enrollments, and those first- and second-year students currently attending the comprehensives or doctoral institutions should be required to attend a UW Colleges campus where their education is less costly.

As you can see, the UW Colleges campuses, as they are presently organized, form an institution that works extremely well at providing truly meaningful education for first and second year students. Rather than proposing to limit our effectiveness by merging us with higher cost, less efficient institutions, we should be looking for ways to enhance and expand our model, perhaps through our receiving limited baccalaureate-degree-granting authority so that we can extend our efficiencies and student success to members of our community seeking to complete their bachelor's degrees.

We have seen the editorials in the newspapers in support of the merger proposal. They do not come from communities where the UW Colleges campuses reside. In addition, we have heard no support for this idea from any of the comprehensive or doctoral campuses' chancellors.

Please examine the attached sheets. We believe you will see that the UW Colleges is a model of efficiency and student success. We urge you not to dismantle the leader in quality and efficiency but rather to extend your support for the UW Colleges. Please contact us if you have any questions. And please tuck the proposal to nucleate the UW Colleges campuses with the four year universities exactly where it belongs—in the dusty bins of the historical archives.

Yours sincerely,

Michael S. Brophy, CEO/Dean
UW-Baraboo/Sauk County

Paula T. Langteau, CEO/Dean
UW-Marinette

Paul W. Chase, CEO/Dean
UW-Barron County

Andrew J. Keogh, CEO/Dean
UW-Marshfield/Wood County

Daniel J. Blankenship, CEO/Dean
UW-Fond du Lac

Deborah B. Cureton, CEO/Dean
UW-Richland

James W. Perry, CEO/Dean
UW-Fox Valley

Janet S. Philipp, CEO/Dean
UW-Rock County

Glenda Gallisath, CEO/Dean
UW-Manitowoc

Raymond T. Hernandez, CEO/Dean
UW-Sheboygan

James F. Veninga, CEO/Dean
UW-Marathon County

Thomas Brigham, Interim CEO/Dean
UW-Washington County

Brad Stewart, CEO/Dean
UW-Waukesha

UW Colleges Costs and Staffing at a Glance, January 2005

Costs

- *Lowest cost in the UW System for undergraduate resident students:*

CAMPUS	Tuition and fees (2004-05)
Colleges	\$3924¹
Oshkosh	\$4616
Green Bay	\$5158
Madison	\$5866
Average of 4-year campuses	\$4901

- *Lowest operating cost per FTE student*

Institution	LAB findings	GPR+tuition	Instructional GPR+tuition	Total Operating Costs
UW Colleges	\$8981/FTE	\$5,949/FTE	\$3258/FTE	\$78.9M
UW System range	\$8981- \$28,659/FTE	\$5949 - \$16,254/FTE	\$3258- \$7908/FTE	
UW System average	\$15,239/FTE	\$8548/FTE	\$4686/FTE	
LaCrosse ²	\$13,024/FTE	\$7375/FTE	\$4423/FTE	\$109.9M
Oshkosh ³	\$13,565/FTE	\$7118/FTE	\$4226/FTE	\$131.4M
Madison Area TC ⁴	NA	\$7800/FTE	NA	NA
Milw. Area TC ⁴	NA	\$9000	NA	NA
Nicolet TC ⁴	NA	\$13,000	NA	NA

¹ Each UW Colleges campus has the same tuition but students on each campus set their own fees. Thus this is an average, with little variation around the average.

² UW LaCrosse (997 positions) is about same size institution in student FTE as UW Colleges (936 positions) (Source LAB)

³ UW Oshkosh is about same size institution in student headcount as UW Colleges: UWO has 1339 positions vs. Colleges 936 positions (Source LAB)

⁴ These three technical colleges have “college parallel” programs

- *Largest number of students per FTE employee*

Institution	Student FTE per FTE employees
Colleges	9.4 (In 2004, we're even more efficient: 9.8)
UW System range	2.2-9.4
UW System average	7.5
UW-LaCrosse ¹	8.2
UW-Oshkosh ²	7.1
Madison Area Technical College	7.6
Milwaukee Area Technical College	6.5
Nicolet Technical College	4.8