



LFB Paper: 820 Initiatives (UW System)

A. Funding

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
<p>A1. SUPPORT</p>	<p><i>Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$21,455,600 GPR and \$7,935,200 PR in 2008-09 to fund the Growth Agenda Initiatives for the UW System.</i></p> <p>This funding is needed to (1) increase the number of Wisconsin residents who have four-year college degrees (2) attract more college graduates to Wisconsin and (3) create new knowledge-economy jobs.</p> <p>Funding for the Growth Agenda would impact every legislative district in WI. Several of our institutions enroll students from every district. The Growth Agenda will focus on increasing opportunities for place-bound citizens to enroll through the Adult Student Initiative and increased online offerings, and increase the number of off-site locations for programs such as nursing and engineering.</p> <p>Increased funding for Applied Research, the NanoSTEM initiative at UW-Eau Claire and UW-Stout, along with a major investment in research initiatives at UW-Milwaukee will help strengthen the research and new technology base for the state of Wisconsin. These new opportunities should attract new businesses and graduates to Wisconsin.</p> <p>Under the Governor's recommendation the UW System would allocate the resources in a manner designed to allow all the initiatives to be implemented.</p>

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
A2. OPPOSE	<p data-bbox="532 184 1351 302"><i>Modify the Governor's recommendation to provide proportionately distribute the GPR funding among the institutions.</i></p> <p data-bbox="532 331 1425 840">This modification would distribute resources to the institutions proportionately based on the total amount of GPR requested by the Regents and recommended by the Governor. The legislature has vested the Board of Regents with the authority to distribute resources. The Board may wish to consider other factors such as the impact of what appears to be minimal reductions on small appropriations. The impact of a \$5,500 reduction on a \$124,500 request could be significantly more detrimental to a program than a proportional reduction to a much larger program. In some cases to ensure the ability to achieve the required result, an initiative might need to be held harmless to a reduction.</p> <p data-bbox="532 869 1386 987">The UW System is committed to implementing all of the programs and ensuring the results with the funding recommended by the Governor.</p>
A3. OPPOSE	<p data-bbox="532 1003 1357 1079"><i>Delete one or more of the individual initiatives and the related funding.</i></p> <p data-bbox="532 1108 1442 1642">All of the Growth Agenda initiatives were designed to help grow the economy of the state of Wisconsin in a way that utilized the strength of that campus, the needs of the region and existing resources within the System. Deleting any of the individual initiatives would decrease the effectiveness of the overall Growth Agenda. Every one of the institutional initiatives were supported by their region. The Systemwide initiatives were all designed to create maximum impact for the state with a minimal investment. Removing an initiative would result in fewer graduates, decreased regional impact, and decreased retention of qualified students who may require some additional support to achieve the goal of a bachelor's degree.</p>

<p>A4. OPPOSE</p>	<p><i>Delete provision.</i></p> <p>The Growth Agenda for the state of Wisconsin provides quantifiable outcomes, and sets forth an aggressive agenda with a relatively small state investment. Any delay in starting the growth agenda puts the state further behind in creating a new economy workforce and allows the state to fall further behind in national benchmarks.</p>
<p>B. POSITIONS</p>	
<p>B1. SUPPORT</p>	<p><i>Approve the Governor's recommendations which would not provide GPR positions in the budget but would allow the UW System to create positions as needed to advance the initiative.</i></p> <p>Under the Governor's recommendations, the UW System would be able to create additional GPR positions as needed to fund Growth Agenda initiatives. This would provide institutions with the assurance that they would have the position authority when needed but the state would not have to add authorized positions prior to the time that they are required.</p>
<p>B2. OPPOSE</p>	<p><i>Delete the current law authority for the UW System to create GPR positions. Provide the UW System with 300.0 GPR positions in 2008-09 to support these initiatives.</i></p> <p>The UW System's position creation authority was provided to allow institutions to replace positions within the authorized salary line without creating additional funding liabilities for the state. The System has been very careful in its use of this authority which is considered one of the most important flexibilities for institutions in meeting student, regional, and state needs.</p>



LFB Paper: 821
Title: UW-La Crosse (UW System)

A. Funding Level

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
1. SUPPORT	<p><i>Approve the Governor’s recommendation, which would provide \$4,363,400 PR from tuition revenue for UW-La Crosse to support its Growth and Access Initiative...</i></p> <p>This funding is necessary for UW-La Crosse to implement its multi-biennial Growth and Access initiative which will benefit the state by increasing access to UW-La Crosse, enhancing levels of academic excellence, increasing diversity, and providing the increased economic benefits of having a larger student enrollment and additional faculty and support staff.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
2. OPPOSE	<p><i>Modify the Governor’s recommendation to delete \$3,462,000 PR in 2008-09, which would provide \$901,400 PR as a change to the base. This funding level would be consistent with the amount of tuition revenue available under this initiative in that year.</i></p> <p>Because the UW-La Crosse Growth and Access Initiative is a multi-year initiative and will be starting one-year later under the Governor’s budget than was proposed by the UW System Board of Regents, less tuition revenue may be generated in 2008-09 than requested. However, UW-La Crosse would only utilize the amount of tuition authority it can generate in tuition revenue each year. Having additional tuition authority available promotes predictability and allows the campus to plan for growth before needing to request additional tuition authority in the future.</p>

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
3. OPPOSE	<p><i>Delete provision. The UW Board of Regents could implement the UW-La Crosse initiative using its authority to charge differential tuition.</i></p> <p>While the UW System Board of Regents does have statutory authority to implement differential tuition initiatives, the Board has requested additional tuition revenue authority in order to implement the UW-La Crosse Growth and Access Initiative.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
4. OPPOSE	<p><i>Delete the provision and prohibit the UW Board of Regents from using differential tuition to implement the UW-La Crosse Initiative.</i></p> <p>The UW System Board of Regents has been granted statutory authority under Wis. Stats. § 36.27(1)(im)6 to implement differential tuition initiatives. The UW System does not support limitations on this statutory authority.</p>

The Preferred Option is #1. This option would provide the tuition revenue authority required to implement the UW-La Crosse Growth and Access Initiative.

B. PR Positions

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
1. SUPPORT	<p><i>Approve the Governor’s recommendation, which would not provide positions and would rely upon the UW System to create the positions needed to implement the UW-La Crosse initiative under SB 40.</i></p> <p>The use of the UW System’s position creation authority is necessary under this scenario for UW-La Crosse to implement its multi-biennial Growth and Access initiative which will benefit the state by increasing access to UW-La Crosse, enhancing levels of academic excellence, increasing diversity, and providing the increased economic benefits of having a larger student enrollment and additional faculty and support staff.</p>

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
2. SUPPORT	<p data-bbox="532 184 1430 304"><i>Modify the Governor's recommendation to provide 28.0 PR positions in 2008-09, which would be consistent with the funding provided under Alternative A1.</i></p> <p data-bbox="532 331 1446 667">This option would not require the UW System to utilize its position creation authority in order for UW-La Crosse to implement its Growth and Access initiative which will benefit the state by increasing access to UW-La Crosse, enhancing levels of academic excellence, increasing diversity, and providing the increased economic benefits of having a larger student enrollment and additional faculty and support staff.</p>
3. OPPOSE	<p data-bbox="532 676 1414 800"><i>Modify the Governor's recommendation to provide 8.0 PR positions in 2008-09, which would be consistent with the funding provided under Alternative A2.</i></p> <p data-bbox="532 827 1451 1123">Because the UW-La Crosse Growth and Access Initiative is a multi-year initiative and will be starting one-year later under the Governor's budget than was proposed by the UW System Board of Regents, having additional positions available promotes predictability and allows the campus to plan for growth before needing to request additional PR positions or using its position creation authority in the future.</p>



LFB Paper: 822

Title: Retention of High Demand Faculty (UW System)

A. Funding Level

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
1. SUPPORT	<p><i>Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$2,307,600 GPR and \$1,025,700 PR in 2007-08 and \$4,615,300 GPR and \$2,051,400 PR in 2008-09 to support competitive compensation of faculty in high demand academic disciplines.</i></p> <p>This funding is needed to increase the capacity of institutions to retain faculty and research academic staff in mission critical and high demand areas. The gap between salaries of UW system staff and their peers has increased to the point that the Board of Regents submitted a request to close the gap over 2 biennia. This initiative will allow the institutions to decrease the loss of critical staff as the gap is closed slowly over time. The recruitment and retention fund is a cost effective method of enhancing retention at the UW System.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
2. OPPOSE	<p><i>Modify the Governor's recommendation to provide an all funds total of \$1,667,000 in 2007-08 and \$3,333,000 in 2008-09 which is equal to the amount provided in the 2005-07 biennium.</i></p> <p>This modification would cut the funding requested by the Board of Regents and recommended by the Governor in half. The number of counter-offers at UW institutions has increased. At UW-Madison, the number of counter offers increased from 58 in 2001-02 to 116 in 2005-06. The recruitment and retention funds will be critical this biennium given the current gap in salaries, especially if there is not a significant pay plan increase recommended.</p>

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
3. OPPOSE	<p><i>Delete the provision.</i></p> <p>When a faculty member leaves the University, it takes an average of one year to recruit and hire a replacement. The new staff member generally has less experience and generates fewer research dollars. The UW System needs to have funds to recruit and retain top staff in order to maintain the quality and reputations of our institutions, to generate federal and gift funds, and to support the needs of students, communities, and businesses.</p>
B. DOA Approval of Plan	
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
B.1. OPPOSE	<p><i>Approve the Governor's recommendation that requires approval of a plan by the Secretary of DOA before expenditure of additional moneys for supplemental salary increases.</i></p> <p>This requirement is not necessary because the Board of Regents is authorized by the Legislature to allocate resources to the UW System institutions. In addition, the Board annually submits a report on salary increases provided to recognize competitive factors to the Joint Committee on Finance, the Department of Administration, and the Director of the Office of State Employment Relations.</p>
B.2. SUPPORT	<i>Delete provision.</i>

The Preferred Options are A1 and B2.



LFB Paper: 823
Biomedical Technology Alliance (UW System)

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
1. SUPPORT	<p><i>Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$2,500,000 in 2007-08 in a new biennial appropriation for the biomedical alliance in southeastern Wisconsin.</i></p> <p>This alliance was established in 2005 with an initial \$500,000 grant. Participating institutions are: UW-Milwaukee, UW-Parkside, the Medical College of Wisconsin, Marquette University, and the Milwaukee School of Engineering. The additional funding requested will permit the participating institutions to provide increased grants to broaden the scope of biomedical research in southeastern Wisconsin. Institutions are required to match all state funds. Therefore this initiative provides a combined pool of \$5,000,000 in collaborative research related funding to southeastern Wisconsin.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
2. OPPOSE	<p><i>Modify the Governor's recommendation to provide only \$500,000 in funding.</i></p> <p>This modification would limit the funding for the biomedical alliance to present amounts. As a result, levels of research would not increase and additional federal dollars would not be forthcoming to the region.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
3. OPPOSE	<p><i>Delete provision.</i></p> <p>This modification would eliminate all funding for this initiative and would eliminate this means of supporting valuable collaborative biomedical research in southeastern Wisconsin. The state would lose the benefit of the matching dollars under this provision.</p>

The Preferred Option is 1 as this will provide for additional support for collaborative biomedical research in southeastern Wisconsin and will provide the participating institutions with a means to capture increasing amounts of federal research funding.



LFB Paper: 824
Title: Islet Transplantation (UW System)

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
1. SUPPORT	<p><i>Approve the Governor’s recommendation.</i></p> <p>This funding is necessary to support research related to islet transplantation at the UW School of Medicine and Public Health, as well help defray the costs of this experimental juvenile diabetes treatment for patients.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
2. OPPOSE	<p><i>Delete provision.</i></p> <p>The deletion of this funding would require this research to be supported by allocations from UW-Madison base funding, private gifts and grants, and contributions made by individual patients. In addition, without this funding the UW School of Medicine and Public Health may be unable to receive grant funds from sources that require state matching funds.</p>

The Preferred Option is #1. This option would provide the funding required to support research related to islet transplantation at the UW School of Medicine and Public Health.



LFB Paper: 825

Lawton and Advanced Opportunity (AOP) Grants

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
A.1. SUPPORT	<p><i>Approve the Governor’s recommendation to increase Lawton funding by \$376,100 in 2007-08 and \$644,400 in 2008-09 and reestablish the statutory sum-sufficient link to average increases in resident undergraduate tuition.</i></p> <p>This option would provide stable, additional financial aid to help minority students cover potential tuition increases and remain in college. The statutory link provides both predictability and reassurance to students that financial aid will keep pace with increases in tuition. This is important because only 43% of students of color graduate within six years of enrollment, while the UW System average is 62%.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
A.2. OPPOSE	<p><i>Suspend the statutory sum-sufficient link and provide certain fixed percentage increase funding ranging from 2% to 8% per year.</i></p> <p>Suspending the sum-sufficient link will eliminate the guarantee to students that funding would keep pace with tuition increases. The average Lawton Grant covered 21% of the cost of attendance in 1991-92, but only 12.3% in 2005-06. The statutory link provides both predictability and reassurance to minority students that financial aid will at least keep pace with increases in tuition. It is possible that, even with the link, the cost of attendance would increase at a greater rate than the funding provided, which may lead some students to drop out.</p>

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
A.3. OPPOSE	<p><i>Delete \$376,100 in 2007-08 and \$644,400 in 2008-09 and eliminate the statutory sum-sufficient link. This option would level fund the appropriation.</i></p> <p>The average Lawton Grant has not significantly increased during the past decade. This option would further exacerbate the trend in declining participation of low income and minority students. The cost of attendance will continue to increase while financial aid remains constant. Students from low income families will find it difficult to meet the rising costs and may either drop out or never attend.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
B.1. SUPPORT	<p><i>Approve the Governor's recommendation to increase AOP funding by \$362,300 in 2007-08 and \$708,700 in 2008-09.</i></p> <p>Additional financial aid funding is extremely important to maintain and increase the access of talented low income graduate students to the UW System. Additional funding will assure students that financial support is available throughout their graduate career. The Advanced Opportunity Program is the only need-based aid for UW graduate students.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
B.2. OPPOSE	<p><i>Provide a certain fixed percentage increase in funding, ranging from 2% to 8% per year.</i></p> <p>Providing funding increases that are tied to the increase in tuition reassures students that funding will keep pace with tuition increases. It is possible that the cost of attendance would increase at a greater rate than the funding provided, which may lead some students to drop out or to transfer to another institution in order to complete their graduate studies.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
B.3. OPPOSE	<p><i>Delete \$362,300 in 2007-08 and \$708,700 in 2008-09. This option would level fund the appropriation.</i></p> <p>This option would further exacerbate the trend in declining participation of low income students. The cost of attendance will continue to increase while financial aid remains constant. Low income graduate students will find it difficult to meet the rising costs and may either drop out or never attend.</p>

The Preferred Options are A.1. and B.1. It is extremely important that access to the UW System is maintained for low-income and minority students and that funding for these grants is provided in a stable and predictable manner.



LFB Paper: 826

Application Fee Increase (UW System)

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
1. SUPPORT	<p><i>Approve the Governor's recommendation to increase the application fee by \$15 for all applicants.</i></p> <p>The purpose of the application fee is to defray the cost of maintaining admissions offices and processing applications. At the time the fee was introduced, the Legislature reduced the GPR dollars allocated to the UW System for these purposes. In addition, by establishing a per-application, rather than a per-applicant, fee, it was also designed to weed out insincere applicants. Finally, application fees permit the cost of admissions to be supported by the applicants themselves, rather than all current students and general state taxpayers. The increase in funding will provide approximately \$1.8 million annually to defray costs related to the online application systems, publications, e-commerce costs, and assessment and evaluation of candidates. This fee has not been increased since 1997. In that same period of time, the numbers of new freshmen applications alone has grown approximately 50%, from 61,000 in 1997-98 to 90,900 in 2006-07. As the numbers of applicants has increased, additional funds have not been available to meet all the increased needs.</p>

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
2. OPPOSE	<p><i>Modify the Governor's recommendation to permit increases of \$9 for new freshmen and out-of-system transfers and \$11 for graduate, law and medical school students.</i></p> <p>This modification would relate the increase only to inflationary levels by determining the amount in relation to growth in the CPI since the last increase in application fees. This modification does not take into account the additional factors beyond inflation, which result in additional costs, such as e-commerce costs related to payment by credit card, expanded online programs, and the actual growth in the number of applicants. Since the application fee was initially established to defray the cost of maintaining admissions offices and processing applications, this option does not meet this requirement.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
3. OPPOSE	<p><i>Modify the Governor's recommendation to increase the application fee for all students by \$5</i></p> <p>While this modification does not even permit the fees to keep up with inflationary increases, it would increase revenue by \$600,000. This amount would be sufficient only to fund the update of the online application system. Funding of e-commerce costs related to credit card payments, updates of application materials, evaluation and assessment of candidates would not be possible. Since the application fee was initially established to defray the cost of maintaining admissions offices and processing applications, this option does not meet this requirement.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
4. OPPOSE	<p><i>Delete the provision</i></p> <p>No funding would be available for any of the improvements or enhancements required.</p>

The Preferred Option is 1 as it provides adequate funding for all improvements required.



LFB Paper: 827
UW-Madison Intercollegiate Athletics (UW System)

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
1. OPPOSE	<p><i>Approve the Governor’s recommendation.</i></p> <p>The UW-Madison Athletics Board reevaluated the expansion of the University Ridge Golf Course and no longer requires funding for this purpose at the current time.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
2. SUPPORT	<p><i>Modify the Governor’s recommendation to decrease PR expenditure authority by \$2,625,000 annually. This would reflect the UW Athletics Board Decision to scale back the expansion of the University Ridge golf course and forgo plans to create an academy course.</i></p> <p>This modification would adjust spending authority levels to those consistent with what the Athletics Board is currently anticipating.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
3. OPPOSE	<p><i>Delete Provision.</i></p> <p>This alternative would remove spending authority related to new NCAA legislation and the additional operating costs for Camp Randall Stadium and the Porter Boathouse. Authority would also be removed for capital expenditures for Heritage Hall within Camp Randall Stadium and a roof replacement for the McClain Facility.</p>

The Preferred Option is #2. This option would provide self-funded expenditure authority to continue the Division of Intercollegiate Athletics strategic financial plan which provides extracurricular activity for approximately 1,150 student-athletes and band and spirit squads in addition to more than 7,000 camp and clinic participants.



LFB Paper: 828

Title: Nonresident Tuition Remission for Certain Undocumented Persons (UW System)

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
<p>1. SUPPORT</p>	<p><i>Approve the Governor’s recommendation which would require the UW System and WTCS district boards to provide a nonresident tuition remission to each person who is a citizen of another country, if that person meets all of the following requirements: (a) graduated from a Wisconsin high school or received a high school graduation equivalency from this state; (b) the person was continuously present in this state for at least one year, in the case of a UW System institution, or three years, in the case of a WTCS institution, following the first day of attending a high school in this state; and (c) the person enrolls in a UW System institution or WTCS institution and provides the institution with an affidavit that the person has filed or will file an application for a permanent resident visa with the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services as soon as the person is eligible to do so. The provision would first apply to persons who enroll for the semester or session following the bill’s effective date.</i></p> <p>The UW Board of Regents, at its June 2004 meeting, passed a resolution supporting a change in Wisconsin law that would expand the current exemptions from nonresident tuition to include undocumented persons meeting the criteria established in the Governor’s provision. Ten other states already offer this type of nonresident tuition remission.</p>

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
2. SUPPORT	<p data-bbox="532 184 1433 390"><i>Modify the Governor’s recommendation to specify that a person must have been continuously present in this state for at least three years following the first day of attending a Wisconsin high school to qualify for a remission at either a UW System or WTCS institution.</i></p> <p data-bbox="532 422 1386 632">This modification would establish a consistent policy for both the UW System and WTCS institutions, and would provide the remission to students who completed the majority of their high school education in Wisconsin. According to DOA, this was their original intent.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
3. OPPOSE	<p data-bbox="532 682 857 716"><i>Delete this provision.</i></p> <p data-bbox="532 747 1446 909">Students who would be affected by the nonresident tuition provision in the Governor’s budget have attended Wisconsin high schools and have families who have lived and worked in Wisconsin.</p> <p data-bbox="532 940 1425 1066">Charging nonresident tuition has the potential to make college inaccessible to these students at a time that the state needs additional college graduates.</p> <p data-bbox="532 1098 1369 1249">College graduates earn over \$1,000,000 more than high school graduates over the course of their lifetime and contribute to both greater economic activity as well as additional tax revenues for the state.</p>

The preferred option is #2. This option would allow undocumented students who have lived and attended high school in the state of Wisconsin to pay the resident tuition rate to attend the a University of Wisconsin System institution, and would contribute to the goal of the Growth Agenda to increase the number of people with baccalaureate degrees. In addition, this option would establish a consistent policy for both the UW System and WTCS institutions.



LFB Paper: 284

Title: Initial State Payments for Health Insurance Premiums for Certain State Employees (ETF)

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
1. SUPPORT	<p><i>Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide that, except for limited-term employees, the employer-required contribution toward the health insurance premium of certain state employees would begin on the first day of the third month, instead of the first day of the seventh month, beginning after the date on which the employee begins employment with the state, not including any leave of absence. The provision would take effect July 1, 2008.</i></p> <p>This would provide a significant recruiting tool for experienced workers. With this change, the state's practices would be more consistent with those of other public employers like Brown, La Crosse, Milwaukee and Oneida counties, the city of Madison, and the Janesville, Madison, and Waunakee school districts.</p> <p>This change would also bring the state more in line with surrounding states like Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Michigan, and Minnesota, which all have initial coverage, with full employer contributions, ranging from the day of employment to 35 days after the day of hire.</p>

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
2. NEUTRAL	<p data-bbox="537 184 1448 478"><i>Modify the Governor's recommendation to provide that, except for limited-term employees, the employer-required contribution toward the health insurance premium of certain state employees would begin on the first day of the fifth month, beginning after the date on which the employee begins employment with the state, not including any leave of absence. The provision would take effect July 1, 2008.</i></p> <p data-bbox="537 506 1448 707">This change may improve the ability to recruit experienced workers. The benefits would not be as great as the change to coverage at the beginning of the third month, although it would still reduce employee the cost and uncertainty created by the current 6 month required waiting period.</p>
3. OPPOSE	<p data-bbox="537 724 792 758"><i>Delete provision.</i></p> <p data-bbox="537 787 1409 989">According to the paper, the cost of implementing such a change would be very small compared to the increased ability to recruit qualified workers. The proposed change would make the state of Wisconsin more competitive with other governmental units in Wisconsin and in other states.</p>

The Preferred Option is # 1.



LFB Paper: 285

Title: Health Insurance Coverage for Domestic Partners of State Employees and State Annuitants (ETF)

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
<p>1. SUPPORT</p>	<p><i>Approve the Governor’s recommendation to permit state employees and state annuitants to include domestic partners in the state employee health insurance coverage plans offered by the Group Insurance Board, but correct the bill to include coverage of domestic partner’s minor children dependent on an annuitant for support and maintenance.</i></p> <p>The UW System Board of Regents has gone on record multiple times in support of domestic partner benefits. In the UW System pay parity request adopted in April 2004, the Board said that it “endorses state group health insurance for domestic partners of all state employees, funded from the compensation reserve in the same way as for all other state employees.” The Board is also on record as recently as the October 2006 Board meeting in support of providing domestic partner benefits. UW-Madison is currently the only Big Ten university that does not provide domestic partner health benefits to its employees, placing the institution at a competitive disadvantage with its peers.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
<p>2. SUPPORT</p>	<p><i>Delete the Governor’s Recommendation. Instead, direct the Office of State Employment Relations to explore providing reimbursement to state employees with domestic partners who do not have health insurance coverage available to them through their own employers by providing a monthly reimbursement equal to the difference between the state contribution share of the single coverage monthly premium cost and the state contribution share of the family coverage monthly premium cost of the lowest-cost tier 1 plan that is available in the county in which the employee resides, but</i></p>

	<p><i>not more than the actual monthly premium cost of the domestic partner's health insurance coverage. Further, direct the Office of the State Employment Relations to: (a) identify any statutory changes that might be required to implement a reimbursement program; and (b) if no such changes are required, develop procedures relating to the certification and reimbursement of domestic partner expenses for health insurance coverage.</i></p> <p>The UW System Board of Regents has gone on record multiple times in support of domestic partner benefits. In the UW System pay parity request adopted in April 2004, the Board said that it “endorses state group health insurance for domestic partners of all state employees, funded from the compensation reserve in the same way as for all other state employees.” The Board is also on record as recently as the October 2006 Board meeting in support of providing domestic partner benefits. UW-Madison is currently the only Big Ten university that does not provide domestic partner health benefits to its employees, placing the institution at a competitive disadvantage with its peers. This option would be a taxable benefit, and therefore would not cover the full cost of insurance. However, it is a step in the right direction.</p>
<p>UW System Position</p>	<p>Description and Rationale</p>
<p>3. OPPOSE</p>	<p><i>Maintain current law.</i></p> <p>Maintaining current law prohibiting domestic partner benefits puts the UW System at a competitive disadvantage with its peers when recruiting faculty and staff. UW-Madison is currently the only Big Ten university that does not provide domestic partner health benefits to its employees.</p>

The Strongly Preferred Option is #1. This option would enable the state of Wisconsin, including the UW System, to offer domestic partner benefits to its employees.



LFB Paper: 460
Wisconsin Higher Education Grants and Tuition Grants
(HEAB)

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
1. SUPPORT	<p><i>Approve the Governor's recommendation to increase WHEG-UW funding by \$10,719,400 in 2007-08 and \$15,719,400 in 2008-09.</i></p> <p>The WHEG program is smaller than similar programs in some surrounding states. The Minnesota State Grant Program provided over \$124 million in aid during 2006, while Illinois provides over \$300 million in grants through the Monetary Award Program. This option would provide stable, additional financial aid to hold the most financially needy harmless against increases in the cost of attendance, which leads some students to avoid enrolling in UW. The proportion of UW enrolled freshman students from the lowest income quintile has decreased from 15.8% in 1994 to 12.8% in 2005.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
2. OPPOSE	<p><i>Suspend the statutory sum-sufficient link and decrease WHEG-UW funding by \$3,707,200 in 2007-08 and \$5,559,300 in 2008-09.</i></p> <p>Suspending the sum-sufficient link will eliminate the guarantee to students that funding would keep pace with tuition increases. It is possible that the cost of attendance would increase at a greater rate than the funding provided, which may lead some students to drop out. While the proposed figures reflect a percentage increase for WHEG-UW for the 2007-09 biennium, low income students would still not be assured of receiving sufficient funds to cover the actual dollar increase in the cost of tuition.</p>

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
3. OPPOSE	<p><i>Suspend the statutory sum-sufficient link and decrease WHEG-UW funding by \$3,707,200 in 2007-08 and \$5,559,300 in 2008-09. Use these funds to increase the WHEG-TCS and Tuition Grants for students attending a technical college or private institution, respectively.</i></p> <p>Suspending the sum-sufficient link will eliminate the guarantee to students that funding would keep pace with tuition increases. Transferring funds from WHEG-UW to programs to assist students at other institutions will not increase access of low income students to the UW System. Although additional funding would be provided for WHEG-UW, low income students would still not be assured of receiving sufficient funds to cover the actual dollar increase in the costs of attendance. Low income students are finding it increasingly difficult to access a college education, as the proportion of UW enrolled freshman students from the lowest income quintile has decreased from 15.8% in 1994 to 12.8% in 2005.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
4. OPPOSE	<p><i>Suspend the statutory sum-sufficient link and provide certain fixed percentage increases in funding ranging from 2% to 8% per year.</i></p> <p>Suspending the sum-sufficient link will eliminate the guarantee to students that funding will keep pace with tuition increases. The statutory link provides both predictability and reassurance to low income students that financial aid will keep pace with increases in tuition. It is possible that the dollar cost of tuition would increase at a greater rate than the funding provided, which may lead some students to drop out.</p>

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
5. OPPOSE	<p data-bbox="532 184 1419 344"><i>Delete the Governor's recommendation. Statutory sum-sufficient link for WHEG-UW would be maintained, with funding increase of \$2,671,100 in 2007-08 and \$5,523,800 in 2008-09.</i></p> <p data-bbox="532 380 1450 661">This option would provide stable, additional financial aid to hold the most financially needy harmless against increases in the cost of attendance. The percentage increases during the 2007-09 biennium would partially address tuition increases, but the percentage increase in the appropriation would not be sufficient to ensure that students would be held harmless for the full dollar increase in tuition.</p>

The Preferred Option is #1. It is extremely important that access to the UW System is maintained for low-income students and that funding for these grants is provided in a stable and predictable manner that addresses not only tuition increases, but also the many other costs associated with college attendance.



LFB Paper: 461

WHEG Sum Sufficient and Maximum Grant Links (HEAB)

A. Sum Sufficient Link for WHEG-UW Appropriation

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
A.1. OPPOSE	<p><i>Eliminate the statutory sum-sufficient link of WHEG-UW to the average increase in resident undergraduate tuition for the UW System.</i></p> <p>This option would further exacerbate the trend in declining participation of low income students. The cost of attendance will continue to increase while financial aid could remain constant. Low income students will find it increasingly difficult to meet the rising costs and may either drop out or never attend. The statutory link provides both predictability and reassurance to low income students that the financial aid appropriation will keep pace with increases in tuition.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
A.2. SUPPORT	<p><i>Maintain the current statutory sum-sufficient link of WHEG-UW to the average increase in resident undergraduate tuition for the UW System.</i></p> <p>The WHEG program is smaller than similar programs in some surrounding states. The Minnesota State Grant Program provided over \$124 million in aid during 2006, while Illinois provides over \$300 million in grants through the Monetary Award Program. Maintaining the sum-sufficient link will assure low income students that WHEG funding, at the very least, keeps pace with the percentage of tuition increases. The WHEG program allows UW institutions to provide a stable source of financial aid that ensures that college is affordable for low income students.</p>

B. Statutory Maximum for WHEG Grant

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
<p>B.3. SUPPORT</p>	<p><i>Modify the maximum WHEG from the statutorily fixed \$3,000 to 50% of the resident undergraduate tuition charged at UW-Madison.</i></p> <p>This proposal would provide additional flexibility to allow the maximum WHEG award to increase consistent with tuition. In 2006-07 approximately 7,000 of the 28,857 WHEG recipients received the maximum award. Should tuition rise next year, the bill would allow these students to at least be eligible to receive an increase to cover any tuition increase. The Board of Regents has formally taken a position supporting legislation that would tie the maximum WHEG to 50% of tuition at UW-Madison.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
<p>B.4. OPPOSE</p>	<p><i>Delete the modification of the maximum WHEG to 50% of the resident undergraduate tuition charged at UW-Madison. Maintain the maximum at \$3,000.</i></p> <p>Tying the maximum WHEG to 50% of tuition at UW-Madison would allow the maximum grant to increase automatically without requiring future legislative action. This is especially important for those students who receive the maximum WHEG award (approximately 25% of WHEG recipients in 2006-07).</p>

The Preferred Options are A.2. and B.3. It is extremely important that access to the UW System is maintained for low-income students and that financial aid for these grants is provided in a stable and predictable manner that, at a minimum, matches the percentage increase in tuition.



LFB Paper: 462

Veterans Tuition Remission Reimbursement (HEAB)

Funding Level

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
<p>A. 1. OPPOSE</p>	<p><i>Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$5,013,700 in 2007-08 and \$6,652,300 in 2008-09 in a new appropriation which will permit HEAB to reimburse the UW Board of Regents and the Wisconsin Technical College System for tuition and fees remitted to veterans and certain dependents.</i></p> <p>This provision would fund a portion of the tuition remissions granted to veterans and certain dependents. The dollars included in this recommendation were based on early projections of usage. Because actual enrollment by veterans exceeded earlier projections (information not previously available to the Governor), this option will only permit funding of approximately 21-23% of the anticipated remissions for the upcoming biennium. With this level of funding, the University and WTC Systems may still have to raise tuition to cover lost funds. As a result, all students would be required to pay more in tuition and fees. Alternatively, services to students would be reduced in an attempt to cover the budgetary shortfall.</p>

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
<p>A. 2. OPPOSE</p>	<p><i>Modify the Governor's recommendation to permit HEAB to prorate funding of remissions if the total dollar amount appropriated is insufficient to fund all remissions.</i></p> <p>This modification permits HEAB to prorate the payments by reimbursing the same percentage of total remissions at each institution and district. It will not permit full funding of remissions under a sum sufficient appropriation. The University and WTC Systems may still have to raise tuition to cover lost funds. As a result, all students would be required to pay more in tuition and fees. Alternatively, services to students would be reduced in an attempt to cover the budgetary shortfall.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
<p>A. 3. SUPPORT</p>	<p><i>Modify the Governor's recommendation to provide an additional \$6,886,300 in 2007-08 and \$7,737,700 in 2008-09 to fund 50% of the estimated tuition remissions in the biennium.</i></p> <p>This modification permits HEAB to fund additional remissions. It will not permit full funding of remissions and may require the University and WTC Systems to raise tuition to cover the lost funds. As a result, all students would be required to pay more in tuition and fees. Alternatively, services to students would be reduced in an attempt to cover the budgetary shortfall.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
<p>A. 4. SUPPORT</p>	<p><i>Modify the Governor's recommendation to create a sum sufficient appropriation to fund 50% of the remissions</i></p> <p>This modification permits HEAB to fund all remissions but only at a 50% level. It will not permit full funding of the remissions and the University and WTC Systems may be required to raise tuition to cover the lost funds.</p>
<p>Suggested Alternative</p>	<p>The UW System supports any option which will increase funding for this program (See A.3 and A.4) and eliminate some of the need to raise tuition for all students. However, our suggested alternative would be the creation of a <u>sum sufficient appropriation</u> for this program to fully fund these remissions, even if, in the present biennium, the appropriation was capped at 50% of the total remissions.</p>

Clarification of 128 Credit Limit

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
B.1. SUPPORT	<p><i>Clarification of current law to require a 128 credit limit to apply to the sum of remissions received by one individual at both systems.</i></p> <p>This clarification will reduce the need for remission dollars and is in line with legislative intent to fund one educational opportunity, rather than several.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
B.2. OPPOSE	<p><i>Maintain current law relative to combined usage of remissions at UW System and WTCS institutions.</i></p> <p>At present, one individual can obtain remissions for 128 credits at a UW institution and then continue for 128 credits at each WTCS district. This is probably beyond the original legislative intent.</p>

The preferred Option is B.1 because it will reduce the need for remission dollars and most closely aligns with legislative intent.

Clarification of Deadline

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
C.1. SUPPORT	<p><i>Clarification of current law to require an application deadline</i></p> <p>This clarification will permit campuses to determine the usage of these remissions in a timely fashion and will permit financial aid which, if not provided to veterans and dependents, would be available to other deserving students, to be distributed to other deserving students in a timely fashion.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
C.2. OPPOSE	<p><i>Maintain current law relative to deadlines.</i></p> <p>At present, individuals can apply for remissions retroactively. This creates a problem for campuses which must account for funds and limits the amount of financial aid which, if not provided to veterans and dependents, would be available to other deserving students.</p>

The Preferred option is Option C.1 because it permits proper record keeping and provides for more equitable distribution of financial aid to all students.

Clarification of Eligibility

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
<p>D.1. NEUTRAL</p>	<p><i>Clarification of current law to provide tuition and fee remissions for undergraduate work only.</i></p> <p>The Legislature, rather than UW System, determines eligibility for these remissions. At present, individuals can apply for remissions for all levels of study. Because the tuition for graduate and professional studies is higher than that for undergraduate studies, this change would permit more individual remissions to be granted. However, some veterans already have received an undergraduate degree, and therefore would be precluded from using this benefit. We support having eligibility open at all educational levels but recognize that, in the absence of adequate funding, this would represent a cost-saving measure.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
<p>D.2. NEUTRAL</p>	<p><i>Clarification of current law to provide tuition and fee remissions only during the first 10 years following separation</i></p> <p>The Legislature, rather than UW System, determines eligibility for these remissions. At present, veterans can apply these remissions at any time. This change would provide a time limit of ten years past separation. While this might provide a cost savings, it would not take into account possible life changes that would necessitate a return to school on the part of the veteran. On the other hand, a time limit does permit more accurate estimation of future usage.</p>

The UW System is neutral on both options.



LFB Paper: 463

Wisconsin Covenant Program (DOA and HEAB)

A. Wisconsin Covenant Scholars Grant Program

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
A.1. SUPPORT	<p><i>Approve the Governor's recommendation to create a Wisconsin Covenant Scholars Program. Grants would be provided to students who are Pell Grant eligible and meet the income requirements for the federal reduced-price lunch program.</i></p> <p>This option would provide a new source of additional financial aid to help low income students address the cost of college attendance. The proportion of enrolled freshman students from the lowest income quintile has decreased from 15.8% in 1994 to 12.8% in 2005. Many low income students are unfamiliar with financial aid programs and believe that a college education is unaffordable. The Covenant program will reinforce that college is attainable for all students.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
A.2. SUPPORT	<p><i>Modify the Governor's recommendation to create a Wisconsin Covenant Scholars Program. Grants would be provided to students based upon expected parent and student contributions using an approved needs methodology.</i></p> <p>This option would also provide a new source of additional financial aid to help low income students address the cost of college attendance. The proportion of enrolled freshman students from the lowest income quintile has decreased from 15.8% in 1994 to 12.8% in 2005. Support is contingent upon the use of the standard federal needs methodology to determine the expected family contribution.</p>

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
A.3. OPPOSE	<p><i>Delete the Governor's recommendation to create a Wisconsin Covenant Scholars Program. This option eliminates this program.</i></p> <p>This option could further exacerbate the trend in declining participation of low income students. Students from low income families are finding it difficult to manage rising costs and without additional financial aid assistance, may either drop out or never attend. In addition, any low income students are unfamiliar with financial aid programs and believe that a college education is unaffordable. Without the Covenant program, many students will continue to believe that college is unattainable.</p>

B. Office of the Wisconsin Covenant

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
B.1. SUPPORT	<p><i>Approve the Governor's recommendation to create an Office of the Wisconsin Covenant with two GPR positions.</i></p> <p>Creation of a new financial aid program necessitates staff to administer the program and ensure that students and their families are knowledgeable about the program requirements.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
B.2. NEUTRAL	<p><i>Create an unclassified Director of the Wisconsin Covenant position rather than a division administrator position.</i></p> <p>This alternative would maintain staffing for the Office of the Wisconsin Covenant, but the Director would no longer be a division administrator position.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
B.3. NEUTRAL	<p><i>Delete \$88,500 in 2007-08 and \$52,200 in 2008-09, and create an unclassified Director of the Wisconsin Covenant position in 2008-09. This position would be federally-funded and located in the Office of the Secretary of the Department of Administration (DOA) until January 1, 2009.</i></p> <p>This alternative would maintain staffing for the Office of the Wisconsin Covenant, but the Director would no longer be a division administrator position and would be in the Office of the DOA Secretary until 2009. GPR funding should be made available if federal funding becomes unavailable for this position.</p>

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
B.4. NEUTRAL	<p><i>Create two classified positions within the Department of Public Instruction (DPI). DPI would serve as coordinator for the Wisconsin Covenant.</i></p> <p>This alternative would maintain staffing for the Wisconsin Covenant, but the program would be administered by DPI. The program would, however, expand DPI's current mission to include the administration of the large financial aid program.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
B.5. OPPOSE	<p><i>Delete the Governor's recommendation. The Director of the Wisconsin Covenant would continue to be federally-funded within the Office of the Secretary of DOA.</i></p> <p>This alternative would create a new financial aid commitment without adequate staff to administer the program. The nature of the Covenant program requires outreach and education so that students and their families understand, and can comply with, the program requirements.</p>

C. Character Education Teacher Training Grants

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
C.1. SUPPORT	<p><i>Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$250,000 GPR annually for character education teacher training.</i></p> <p>Successful completion of the Covenant program requires that student demonstrate good citizenship. Character education training will allow teachers to assist students in meeting this requirement.</p>
UW System Position	Description and Rationale
C.2. NEUTRAL	<p><i>Modify the Governor's recommendation to provide \$250,000 GPR annually for character education teacher training to DPI rather than the Office of the Wisconsin Covenant.</i></p> <p>Successful completion of the Covenant program requires that student demonstrate good citizenship. DPI administers many programs in secondary schools across Wisconsin and could administer this program.</p>

UW System Position	Description and Rationale
C.3. OPPOSE	<p data-bbox="537 184 1398 264"><i>Delete the Governor's recommendation and eliminate the character education teacher training program.</i></p> <p data-bbox="537 296 1446 499">Character education training will assist students in meeting the good citizenship requirement of the Covenant program. This training is essential so that teachers can help students to understand this requirement and how to become Covenant scholars.</p>

The Preferred Options are A.1. or A.2., B.1., and C.1. The Wisconsin Covenant Scholars Program will provide an important source of funding to assist low income students in attending college. A necessary part of any financial aid program is adequate staffing, especially when using this model of program, which requires education and outreach to students and their families. Because students are required to demonstrate good citizenship in order to successfully qualify as a Covenant Scholar, character education training is an important component of a fully-implemented program.