MEMORANDUM

TO: UWM Faculty Senate

FROM: The University Committee

RE: March 19 Committee-of-the-Whole Discussion

March 11, 1981

This paper is intended to stimulate discussion on the four recommendations of the Faculty Governance Report (UWM FAC. DOC. 1233). These are not motions, but merely ideas to be discussed during the Committee-of-the-Whole session on March 19. The University Committee invites Faculty Senators' comments and revisions, either oral statements at the Senate meeting or written statements sent to the University Committee. Your reactions will help us formulate specific motions for consideration by the Faculty Senate at a subsequent meeting.

Recommendation #1 of the Study Group Report:

"A mechanism be developed so that the faculty will have the opportunity to participate officially in the budgetary process beyond the departmental level. The allocation of scarce resources directly effects the areas in which faculty is given specific responsibility for immediate governance by 36.03(4) of the Wisconsin statutes. Therefore, the faculty should have an official role in the distribution of scarce resources."

Possible Responses to Recommendation #1:

A. Establish a Faculty Senate Committee on Budget. The Senate would elect a committee from among its membership. Seven members would be elected to staggered two-year terms; the chair would be elected by the committee. No more than three of the members would be from a single school, college, or equivalent academic unit. No more than one elected member would be from a single department in a departmentalized school or college. Its primary charter would be oversight of all budgetary matters having implications for educational policy.

B. Strengthen the faculty's voice on budgetary matters within each college or school by forming college/school budget advisory committees where they do not exist. The faculty who chair these college-level budget advisory committees should
meet periodically to share common concerns, problems, and methods used to cope with these problems.

**Recommendation #2 of the Study Group Report:**

"That the Physical Environment Committee be restructured as a faculty standing committee, as defined in Chapter 6.01(1), UWM Policies and Procedures, and other appropriate sections of Chapter 6. The rationale for this recommendation is that the activities of this committee have become so important during a period of possible retrenchment that the faculty should have a stronger voice in the decisions arrived at by this committee."

**Possible Responses to Recommendation #2:**

A. Reconstitute the Physical Environment Committee as follows:
   MEMBERSHIP: Fourteen voting members as follows: 8 elected faculty members; 2 elected academic staff members; two students; one academic dean and one administrative officer appointed by the Chancellor; and 4 non-voting members: the Chancellor, the chief academic officer, the chief business officer, and the Secretary of the University. FUNCTIONS: Unchanged.

B. De-codify the Physical Environment Committee as a faculty standing committee.

C. Form a Faculty Senate Committee on Physical Environment, the composition of which would parallel the Faculty Senate Committee on Budget proposed in 1.A. above.

**Recommendation #3 of the Study Group Report:**

"A mechanism be developed now so that the faculty will have the opportunity to participate officially in decisions regarding possible programmatic decrements and in the mechanisms employed in making such decrements. The rationale for this recommendation is that the faculty has traditionally participated in programmatic incremental decisions and, therefore, should participate if programs are to be curtailed."

**Suggested Response to Recommendation #3:**

A. Request that the Academic Program and Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Faculty Council, in cooperation with the respective Deans and the Vice Chancellor,
propose procedures for program decrements. These procedures could parallel their existing procedures for incremental decisions.

Recommendation #4 of the Study Group Report:

"Develop a structure which officially involves faculty before any new criteria, in addition to the traditional criteria of teaching, research, and service, are used in decisions concerning continuation and promotion to tenure."

Suggested Responses to Recommendation #4:

A. The issue of programmatic need relates to a position and not the qualifications of the incumbent. Therefore, programmatic need should be separated from the faculty member's performance and potential, which are judged by colleagues at the departmental and divisional committee levels. Performance and potential should be judged on the basis of teaching, research and service.

B. The issue of programmatic need should be examined annually by departmental executive committees and administrators. Any administrative decisions concerning programmatic need must precede by a reasonable time any collegial reviews involving personnel decisions of contract renewal, promotion or tenure.
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