Recommendation of the University Committee to amend
Chapter 1, Section 1.06 (2) of UWM Policies and Procedures,
Membership and Structure of the Faculty Senate

OLD

1.06 Membership and Structure of the Faculty Senate

(2) Members of the Faculty Senate are elected at large by the University Faculty. Representation is apportioned among the various faculty divisions of the University on the basis of the number of faculty members in each. The University Committee makes an annual review of representation and provides for necessary adjustments in the next election.

NEW

1.06 Membership and Structure of the Faculty Senate

(2) Members of the Faculty Senate are elected by divisions with voting by members of the division. Representation is apportioned among the various faculty divisions of the University on the basis of the number of faculty members in each. The University Committee makes an annual review of representation and provides for necessary adjustments in the next election.

RATIONALE:

Under the proposed system, voters are more apt to know those for whom they vote and generally would know them through professional contacts or expertise. Members elected by divisions would provide the extra assurance of representative divisional concerns. The proposed system would, in addition, parallel our divisional structure for personnel matters.

The report of the Task Force on Faculty Senate Representation is attached for your information.
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The Task Force has completed its work and reached no consensus on the most appropriate method for representation and election to the Faculty Senate. Rather, we would like to recommend that the Faculty Senate and then the Faculty should make a choice among the following three alternatives:

1. Retention of the present system of representation by divisions with voting by the entire faculty on an at-large basis.

2. A proposed system of representation by division with voting mainly by division but with a significant component of at-large voting.

3. A proposed system of representation by school or college with voting mainly by each school or college but with a significant component of at-large voting.
I. A Proposed System of Representation by Division

Under the present system of election, faculty senators are chosen to represent the four divisions with voting by the entire faculty on an at-large basis.

Under the proposed system, nominations would continue to be made by divisions with the relative allocation as at present. Votes for representatives of a given division, however, would be cast by members of that division. In addition, each voter would be entitled to three more votes which could be cast for nominees within or outside his/her division but no more than one vote for each nominee. The other election regulations, e.g., the provision which requires at least two assistant professors from each division, would remain the same.

RATIONALE:

Two main objections have been made to our present method of election to the faculty senate: 1) faculty senators are chosen to represent the four divisions but they are elected not by faculty members from each of those divisions but by at-large voting and 2) the faculty has grown so large that most members know few of the candidates from all the four divisions for whom they are voting. The proposed system of representation and election would answer these two objections, by providing for voting only by members of each division for the faculty members to represent that division, except for the right of each voter to cast three votes outside his/her division. The latter exception would make possible a significant degree of at-large voting and satisfy those faculty who wish to cast votes outside their division.

The argument for representation by division rather than by school or college is that the issues that come before the faculty senate are generally much broader and more universal than those on which the schools and colleges have separate and divergent interests. That is also the rationale for maintaining at least a degree of at-large voting.
II. A Proposed System of Representation by Schools and Colleges

The proposed system would replace the present system where senators are selected based on their divisional affiliation, but elected by the faculty at-large.

The proposal would keep the total faculty senate at about the same size (currently 46 plus 6 members of the University Committee, minimum size required is 46 total), and reserve 8 seats for election at large. (Thus 14 seats including the University Committee, would be elected at-large). The remaining senators would be elected by schools and colleges.

The specifics are as follows: For schools or colleges with more than 24 voting faculty members, the faculty count shall be divided by 24 and rounded off to determine the number of senators. Any school or college entitled to four or more senators must elect at least one assistant professor for every four entitlements. For departmentalized schools or colleges, not more than two senators selected under this entitlement may be from the same department. Each school or college will be allotted at least one Senator. The College of Letters and Science, which has the largest representation, will be allowed to split its nomination and election procedure if the majority of the faculty in L&S choose to do so.

Any candidate would have to decide beforehand whether to run for an at-large university-wide position or for a school/college position.

RATIONALE:

The current procedure of electing members by the faculty as a whole may make name recognition a primary reason for elective success. The present procedure may also encourage bullet voting for possible disproportionate representation by certain groups or by faculty members who espouse a specific issue. By reserving 8 seats for an at-large election, some groups should find more adequate representation than they would if all seats were assigned to the schools and colleges.

The present system, which is based on divisional affiliation, is not very representative since divisions represent a rather artificial construct unique to Madison and Milwaukee. It is questionable whether there is a sufficient community of interests in any one division to make this the basis for a choice. Almost all other universities surveyed base election on representation by schools and colleges.

The Senate should be representative; there should be direct accountability to the electorate. This is not the case at present. Yet, since the Senate deals mostly with university-wide issues, the representation should not be too narrow, as would be the case if elections were held on a departmental basis.