

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE**  
**2002-03 ANNUAL REPORT**

The University Committee was active in many arenas and levels of governance as the Executive Committee of the Senate.

1. Interactions with Faculty Senate Committees.

---

With relation to promoting the study of issues leading to appropriate action on the part of Senate committees we considered reports from and urged further study on the part of the Disciplinary Policy Committee, and the Subcommittee of the Senate on the Evaluation of Administrators. In the case of the Disciplinary Policy Committee, at year's end they recommended that the Senate endorse the current disciplinary policy, but agreed to continue their study of much more clearly defined issues emerging from their many deliberations during the 02-03 year. While the SSEA successfully advocated that the Senate seek an Attorney General's opinion on the vulnerability of the SSEA/Senate to a lawsuit on the part of an evaluated administrator, the specific case in point of the evaluation of Chancellor Zimpher became moot with her resignation to assume the Presidency of the University of Cincinnati.

The University Committee plans to develop a short list of continuously important concerns/issues which the Rules Committee should turn to should future occasions arise when there are no specific agenda items submitted for Faculty Senate meetings by appropriate committees of the Senate. This decision was made when the Rules Committee unexpectedly cancelled a Senate meeting.

2. Interactions with Academic Staff Committee

---

Three meetings were held between UC and ASC on a variety of topics. One such discussion led to UC formulating and endorsing three principles to be invoked in the process of the budget reduction exercise undertaken during the year:

- (A) Schools be held responsible for their own financial shortfalls;
- (B) First positions to be eliminated should come from campus/department administration which did not directly support our core instructional and self-funded research mission;
- (C) Examine the most financially feasible means to provide efficient campus-wide infrastructures to insure regulatory compliance with law.

These principles were then endorsed by both the Academic Staff Committee, and also by the Faculty Academic Planning and Budget Committee.

3. UC Interactions with UWSystem/Board of Regents

- (A) The UC actively supported the approval process for the History Ph.D. both at Faculty Representatives meetings, and also before the Education Committee of the Board of Regents

- (B) University Committee, in meetings with President Lyall, Faculty Representatives, Board of Regents President Gottschalk, and in letters to the Board of Regents and to Regents Gottschalk and Olivieri, strongly advocated for a restructuring of the current systemwide tuition distribution formula. The current formula is greatly more costly in tuition dollars to UWM (and Madison) students than to other system students, and results in an unfair added financial burden for our students on the UWM campus.

Resolution of this important issue will be a continuing focus of the 2003-2004 UC members.

4. The NCA Accreditation Process

The 02-03 University Committee recommended to Provost Wanat that a new Assistant Chancellor be appointed to lead the campus in developing the accreditation report; we suggested potential candidates to fill this position. In addition we sought the suggestions of all chairpersons and the Faculty Senate for names of faculty colleagues likely to contribute constructively in fulfilling roles as leaders/members of the five steering committees creating the final report. We met with candidates for these roles, and we responded thoughtfully to issues raised.

5. Endorsement of the Black and Gold Commission Report.

University Committee crafted a motion in support of the Black and Gold Commission Report. Cooperating with the Rules Committee and the FAPBC we succeeded in a mutually endorsed motion which the Senate passed.

6. OASIS and the Fall Tuition Crisis

\_\_\_\_\_ The University Committee investigated thoroughly the unfortunate fall semester financial aid crisis resulting from both UWM implementation of the new OASIS software, and also from the temporary failure of our new system to successfully interface with the US Dept. of Education new software. Ongoing consultations with Bruce Maas, Mary Roggeman, and Beth Weckmuller reassured us that the difficulties have been resolved.

7. The 02-03 Campus Budgetary Process

\_\_\_\_\_ We recognized that the campus had to prepare to act along two potential pathways. The first would be the prioritizing of many fine proposals submitted by schools and colleges in fulfillment of the Investment. UC participated in discussions with the Chancellor, Provost, and interacted with the APBC in examining this process.

The second pathway addressed the painful reality of the need to reduce budgets in the face of the system-wide \$250M cut. The guidelines which we authored to engage this process are enumerated earlier in this report.

University Committee members responded in full to the set of questions posed by Provost Wanat, and presented our consensus on all five questions in our letter to the Chancellor and Provost in April. In particular, the UC insisted that deans must retain degrees of

freedom to reconfigure their budgets once targets were known; in addition, we opposed using any “rounding up” model for accumulating a fund of resources as a source of monies to strengthen high quality/productive programs in need. We strongly endorsed pursuit of restructuring the UWSystem tuition reallocation formula.

Earlier in the year we had endorsed by consensus the proposals of four schools to seek permission to assess differential tuition charges to support their higher costs of offering courses.

8. Consideration of Formal Enumeration of Chairs’ Duties

Considerable time was spent studying/editing Policies and Procedures 4.07, along with revisions to Senate Academic and Administrative Policies document detailing a menu of potential duties for inclusion in determining the final description agreed to between any given department executive committee and its school/college Dean.

9. Campus Policies Considered

A substantial number of meetings directed attention to UWinterim, to summer school salaries, and to overload policies.

UC orchestrated a Faculty Senate discussion of UWinterim at the January Senate meeting. Professor Margo Anderson assisted in presenting a summary of the concerns which arose the time UWinterim was originally formulated . Continuing concerns yet to be addressed by the Senate are (1) appropriate courses to offer during UWinterim sessions, and (2) reiteration of the Senate’s intended limitation of 3 credits maximum to be earned during UWinterim.

The UC studied the issue of summer school salaries, and recommended that a temporary policy be adopted on a trial basis which would allow/insist that Deans and Executive Committees negotiate any modification in salary from 1/9 per course for summer school teaching. Such a policy would have legitimized the practice which is already being pursued in some cases, and would have strengthened Executive Committee curricular control over summer course offerings. The Senate did not agree with the UC, and defeated the motion on this issue.

Finally, UC requested that Erika Sander take the lead in studying any changes to the campus overload policy. By the end of the 2002-2003 year (August 2003), the University Committee reached consensus that overload limits do not apply to temporary base adjustments (where the individual has only one job title or appointment). Overload applies to additional job titles or additional appointments during a time when the individual is already under a 100% contract.

10. Challenges to Effective Faculty Governance Noted by the University Committee

\_\_\_\_\_The following observations were noted by UC members with relationship to faculty governance process.

- (A) There appears to be an increasing number of serious issues requiring faculty consideration/decision, accompanied by ever-shortening intervals of lead time to accomplish thorough study. Furthermore, the increasing amount of materials to be examined on any given issue are becoming more complex.
- (B) Reporting out to UC constituents and to Faculty Senate on this constant barrage of new and complex issues seems to be producing an erosion of trust on the part of some colleagues/Senators. UC often is challenged during Senate meetings to re-cover information already vetted in lengthy UC meetings. UC members gladly engaged in information sharing, but Senate meeting time was often too short to accomplish all necessary business.
- (C) There are too few faculty members committed to governance service, which is in fact the means we have to ensure that UWM indeed gives students access to excellence.

Respectfully submitted,  
Marcia R. Parsons, Professor  
UC Chair 2002-2003