University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
University Committee
Annual Report
September, 1977

This report describes and delineates the work of the University Committee during the last year. Further information concerning the items is available in the Committee Minutes and NEWSLETTERS.

Regents - Legislature

One of the important functions of the University Committee is to represent the faculty before the Board of Regents. To achieve this, it has become customary for two members of the University Committee to attend the two-day meetings of the Board each month. During the past year, members of the Committee met with three of the Regents at luncheon meetings and spoke to individual Regents on an informal basis on many separate occasions. Some of the more important issues that were covered included replacement of the W.A.R.P. funds, faculty salaries, collective bargaining, selection procedures for the Search and Screen Committee for President of the System, new academic programs, and campus building requests. In addition, the University Committee sponsored a dinner honoring former President of the Board Frank Pelisek, whose term ended this year, for his service to the System and our campus.

Since most of the funds for this campus come from the Wisconsin legislature, faculty communication with members of the legislature is of great importance. Members of the University Committee met with individual members of the legislature at nine formal meetings and at many more informal ones. The principal topics discussed were the $300,000 for applied urban research, faculty salaries, collective bargaining, campus budget requests, and community and legislative views of our campus. The University Committee also sponsored a dinner honoring Dennis Conta, former assemblyman from the District and former Co-Chairman of the Joint Finance Committee, for his service to the University and the community.

We believe that one of the most important contributions of the University Committee this year has been in its effort for legislative liaison in cooperation with the administration. As we noted in our last NEWSLETTER, we believe this general effort has been carried out with considerable success, and we intend to continue to expand our efforts.

Ombudsman and Grievance Role

In their role as ombudsman for the faculty, the members of the University Committee are frequently approached on an informal basis by phone or in person to hear grievances, to interpret our Policies and Procedures on whether violations have occurred, and to give advice on procedures to follow in seeking redress. In addition, one department and over 20 faculty members made appointments and formally consulted with a member of the University Committee, usually the Chairman. Finally, the University Committee in its capacity as the highest appeal body for faculty held six
hearings, three on cases of non-renewal and three on Divisional Executive Committee
decisions not to grant tenure. The University Committee found procedural or substan-
tive error in only one of the appeals, and this case was referred back to the depart-
mental executive committee for de novo review. In two of the other cases, the matter
was referred to the dean in question with a request that he/she consider certain
matters that were deemed to be outside the purview of the University Committee.

On the basis of the appeals it has heard, the University Committee believes
that not all departmental and divisional executive committees are exercising the
greatest possible care in protecting the procedural rights of probationary faculty
members and setting forth reasons for non-renewal with acceptable clarity. We hope
the new requirement that each departmental and divisional executive committee shall
set forth in writing the criteria for promotion to tenure will help reduce the number
of appeals in cases of non-renewal. Finally, the Chairman of the University Committee
met twice on faculty grievances with representatives of the attorney-general's office
and testified in federal court on governance procedures in the appeal of a former
member of our faculty.

Miscellaneous Activities

As part of its liaison efforts with campus administration, the University Com-
mittee held seven joint, regularly scheduled meetings with the Chancellor and Vice
Chancellor, three with the Academic Deans' Council, and seven with the Chancellor,
Assistant to the Chancellor and representatives of the Student Association. Addi-
tional meetings on specific issues were held with the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor,
Assistant Chancellor for University Relations, the Assistant Chancellor for Admin-
istrative Affairs, and a majority of the academic deans.

On a system-wide level, members of the University Committee have attended the
seven meetings of the Interim Faculty Consultative Council, and the Chairman of the
University Committee has served as Chairman of the System Faculty Council (representa-
tives of Milwaukee, Madison, Extension, Parkside, Green Bay, Center System, and
Oshkosh), and as Chairman of the Biennial Budget Working Group which made the recent
recommendations on salaries for faculty and academic staff to the regents.

On the campus level, members of the University Committee have participated in
other activities including orientation for new faculty members, service on Search
and Screen committees for deans of the Graduate School and School of Business Admin-
istration, and service on the Chancellor's Budget Advisory Committee, the Physical
Environment Committee, the Economic Compensation Committee and several ad 
hoc com-
mitees.

The State of Governance

The University Committee believes that faculty governance on this campus is
alive and well and growing in strength. For example, the grievances which have
been appealed to us were essentially complaints against departmental and divisional
executive committees rather than against campus administrators. The rejection by
a dean of the positive recommendation of both a departmental and divisional executive committee is quite rare, and it is even rarer for the Chancellor to refuse to approve any legislation passed by the Senate. In addition, the Chancellor has accepted University Committee interpretation of our policies and procedures, even though in one case he believed that we were in error; and he has without exception accepted our nominations to campus committees. In general, we believe that a major limitation on faculty governance on this campus is apathy on the part of many faculty members who are unwilling to shoulder the burden of committee service and more active participation.

Of course, we are not maintaining that the faculty alone governs the University, but rather that it shares importantly in its governance. While the term faculty governance is used to denote the role of the faculty in the governance of the University, the term shared governance is more properly used to denote the fact that faculty, administrators, both campus and system, academic staff, students, and the Board of Regents, share in the governance. However, we believe that there are only a few campuses in the country in which the faculty has as great or greater powers than does our faculty in the governance of this institution.

Finally, we should note some areas in which faculty governance should be strengthened. One major area which needs strengthening comes at the system rather than the campus level. Since merger, this campus has been deluged by central administration requests which have imposed the burden of additional reports and paperwork on faculty and campus administration. Funds and building space have often been allocated by mechanical formulas, and members of the faculty have increasingly felt a sense of alienation and loss of power, vis-a-vis central administration. We hope that President Young can reverse this process, strengthen campus autonomy and, thereby, strengthen the role of the faculty in the governance of the institutions in the University of Wisconsin System.

On a campus level, we would suggest two areas in which faculty input needs strengthening. One is the relating of building priorities to programmatic needs. Too often, the "experts" have taken over in this area and faculty input has been nominal rather than real. We have suggested changes in the composition of the Physical Environment Committee which should help provide for a more effective faculty voice, and the suggestions have been accepted by campus administration.

The second area of faculty governance which has caused some concern is the amount of faculty input into the budget process. The creation of the Chancellor's Budget Advisory Group and the various school and college budget advisory committees are recent, important steps in achieving this goal, but again, it is difficult for faculty members, in a short time, to master effectively the mechanics of the budget process so that they can participate in it on a level of competence approaching that of the professional administrators. It is hoped that faculty competence in this area will develop with experience, and that the budget process will be carried out within a more effective system of shared governance.
Following is a listing of the more significant actions, recommendations, and/or interpretations which have been made during the last year.

Task Force on Faculty Governance

The Task Force on Faculty Governance completed its report and recommendations. A joint meeting in May of the University Committee and the Task Force was useful in discussing specific points covered in the document. The document, with some changes, has been sent to the Codification Committee and will come before the faculty for consideration at a special meeting during this semester or at the first meeting of next semester.

Assistant Professor with Tenure

The University Committee is recommending to the Codification Committee the drafting of legislation which would discontinue the use of the rank of Assistant Professor with Tenure and utilize instead the rank of teaching academic staff (with the inclusion of a grandfather clause).

Divisional Committees

Recommendations were made to draft legislation which would permit former Divisional Committee members to serve on present Divisional committees to replace absent members or those who must abstain because of the tradition barring double input at the Executive Committee and Divisional Committee levels. The University Committee is submitting the following suggested legislation to the Codification Committee:

After completion of a full term, each past member shall continue as an alternate member for two years. When the number of current members available to review a candidate for promotion and tenure is less than seven, the Divisional Committee shall replace the unavailable member(s) by ad hoc appointment(s) from the pool of alternate members. There is no limit on the number of ad hoc appointments for a given alternate; however, each ad hoc appointment shall be in accordance with rules regulating the structure of Divisional Committees as specified in Section 3.04, and each appointment shall be prohibited from reviewing a specific candidate whom he/she previously reviewed while a member.

Honorary Degrees Committee and Human Rights Committee

Supported a proposed amendment by the Honorary Degrees Committee to permit the administrators appointed by the Chancellor to serve as voting members of the Committee. Also supported amendments to the legislation on the Human Rights Committee to permit classified staff members to serve as voting members.

Considered and took action indicated on the two following recommendations by the Committee on Honorary Degrees: 1) Faculty Senate, rather than the entire faculty
vote on Honorary Degrees. This proposal was referred to the Task Force on Faculty Governance. 2) At least 50 percent of the candidates for an honorary degree presented to the faculty have some connection with the university, city, or state. This recommendation was forwarded to the Codification Committee as "Supplement to Chapter 6" of the UWM Policies and Procedures.

Committee Charters

Reviewed new charters of all standing University committees except Physical Environment and Athletic Board. Charters were subsequently approved by the Senate as "Supplement to Chapter 6" of the UWM Policies and Procedures.

Selection of Departmental Chairmen

Considered the implication of the state's open meeting law upon procedures for choosing departmental chairmen, and advised faculty accordingly. Subsequently submitted legislation to the Senate which permits the recommendation of a departmental chairman through the use of unsigned ballots at a departmental meeting. This legislation was approved and incorporated into Chapter 4 of UWM Policies and Procedures. (UWM FAC. DOC. NO. 1028)

Attendance of Faculty Meetings

Offered a resolution to the Senate that members of the Senate attend all meetings of the faculty. This recommendation was also referred to the Task Force on Faculty Governance with the suggestion that an attendance requirement be incorporated into the Policies and Procedures as an amendment to Chapter 1. (UWM FAC. DOC. NO. 1020)

Adjunct and Clinical Titles

Considered and recommended to the Vice Chancellor that the use of "adjunct" and "clinical" titles be expanded in some circumstances to include persons already employed within the university.

Continuing Education Units

Referred a report from the Task Force on Continuing Education Units to the Academic Program and Curriculum Committee for review. Revised report and recommendations were subsequently approved by the Senate. (UWM FAC. DOC. NO. 1027)

Support for Committee Service

Reaffirmed its position to the administration that released time for major committee service should be provided to faculty members and that departments should receive funding to replace released faculty time with ad hoc instruction.
Submitted a Decision Item Narrative (DIN) to campus administration for additional budgetary support for the Academic Programs Committee, the Academic Staff Review Committee, the Lectures Committee, and the Sabbatical Leave Program (December 1, Item 1).

Lectures Committee Funding

Urged the Chancellor to continue to provide funding for the Lectures Committee. He subsequently approved our recommendation.

Landis Commission on the Graduate School

Continued to work with the Graduate Faculty Council, the academic deans, and the Codification Committee to develop legislation from the recommendations of the Landis Commission on the reorganization of the Graduate School. This proposed legislation is being considered by the Codification Committee and is expected to come to the Senate for consideration this Fall.

Election Procedures for University Committee

Developed and proposed to the Senate changes in Chapter 6 (Supplement) of the Policies and Procedures to clarify election procedures for members of the University Committee and for filling vacancies. (UWM FAC. DOC. NO. 1026)

Evaluation of Administration

In consultation with the Academic Program and Curriculum Committee, the University Committee appointed a Task Force on Evaluation of Administration. The Task Force is charged to determine whether formal evaluation of administration at the school, college and/or campus level is desirable, and if so, to submit recommendations for its implementation.

Layoff Procedures in Case of Financial Emergency

Developed proposed legislation to establish methods of determining seniority in case of layoffs due to financial emergency. (Such legislation was mandated by state law.) After extensive debate, a revised version of the legislation was passed by the Senate at its May meeting. (UWM FAC. DOC. NO. 1021)

Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects

At the request of members of the Senate, the Committee began discussions with the Graduate School and the IRB regarding its operation, composition, and dissemination of information. The University Committee has made a number of suggestions to improve faculty input into this important committee. Discussions will be continuing during 1977-78.
Location of Meetings of the University Committee

Because of the concern expressed by some members of the Senate that the small size of its meeting room prevented interested parties from attending meetings, the Committee experimented during January and February with holding its meetings in a large room in Chapman Hall. As no one attended any of the meetings (except for scheduled hearings), the meetings were returned to Sandburg W1320. The meetings are open, of course, and if guests should exceed capacity, the meeting will be moved to a larger room.

Meetings of Campus Governance Officers

Recommended approval of statement on relations of the faculty with UW System Administration, which provides for meetings of campus governance officers (in our case the Chairman of the University Committee). This statement came into existence in answer to President Weaver's request for the creation of a more formal group to represent the System Faculty members at the level of Central Administration and the Regents. This document is an effort to permit the campuses and Central Administration to exchange information. Any proposals would come before the faculty governance bodies.

Collective Bargaining

The University Committee, in cooperation with the Task Force on Collective Bargaining, continued to monitor developments in this area. The most recent legislative hearings on this subject took place in July before the Senate Agriculture, Aging and Labor Committee. The chairs of the University Committee and the Task Force on Collective Bargaining set forth our opposition to the Association of UW Faculty (TAUWF) SB289 and Wisconsin Education Association Committee (WEAC) SB363 bills, because they do not exclude faculty governance from the bargaining process. This was done in accordance with two resolutions passed by our Faculty Senate. In addition, we presented to the Senate Committee data from questionnaires from our campus and from Madison, Extension, and the Center System. These institutions represent approximately 55% of the faculty in the System and are the only campuses in the System which have polled faculty on the various bills. These questionnaires indicate that while the faculty on these campuses is divided on whether to bargain collectively, there is very strong opposition to the TAUWF and WEAC bills.

The Senate Committee, noting the division of the faculty on collective bargaining and on the different bills, asked the various groups to reach a compromise on the bills. This proved to be impossible, and the Committee may itself attempt to modify one of the bills and introduce it into the legislature next year.

Tenure Requirement

The University Committee is recommending that the Chancellor, academic vice chancellor, academic deans, and academic associate deans must hold tenured faculty
appointments, our rationale being that these officers should have the necessary qualifications to attain tenure in an academic department. Madison has recently adopted similar legislation.

Functions of Executive Committee

The Department of Chemistry asked its Dean, as well as the University Committee, for an answer to the following question: Should motions regarding personnel policy (e.g., size of faculty, distribution of budgeted positions among lecturers and senior faculty, etc.), as opposed to motions on individual persons, be treated by the Executive Committee or by the Departmental Committee? After meeting with the departmental chairman, the University Committee concluded that 1) the relevant language in our Policies and Procedures on the delineation of these functions is admittedly ambiguous, and we shall bring legislation to the Senate to clarify this ambiguity, 2) the proper interpretation in cases of conflict over the functions of the Executive Committee and Departmental Committee on questions of budget and personnel would place the primacy of power with the Executive Committee. The University Committee strongly stresses that the Executive Committee can ask for recommendations from the Departmental Committee on all general matters of budget and personnel.

Academic Staff - Faculty Status

In response to the question "Should members of academic staff have faculty status at the department, college, or university levels?" the University Committee ruled that departmental faculty status can be conferred with or without the right to vote for chairman by the Executive Committee of the department. Procedures for granting voting rights on a school or college level are defined in 2.02(2) of the UWM Policies and Procedures.

Administrators Serving on Departmental Committees

The Committee responded to several requests for rulings on service by administrators on departmental committees. The Committee has taken the position that the existing legislation is explicit in enumerating the offices to which it applies and that it must often be assumed that an administrator is likely to have input into decisions that are made in the office which he/she serves, even if his/her primary duties seem to exclude such input. On the other hand, the right of the department to avail itself of the advice of one of its members who is serving as an administrator can also be interpreted very broadly. The University Committee feels it must rule restrictively if asked—but it will rule only if asked.

Membership on the Graduate Faculty

The Committee recommended that the current definition of the Graduate Faculty in 2.05(2) of the UWM Policies and Procedures must be followed until it is changed by faculty action.
Use of University Mails

In consultation with the university legal counsel, the University Committee found that university mail services may not be used to support political objectives. Campus and professional associations should not distribute literature which is political in nature.

Balloting for Department Chairman

The University Committee dealt with a dispute within a department regarding the use of a mail preferential ballot for department chairman and took the position that in a case where some faculty members were reluctant to vote by a show of hands a mail ballot is advisable to preserve anonymity, even when only a majority of the members of the department desire it. This issue has become moot as a result of Senate passage of legislation which states that "the method of expression of individual preferences must include the use of a written preference ballot, which may be a mail ballot."
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