In compliance with UW System President Robert O'Neil's memorandum of July 3, 1980, Chancellor Horton appointed Professors Margo Conk, Willis Hagen, Robert Ingle, Ethel Sloane, and John Solon to serve as a Faculty Governance Study Group to examine the current condition of faculty governance at UWM, taking into account the specific guarantees of s. 36.09(4). Robert Ingle was appointed chairman. The Group held its first meeting on August 26, 1980. On September 2, 1980, the Study Group sent to the faculty a memo explaining its charge and requested the assistance of the faculty in achieving its objectives. (See enclosure 1.) The Group announced that it would hold open meetings on Monday, September 15, 1980, from 9:00 a.m. to 12 noon, and on Tuesday, September 16, 1980, from 1:30 to 4:30 p.m. Additional meetings were held on September 26, and October 3, 1980 to analyze and discuss the data and to prepare the report.

The Group received a total of 14 written statements and 9 oral statements from faculty members. This represents a maximum of about 3-5% of the total faculty taking into account the fact that the representatives of faculty groups, AAUP and TAUWF, spoke for more than one person. If, however, the number of faculty who turn in preference sheets for committee service each year (approximately 300) is used as an indicator, it might be said that the Group heard from about 8% of the "active" faculty.

In general, the Study Group heard no overwhelming opposition to faculty governance.

The Study Group sought specific examples and illustrations of the working (non-working) of faculty governance in the areas of:

1. Institutional policy development,
2. Academic and educational activities,
3. Faculty personnel matters, and
4. Faculty organizational structure.

In analyzing the data it became evident that the lack of official involvement of the faculty in budget matters was of paramount concern. Although the concern could be classified as lack of involvement in institutional policy development, it formed the base for faculty concerns in both academic and educational activities and in faculty personnel matters.

The current governance structure does not provide official involvement for faculty in the allocation of scarce resources beyond the departmental level. It is evident that this concern of the faculty appears to have become paramount in early 1978 as a result of changing times, i.e. declining enrollment projections and declining budgets.

1. Institutional Policy Development

The Physical Environment Committee, the UWM committee charged with decision-making for space allocation and renovation decisions, is an extremely important policy committee because of the limitation in space and moratorium on building on the campus. The Physical Environment Committee was cited as an example of a weakness of faculty involvement in institutional policy development. It was pointed out that the Physical Environment Committee does not fit the definition of a faculty standing committee,
and at this time when decisions concerning specific assignments and changes in the amount of space assigned to schools and colleges because of enrollment shifts are being made, the faculty should have a stronger voice in these deliberations.

2. Academic and educational activities

There has been discussion of late on the potential need in coming years to make program reductions for financial reasons. Currently there exists no mechanism for faculty to make or even participate in decisions involving such reductions, except for the calling of a campus-wide financial emergency.

3. Faculty personnel matters

In a related matter, campus administration has recently begun (1978) to add a statement to letters of renewal for non-tenured faculty that tenure could be denied for programmatic or fiscal reasons. Faculty members who appeared before the Group expressed their concern over the alteration of contract language without consultation or involvement of the faculty.

4. Faculty organizational structure

Although some faculty members appeared before the Group with specific complaints, it was evident that their statements reflected human failures or foibles of those who served on Faculty Committees rather than structural problems or failures of the governance system. There did not appear to be any attempt by administration either to abrogate or frustrate the rights of the faculty to determine its own organizational structure.

Recommendations

After listening to the statements made by those faculty members who appeared before it and after a careful reading and analyses of the written statements presented to it, the Faculty Governance Study Group makes the following recommendations:

1. A mechanism be developed so that the faculty will have the opportunity to officially participate 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.

2. 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.

3. A mechanism be developed now so that the faculty will have the opportunity to officially participate 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.
4. 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.

As a result of its hearings and deliberations, the Study Group found the governance structure to be a viable and continually evolving system which needs constant attention so that it can adequately deal with changing conditions.

The Study Group expresses its thanks and appreciation to those members of the university community who participated in the open hearings and who sent written comments to the Group. Without such assistance it would have been impossible for the Study Group to complete its task in the time allotted to it.
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