



Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee
Activities 1993-94 School Year
 Submitted July 27th, 1994

During the first semester the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee had no cases before it. At the start of the second semester, however, the University Committee asked us to hear the complaints filed by Criminal Justice Professors Ellen Steury and Nancy Frank against Criminal Justice Professors Carl Pope, Stan Stojkovic and Rick Lovell. These complaints had been lodged with former Affirmative Action Officer Eleanor Miller, who had reached a determination and had made a determination and recommendation to Chancellor Schroeder. The Chancellor had made a decision and imposed a discipline on Professors Pope and Stojkovic. Professors Pope, Stojkovic and Lovell then brought the case to civil court. There, Judge McCormick, denying the request for a summary judgment, remanded the original case back to the university for a hearing. The UWM University Committee then decided that the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee was the proper committee for that hearing.

The Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee was not convinced that we were indeed the right body. Our concern was that we were established as a fact-finding committee, not a review or appeal body. Eventually, however, our committee sent Professor Erika Sander, then Chair of the University Committee, a memo agreeing to hear the case, but we also said that any important "questions and side issues" raised in the process would be kept aside and referred back to the University Committee after our deliberations were concluded. That process is concluded. We have met the deadline imposed on us by Judge McCormick, and we have written to the University Committee outlining our concerns as we said we would. Copies of the pertinent documents are attached to this report. We hope that the "questions and side issues" we have raised in our letter to Professor George Baker, current Chair of the University Committee, will quickly be addressed. This concludes our involvement in this matter.

All of the previous memos, letters, findings, documents, correspondence etc. have been the statements and opinions of the whole Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. Obviously, this was a difficult case. Hearing a case such as this under ordinary circumstances would have been a heavy responsibility in itself, but this one was not heard under ordinary circumstances: The question of FRRC jurisdiction was clouded at best. The case was over two years old. A discipline had already been imposed. The case was under judicial remand at the state level, and how it was handled might well interest the Federal Government, not to forget our own university community. To meet the court imposed deadline the hearing had to take place after the end of the semester. Most importantly, at the very core of the matter was the question of justice, fairness and a long awaited resolution for five of our colleagues.

Now, as chair of the committee, I would like to speak for myself. I must express my admiration for all of my colleagues on the committee. Their commitment to fairness, their sincerity and dedication to the process were complete. The level of discussion and debate was invariably high. Speaking as outgoing chair, I want to say that it was a privilege to work with them. I would be remiss if I did not also acknowledge the contributions of Mr. John Tallman, Mr. Edward Alschuller - senior system counsels, and most especially Ms. Bridget Kemp.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Benjamin

Barry Benjamin, Chair
 The Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee