ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES COMMITTEE (UFRRC)  
(Report Period April 20, 1973 - June 5, 1974)

Regular meetings of UFRRC are scheduled from 12:15 to 1:15 p.m., the first and third Wednesdays of each month in the Student Union. During the 13-% month period covered by this report, there have been 17 regular meetings of the Committee, 3 special meetings, and 4 study sessions.

The regular Committee membership is shown at the end of this report. Due to the fact that Dr. John B. Puegi, Professor of Comparative Literature, was on leave from the University to conduct grant work during the Fall Semester, Dr. Henry Snyder, Department Chairman, Curriculum & Instruction, was appointed as a Committee member for the Fall 1973 Semester.

From its experience during the last year, the Committee has found no reasons to alter its procedures in accepting and investigating complaints. In developing these procedures during the first year of its operation, the Committee decided to take complaints directly and originally, formally or informally, but to recommend that the complainant exhaust the following procedure before filing a grievance:

Step 1: Individual complainant to individual faculty member against whom he has a grievance. This process should take no longer than two weeks. If no satisfactory solution can be reached;

Step 2: Individual complainant to chairperson of department. Here again, a maximum of two weeks should be sufficient for resolution. If the complainant has not received satisfaction, he moves on to;

Step 3: Individual complainant to dean of his school. With an additional two week period the case should be resolved, or as the final appeal, go to;

Step 4: Individual complainant to UFRRC.

Thus, a total of no more than six week should elapse before a complainant either: a) is satisfied that he has been fairly and justly dealt with through the route described above or b) makes a documented referral to UFRRC. After the documented referral, the Committee considers such a complaint at its next scheduled meeting. . . .

Following the established procedures, the Committee considered five cases, received evidence and after arriving at a finding in each situation, made recommendations to the appropriate person and/or bodies.

In addition, the Committee worked with the UWM Ad Hoc Senate Committee concerning grievance procedures and policies.

The Committee makes the following recommendations pertaining to its future operations:

1. Legal counsel should be available for students, faculty, and administration in preparing their grievances. Some frustration has been suffered within the Committee due to the lack of preciseness of charges by those filing grievances.

2. Legal counsel should be made available to FRRC as was the original intent of Chapter 5C. The Committee believes that this counsel should be independent of the University administration.
3. Due to the huge volume of work involved in the few cases so far, it is believed that the Committee chairperson should have release time and be certain of the availability of typing and secretarial help.

4. FRRC believes that its relationship to the administration and to the University Committee should be clarified. For instance, in one case, the Committee worked diligently for months prior to its recommendations to the Chancellor for reconsideration, and the Committee noted that the reconsideration body was the University Committee which had already ruled upon the procedural aspects of the case. In its report back to the Chancellor, the University Committee stated that proper procedural matters had been followed within its committee and that the substantive matters had been handled by the respective Department and the Dean of the respective College. The Committee feels that the action of the University Committee did not constitute an independent, unbiased, unprejudiced reconsideration and that the University Committee should have, because of its prior action, disqualified itself and called for a completely new and independent reconsideration. In this case, FRRC feels that mockery was made of its actions.

5. As a result of its actions particularly over the last year, FRRC feels that an appropriate faculty committee in close alliance with the UWM administration and with UW Central Administration should delve immediately into the questions as to whether the rights of individual faculty members under the First Amendment and under due process are being carefully respected and preserved by executive committees, deans reviewing cases, and the appeals considered by the University Committee. Such a review should also include all aspects of the open-meeting and open-record laws of the State of Wisconsin.

6. FRRC believes that the administration should set up a mechanism for reporting back what actions have been taken on FRRC recommendations. . . . Actions taken by FRRC on December 3, 1973, recommended that the rules pertaining to conflicting activities should be made more precise and that the rules pertaining to use of University equipment and personnel, including financing and auditing, should be improved. As of the date of the writing of this Annual Report, no official word on administration action on these recommendations has been forthcoming. The Committee did learn, through activities and news items in the press on or about May 18, 1974, that the administration had received a report dated March 4, 1974, recommending, as far as equipment and personnel are concerned, essentially what FRRC had recommended. But there has been no feedback to FRRC. FRRC also notes that a code of ethics making more precise the responsibilities of the individual faculty member on outside activities is presently being processed. Depending upon the outcome, this could fulfill the other basic recommendation of FRRC. Under date of December 19, 1973, the University Committee, in a four-page letter to the Chancellor, stated as follows: "It seems to the University Committee highly likely that the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee chose to blame the impersonal University Laws and Regulations to avoid blaming the person or persons who had failed to conform or to enforce those Laws." Thus, it is with gratification to note that present actions are demonstrating such was not the case and FRRC had made sound recommendations. The lament of FRRC was the minimum of feedback to it during the entire process, believing modestly that FRRC might have made subsequent contributions.

Vinton W. Bacon, Chairperson       Ruane Hill       Ruth Milofsky
Jean Currey             Paul Lydolph       William Stroud
John Fuegi

This report was delayed while the Calendar Committee sought legal advice on the use of names in the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee Report, so that confidentiality would be preserved.

*Indefinite designation replaces a name removed to protect confidentiality.