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Outsiders frequently are surprised to discover that life within an academic community is no more tranquil or stable than it is among citizens who live and work off campus. In a time of social unrest and revolt, internal campus confusion leads to public concern over the operation of state supported universities. No more pressing priority faces the state university than does the achievement of understanding of its structure and conduct. This paper is a response to the critical need for clarification of the historical development, contemporary status, and probable future of faculty government of The University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee (UWM).

SCOPE AND RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

The Concept of University Academic Organization. Like all human enterprises, an institution of higher learning must operate under some rational system characterized by identifiable roles, predictable continuity, and group goals. Unlike a military unit with the “command” implications of concentrated authority or a business enterprise with the “management team” functions of authority, responsibility, and accountability, a university is organized as a polity. By traditional practice and by legal sanction, a state university operates under a faculty government, with varying degrees of democracy.

The jurisdiction and powers of a university faculty are seldom definitive, attempts at legal specificities notwithstanding. Does the faculty “control” or merely “participate in” decisions concerning the academic program? Such extreme disclaimers and claims are useless rhetorical exercises. Ultimately, “... an effective system of campus governance should be built on the concept of ‘shared authority’ between the faculty and the administration.”1 A democratic government depends on mutual checks and balances—especially a balance of authority (“effective influence”)2 among its major branches. At least in the ideal university academic or-
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* This paper was presented in condensed form at the Centennial Meeting of the Wisconsin Academy, October 2, 1970.
2 Faculty Participation, p. 14.
ganization, the faculty legislates academic policy proposals, while the administration exercises the executive functions of review, approval, and implementation. Curiously, the judicial function of democratic governance appears to operate as a de facto rather than a de jure phenomenon in contemporary university practice.

Method, Data, and Limitations of the Study. This study reports the results of a descriptive evaluation of UWM faculty government as an effective instrument in the operation of the institution. The period covered begins with the initial academic year of 1956–57 and extends to the conclusion of the 1969–70 academic year. The writer has compared the theoretical assumptions underlying faculty government with the actual decision-making processes of the faculty. In arriving at the conclusions and predictions stated at the end of this report, the author has used two major categories of information. Archival records of faculty meeting agendas, minutes, documents, and reports provide the primary source basis for developmental assessment, in addition to statutory laws and other codified regulations. Critical observations of faculty meetings and practices constitute the other body of source material. Except as faculty-administrative relationships impinge directly on the subject of faculty governance, no attempt is made to study administration, per se. And although discrete faculties of the several colleges, schools, and departments are responsible for academic policy within their restricted jurisdictions, the operation of these subsidiary UWM units is outside the limits of this general study.

HISTORICAL AND LEGAL BASIS OF UWM FACULTY GOVERNMENT

In a landmark action, the 1955 special session of the Wisconsin Legislature created a Coordinating Committee (later Council) for Higher Education, directed the CCHE to merge the competing state college and university extension center in Milwaukee into a single institution of higher learning as an integral part of the University of Wisconsin under the governance of its Board of Regents, and placed administrative authority for the new institution in a Provost (later Chancellor) reporting directly to the President. For purposes of this study, however, the most significant legislative provision was that “... this unit of the university ...” (shall have) “... the same degree of self-government by its own faculty as is vested in other units of the university.”

The political solution in Madison to the Milwaukee problem of educational consolidation was a pragmatic decision, as are most political acts. The Executive Committee of the “Committee of Thirty” (composed of representatives of the three institutions

*Wisconsin Statutes, 39.024 (3) (h).*
involved in the merger) commented in its final report of implementation recommendations to the Board of Regents that the Legislature's language had been "... probably fortunately far from precise." The Committee noted its difficult preoccupation in arriving at decisions regarding organization of UWM to emphasize autonomy while insuring the integrity of the total University of Wisconsin. Developments in succeeding years were to demonstrate continuing shifts in this delicate balance of academic government which the basic legislation and initial implementation had attempted. Changing powers, structure, and external relationships of the Milwaukee campus faculty seem to have been inevitable.

Because there was no other unit of the University which was comparable to the Milwaukee institution and because of the psychological and physical separation of the Milwaukee faculty from the rest of the University faculty in Madison, the implementation document suggested that the UWM faculty would have "... a smaller degree of participation in affairs considered by the total University faculty, and (2) a larger degree of self-government than "... existed in other units of the University." Although notices of the Madison-based general faculty meetings were to be sent to Milwaukee faculty members, it was clear that they were effectively disenfranchised. This was especially irksome to UWM faculty members in search of their own unique identity, in view of the Regents' definition:

The faculty of the Milwaukee unit, operating within policies and standards governing the University as a whole, and its several units, shall hold meetings at regular intervals (1) to discuss matters which require action by the [general] University faculty and to make recommendations thereon; and (2) to take actions on matters which are within established University policy but which relate to the Milwaukee campus only.

The Regents did make one concession to the Milwaukee institution's different character and tradition inherited from its state college predecessor institution: Faculty membership was extended to those holding the rank of instructor. (The general University faculty and its co-terminous Madison campus faculty excluded academic staff members below the rank of assistant professor.)

Milwaukee faculty members anxious to assert their own self-governing identity may have overlooked a major result of the act of merger. As interpreted in an official opinion by the state attorney general, a three-way merger had been effected. The two Milwaukee
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institutions had become one with the University of Wisconsin. A university system had been created which would eventually operate as a federal academic government. Of greater immediate importance, Milwaukee faculty members had become instant heirs of a long and strong tradition of faculty authority over educational affairs. In over a century, University faculty members had achieved a remarkable degree of self-determination over courses, degree programs, and personnel matters subject to usually only nominal administrative and regent approval. By legislative enactment and bylaws of the Regents,¹⁰ the immediate government of the University had become the province of the faculty.

The contemporary structure and scope of faculty authority in the University is a product of intensive self-examination around the turn of this century. University historians Merle Curti and Vernon Carstensen point out that in the waning years of the nineteenth century “The faculty was not only a legislative body but a judicial and, to some degree, an administrative agency as well.”¹¹ Following a critical controversy in 1910 over the respective roles of the faculty and the Regents in educational policy decisions, the faculty adopted in 1916 a committee recommendation which “… went a long way toward solving the problem of maintaining democratic faculty control over educational policy and of relieving the teaching staff from routine matters”¹² of administrative implementation. In essence, the plan recognized the faculty’s direct legislative interest in policy formation based on investigation and recommendations of a new faculty standing committee, called the University Committee. Under the new rationale, an Administrative Committee composed of the President, other University administrators and the Secretary of the Faculty would supervise the execution of routine matters. To complete the separation of powers in academic government, the plan classified other faculty authorized committees according to whether their chief functions were policy determining or administrative. The basic rationale of the 1916 faculty reorganization has continued to underlie the philosophy and practice of faculty government.

But if the new faculty government at UWM was an heir, it was also a parent of change. The merger of 1956 precipitated a series of academic government revisions in structure and relationships which affected the total University system, the Madison
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campus operation, and other units of the University. In a 1958 special report to the UWM faculty, its University Committee acknowledged successful operation of UWM self-governance within its legally required framework as an integral part of the total University. But the report called for a reaffirmation of the faculty's traditional prerogative to have charge of academic affairs and for appropriate safeguards to insure the faculty role in policy-making. At the same time, the University Committee insisted that "... faculty committees should reverse the trend toward greater concern with administrative detail and non-policy matters by insisting that these functions be carried out by administrative personnel," in keeping with the traditional role of the faculty of the University. Viewed as a major faculty committee statement on the future of the University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee, the 1958 report is perhaps surprising in its mild and scant mention of desirable modifications in academic government relationships within the University.

Despite the initial guarantee of faculty self-government, the operation of academic affairs at the Milwaukee campus for the first few years was essentially a branch or satellite activity of the Madison-based faculty. An elaborate system of inter-campus conference committees to coordinate curricular and personnel questions began to break down in complexity. Requirements for review and approval of Milwaukee campus faculty policy decisions became steadily more irksome. Finally in 1963, the UWM faculty set the stage for the University system-wide reform in academic government which has continued to the present. It adopted proposals which would (1) make the UWM faculty the final faculty approval body for curricular programs, (2) authorize the UWM faculty to inaugurate its own campus committees to review course proposals, (3) establish a discrete Madison campus faculty, (4) establish a University of Wisconsin faculty for consideration of general policy matters which affect all campuses of the University, and (5) recognize the UWM faculty as having final faculty jurisdiction over Milwaukee campus matters. Approval by the general University faculty and by the Board of Regents contributed to a comprehensive overhaul and codification of University rules.

Today, the Laws and Regulations of the University of Wisconsin provide for the academic government of a University federal system. General "constitutional" provisions relating to the whole University set forth basic statutory laws and Regent bylaws, describe the operation and jurisdiction of the system-wide University Faculty Assembly, state system-wide rules, and prescribe
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a minimal legal framework for legislation by unit faculties, such as the UWM faculty. Legislation adopted by the UWM faculty, following approval by the Regents, is embodied in a set of chapters reserved for the Milwaukee campus government.

OPERATION OF FACULTY GOVERNMENT

Structural Elements of the Polity. The faculty government of The University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee operates as a deliberative body and as a cluster of subordinate committees. Meeting as a body, the faculty legislates academic policy decisions usually based on investigations conducted by subject matter committees. Beginning with the 1969–70 academic year, the faculty delegated its powers and jurisdiction to a representative senate, between meetings of the faculty. An examination of meeting practices of both bodies reveals to a large degree the identifiable roles, predictable continuity, and group goals of UWM faculty government.

Sessions of the Body: Faculty Meetings. The initial regulations governing UWM faculty meetings\(^\text{14}\) were a brief adaptation of the existing rules of the parent University of Wisconsin faculty. With the preoccupation of integrating the two diverse faculties and academic programs into the University system, UWM faculty members apparently were satisfied with minimal and non-original rules of procedure in the early years of the institution. Succeeding years brought piecemeal changes, culminating in a codified exposition in 1967 and a major experimental revision of faculty government processes in 1969.\(^\text{15}\)

According to current faculty adopted and regent approved legislation, the faculty meeting is parliamentary, democratic, systematic, and definitive. But in the light of empirical observation of recorded experience, the faculty meeting is sometimes licentious, authoritarian, anarchic, and indecisive. Viewed from the perspective of fourteen years, a meeting of the UWM faculty is remarkably similar to other public deliberative bodies. Like other legislative polities, the faculty places increasing faith in an increasing corpus of complex rules directed toward simplistic ends. To some extent, it shares the common communication mystique which assumes that Truth and Understanding are inevitable products of free and unlimited verbal confrontation. A summary look at faculty procedures implemented in practice illustrates its strengths and weaknesses.

\(^{14}\) Proposed Regulations Governing University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee Faculty Meetings by University Committee—Milwaukee, UWM Faculty Document 1, February 6, 1957.

\(^{15}\) The University Faculty—Milwaukee, UWM Faculty Document 384 (revised), March 9, 1967 and The University Faculty—Milwaukee and its Senate, UWM Faculty Document 485 (revised), March 20, 1969.
From its first organizational meeting on September 14, 1956 through the last session of the 1969–70 academic year, the UWM faculty was convened as a body 123 times. Ninety nine of these sessions were regularly scheduled monthly meetings; twenty four were additional special meetings. (With the inauguration of the senate, the full faculty held only two prescribed regular meetings during 1969–70, with four additional special meetings.) Legal membership of the faculty exactly doubled during the fourteen years of this study: from 310 to 620. (In 1964–65, except for those who enjoyed “grandfather’s rights,” instructors were disenfranchised by system-wide rules and the net membership declined by eight from the previous year.)

Because the faculty convenes as a “town meeting” with no regular quorum requirement, attendance is affected by the urgency of issues, the intensity of feeling of special interest groups, or ceremonial obligations. The percentage of those attending ranged from 25% to 37% during the first year, and the range has not varied significantly in the succeeding thirteen years. The all time low of 7% was recorded at a meeting which debated important basic portions of the University code concerning personnel, UWM faculty government, and the system-wide University Faculty Assembly.16 Two special meetings tied for the second low percentage of participating attendance: One adopted the UFA legislation, and the other passed a resolution in opposition to the Vietnam war.17 The record high attendance figures were achieved at two special faculty meetings in response to emotional campus issues. Recruiting policies and attendant student protests concerning the Vietnam conflict brought out 69% of the faculty, plus 70 student visitors. At the height of campus disruption associated with the national student strike of May, 1970, 64% of the eligible faculty debated and passed a series of resolutions greeted by the jeers and cheers of an estimated 250 students in a standing room only auditorium. In neither of these two most highly attended faculty meetings in fourteen years were the stated consensus or adopted resolutions binding or effective on University policy and action.18

Although the official minutes of faculty meetings record only fragmentary or sporadic excerpts of meeting dialogue, veteran faculty meeting-goers conclude that a small number of members dominate discussion and debate. Categories of frequent vocal participants include spokesmen for the “safe” positions of the faculty “establishment,” apologists for militantly activist causes of a

16 Minutes, Regular Meeting of the UWM Faculty, March 9, 1967.
17 Minutes, Special Meeting of the UWM Faculty, March 21, 1967 and Minutes, Special Meeting of the UWM Faculty, November 14, 1969.
18 Minutes, Special Meeting of the UWM Faculty, November 27, 1967 and Minutes, Special Meeting of the UWM Faculty, May 14, 1970.
para-educational nature, self-appointed defenders of real and imagined “oppressed” minorities of faculty opinion, and chronic participants indulging a need for public recognition. Explanations for non-attendance and non-participation by the overwhelming silent majority probably range from passive apathy to active disgust. Regardless of motivations, faculty meeting government obviously is a minority exercise.

Although faculty meeting attendance and participation are predictably unpredictable, the content of agenda items is relatively certain. Faculty rules provide that, except by unanimous consent, business at a faculty meeting is limited to written proposals in proper form which have been included in the prepared calendar (agenda) distributed in advance. The original mechanism designated the Administrative Committee to prepare the calendar, including only those matters under the jurisdiction of the faculty. Although that criterion is still implicit, a later codification dropped the stated requirement. The latest rule assigns the task of calendar preparation to a faculty committee elected by the senate. As a further indication of faculty preoccupation with democratic due process, regulations assure that any matter omitted from a calendar shall be included in the calendar of the next regular meeting by affirmative vote of those present.\textsuperscript{19} Calendar regulations were intended to insure advance familiarity with issues, parliamentary efficiency, and protection of individual rights. But periodic complaints of arbitrary and capricious actions by the former Administrative Committee and the current Calendar Committee pose a continuing and unresolved question for the future of faculty government.

The problem of appropriateness of faculty meeting business is substantive as well as procedural. Controversy about access to faculty meeting deliberation is matched by controversy about the appropriateness of the issues themselves. The question is not merely academic; it is at once political and social. UWM faculty members are not merely state employees; they are also public officers. The transacted business of a faculty meeting is not merely University educational policy; it is also public policy. The provisions of the Wisconsin Anti-Secrecy Law, as interpreted by the attorney general, are applicable to meetings of the UWM faculty as to those of other public bodies concerned with the transaction of governmental business.\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{19} Chapter 31, The University Faculty—Milwaukee and its Senate, \textit{Laws and Regulations of the University of Wisconsin}, 31.04 (4) (c).

\textsuperscript{20} Attorney General Bronson C. La Follette, letter to University of Wisconsin President Fred Harvey Harrington, December 23, 1968.
A review of the calendars and minutes of the meetings of the UWM faculty during its early years shows only rare recourse to special meetings devoted to issues of dubious or uncertain faculty jurisdiction. Until 1959–60, the faculty deviated from its preoccupation with academic programs only once; it passed a resolution to the Regents protesting the inauguration of fee parking facilities on campus and claiming "faculty control" of University affairs as a traditional right. Only two of the five special meetings of the 1959–60 academic year involved strongly controversial matters, and both concerned academic policy: ROTC and a discussion of the loyalty oath provisions of the National Defense Education Act. In general, through the first eleven years, the UWM faculty's handling of controversy was parliamentary, democratic, systematic, and definitive. Appropriate issues of scholarship, campus planning, grading systems, and related academic subjects were deliberated with little public notice. But in 1967–68 and ensuing years, a public mood of division and unrest was equally apparent on the campus and in meetings of the faculty. Public issues became University issues, and faculty controversies became public controversies.

However historians of the future may judge the conduct and results of faculty meetings of our recent past, the pragmatic conclusion of many faculty members from their limited perspective must have been that the general faculty meeting as an academic government device was tried and found to be wanting. Impatience with reliance on reasoned discourse, the raising of peripheral and emotional issues, or aborted attempts to inject such subjects into faculty deliberations often seemed to arise in frustration and to end in frustration. The crisis in faculty government perhaps was inevitable. The growth in numbers and complexity of the institution had increased the probability that the faculty meeting as a "system of communication" would fail. George Reed Field's doctoral study had found that "... only slightly over 50% of the Milwaukee faculty members reported that they had substantial authority to participate in academic policy determinations" and that in other critical areas of institutional relationships Milwaukee faculty members had a greater degree of dissatisfaction than did their well established counterparts on the Madison campus. UWM academic government also seemed to have become a classic
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21 Minutes, Special Meeting of the UWM Faculty, December 3, 1958.
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case of "executive-legislative conflict." In this period of strife, the conflict was only partly the traditional campus administration-faculty clash over authority. In a larger sphere, the authority of the established faculty parliamentary system and leadership seemed to be as much in question as the authority of the administration. In the waning years of a decade in which most American college and university presidents reported increased faculty influence as the most important campus change, the UWM faculty's perception of its role was confused and divided.

The testing and at least tentative resolution of the role of the faculty meeting in governance began in November of 1967. A special meeting of the faculty was called to consider a resolution attacking administrative policy on demonstrations by students against job recruiting agencies associated with the Vietnam conflict. In a ruling subsequently supported by the faculty Codification Committee, the presiding officer ruled that the issue was limited to discussion without formal action. The angry response of proponents was the adoption of a resolution which distilled the essence of faculty division. In a regular meeting attended by 18% of the eligible members, the faculty directed that the Chancellor establish a student-faculty committee to inquire into matters of university autonomy, academic freedom, and decision-making. The "Committee of 32" was to be concerned specifically with the relationship of the University to critical public issues and political action on campus. Without official sanction as a formal faculty committee, the vague alliance of faculty members and students went about its investigation with no definite conclusion.

The underlying issues raised in the "Committee of 32" resolution erupted again in a special meeting in March of 1969. Approximately 18% of the faculty and an uncounted number of students listened to an emotional debate which ended with the adoption of three resolutions and adjournment fifty minutes after the regulation time. Again the faculty motions reaffirmed the "validity of the Wisconsin tradition of shared faculty power," called on the administration to consult with faculty committees prior to acting contrary to recommendations, and requested administrative and regent permission to enable the admission of black students who had been expelled from Wisconsin State University—Oshkosh fol-

27 Minutes, UWM Codification Committee, February 5, 1968.
28 Minutes, Regular Meeting of the UWM Faculty, December 14, 1967.
29 Minutes, UWM Codification Committee, January 28, 1968.
lowing a disturbance at that institution. One week later, another special meeting adopted motions which would develop a degree-granting Center for Afro-American Culture. Counter-proposals, charges of "institutionalized racism," and a dramatic walkout of dissident faculty members and students were observed in silence by a majority of the faculty.

The minutes of the regular meeting of March 20, 1969 constitute an understated record of a peak of strong feeling which accompanied the almost continuous intrusion of faculty authority issues. The main scheduled business of the meeting was consideration of a recommendation of the Codification Committee for amendment of the charter chapter of UWM faculty government to provide for the creation of a faculty senate. Consideration of the proposal previously had been delayed at the last regular meeting by discussion of the Oshkosh students case. Before the senate proposal was referred finally to the full faculty (and subsequently approved by mail ballot), it was subjected to a barrage of substantive objections and extraneous verbal maneuvers. Interruptions included attempts to permit students to speak on a petition circulated earlier, challenges to rulings by the chair, frivolous amendments, a premature motion to adjourn, a call for a vote recount, and requests for parliamentary rulings. The conduct and atmosphere of this and previous meetings probably contributed to final approval of the senate as a partial replacement for general faculty meetings.

The controversy over controversy continued into the final year covered by this study, in spite of and because of the creation of a faculty senate. In two regular and four special meetings, the faculty debated Indo-China resolutions, response to a student strike, sustained senate action on the academic year calendar, and prohibited the senate from amending provisions of the basic charter of faculty government.

Sessions of the Body: Senate Meetings. A summary of the steps leading to the creation of the UWM faculty senate reveals a lengthy, deliberate, and democratic process in the achievement of faculty government goals. Because of political realities, the senate represented an evolution in faculty governance rather than an abrupt departure. The persuasive case rested on a compromise solution to schedule two regular meetings of the general faculty each year and to delegate interim legislation to the smaller repre-

30 Minutes, Special Meeting of the UWM Faculty, March 6, 1969.
31 Calendar and Minutes, Special Meeting of the UWM Faculty, March 13, 1969.
32 Minutes, Regular Meeting of the UWM Faculty, March 20, 1969.
33 Documents Leading to the Establishment of the Faculty Senate at the University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee, undated compilation, Office of the Secretary of the Faculty, UWM.
sentative body. In response to faculty fears of loss of participatory
inghts, the power of review of senate actions was retained by the
faculty, senate meetings were opened to non-voting participation
by non-senators, the right to convene special meetings of the
faculty was retained, and senators would be bound to conduct their
sessions according to general faculty rules. Finally, the senate
meeting mechanism was frankly proposed as experimental legisla-
tion, subject to future faculty review and modification. The limited
experience of the first year of operation can only suggest some
tentative characteristics.

With a quorum requirement of a majority of its membership of
47 and a roll call provision, the freshman year senate maintained
an attendance ranging from a low of 68 to a high of 82 per cent.
In another evidence of increasing concern with "pure" faculty
governance, the senate elected its own president pro tem to preside
in the absence of the Chancellor. Meetings generally adhered
closely to established parliamentary rules and reasoned debate,
after some initial uncertainty over jurisdiction and procedures.
Reflecting in part its composition of faculty members of higher
academic rank and greater seniority, however, the initial senate
spent little time expressing doubt about its authority in academic
policy determinations.34 Legislative actions involved internal mat-
ters of faculty concern, except for the adoption of a motion provid-
ing for committee study of academic cooperation among the several
University campus units in southeastern Wisconsin.35 This action
was taken despite the contrary advice of a visiting officer of the
Milwaukee campus administration who asked for delay.

The Faculty Committee System. One of the first acts of the UWM
faculty was to define a system of faculty committees. The process
of definition has continued at an increasing pace through the period
of this study. Certain general themes and trends are readily ap-
parent; they include standardization of codified committee descrip-
tions, consolidation of outmoded and overlapping committee func-
tions, recognition of distinctive Milwaukee campus problems,
procedures, and goals, emphasis on committee membership by
election rather than by administrative appointment, fluctuating
interest in providing for student involvement, and identification
of committee authority, responsibility, and accountability. The
basic charter of the UWM faculty declares that it "... may delegate
functional authority and responsibility to committees ...; however,
such bodies ... are accountable to the University Faculty—
Milwaukee which retains final jurisdiction over all educational
matters. ...".36 A separate Milwaukee unit chapter of University

34 Field, p. 128.
35 Minutes, Regular Meeting of the UWM Faculty Senate, January 8, 1970.
36 Chapter 31, 31.02 (4).
laws and regulations specifies provisions for the establishment and regulation of both standing (permanent) and special (ad hoc) faculty authorized committees. This chapter also prescribes the membership and functions of the current roster of standing committees.

Committees exercise an important and sometimes confused role in academic government. Most business transacted in meetings of the faculty or its senate is based on informational reports of committee activities or specific recommendations to the faculty legislative body. But much committee activity is in separate implementation of faculty delegated duties. Although the Secretary of the Faculty is administratively responsible for mechanical details of the committee structure and operation, each committee reports directly to the faculty or its senate. Problems of interpretation of functions, conflicts of jurisdiction, charges of usurpation of powers, failures to carry out specific assigned responsibilities, and disagreements between committees are either ignored by neglect, resolved by private negotiation, or subjected to a faculty body vote. In the absence of any real judicial mechanism, there is no alternative to these options. For example, when a joint meeting of the University Committee and the Codification Committee failed to resolve the question of applicability of general committee regulations to the University Committee, the issue was adjudicated by a vote of the senate.

The existing committee structure is a product of a flurry of codification activity which began in 1966 and extended through the 1969-70 academic year. A significant part of this activity was due to the intervention of the University Board of Regents in requiring or requesting faculty legislation affecting or involving students. Faculty committees on student conduct were defined in accordance with regent instructions. In 1969, the Regents requested the various unit University Committees to investigate and to develop procedures for greater student involvement in broad educational matters. A subsequent survey by the UWM University and Codification Committees led to greatly increased student membership on a number of faculty standing committees. Earlier efforts to provide for student representation in the committee element of faculty government were essentially ineffective, with the notable exception of the active Student Life and Interests Committee.

27 Chapter 34, Milwaukee Campus Committees.
28 Minutes, Joint Special Meeting of the UWM Codification Committee and the University Committee—Milwaukee, September 18, 1969.
29 Minutes, Regular Meeting of the UWM Faculty Senate, October 9, 1969.
30 On December 5, 1966, the Secretary of the Faculty issued a memorandum informing the chairmen of all faculty committees that faculty legislation required a self-study report of functions and membership to the Codification Committee by February 1, 1967.
31 Action by the University Board of Regents, July 25, 1969.
"Meaningful participation in ... university government is not guaranteed merely by the presence of students on committees, ..." but the experience of another state university system with unit campus governance suggests that "the development of increased student participation must ... grow naturally." After fourteen years, the starting point for student participation in UWM academic government appeared to have been committed to committees.

CONCLUSIONS AND PREDICTIONS

To describe the shape and nature of the past and present is difficult enough; to describe the precise pattern of the future is absurd. We do not know what conditions will affect The University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee in 1984—nor in 1983, for that matter. We cannot do more than enjoy the good-humored warning of McGeorge Bundy's prophetic report from an "Academic Utopia" of 1975 in a pseudo-retrospective look at our shortcomings of the 1960s. But any future UWM faculty government will be derived from its past. Here, then, are some major conclusive assessments with their likely predictive corollaries.

1. The judicial functions of a democratic academic government are not being served as an identifiable activity or are being exercised on a sporadic and non-systematic basis. These normal judicial functions include: (a) determination of compliance with prescriptive and proscriptive rules, (b) interpretation of the meaning/intent of discrete rules and provisions, (c) reconciliation of apparent conflicts or inconsistencies among rules, and (d) judicial remedy for individual grievances in cases of illegal acts, usurpation of powers in the practice of faculty government or failures to act as required. This study suggests that judicial concerns will continue to be faced in something less than a comprehensive rationale.

2. The "doctrinal anti-administrative attitude" as a faculty characteristic may be expected to persist in the muted form of an "arm-length" communicative relationship between faculty government representatives and members of the campus administration. This study suggests that traditional anti-administrative feeling is becoming more translated into anti-faculty establishment authority bias by individuals and groups of faculty members who are alienated from the silent majority which supports gradual change.

44 Executive Vice President John W. Oswald, University of California, letter to Professor Kirk R. Petshek, Chairman, UWM Codification Committee, March 23, 1970.
3. The modest but increasing trend to increasing exercise of legal power by administrative and regent levels to cope with immediate and potential campus problems may be expected to persist, "lacking faculty action" of specific appropriateness and acceptable speed. The future may see a reversal of the traditional "faculty proposal—administration/regent disposal" process unless faculty anticipatory behavior involves more than the adoption of resolutions on public issues which spill over into campus controversy and disruption.

4. During the period covered by this study, UWM faculty government became increasingly codified into a systematic rationale of fixed and delegated authority. But the academic tradition of free and extensive dialogue is so strong that action oriented faculty government leaders and campus administrators will continue to find it difficult to heed Robert M. Hutchins' conclusion that "durable action" in university governance requires "patience.”

5. The structure and operation of UWM faculty government has changed gradually into its present form and practice. Confronted with the impact of persistent or recurring social disruption, it will continue to evolve. The major faculty goal of self-determination of institutional uniqueness through parliamentary democracy will continue to dominate its individual and collective behavior.
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