



# LIBRARIES

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

## **Minutes of the regular meeting of the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System: April 18, 1975. 1975**

Madison, Wisconsin: Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System, 1975

<https://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/SEEMH22OCELNK8A>

Copyright 2008 Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System

The libraries provide public access to a wide range of material, including online exhibits, digitized collections, archival finding aids, our catalog, online articles, and a growing range of materials in many media.

When possible, we provide rights information in catalog records, finding aids, and other metadata that accompanies collections or items. However, it is always the user's obligation to evaluate copyright and rights issues in light of their own use.

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING  
of the  
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

Madison, Wisconsin

Held in the Clarke Smith Room, 1820 Van Hise Hall  
Friday, April 18, 1975, 9:05 A.M.

President Pelisek presiding.

PRESENT: Regents Barkla, DeBardleben, Dixon, Fish, Hales, Lavine, McNamara,  
Neshek, Pelisek, Renk, Sandin, Solberg, Walter, Williams, and Zancanaro.

ABSENT: Regent Thompson.

- - -

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE SYSTEM

President Pelisek stated the purpose of the Special Meeting was to hear the report of the President of the System in response to our directive to him to provide the necessary studies and appropriate report that we might subsequently transmit to the Governor of the State of Wisconsin and the Legislature a response to the Governor's request of January 8, 1975 to bring to him and the Legislature a plan for phasing out, phasing down, or consolidating institutions and programs, including the proposed language to be inserted in the 1975-77 biennial budget authorizing implementation of our proposed plan.

President Weaver made the following statement: "On October 8, 1971, in my concluding remarks to one of the former Boards of Regents, I observed that we stood at 'the summit of an institutional divide--a divide formed by the conclusion of one era, the anticipation of another.' I noted at that time that, 'Your University has never before feared change; it need not fear it now. Indeed, if it is to attain its rightful destiny--if it is, in fact, to validate

its greatness--it must always be ready to meet the demands of change with well-considered change.'

"Just a bit over three years old, this System of Universities has made significant moves in the direction of change, and it has done so while coping with unprecedented problems and demands. Some feel we have moved too fast; others, that we have been too slow. Importantly, I hope we have always been well focused on our most basic responsibility, that of assuring that the quality and strength essential to universities worthy of the name have been protected and retained.

"Proposals for major change often arise out of some immediate dilemma or problem. The issue now before us, as to whether the State of Wisconsin wishes, or is able, to continue its present level of public university commitments and to pledge ongoing support for higher educational opportunity and the advancement of knowledge emerges in just this fashion. There is an ever-present danger of loss of perspective in attempting to deal with a question of this magnitude on short notice, and in an environment where current economic distress can unduly and unwisely influence decisions concerning the longer-range public interest.

"The report which I present to you this morning reflects our staff effort to speak truthfully, sensitively, responsibly and responsively to the difficult assignment you gave us. It is offered as a contribution toward informed public judgment. We do not attempt to hide our belief in the priceless cause of public higher education, nor do we avoid our responsibility to answer the concerns that have been laid before us.

"You have our report, findings and recommendations regarding the Governor's request for specific plans that might be utilized in reducing the scope of the University of Wisconsin System over the decade ahead. I respectfully recommend the transmission of this report to the Governor and the State Legislature. It is, I believe, fully responsive to the initial request as well as to the subsequent companion request from the President of this Board. Hopefully it will provide solid foundation for rational public consideration and debate. It seeks to provide our elected representatives--the persons ultimately responsible for the final decision in such fundamental public policy matters--with a clear statement of the policies, priorities and consequences inherent in any immediate moves designed to reduce the scope of this System.

"The report I bring you is divided into three major parts, preceded by a Summary and Prologue:

"Part One discusses the implications of enrollment forecasts, educational opportunity, campus sizes and missions, program offerings and evolving societal needs, in relation to quality and cost, thus providing the matrix for any long-range planning effort;

"Part Two seeks to speak directly to the request of the President of the Board of Regents for a statement of our current planning assumptions, procedures and directions;

"Part Three responds directly to the Governor's directive, in presenting criteria, procedures and legislative language by which the State could, if it deems such action to be in the public interest, take immediate steps to initiate a reduction in the scope and size of the University System.

"This Report is not advanced as an 'either/or' matter; none of the participants in the public policy arena can pretend to final knowledge. The Report is, in truth, and 'if/then' exposition, aimed at serving the needs of informed judgment. Even our listing of a decision agenda for state government at the end of the Report provides options, and not just the choice between change and no change.

"What emerges in the relationships between Parts Two and Three is in the nature of a dilemma. On the one hand, we have a commitment to serve Wisconsin citizens who seek and can profit from higher educational opportunity. The numbers of these citizens will steadily increase, at least through the next six years, and most likely will continue to increase, even if at a slower rate in the foreseeable years which follow.

"On the other hand, we cannot serve effectively a constantly growing demand for our services on the basis of static or declining real dollar resources; even though that is precisely the situation we now face.

"In the Prologue to my report, I outline the dimensions of our current budgetary travail in summary detail, and then note the magnitude of our potential difficulties when viewed against the even grimmer, long-range budgetary assumptions. It is important to grasp the implications of an expectation that we meet the bulk of our program needs over the next decade exclusively through internal surgery. It is worth noting that just to replace the nineteen million dollars in funding, eroded from our supply budgets by inflation in this biennium, would, on this basis, require the complete elimination of two of our smaller four-year universities or the entire fourteen campus Center System. So drastic a move as this would only allow us to stay even with our 1972-73 purchasing capability. It assumes, unrealistically, and incidentally, that the students and faculty of those campuses would no longer be a System responsibility.

"The immediate public policy issue becomes clear. If we are to fulfill our missions as historically defined, we need to be certain the state still supports those missions, and supports them with the full realization that they cannot be fulfilled on the basis of static or declining resources. If we are to plan for long-term fiscal austerity and retrenchment, this needs to be directed with the complete understanding that this will require a most basic change in direction for the State of Wisconsin--a deliberate decision to constrain, for fiscal reasons, the levels of access to educational opportunity that have historically been provided. We also need some indication of how minor or major such constraints as may be envisioned are to be.

"I obviously am not neutral on the issue posed by this request, nor am I oblivious to the current fiscal dilemma of this State. I happen to believe that this Board's present course of action, and the state's traditional commitment to public higher education, should be sustained. If we face hard times now and then, we will seek to limit our requests to only those things we consider to be the irreducible minimum. Economic history is not simply a story of unrelenting downturns. However, I am persuaded that this state will recover from its momentary distress. I am convinced that advanced public education for our citizens is an essential ingredient in that recovery, as in long-term economic growth and social improvement.

"Let me now state, as simply as I know how, what I see to be the heart --the true essence--of this document. In attempting this, I am fully mindful of the fact that we are dealing with an enormously complex set of issues. Many things, good and bad, have been said about universities, but no one has ever claimed that they are easy institutions to understand, nor that they work with simple problems. In addressing ourselves professionally to the sensitive and tightly interwoven fabric of problems in long-range planning for this System, we have necessarily pursued a variety of intricately involved topics, all of which affect our judgments and recommendations.

"Nevertheless, and at the cost of some oversimplification, let me set forth succinctly what I believe this Report says to the people of Wisconsin. Let me do this by first stating what it does not say. In turn I will try my hand at delineating what it does say.

"The Report does not say that the University of Wisconsin System, and its array of institutions, is now perfectly attuned to the task of providing the best possible higher educational service to the State of Wisconsin. Changes have been made in the last three years. Planning aimed at change and adaptation is continuing. Like all dynamic institutions, we can improve, and we urgently seek improvement.

"The Report does not, as some have urged would be useful, ignore 125 years of history and speculate on how one would redraw the higher education map of Wisconsin if he were free to start de novo. The history of our institutions --the youngest as well as the oldest--is closely intertwined with the histories of communities, regions, the state, the people who serve in those institutions, and the people they serve. We could no more abandon this history than we could abandon the accidents of our state boundaries, the cultural and ethnic backgrounds of our citizens, or the places where our people concentrate themselves to live and work. We have no way of assuming the advantage of hindsight for a return to a new and sudden moment of improved creation. Instead we must keep asking constantly how we can best use now, and for tomorrow, the resources of people, libraries, and laboratories we now have. This is the planning goal of the University System. This is a goal that seeks foresight, not hindsight--a foresight to carry us toward the 21st Century with a wisdom derived from a careful reading of history.

"The Report does not say that we have reached the highest level of effectiveness possible in bringing educational services of quality to the people of Wisconsin. We have steadily sought to become more effective. We would gladly invite comparison of our record for 'productivity', efficiency and effectiveness with the record of any university, or system of universities, in the nation. In spite of this, we continue to seek and to achieve improvements.

"The Report does not say that the choice is between the System as it now exists in all its details and a System which has been directed to reduce its scope. Our own planning assumptions and procedures, outlined in the Report, anticipate and call for change. They envision the possibility of alteration, phase down, or even phase out of institutions at any point in time when enrollment and resource forecasts make such moves desirable or necessary.

"The Report does not say that the choice is between unlimited growth in tax resources for the University System, and long-term fiscal austerity. We are acutely conscious of the fiscal problems that face our State government, and of the fact that unlimited access to new resources is not a realistic possibility for any public institution. Thoughtful people will differ as to the priority to be assigned to higher education among the many claimants for public dollars; they will, indeed, even differ regarding the extent to which government can fully support maximum access to educational opportunity. Notwithstanding these things, there still is clearly a choice--a choice between those who would join me in saying that strong education has built Wisconsin's very foundations --that quality education is, indeed, still its greatest strength and asset, both for today and tomorrow, and that we have a state's future at stake in keeping the opportunity for it open and fully available; and there are those who would say that such a goal is no longer realistically possible. It is that crucial choice that now hangs in the balance of public decision, and that lies at the vortex of this Report.

"What the Report does say is that if there is a public finding by the Legislature that resources for additional students and continued progress will not be, or cannot be, or should not be, forthcoming in the next decade, then it is clear that the size of the System must be reduced, and an unequivocal Legislative directive must be given to the System to take such action. Obviously, such a finding, and such a directive, would represent a most fateful public policy choice for the State of Wisconsin.

"It is an almost desperately fateful choice, because of a few irrefutable facts:

"First, unless artificial constraint is applied, enrollments in the System will continue to grow for at least three more biennia. After that the possibilities are several: growth may continue, or level out, or decline. But no one can judge now what will occur six, ten, or fifteen years from today, unless restraining decisions are made now that will operate to limit access to our University System.

"Second, the University of Wisconsin System cannot--I repeat, cannot-- provide education of quality for more students without appropriate, compensating increases in resources. Our services are provided by people, for people. We should give fair warning, and we must continue to warn, that we cannot go on reducing faculty and staff, as well as support for instructional materials and equipment, and simultaneously undertake the teaching of ever-increasing numbers of students. To attempt such, is an inescapable proscription for irreversible mediocrity. I find it hard to believe that anyone would find this an acceptable alternative.

"Third, it follows clearly that, if our fiscal future includes no enlargement of our present resources beyond provisions for salary and price increases, then we cannot--I repeat cannot-- provide educational opportunity for all of the Wisconsin citizens who would, if permitted, seek such services.

"The matter can be stated simply. A vast array of Task Force data, thoughtfully prepared and painstakingly analyzed, reveals this truth: A direction given now to reduce significantly the scope of the University of Wisconsin System over the next decade, is also a directive to reduce access to educational opportunity for some part of our people. No other consequence can lead from the established facts.

"In concluding my comments, let me ask your indulgence to step back for a few minutes from the trials of the moment in order that we may remind ourselves of those things the universities of Wisconsin have meant, and might continue to mean for our people. Decisions of great importance should not be taken without some sense of history, and in the Prologue of my Report I speak briefly to such matters.

"We should remind ourselves at this time that for well over a century, the people of Wisconsin have held certain propositions to be self-evident:

"(1) That Wisconsin's citizens should have ready access to higher educational opportunity of quality and of relevance to their purposes, interests and abilities.

"(2) That personal and societal need for knowledge constantly increases as a direct function of the complexity of society and the mounting aspirations of our citizens.

"Our unwavering confidence has been that public university education is a public good, and that the public investment in such endeavors is repaid to society many fold, and in countless ways:

-- The investment is repaid through the lives and taxes of citizens who realize more fully their potential for making wise personal and civic decisions, and who develop the skills needed for productive lives and careers.

- The investment is repaid through the functioning of communities of scholars which bring the power of vibrant, useful knowledge to bear on the problems of people and their institutions.
- The investment is repaid further through the impact of knowledge on the intellectual, cultural and economic vitality of society in general.
- The investment is an expression of the fact that what a society honors and values best describes its goals. Wisconsin has honored the search for and transmission of knowledge and, in so doing, has established a quality of life that even in the face of sacrifice, its citizens have been unwilling to do without.

"These beliefs and their consequences are both present fact and matters of history. The issue now before the State of Wisconsin is whether it wishes, or is able, to continue its adherence to these beliefs.

"I must now rest my case with you. In turn, you must, without delay, place our case before the people of Wisconsin. You and I, and others, who live day by day with the destiny of our public universities, have a deep and abiding concern for their health--for their ability to retain their longstanding traditions of intellectual pioneering for the public good. The people of Wisconsin have had great faith in public higher education. Above everything, I would covet the hope that through the difficult days of decision that lie immediately ahead, the citizens of Wisconsin will sustain that faith."

President Pelisek expressed, on behalf of the Board, thanks to President Weaver and his staff who worked so diligently under such constraints and time limitations to produce what is one of the outstanding documents in the area of public higher education that this nation has probably ever seen. He stated the document will serve as a model for higher education planning, not only in this state but throughout the nation, for the immediate future. He commended President Weaver and his staff for doing an absolutely superb job in meeting constrained deadlines that, back in January, all felt were impossible ones.

Regent McNamara stated that he agreed wholeheartedly with President Weaver's report, noting that it is an extremely far-reaching and forward-looking report and one which he supported completely. Regent McNamara commented on the economic implications of what might flow out of this report, depending upon how we implement it. He noted we live in a state with limited natural economic advantages. We are on the fringe of America's industrial heartland rather than at its center. Our climate is not ideal by any means, and we have other deterrents that clash with industry. While our social programs are among the best in the nation, they are expensive, so these things taken together make it more difficult to attract and keep jobs in Wisconsin than in other states in the midwest.

Our one distinct advantage is one of the best trained and most productive work forces in the nation. If we undermine our educational institutions of



higher education--the Vocational-Technical System, which is outstanding in the world, and the great university system, which is one of the outstanding systems in the world, then we seriously harm the one overriding social and economic advantage that we have and hurt the economic and social opportunities of all of our citizens.

He stated the classes most hurt would be the most recent entries into the work force; and they would be our black citizens and other minority citizens, who only now are beginning to be brought into the mainstream of our American society. He noted they will be hurt first and hardest, but it would hurt all working people. He stated the system is necessary to preserve existing jobs for all of our people and to attract new ones. He noted that, in this complex industrial economic society, new opportunities are created by research and by technological change. He continued that, in the past fifty years, most of the technological change has come either directly or indirectly from research conducted by universities in this country, so what we now do will seriously affect our future.

He stated that, for all of our people, it is the desire and the hope for a better life that have been the ideals of all Americans, specifically the poor and the working people. Their one hope for a better life was through education, through access to education at all levels, including the University level. He stated that, as we now embark on policies in this state to limit the entries of the working people, the minorities and the poor, either through excessive costs or through limitations on opportunities, we are hurting all the people and doing a disservice to our state and its citizens.

Regent Lavine stated that he believed the report is tremendous, complete, fair, and understandable; and given the complexity of the subject, it has got to set some kind of model in taking a very difficult subject and making it very clear to a layman. He did express the fear that those who really don't want to spend the time won't take a great deal of effort in reading the report and might twist it, making it vertical instead of horizontal. He continued they might twist it to say that either the University System gets what it wants or gets very little--it's an either/or kind of bargaining. He stated President Weaver has made it very clear that this is not a vertical either/or argument. It is a horizontal report and says clearly to the people of Wisconsin, here is what is happening if we have varying degrees of support for the University System.

He stated it is true, as a state, we desperately need now, when we are in trouble, increased productivity and answers to our economic problems. Regent Lavine referred to the chart on page 3A of the report showing the number of students and their support which continued on a comparable level until 1970 or 1971, when all of a sudden state support fell off. He stated he was also concerned about the comment in the meeting a week ago that Wisconsin has spent a great deal of our resources to build a first-quality higher education system, noting that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare observed that, if you look at the amount we are spending for each student in the System, we are well over the half-way mark in the fifty states.

Regent Lavine suggested that items 2. and 3. under Section C., on page 24 be deleted; that items 2. and 3. under C. on page 27 be deleted; and that the single paragraph under C. on page 30, dealing with the doctoral cluster, which indicates again using the criteria the report brings out, that we would report back to the Legislature what we have done and they, in turn, would make a decision, also be deleted. He stated he could not believe that, if the people of Wisconsin feel that it is the best public policy to give a support level to the University that requires it to cut back--and he was not at all convinced that they will--it is absolutely crucial that the decision not be made politically, not be made on a provincial basis, and not put us in the box that the people's representatives could turn it into an either/or situation. On the one hand, they could say publicly, "Of course, we support higher education; we think it's important for the people of Wisconsin to have a place to grow, learn and increase productivity, so that they can help the state's economy", but then turn right around and pass a budget which doesn't support it.

Regent Lavine stated that the reason he made these suggestions was because he recalled that, during the merger fight, there was a real concern that the Legislature be involved in any kind of closing or phasing back; and they wanted to see if it was going to be run by the Board of Regents and the System faculty, staff and students, who were interested in quality education. He stated that no one can read this report and feel that President Weaver and the entire University System are not deeply concerned and committed to the best quality education for everyone in the State. He continued no one can read it and not say we have not signaled very clearly exactly what is the way to maintain quality education in Wisconsin, given the levels of support possible.

He continued he felt it absolutely critical that we not be in the position that there is a lot of rhetoric about supporting education, but then we get only half the money necessary to do it; and as a result, cheat the students coming in because they simply will not have a quality program. He stated that, when you maintain access, you dilute quality, which cannot be done in an increasingly complex society; and we are faced with that choice. Regent Lavine said that President Weaver and the Board have said very clearly that we want to maintain quality, if necessary, for less people. He stated that the changes he suggested would say to the Legislature, "If the support level is not adequate, then, with all the criteria set forth all through the public hearings, etc., what we finally to do insure the quality of education and insure the integrity and forward movement of those students who do get a higher education in Wisconsin will be made on an educational basis."

Regent Dixon stated that he would subscribe to Regent McNamara's remarks fully as being most objective and including the entire spectrum of education in the state. He congratulated President Weaver and the members of the Task Force for the presentation of a dignified document. He stated he was extremely tired of being one of the whipping boys for the professional recessionists. He stated we are not advocates of negativism, we are advocates of achievement. He stated the Task Force report is presented in terms which can be understood by Regents, the public, and by those of Legislative I.Q. He stated our charge, as a Board of Regents, is simply to delineate to the citizens of Wisconsin the ways

in which, with their support, we can provide the maximum in quality education for the maximum number of students who seek the opportunity to learn. He noted the motto of the State of Wisconsin "Forward" is the direction in which he hopes we will go.

Regent Hales inquired of Regent Lavine if he would recommend the deletion of the three mandates on page 20 of the report under item D. for reduction in the scope of the System, so that, if we are directed to phase down, we could then decide how we are going to do it. Regent Lavine responded that, if they were the only options, he felt they should go; but the reason he did not think it necessary was because, in the pages that followed, there were so many other variables, alternatives, and possibilities that he assumed they amply opened the door for those other possibilities under the criteria.

Senior Vice President Percy stated he was worried about deleting alternatives because this Board, the Governor, and the Legislature deserve alternatives and those alternatives have been taken into account. He noted the present statutory charge says that only the Governor and Legislature can make that decision, and that was the basis for the preparation of the report.

Regent Fish stated he read the report as a scholarly, concise, accurate and honest one, and would vote for it. He continued he would have the tendency to agree with the observation that, although we may not like some of the alternatives, perhaps we ought to leave them in for the purpose that Senior Vice President Percy pointed out. He stated he would like to touch a little bit on the reality of the situation. He noted we have to recognize that, as far as the Legislature is concerned, the economic impact on the state, and some other factors, is not going to be as overburdening a problem as the securing of the dollars to balance the budget. Obviously, our budget is one of the two highest and is one that is more susceptible to very close review.

He continued that he believed that the public perception, and probably to a lesser degree the legislative perception, is that there are two areas in which the University could make some substantial savings: one, close down some campuses; and two, get the professors to teach more students and we wouldn't need so many faculty. He continued that he felt the report addresses itself pretty well to these facets; but that it is something we ought to highlight, not in the document itself, because it is there, but because it is a comprehensive document that everyone probably is not going to read as completely as we would like them to. He stated he would like to see, in the covering letter that goes with the resolution, some kind of a short highlight pointing out the reality that closing down campuses may be an internal procedure for efficiency's sake; that may have some requirement justification and benefit; but that, as far as it being a source of great fund savings, it is not there.

Regent Fish noted that, in closing down a campus, the faculty and student body is transferred to other campuses. Therefore, the actual savings are minimal at best, practically non-existent. Closing down campuses per se is not going to be any substantial source of money savings in the University budget. He stated there is, in fact, only one basic way that the University budget can

be reduced and that is by limiting enrollment--we can only save money if we have fewer students and therefore need fewer faculty people to instruct them. He continued that we have to highlight the fact that it is only in enrollment limitations that there can be savings of any appreciable amount, not in campus closings.

He continued that the public, and to a lesser degree the Legislature, feels that we ought to somehow increase the faculty contact hours with students --more students for fewer faculty. He stated he felt we ought to relate the ratio of full-time equivalent faculty to full-time equivalent students, as compared to other states. He stated he believed that these are the two areas which the Legislature is going to be looking at; and that we ought to convince everyone immediately that, if we close down Campus A, B, and C, we are not going to accomplish any savings, because students are going to other campuses and we will still have to teach them. He continued that, in this university and in any university system, labor is the substantial portion of the university budget--not janitorial services, light or water. He concluded that these points are brought out in this document, but he would like to see them highlighted in a short one or two paragraph notation that accompanies the resolution as it goes to the Legislature.

President Weaver agreed with Regent Fish that, if you were to summarize all of the reports in one sentence, the one significant sentence is that this is a service enterprise and you save no significant money unless you cut service.

Regent Renk stated he would like to speak on behalf of one of Wisconsin's most important industries, agriculture. He inquired where the dairy industry of this state would be if it were not for the University of Wisconsin. He noted Wisconsin agriculture does not have the God-given land of our neighbors, but that three times in the last ten years this state led the nation in the average yield of corn produced. That was primarily due to the teaching, research, and Extension of the University of Wisconsin. He noted the farmers of the state have lagged behind their neighbors in their share of the national income, but they have fared better than their neighbors because of what the University has done for them.

He noted that the head of the cattle division of the Arizona Land and Cattle Company, who lives next to Arizona State and a few miles from the University of Arizona and has visited most every campus in the country, is sending his son to Madison to attend the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences because he says it is the outstanding university of its kind in the country. He stated the point he was trying to make was that we must maintain the quality of the institution. He complimented President Weaver and his staff on the report and stated he would wholeheartedly support it.

Regent Williams stated that she wished to congratulate all of the people who worked so diligently to prepare the report and complimented President Weaver and Senior Vice Presidents Percy and Smith for their efforts to present the material in such a way that it can be seen in an orderly fashion and that alternatives are presented for everyone. She continued it is important for us to look at what these alternatives are. She noted that it is based on following

assumptions and then actions which would result from those assumptions. She stated she would hesitate to change very much in terms of offering alternatives, noting that the Legislature and the people in State government, in looking at this in the future, are certainly going to be aware of the kinds of things that the Board of Regents would like to be able to do. She continued that we certainly would prefer to be able to make decisions and make recommendations and have those recommendations acted upon; but that the Legislature should be aware of what their alternatives are in terms of what has been done in this report and the types of things that have to be acted upon on the basis of certain alternatives, if we are to be given the responsibility for action. She noted that, if it is necessary to raise tuition each year, the point may come where students will not be able to attend the University and we will thus reduce access and opportunity.

Regent DeBardleben commended the work of President Weaver and of Senior Vice President Smith and the Task Force and the entire Central Administration in meeting the charge which had been given to it. He stated he opposed Regent Lavine's suggestion for the reasons he gave. He continued that, in his opinion, if higher education must be cut back, that decision must be made by the people of the State of Wisconsin through their elected representatives. He stated that he felt it is primarily a political decision, and that is where the responsibility lies. He stated he felt it is the business of the Board of Regents to decide upon educational criteria which we feel should be involved in reaching that decision.

He continued that he feared one of the reasons we are in the trouble we are in is because elected representatives have not been fully enough involved in an understanding of the consequences of fiscal decisions which are being made by the Executive Branch and which have been made and will be made by the Legislature. Appreciation of these matters can be brought home to them only if they can be made aware of the consequences of those decisions--which will be denial of educational opportunity to the citizens who elected them.

Regent DeBardleben stated that if anything should be deleted, it should be option 1. The decision to phase out a Center, to phase out a four-year institution, or to cut back graduate programs at either Madison or Milwaukee is a political decision and should be made in that arena. He continued that he was interested in hearing from the Council of Chancellors and the individual Chancellors who wished to be heard and would also be interested in hearing from representatives of the faculty as to their appraisal of the educational criteria involved in this report.

President Pelisek stated it was the intention of the Chair to allow the Chancellors and faculty leadership to speak on the report before the vote was actually taken.

Regent Sandin stated that she would like to add her hearty commendations to the Task Force for the excellent performance of a monumental task. She stated that, after hearing Regent Renk speak for agriculture and Regent McNamara for business, she would like to speak for education. She said we have always

had rough times in this country--we have had depression, days of witch hunts for communists, days of World War II when the boys were off fighting, days when they came back and we had this great influx of GI's coming back for education, and then the days of Watergate. Somehow we always met all these problems and emerged stronger and better from them. She noted we have educated teachers in the state who have gone out to educate young people in the elementary and secondary grades; and we have one of the finest elementary and secondary education systems in the country. She noted we get more federal aid than only two other colleges in the United States, and that is because of the quality of teaching we have here. She noted we educate doctors, nurses, lawyers, and scientists, all of whom are bringing in more money to the state. She stated it would be very, very foolhardy if we had to cut back any of our education.

Regent Barkla stated that she was very impressed with the report and commended President Weaver and his staff for the work done on it. She noted that, in a time of fiscal constraint and in the depression, there was a great hue and cry to close down the University of Minnesota. She continued that that University is not the size and scope nor does it have the number of institutions in the system that ours does; but that move was put down rather summarily by the people in charge of the University of Minnesota. She stated that the morning St. Paul newspaper reported the Governor and the Regents were being commended for a move to freeze tuition in order to maintain access to the University of Minnesota in a time of fiscal constraints.

She also noted that the University of Oregon was put on the block during the depression; and that one of Wisconsin's native sons, Senator Wayne Morse, started his career politically and educationally in blocking that move. She stated the response to the Legislature and the Governor will do a great deal to assure the people of this state that we are not going to engage in that kind of exercise, and that she did not foresee that the Legislature is going to engage in that exercise at this time.

Regent Barkla stated that she was concerned about the priority of the criteria on page 20 of the report, partly because she lived next door to a campus which was a four-year institution and which has contributed a great deal to the economy of that area. She was disturbed because the criteria number 3 is to phase down, phase out, and consolidate programs in the doctoral cluster and University Extension, after action is taken on the first two criteria. She continued, if you were talking about economic displacement and denial of access to young people in our System, it seemed to her that criteria 3. should come before criteria 1. and 2. She stated the people who will be entering the doctoral programs on our two doctoral campuses will not be people entering the public higher education system for the first time and it will not cut them as hard. She stated that, if people are upset about the economic displacement in phasing out or phasing down some of the four-year institutions and the two-year Centers, then they ought to look at the order of these priorities.

Regent Neshek joined with the other Regents in commending the Administration on the report. He stated that, in looking at the criteria that are set up for phase outs, he did so with a certain amount of bitterness, in that the

Legislature and the Chief Executive have in no instance called for these same types of criteria for private institutions, which are given a public subsidy with the Tuition Grant Program. He stated that the Legislature, in looking at our system and applying the criteria of minimum students in attendance in costs per full-time equivalent students, should apply the same criteria to private institutions if they are to continue to receive public support. He continued that it seemed ironic that our public institutions are asked to account, which we are happy to do; but he would like to see the private institutions account also and be judged by the same standards and the same criteria that have been established in this report.

Regent Solberg stated that we have not done a good job of telling the public what we really are all about and what we really are doing. We are graded more by what the students did back in the 60's or what one student does today, or the type of movie we show on campus and that sort of thing. We ought to start evaluating what we are doing and let the world know what we are doing. He pointed out that the 3M Company is locating a large complex in Menomonie, where the UW-Stout is located; and when they were asked why they selected Menomonie, they said the dominating reason was the location of the UW-Stout in Menomonie--the institution offers the type of education that their industry is really interested in. He again emphasized that this type of story should be gotten out.

Regent McNamara moved adoption of the following resolution, and the motion was seconded by Regents Lavine and Sandin:

Resolution 999: That, upon recommendation of the President of the System, the Board of Regents approves the "President's Report to the Board of Regents in response to the Governor's Request on Reducing the Scope of the University of Wisconsin System", dated April 18, 1975, as its formal submission to the Governor and the Legislature and directs the President of the Board to transmit it accordingly.

*Bu...  
J+P*

Regent Lavine noted that, during the past year, he had chaired fifteen or sixteen of the twenty-two hearings that this Board held all over the state on the very limited item of looking at graduate programs systemwide; and as a result, fifty odd programs were cut. He stated President Weaver pointed out to him that we were in the process of making the System responsive to the needs of the day for sometime. He stated the tragic thing to him was that the legislators, who have made a public career of cutting up the University, would go to those hearings and on the one hand clearly say, "Don't touch one course in my school", without regard to whether the courses were of quality or not, duplicative or not; and then turn around in the Legislature and add to the curve on page 3A of the report. He noted that we did cut a few unnecessarily duplicative programs, and now we are looking at a major effort.

He continued it is a reality that we are not going to get the kind of money that we should get if we are to run the kind of quality system that we are all deeply committed to. He stated he hoped we would get more than talked about, and that the people deserve that in the kind of schools they have. If we are

responsible for the quality of the System, we have adequately in this document told the Legislature what we are going to do and how we are going to do it. That being the case, he was perfectly willing to give them three options. He stated that it is critical, not simply to say we believe in quality, that we be able to maintain quality.

Regent Walter stated that, in theory, she would agree with Regent DeBardleben's position--it should be up to the Legislature--but in practice she felt quality is a very abstract thing, whereas access is very concrete. She stated that, if the Legislature has full authority, which it has according to statute, we will get a certain amount of dollars and quality will have to go down whether we close any Centers or not.

Regent Barkla moved adoption of the following amendment to the report, and the motion was seconded by Regent Hales:

That page 20 after the first paragraph, Section D., the 10th sentence of the Report, which starts "these classes of decisions are here listed:", be revised as follows:

1. A mandate to phase out, phase down, or consolidate programs in the Doctoral Cluster, University Extension and delete the rest of that sentence.
2. A mandate to phase out, phase down, or otherwise provide alternative use for a specific number of UW Centers selected on the basis of criteria stated in this report.
3. A mandate to phase out or phase down one or more University Cluster campuses to be selected on the basis of criteria.

Senior Vice President Smith referred to the language on page 30, which speaks to the question of timing. He stated he believed the effects of this kind of change would be to say that we would necessarily undertake, if the Legislature gives a direction, a reduction in the scope of the doctoral cluster and University Extension in 1975-77, a postponement until 1977-79 of any decisions on the Center System, and a postponement until 1979-81 of decisions with regard to the scope of the University cluster. He stated the reason for the phasing over three biennia is a very simple and practical one. Given the amount of procedure that is involved if we are to do any kind of phasing down properly, including the specifications of hearings and investigations, etc., it was simply not feasible to proceed with all steps simultaneously. So, consequently, he assumed that the question of the necessity of doing this over a period of time has not been challenged; and that this has been forecast for at least three biennia.

With respect to this kind of reversal, he stated that the larger the complexity of the organizational structure you are dealing with the more difficult and complicated the process of analysis and wise decision making becomes. It is not in any sense to demean the Center System and to speak in any disparaging way about the extraordinary significance of the kind of mission carried out



by the Center System to say that it is possible to proceed with analysis of the Centers because of the relative simplicity of the organization and the relative clarity of their relationship to one another and to the Center System as a whole.

Senior Vice President Smith continued the Board has previously set targets for the Center System and announced its intention to proceed with the examination of the Center System. He noted that, if you moved toward larger orders of complexity, it becomes extraordinarily more difficult. He stated that, as we move toward the kinds of complexity involved in the extraordinary interactions of the Extension programs and the interaction between graduate and undergraduate programs represented in the great research centers, you have a chore on your hands of enormous proportions.

He cited the studies of the doctoral programs in New York State which took approximately four years of preparatory study and two years of actual evaluation before recommendations were brought forward, which still have to be processed and acted upon by the institution. He also noted that the planning audit and review activities of the System, on its own initiative, is conducting a review of the doctoral programs as an on-going process. He also noted we have undertaken a review of undergraduate programs, as an on-going process. He noted these will be proceeding regardless of any directive that is given to phase down the System. So it is not the case simply that we are not looking at Extension-- we are looking at all institutions and all programs on a continuing basis. He stated he did not believe it either feasible or wise to reverse the order in a practical sense, and that it would complicate what, at best, is an extraordinary complexity which would result in a series of directives which he hopes we will not get.

Chancellor Haas made the following statement on behalf of the Council of Chancellors: "The Council of Chancellors, as a group, has not reacted either to the original Task Force document nor to the document that has been presented today for the first time. The failure to act as a group on the document was not due to any failure of understanding of the significance and tremendous importance of this issue before us, but largely because of the timing, the ability to look at it from the point of view of the group in the days that have been available.

"Secondly, I don't think it was the thought of any of the Chancellors that there should be a consensus on any individual features of the document until we have the document in its entirety. Obviously, there are differences among the Chancellors, even as there will be among the faculties and the Regents, depending upon the chair in which you are sitting. For example, the issue which has just been brought before you by amendment. It does get into the question of relative importance of the undergraduate access over and against total access involving both graduate work and professional studies; and here again, I think a basic decision must be made. I think it was very helpful to hear Senior Vice President Smith's explanation of the timing insofar as the working order is concerned to meet these options. So, I don't think that we would do anything to come before you with a consensus or an absolutely unanimous decision on any one of these various items.

"On the other hand, several of the Chancellors and members of the Chancellor's staffs have served on the Task Force that did the initial work. Certainly, out of that study and on the part of those people who so participated, as well as the careful reading of the Task Force Report which has been undertaken by every Chancellor, the Chancellors too would express great admiration and respect for the officers who have led us in the Task Force and now the Report of the President this morning in presenting this document. I am sure that I can speak, without having had a vote behind me, of the full support of the Chancellors that this is a document that has been looked at from its educational implications.

"When we get into the political considerations, we may not feel as certain about our position; but certainly, educationally, it is a document the Chancellors would support. We know that every division of the Task Force approached the job from this position, and I think that the reading of the document would indicate that this has been the spirit in which the whole thing has been developed. It is saying that, on behalf of the educational establishment, this is the position that it takes in facing a very prime question.

"I think, too, it ought to be mentioned that there are some positive things that resulted from this that may not have been perfectly edited at the time that we began, or even so today. I think in many ways the preparation of this report has been sort of a final action that has brought us closer together as a System and given us a new admiration and respect for the chief officers here in Central Administration in the kind of leadership that has been provided in looking at the whole question with a maximum of objectivity. I think that this will, in the future, enhance the role of the System, because of this coming together.

"Now, I would say that there may be individual Chancellors here who would like to speak to specific aspects of the report, depending again upon the circumstances in which they find themselves. There will be some differences in points of view, and I think these should be heard. I think we do have to ask questions such as the one Regent Barkla has raised relative to the order in which we are going to attack some of these problems."

Mr. James Hamilton, President of the United Council of Student Governments, stated that, as a Task Force member, he recognized the enormous task facing the committee; and that the Task Force members had left no stone unturned at any time. He noted that being on the committee also enlightened him to many of the problems that the University will face in approaching the future and to many of the problems that they face at the present time. He continued that, as a representative of the United Council of Student Governments, he became familiar with the University budget and, as a result, had a greater understanding of where the money goes and how the dollars are spent.

He stated the Board will be making a serious mistake if they allow an additional 6,000 students to come into the System in the next biennium without additional funding. He stated that, as a student in the classroom, he felt the \$19,000,000 cutback that had been discussed, the one-hundred or more staff positions that would be eliminated over the next two years, and the larger classes

and reduced support per student. He concluded by saying that he supported the report and felt that an excellent job has been done.

Chancellor Fort, UW Center System, made the following statement: "As indicated today by President Weaver in his report to the Board of Regents, the Governor has assumed that the state's priorities in allocating the tax resources available to it will not sustain support for the University System over the next decade at a level sufficient to maintain its present scope and quality. Furthermore, the most that the University System can expect in this period is additional support to cover salary increases and inflationary price increases. The Governor further assumes that enrollments will decline in the decade of the eighties and fall below levels which will justify the present array of institutions and programs. Finally, the Governor, as indicated by President Weaver, is assuming that the resources required beyond the levels needed to sustain quality to meet workload increases and to insure the support needed for program changes must therefore come primarily from retrenchment of the current base budgets of these institutions and programs.

"In effect, the Governor is, therefore, depicting a short-range and long-range picture of economic gloom, as the latter impacts upon the State of Wisconsin, and therefore, on its system of free public higher education. In fact, he is asking the state and its public to adopt a public policy of possibly contrived retrenchment, based upon the presumption that enrollments in the UW System will, in fact, not be sustained in the next decade. Furthermore, that there will be no money from projected state revenue sources to sustain the University System over the next decade in its present scope, size, and quality.

"Therefore, we, as the University, by default, should 'bite the bullet' and get on with the awesome task of reducing the scope of its System. This assumption, of course, runs in direct juxtaposition to the position taken, as so wisely asserted by one Regent at the January 10, 1975 Board meeting, by the Governor of the State of Minnesota. Regents and the public recall that the chief executive of that state, during the course of his January speech before a joint session of the state legislature, indicated the fact that the economic crisis in which this nation was currently involved would affect every decision made by that body of lawmakers. He further indicated to that group that some of them might be tempted to use austerity as an 'excuse' for reducing the state's commitment to education. He concluded by indicating that he rejected this thesis and suggested that, in the State of Minnesota, there was a youth who could give us a better engine if he or she were given a chance. Hence, Minnesota's commitment to education would continue.

"Wisconsin, on the other hand, was spending so much time attempting to suggest what our specific commitment to higher education had been and was that we seem to have lost sight of the fact that, in actuality, this state ranks 25th, and thence below the national average, in proportion of state tax funds spent per full-time equivalent student for operating expenses in higher education. Additionally, that the state ranks 33rd in proportion of state tax revenue apportioned for University System operating expenses, again far below the national average.

"It becomes apparent thus that the assumption rendered by the Governor is platformed on the contention of:

- (1) Long-range reduced state revenues as earmarked for the support of state education; and
- (2) Long-range enrollment projections which would assert student population declines in the System.

These platforms come on as indicated by President Weaver in his report today do not hold up. Enrollment projections which the Governor's staff have made, as based upon the 18-22 year old age pool, are inadequate. The Task Force has already shown the changing pattern of university attendance. Students are older (25 or older) and there are increased numbers of part-time students. Hence, adequately defined enrollment projections, as used by the state, do not speak in a complete way to the resource requirements of the UW System in the decade 1982-92. During this decade, the population group in Wisconsin between ages 25 and 50 will be at an all time high. The question then becomes one of whether or not there is any legitimacy attached to the Governor's assumption--if he is suggesting that lower enrollments automatically mean the need for a reduction in scope for the UW System.

"The President has now submitted his final report to the Regents, and included in same a comprehensively defined list of criteria and procedures which would be used, when implemented, to reduce the scope of the UW System. If the state adopts the Governor's fiscal assumptions, we can make the following comments:

"1. The state cannot be allowed to get itself 'off the hook' by suggesting that, under the guise of short-range and long-range savings, it is asking the University System to make a decision as to which campuses are reduced where and when. This is a public policy issue and is one that the state is going to have to meet head on in relationship to the whole issue of accessibility to higher education and the manner in which same impacts upon quality of higher educational opportunity.

"It is a matter of historical fact that this state went on record, during the mission hearings of several years ago, supporting the University's concept of the boundaries of the University are the boundaries of the state. If, therefore, in the final analysis, the state, under the guise of savings, is intent upon phasing out or phasing down a portion of the Center System--as the very personification of that public policy--then let the state, here and now, say so. If the state, in its determination, is going to make the decision that the fetus will be aborted prior to the time of full birth, then let the state be honest and conscionable enough to say so now. For, if we can agree that the Center System is, in fact, the very manifestation of the so-called Wisconsin Idea, there is no way that the state politically or organizationally can commence with the elimination of portions of the Center System without, in effect, disavowing, abrogating, or totally eliminating the Wisconsin Idea as referred to earlier. If the state, in its determination, suggests the application of certain scope reduction criteria which would relate to down-range FTE's or down-range excess costs (whatever that means), then it's going to have to admit to

the public that these criteria as applied will, in effect, be suggestive of the reality that the state cannot afford anything other than a decentralized, giant, multi-versity concept. Again, if this is the posture that the state is going to adopt politically, then let it admit it. It is a known fact, for example, that the Center System campuses, as institutions, were never established for purposes of 'saving the state money'. Instead, they were designed specifically for the purpose of providing this state with an opportunity for guaranteeing equality of educational opportunity at cost savings to students.

"It is a known fact that, from a historical point of view again, the Center System was established for purposes of providing, on a decentralized basis, accessibility to higher education for all segments of this state. The Centers were designed to guarantee low class size, immediacy of access, personalized education, and accessibility on a population diversification basis. We are talking here about more than 18-22 year old students; we are talking about an institution which is enrolling advanced placement high school seniors, housewives who plan their days around a Center System campus' schedule while enrolling in classes, and perhaps the highest percentage of over 62 years of age auditors of any institution in the System. We are talking about a situation wherein, on one campus, 18-22 year olds vote with the professor to move their classroom site across to the other side of an ice flow for purposes of accommodating the convenience of an 80-year old enrollee. We are talking about a humanized approach to higher education which not only guarantees that student an opportunity for completing the initial years of pre-baccalaureate programs, but also saying, in effect, to that student 'Here's your chance, take the ball and run with it.'

"2. Giant universities have for years sought to decentralize their operations so as to achieve the very epitomy of that which this state has already gained in the Center System--personalized education. If the state--again under the guise of saving money--is going to insist that that concept be abrogated, then let it say so. Let it push for the expansion of the multi-versity concept. Let it not only disavow the continuation of the Wisconsin Idea, but let it even go so far as to rearrange institutions such that we have, perhaps, regionalized campuses which, because of size, will, hopefully, save the state the kinds of money it desires to gain. If that becomes the decision, then let the state become aware of the fact that there are reams of experiences which depict the failure of this move. Even the public schools have noted with candor the inadequacy of a large, metropolitanized, supposedly cost-saving complex such as the so-called educational park which would have placed an entire K-12 complex on one campus as denoted in that model. It would seem to me that we, as a state, could profit from this kind of aborted effort, as earlier exemplified in the fiascos attempted in the plans of the Districts of Pittsburg, Pennsylvania and East Orange, New Jersey.

"3. If it is the state's intent to abort earlier agreements which it had made with the University and its Board of Regents as pertains to the importance of heterogeneity within the UW System, then let it admit so publicly. This system was statutorily mandated as indicated in Budget Policy Paper 2.0, September 1974, to:

'Protect, sustain and encourage diversity of programs. The legislature in selecting particular regions in which to establish campuses assured a diversity of size, since many are in the service areas (a) where the economy of scale enrollments are simply not possible, given the population base or in the base of certain border campuses (b) where subsequent legislatively mandated non-resident tuition increases have served to reverse earlier enrollment planning and facilities expectations. We have public, legislative, region, and institutional expectations of the new system which sustained diversity and character, program, size and location. And anyone who assumes that these protective and diverse expectations are not intentionally held by the citizenry, need only to recall the campus/region/public reaction to the graduate program audit effort of 1973 or the citizen turnout for mission hearings at the smaller center campuses.'

"Hence, I don't stand here for purposes of attacking the efficacy of cost indices or FTE enrollment indices, which might be used as a means of enabling the state to identify those campuses which, as a means of meeting the state mandate, must be phased out. Instead, I challenge the state to say, flat out, that its posture with regard to the support of public education has changed. That publicly and politically it desires to render asunder the higher education base which was established years ago; and that it intends to do so by forcing the Center System to become the first institution to walk the scaffold.

"It is ludicrous for the state to suggest that, through the application of these recommended criteria or any criteria, monies are going to be saved from a 1975-77 biennial budget of millions by closing down Center System Campus A or closing down Center System Campus B. The total savings with respect to GPR/academic fees for 1974-75 for Campus A would be \$103,950. If the campus did not operate in 1975-76, we are talking about a savings of only \$212,080. If program diversification, low class sizes, services to the people in outlying rural areas as well as urban areas, are to become sacrificial lambs of the state's mandated cost savings edict, then automatically the Center System becomes the primary target. The assumption seems to be one wherein, if the state can throw the legislature a bone in the form of one or two Center System campuses, the heat will be off, talk of scope reduction will abate, those in the state who have suggested that the time has come for the University to reduce its size will have had their appetites satiated. I think it would be fruitless for me to suggest any efficacy attached to that statement. My concern instead, notwithstanding the motives that pertain to why campuses were built where, is that of asking the state to make known its position as it pertains to the future of this system, including our own institution.

"In conclusion, let's return to history and review one crucial point. The Regents recall that Gibbons, in his classic on The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire presented five major reasons for the decline of Rome. Her armies had conquered all of the then known world, her legions were powerful. Her prosperity, popularity, and organizational strength were of historical importance.

"Rome was riding the crest of power and might in the world. It was at this pinnacle of success that the great empire faded and fell. Rome, as history tells us, has never since gained its once great position of prominence in the world. In Gibbons classic work, five basic reasons were listed for the decline of this great empire:

1. The undermining of the dignity and sanctity of the home and the educational enterprise.
2. Higher and higher taxes.
3. The spending of public money for free bread that never reached the poor.
4. The mad craze for pleasure--the coliseums were filled; the churches were empty.
5. Rome built great armaments to keep the enemy without, but the enemy was already within the city. There was wholesale decay of individual responsibility. There was a great decay of religion. Faith had poured into mirror form and had lost its power to guide the people. In effect, Rome had built great armaments to keep the enemy without the city, but the enemy was already within the city.

"I would submit for Wisconsin that the enemy is non-commitment on a projected basis to higher education; the enemy is a disavowance of this state's commitment to the Wisconsin Idea; the enemy, in the final analysis, is a willingness to accept the Governor's assumptions and to use these as a basis for determining which institution goes to the scaffold first, as this state seeks to reduce the scope of the University System. That cannot happen. It must not happen. It will not happen. It will not happen if the people of this state indicate to the Governor, indicate to the Legislature, that the assumptions are not valid and that they will not allow the Center System or any institution to become the bone tossed to the state for purposes of enabling it to say to its constituencies, 'See, we have reduced the scope'."

Chancellor Field, UW-River Falls, pointed out that, if the dollars are not available, it might be conceivable, due to the complexity of the System, that a doctoral program might be eliminated at the same time it might be decided that a part of a four-year system might be consolidated or phased down, and possibly that concurrently one or two two-year Centers might be phased out. By stating on page 22 of the report the order in which they appear, it makes it opposite of what some of the Regents and Central Administration have said about the basic philosophy of the complex system in which we exist. He stated, therefore, if it is not possible to accept Regent Barkla's amendment, then he would hope the Regents might consider striking the words "in the order", striking the numbers 1., 2., and 3., and inserting a statement that, because of the complexity of the System, they will be considered in total as the options present themselves in the best interests of the State of Wisconsin.

Professor Culver, President of TAUWF, noted there is a resolution before its delegate assembly commending the administration on handling this problem and giving the responsibility to the Governor and the Legislature for the determination of this very important policy. He stated TAUWF would not indicate

that it was going to approve of what they might favor and are greatly concerned about the impact of any phase down of institutional programs on the faculty. He stated TAUWF supports the report and the work that Central Administration has done.

Professor Finman, UW-Madison, commended the position of the Task Force and Central Administration's report.

Regent Barkla stated that, if we have to phase down or phase out, it just makes sense that we could start with the doctoral cluster and Extension; because, in her opinion, we should start with the programs which are going to have the least effect on denial of access and the least effect on economic displacement of the institutions involved.

Senior Vice President Percy responded to Regent Barkla that the most effective thing that could be done would be to eliminate the part "to be taken in the order". He continued the Administration placed them in an order which was not a pecking order but a processing order, and that they were placed exactly for the reasons Chancellor Fort so eloquently outlined. He continued "let the Legislature then say who goes to the scaffold and let them say it clearly in terms of the criteria we have established". He stated that on page 21 it says, "The state may select multiples from among these, or several of these"; and we are telling them we will have to approach it in a phased way, if they give us multiple directives.

He stated that he did not think that the language as stated in any way constrains the Legislature. Indeed, we are trying to set up the decisions in such a way that they could proceed through that. He noted it is conceivable that the Governor may recommend the first and the third options, or he may recommend the second and third. The Administration's view was that this was a processing order and not a priority order judging the relative merit of the institutions involved.

Regent Lavine stated that earlier, as mentioned by Regent Hales, it became clear that the intention of the document was that items 1., 2., and 3. are modified by all the explanatory material that comes after them. He stated that, in some way, he would like to see item 1. absolutely mandatory. He noted that the Center System has been the most mistreated. We had an agreement in the last legislative session that they had a certain number of given years to reach a target agreed upon between the University and the Legislature in terms of the amount of dollars spent. He continued that, every time a student goes to a Center System campus, the Legislature on the one hand says, "Oh, absolutely, we are going to let you have four years to get to a certain point"; and then the next year they say, "We will probably close you in the Fall."

Regent Lavine stated he was not worried about the order here because he did not see how it is possible to write this document in such a way as to state in three and one-half inches all that comes on the pages that follow. He noted that, on the pages that follow, it says "We have in process a review of the doctoral campuses." He stated he felt a little put upon that some people are claiming that this is something new and hoisted upon us. He observed that,



ever since he had been a Regent, and certainly since the merged system had been formed, President Weaver, Central Administration, the Chancellors, and everyone else has been about the job of seeing that Wisconsin has been changing. He stated he would contend that Regent Barkla would also not like an absolute order of only those three things that she mentioned.

Regent Solberg stated that he would have some of the same types of concerns as Regent Barkla. He noted that, reading this very technical wording, it sounds as though there is a pecking order and that the two doctoral colleges are going to be the last to be picked on and that the so-called hinterlands are going to be first to be picked on.

Regent Fish commented that he did not believe that the Legislature and the Governor are trying to make any decision as to where the University is going to go five years, ten years, or twenty years from now; and that we have to look precisely at what they are looking at. He stated they are looking at a fiscal crisis in State Government; and they are looking at ways to try to balance the budget, or if they had a tax increase, to make it as minimal as possible. Regent Fish said that we should stress the point he made before that the only way you are going to get a substantial savings for the State of Wisconsin is by enrollment limitations; and that there aren't going to be any savings in the 1975-77 or 1977-79 biennium or the 1993-95 biennium from some of the things that are in these documents.

Regent Fish stated that, if you look at item 1. under paragraph D., (a mandate to phase out or otherwise provide alternative use for a specific number of UW Centers selected on the basis of criteria stated in this report) you must decide what they will be looking at at the other end of State Street. What's the first question they are going to ask? How much savings can we get from item 1.? If there are no savings or very limited savings under item 1., they will immediately go to item 2. He stated we are debating semantics that are not going to be that substantive when it comes before the Governor and the Legislature. He stated he would prefer to adopt the Task Force Report as written without alteration in the knowledge that these other factors that have been mentioned will take precedence over any semantic changes which we may now make which we may think are earth shaking but really have little, if any, effect on the matter.

Chancellor Young, UW-Madison, stated he would not take part in arguing that one activity is more important than another; and that, if the Board today adopts the proposed amendment and suggests the doctoral campuses should go in order to save something else, then you are telling one of the most distinguished faculties in the United States that what they are doing is relatively unimportant. He urged the Board not to do that.

Regent DeBardleben stated that he supported the concept that the document should be adopted as it is--that access is important and that these are decisions that are going to be made in another arena. He stated he would support what Regent Fish said, that these criteria are reasonable and should be supported.

The question was put on the amendment, and it failed on a roll call vote, with Regents Barkla and Hales voting "Aye" (2), with Regents DeBardleben, Dixon, Fish, Lavine, McNamara, Neshek, Pelisek, Renk, Sandin, Solberg, Walter, Williams, and Zancanaro voting "No" (13), and with Regent Thompson absent.

The question was put on Resolution 999, and it was voted on a roll call vote, with Regents Barkla, DeBardleben, Dixon, Fish, Hales, Lavine, McNamara, Neshek, Pelisek, Renk, Sandin, Solberg, Walter, Williams, and Zancanaro voting "Aye" (15), with no "Noes", and with Regent Thompson absent.

President Pelisek stated that this will go down in higher education as a most remarkable document, and that he would like to add the commendation of the members of the Board to Central Administration and President Weaver for the preparation of this document and his personal commendation to the members of the Board for their consideration and their decision to adopt it on a unanimous vote.

President Weaver expressed his gratitude to the Board and stated that it was a tremendous tribute to the staff that has worked very hard on the document. He stated he and the members of his staff were very grateful that the Board found this document an adequate statement to lay before the people of Wisconsin on what probably is the most crucial challenge of higher education in this state's history.

Regent Williams stated that, in the last ten years, we have seen the building of UW-Parkside, UW-Green Bay, and Medford in the Center System; and that she found it very difficult to believe that the Legislature is going to go through a process of unbuilding between 1975 and 1985. She also noted that there might be a possibility that, instead of that kind of unbuilding in order to reduce the scope of the educational enterprise as the Governor of the State of Maine has suggested, the Board of Regents be phased out and the functions of the Board be turned over to a committee of the Legislature and the Governor.

Regent Sandin inquired as to how much the work of the massive Task Force had cost the University. Senior Vice President Percy responded that, if no value were put on the time of the people involved, he would estimate \$50,000. President Weaver added that, if you put the value of the time of the people involved in, it would be approximately \$250,000.

(The meeting recessed at 11:35 A.M., and reconvened  
at 11:45 A.M.)

---

President Pelisek announced the next item on the agenda is the Report of the Regents Task Force on University Governance and Collective Bargaining and requested the Chairman of the Task Force, Regent Lavine, to make the presentation.

Regent Lavine noted that, over the past eleven months, the Task Force had reviewed extensively the Wisconsin System for Public Employees, most of whom have the entitlement to bargain collectively, but does not necessarily mean that they have exercised that right. The Task Force also looked at the nation as a whole and perceived that almost all the states have passed enabling legislation which does not require that faculty members bargain collectively, but which entitles them to do so.

Critical to the report are the items found on page 27 thereof, which say that collective bargaining will not deal with matters of institutional autonomy, missions, tenure, academic freedom and diversity of opinion, the merit system for salary determination, Chapter 36 of the statutes--the merger law. Recognition therein of the responsibilities and authority of the Regents, the President, the Chancellors, the faculty and the staff and students and provisions of the merger law will take precedence over collective bargaining legislation. He noted the minority opinion indicates that bargaining should be open ended, and that one could argue that it is simply not possible to separate them.

He stated the situation of the University of Wisconsin in 1975 is not akin to the labor movement of the 1930's, when there was little, if any, participation available for employees in any kind of decision making for them to articulate their views. By contrast, academic institutions in this country and this state have developed long-time methods that are a different form of collective bargaining, a form more appropriate for a university called "shared governance" in various forms throughout the System. He noted that, on some campuses, it is the faculty and on other campuses it is a university-wide senate.

He noted that the State of Wisconsin has a weak statute in this respect--a statute with broad entitlement to every constituency in the university to play a major part in the way the System operates. It also gives broad entitlement to all kinds of academic matters to the faculty and also involves the students and others. He stated the report attempts to make as broad as possible the faculty and academic staff's choices and is allowing time for Chapter 36 to be used. It also insures preservation of the critical parts of the University that operate under Chapter 37.

He noted that some people will argue that, over time, a system of decision making for economic factors cannot run side by side with a different system of decision making for academic matters. He stated this is not necessarily the case, as the Task Force had faculty from Rutgers University state that they had a two-fold system, which does work and which does not necessarily double up on the other. He stated there is great reservation on the part of many people as to whether collective bargaining in higher education is wise at all. He noted that many people appeared before the Task Force with substantial expertise and argued that it was wrong for the good of higher education. They were not arguing whether or not people should have the right.

He pointed out that we are not talking here, and we ought not to discuss in great depth, about whether or not the faculty should organize to bargain. We are simply saying do they, like other public employees, have the right; and if so, what is the best method if that right is going to be considered by the Legislature.

Regent Lavine moved adoption of the following resolution, and the motion was seconded by Regent Walter:

Resolution 1000: That the Board of Regents concurs with the Report of the Task Force on University Governance and Collective Bargaining finding that "collective bargaining as it presently operates in industry and in public employment may not be compatible with the 'shared governance' traditions and practices of higher education." Therefore, the Regents do not endorse the extension of those forms of collective bargaining to the University of Wisconsin System; and

That, if the State Legislature is to give consideration to some form of collective bargaining for the University of Wisconsin System, the Board of Regents endorses and supports the report of the Regents Task Force on University Governance and Collective Bargaining, which recommends legislation separate from state and municipal collective bargaining laws, with limited scope of bargaining and which recognizes and protects the traditions and practices of shared governance in the University of Wisconsin System. The UW System administration is authorized to submit a legislative proposal to implement the report.

Regent Fish made the following statement: "I have carefully studied the report of the collective bargaining task force. Clearly they thoroughly studied this complex and perplexing problem and they are to be commended for their diligence and the opportunity for input they gave to conflicting views.

"It would be pleasant if there might be some satisfactory solution suggested, but it would be my observation that certain facts ought to preclude positive affirmative action by this Board.

"Indeed, I question the propriety of our action in giving birth to a document that could be interpreted as suggesting to the Legislature that collective bargaining may serve a useful purpose in University affairs. The Legislature, the body that will ultimately decide this regardless of our action, is now studying the thorny problem of collective bargaining and related no strike provisions for public employees. History proves that enabling legislation usually leads to positive action.

"I am concerned that some may view that certain issues can be isolated as economic issues and subject to bargaining while others are identified as non-economic and not subject to bargaining. In actuality all issues must be considered economic to one degree or another, and we should not delude ourselves into believing that any limitations are practical or enforceable.

"As a Board of Regents our responsibility is to every student, every faculty member, every member of administration, and every citizen of this state. I fail to see how adoption of this proposal can benefit any of these groups.

"Faculty in the long run cannot find it advantageous. Despite the support of TAUWF--a group representing less than 15% of eligible members--adoption of this document would positively destroy faculty governance. It would erode or destroy the relationships between faculty and campus administration and between campus and central administration.

"Instead of the current friendly peer relationship, we would find administration in an adversary position. The Board of Regents would become even more impotent. Budgeting and planning would suffer.

"The theory of merit within the context of faculty governance would die an ignominious death.

"Clearly tenure, departmental input and academic freedom would suffer or perish. A substantial percentage of the faculty recognizes they cannot have it both ways.

"Students cannot be gainers if the end result is attrition or destruction of faculty governance--a system that has given the University of Wisconsin a reputation envied throughout higher education. Those few institutions that have embraced collective bargaining have not prospered under it. The University of Wisconsin is in the business of the deliverance of the maximum quality in higher education. Anything that interrupts that goal is unfair to the students.

"And finally, the citizens that pick up 50% of the cost of higher education must view with alarm the deterioration of an institution they often criticize but usually admire. To superimpose collective bargaining over the other citizen concerns could cause serious reevaluation of the dedication of this state to its university.

"I am not enamored with the suggestion that we ought to preempt legislative action by supporting a less harmful position. We should not prejudge what the Legislature might do, we should recommend what we believe ought to be done. A man proclaiming innocence does not tell the judge, 'I am not guilty, but if you find me guilty, I'd rather be shot than hanged.'

"There is one aspect of this that does disturb me. Concluding that, indeed, it is not in the best interests of any of the involved parties to support collective bargaining, can we deny collective bargaining rights to anyone? I submit that that is not a judgment we should make.

"While I am convinced collective bargaining would sap the strength of our university, we must continue to bring to the attention of Wisconsin the necessity to properly compensate our faculty within the rules we now utilize. It doesn't make for easy logic to view the consistently higher percentage salary increases allocated for other state tax-supported employees.

"I would, therefore, move that the report of the Board of Regents Collective Bargaining Task Force be forwarded to the Legislative Education Committees with an indication that the Board of Regents are opposed to faculty governance collective bargaining."

The motion was seconded by Regent Neshek.

Regent McNamara stated that he would like to make a comment and to clarify his own position, for the record. He noted that Regent Fish's motion was quite clear in that it is an outright condemnation of collective bargaining for faculty governance and as such is a fine 19th century document. He stated he was troubled by the original motion, even though he supported it, because, in supporting it, there might be those simplistic minds who would say that he was supporting that and was opposed to collective bargaining. He stated he was for the motion because he recognized the difference between the way collective bargaining is carried on in the industrial environment and the environment of the University.

He continued, the reason he supported the motion of the Task Force is that the University is a different institution than an industrial enterprise. The University is essentially a collection of students and faculty operating as peer groups in a cooperative environment, and the faculty has certain prerogatives or rights that do not accrue to the workers in private industry. For example, the faculty, through shared governance, participates in the selection of its own department heads, their own supervisors. They set their own hours of work by and large, and that does not happen in industry. They pretty much determine the content of their jobs in terms of teaching assignments, etc. That is as it should be, but it does not happen in industry. Through their elected representatives at various times, they participate in the decision-making processes of the University.

He noted that, if you compare this Board of Regents to the board of directors of a corporation, the faculty participates in the deliberations of the Board of Regents and that does not happen in private enterprise. He noted they have control over the tenure system--they administer their own seniority system--and again, that is not quite true of private industry. He noted that, in private industry, one can be discharged or laid off with as little as an hour's notice; whereas it takes a year with full salary for a faculty member to be relieved of his position, which again is as it should be. He continued that he was not denying the validity of collective bargaining in the university setting and did not share the feelings of doom that Regent Fish brought forth. He pointed out that some of the companies with which he had bargained are in a better financial position than they were before bargaining. This may mean that the University might be more healthy afterwards and not be destroyed in the process.

He pointed out there is a difference because of shared governance and because of the different relationship of faculty to the groups that normally comprise it. He also pointed out that, in the Task Force discussion, there was the rather naive assumption that there was an interest in a model collective bargaining. He stated there is no such thing--there are almost as many models as there are people who bargain. The craft unions have one form of bargaining, the teamsters another, the plant industry has still another, the railway unions have another, and the union with which he he was associated has another--so that there is no one model. He stated what really happens is that everyone involved

in the bargaining process approaches the matter pragmatically and adjusts their bargaining techniques to meet the situation of their particular enterprise or industry. He stated what the motion does is simply transfer the pragmatic approach of private industry and the state union movement to the academic halls. He stated he was making these remarks to justify his vote in favor of the resolution, because it might appear to his constituents that he was voting against collective bargaining.

Regent Neshek stated that his opposition to collective bargaining relates only to collective bargaining in higher education and not to the other areas in industry which have been referred to. He continued he was going to support Regent Fish's motion for a number of reasons. He stated it was his honest opinion and belief that, if collective bargaining becomes a reality, we are going to have many, many adverse results--results which will be much more adverse than some of the things which might happen which were discussed earlier in the meeting in the phase out report.

He stated we would have an elimination of the concept of shared governance if collective bargaining were approved. It sets up an adversary relationship between the faculty and the Board. He stated it would eliminate the merit system which we now have in our university system. He continued collective bargaining connotes working for the collective interest of all members; consequently, merit pay will soon be bargained out and the quality of our institutions will diminish, and mediocrity and stagnation will overtake us. He stated we can look forward to a relationship between the faculty and the Board which will be highly structured and legalistic. Regent Neshek said the role of the Board of Regents will diminish because negotiations would soon be carried on by the ultimate decision makers--not this Board but by the representatives of the chief executive of the state and the Legislature. He continued that, if these things are the natural occurrence of collective bargaining, he did not believe it to be in the best interest of higher education.

Regent Neshek read excerpts from a letter directed to Professor Arthur Kelman, Chairman of the Department of Plant Pathology, UW-Madison, from Carl H. Breckman, Professor of Plant Pathology, University of Rhode Island, where they have had experience in operating under the collective bargaining procedure: "Dear Arthur: I shudder at answering your inquiry about collective bargaining, but I shall try. I must say at the outset that I was not in favor of collective bargaining initially, although I joined the Union, AAUP, as soon as it became official. I still have grave reservations about the whole collective bargaining process.

"There is no doubt, without some system for ferreting out abuses and discrimination, any system is unfair to some individuals. What we have done to reduce the possibility of unfair treatment of individuals by chairmen, deans, and the big A is to substitute a very highly structured system of student-faculty peer, chairman and administrator evaluation. Actually, this was initiated by our faculty senate, which is still healthy. The problem is that once the bargaining unit checks it out, it went into the bargaining process. The Board of Regents presented its demands; and as a result, the whole process became highly

structured and legalistic. Once in the contract it is there to stay, as is, except through modification by the collective bargaining process. The net result of collective bargaining is, in my view then, that all properties become highly structured and legalistic--no one dares move without getting proper legal advice.

"Furthermore, the faculty may think it is going to achieve more clout and increased salary pick up, and it may. But there is another side in the bargaining process, and one pays a price for better salaries. Personally, I prefer a little less salary, if indeed we achieve higher salaries because of bargaining, in order to retain more flexibility. I fear that the university will stagnate in the highly structured system we have achieved through collective bargaining.

"With respect to the Faculty Senate, the officers of the AAUP unit and the Faculty Senate have coordinated very well and have hammered out areas of responsibility that both sides respect. AAUP is interested chiefly in hammering out contracts, and they work hard at that--I do not disparage their effort. The Senate is responsible for curriculum matters, educational policy and has a strong input with respect to budgetary priority. Both organizations seem to be working well and cooperating to do jobs for which they are responsible. It is not that I disapprove of how AAUP functions, I disapprove of what I find a colorful force toward stagnancy and mediocrity and the enormous load of red tape and form filling that has been put upon us. I do not feel that collective bargaining has enhanced the quality of the educational process.

"The overriding concern of AAUP was, and continues to be, faculty salaries. It has made the educational process far more cumbersome. It has insisted on rewarding mediocre performance to the same degree as outstanding performance. The process of bargaining does not require an adversary relationship. Therefore, the individuals who champion the cause intend to rise to positions of responsibility and often are those who have a basic disrespect for any power but their own, and tend to be the street fighter, the bitter, the disenchanting, and the resentful. I don't think this kind of atmosphere helps the educational process at all. Go cautiously. With warm regards."

Regent Barkla noted that one of the options presented by the Task Force Report, if that is passed by the Legislature rather than the bill which is in the Legislature supported by TAUWF, is the provision for a no fair share of their dues. She noted the option open to the people involved is that they could participate in collective bargaining on economic issues, but would not pay for the efforts of the people who are doing the collective bargaining. She stated she believed that Regent McNamara would agree with her that that is not one of the options that ought to be in a collective bargaining bill. She stated she supported the concept of collective bargaining for the faculty.

Regent Solberg stated that, all through the meetings of the Task Force, he was concerned with one primary question--what would be in the best interest of higher education in the State of Wisconsin? Should or should not there be collective bargaining? He stated he too questioned the inevitability of the



conclusions of the report, and he still questioned whether it is inevitable. After weighing the matter very carefully, he was concerned that, if there is to be some type of legislation, we suggest to the Legislature what we think would be in the best interest of education--this type of collective bargaining. He noted the form of the resolution that has been suggested does show that we are concerned about some forms of collective bargaining, and that we ought to pass something affirmative.

Regent Fish noted that his resolution did say that the Report of the Collective Bargaining Task Force would be forwarded to the Education Committees of the Legislature; and although we would be indicating that we are opposed to faculty governance collective bargaining, they would have the results of the efforts of the Task Force before them, in the same way as they would if it was passed. He noted that, if it is passed, the assumption is that we support it. If we do not support it and still submit the Task Force Report, it would be obvious that, if they are going to do something, it is less undesirable than other methods.

Regent DeBardleben stated that he was in strong agreement with many of the objections to collective bargaining voiced by Regents Fish and Neshek, but did not believe that it is going to be an effective way of improving or even maintaining the quality of this institution as far as faculty salaries are concerned; because he did not believe the result of the collective bargaining between the Regents and the faculty is going to carry any more weight with the Joint Finance Committee than presenting a Regents' budget.

Regent DeBardleben stated he was concerned about the language of subsection 4. of Section 36.09 of the Statutes which provides that the faculty of each institution, subject to the responsibility on the part of this Board and subject to the immediate governance of these institutions, actively participates in institutional policy development. He noted the language states that the faculty has the primary responsibility for academic and educational activities and faculty personnel matters. He continued that he felt this is proper language and the way it should be, and that he did not believe that the collective bargaining process is going to result in watering that down.

He noted the proposal does not mandate the faculty to organize or collectively bargain--it gives them the option, if adopted. Regent DeBardleben said he would hope that they would not exercise that option; that he personally hoped they would feel that the union collective bargaining concept is incompatible with the independence of the scholar and with the community of scholars concept that would open an authoritarianism that he found repugnant in an academic atmosphere. He stated this does not jam it down their throats, and that he felt it would be unreasonable for us to oppose their right to do it if they choose. He stated that, if collective bargaining in higher education is going to be approved, we should make our voice known as to what form we think it ought to take.

Regent DeBardleben stated that Regent Lavine and the Task Force are entitled to great credit for the work they have done, and that they have shown great discrimination and sensitivity to the needs of the institution and faculty

in working out the proposal. He stated that, if we are to have collective bargaining in the University, this is something that we would have to recommend.

Regent Hales stated that, for the past several years, we have read about the trend of many of the faculties in many of the universities in the country in adopting collective bargaining. He stated that we would be ignoring our responsibilities as policy makers of higher education in this state if we did not react in a positive way to this trend. He noted that, when we look at the history of the University of Wisconsin, it has a tradition of being one of the universities that has been in the forefront in matters concerned with social change; and that we would not be meeting our responsibilities if we turned our back on this important issue and forfeited any input that we may have. He stated we might not be pleased with collective bargaining, and we might not be pleased with the trend, but we cannot say that we don't like it. Regent Hales said there are many things about which he had reservations and that it is not a perfect document; but at the present time, it seems to be the best posture that we have to meet the issue head on.

(The meeting recessed at 12:30 P.M. for lunch, and resumed at 1:05 P.M.)

---

Regent Sandin inquired if the Task Force had taken a straw vote or a sampling of the Legislature to determine whether or not collective bargaining is going to be inevitable. Regent Lavine responded that, in his opinion, both houses will consider a bill of this sort; but whether or not it would pass, he did not know. Regent Fish stated there is no question that the bill will be considered and there is not much question but that it will go through the Assembly; but he felt there is a substantial question whether it will go through the Senate. He stated he was not opposed to collective bargaining; but that, if indeed there is a faculty right for collective bargaining, there may not be the burden on us to initiate that step.

Regent Sandin stated that she had fourteen years of collective bargaining experience at the secondary school level and had many personal reservations about this. She stated she felt that every person who works, whether they work in public industry or private, should have a right to bargain if they want to. She continued that, if we do go to collective bargaining, we are going to see, as in the secondary school system, one state setting the stage for the rest.

She stated she shared the hesitation of Regent Neshek concerning the role of the Board of Regents, when we are not the body that levies the tax. We are doing the bargaining up to a certain point, but we have no power to set the budget. She continued that we would soon be bypassed, as school boards are getting bypassed; that the teachers will go directly to the Legislature; and that she had great reservations about that.

Regent Lavine stated that the city school boards can go to the City Council and the Board of Control, but in our situation, we can negotiate only after the Governor's budget comes in and the basic amount of state monies available are set. He noted the proposal for public employees provides that the Department of Administration would be the representative of the Regents and they negotiate in consort with the Joint Committee on Employee Relations. The proposal worked out with the legislative committees does not go to the Legislature for amendment--it goes to them to be voted up or down, like any other kind of resolution. He emphasized that the Joint Committee on Employee Relations is not involved in the negotiations in a direct way, but they do funnel a proposal to the Legislature.

Regent Sandin observed that what we are going to do this afternoon is going to have a more far-reaching effect on the University of Wisconsin than what we did this morning.

Regent Williams stated that she questioned how much collective bargaining can do to improve the process of education, noting that, as a member of a union, she had benefited in some concrete ways from membership in a teachers' organization and from the collective bargaining which has been derived from that organization. She stated she did not feel that the idea of collective bargaining or organizing to do it does very much in terms of thinking about students or considering various improvements in the process of education. She stated she felt we have to recognize that faculty members may feel that this is very important to them; and that they should have the right to proceed with collective bargaining, if they feel that way.

She stated that we ought to put ourselves in the role of what could happen under the bill, and ask if we are capable of acting in the category of employer. She stated she did not see how we could say to the Legislature in one breath, "we are opposed to the concept of collective bargaining"; and then in the next breath say, "if we do have collective bargaining, we are capable of performing the role of employer and are equipped and qualified to carry out that role."

Professor Culver, President of TAUWF, urged those who have some reticence about allowing the faculty to do this to take the point of view that he believes prevails among the faculty. He pointed out that the faculty are professionals and will not bargain away professional things. They value tenure, their academic freedom, and governance rights; and that these are high priority things for them as they come to the bargaining table. He stated that TAUWF has been looking at the matter for five or six years, and their position now has come around to recognize that it could be a very great possibility that collective bargaining can assist faculty in doing their job better. He stated it will not make them any less professional or make them give up those things that make being a professor a very unique opportunity in this world. He urged the Board to pass the Task Force resolution and endorse the idea that the faculty should have the right to bargain if they so desire.

Professor Finman, speaking on behalf of the System Faculty Council, stated that it takes no position on whether the Legislature ought to adopt a bill authorizing collective bargaining; but with one dissenting vote, takes the position that, if any legislation is adopted, it ought to guarantee two things--that each institution be entitled to be a separate bargaining unit and that the structure, procedures, processes, and authority of faculty governance be excluded from bargaining. He stated the resolution would do that. The Task Force proposal is along those lines; and therefore, the Council supports it.

Regent Lavine stated, for the record, that there is a very real possibility of federal legislation giving entitlement to the faculty for collective bargaining; and that the only way the state could have an option on that is if they happen to have a different format present. He noted we are not debating here the question of whether or not the faculty will choose to organize but that they have that entitlement. He stated we ought to support the Task Force Report so we are certain that those things are handled in the manner which the University has developed over quite some period of time.

He noted that, throughout the eleven months of the Task Force study, he had stated his views on but a couple of occasions, because he was acting as a referee and that was enough of a task. His own views are that the faculty should have the right to form a collective bargaining unit. He continued that, if he were asked if he would support collective bargaining for faculty and encourage them to join a bargaining unit, he would have to say unequivocally "No", not only for the University's benefit but in many ways for the faculty's benefit. He stated that, looking at the approach to wage settlement akin to the timetable used for other public employees with some modifications, might meet some of the concerns the faculty have raised. He stated he believed the Task Force Report is the only way to go.

Regent Fish stated that he was not questioning whether the faculty should or should not have the right to bargain collectively if the Legislature so designates, but that his point was that we should not be making that evaluation. He noted that many of the members of the Board have severe reservations about the matter, and questioned why we would recommend something that we have so many reservations about. He stated he did not want to vote for a proposal that says, "We don't approve of it; we think it will impair the University; but if you are going to pass it, this would be less harmful than another way."

Regent DeBardleben inquired if the resolution would be more acceptable if paragraph 1. were deleted; and if there were substituted in place of it essentially the words, "the Board of Regents expresses no opinion as to whether collective bargaining should be extended to the University of Wisconsin System." Regent Fish responded that he would be happier with that resolution, but that he was still concerned with our taking a recommended course of action.

Regent Lavine noted that the bill presently involved in this area now resides in the Assembly Labor Committee; that Regent Fish's resolution would be for the Assembly Education Committee; and he asked if it was the intention to have them separated. Regent Fish responded that he was not suggesting that we

draft legislation; but he was suggesting that, at this point, the report be for whatever action or information the Education Committee deems best.

The question was put on the proposed substitute resolution, and it failed on a roll call vote, with Regents Dixon, Fish, Neshek, and Sandin voting "Aye" (4), with Regents Barkla, DeBardleben, Hales, Lavine, McNamara, Pelisek, Renk, Solberg, Walter, Williams, and Zancanaro voting "No" (11), and with Regent Thompson absent.

Regent Neshek moved adoption of the following substitute amendment to the principal motion, and the motion was seconded by Regent Dixon:

That the Board of Regents opposes in principle the concept of collective bargaining for faculty and academic staff, and views it as potentially damaging to the more essential concept and tradition of shared governance within the University.

If, however, the Legislature determines that collective bargaining for the faculty of the UW System is in the public interest and is intent on enacting legislation providing for such bargaining, then the Board of Regents urges the Legislature and appropriate committees thereof:

- 1) to review the report of the Special Regent Committee on Collective Bargaining; and
- 2) to enact the model statute based on that report which is attached to this resolution.

Regent Lavine stated that it would not be wise for this Board to say, on the one hand, that they oppose the principle of collective bargaining and then find themselves in the legislative arena presenting a proposal which comes under that resolution. Regent Neshek stated that there have been many Board members expressing opinions and reservations concerning collective bargaining; and if we have those reservations, we should not be afraid to tell the Legislature that. He stated we should tell them we are opposed to the principle because of these reservations, and then advise them that, if they are going to enact it, we feel that the best model is the one developed by the Task Force.

Regent Dixon stated that he seconded the motion because it appeared to him to be a most effective compromise which does not really dilute the original resolution and is something we can all live with. He stated that he did not feel that we are deserting our principles, but are coming out with a definite stand. He continued that he felt we have something which is rather clean that we should be able to pull off.

Regent DeBardleben stated that it is clean only if you are willing to disregard the right of the faculty to decide whether or not it should have collective bargaining. He stated the original resolution does provide that if the Legislature decides to enact a bill for collective bargaining. It does give the faculty the right to decide whether or not it wants to form a collective bargaining unit. He stated that, if the Legislature would follow the resolution proposed by Regent Neshek, the faculty would be deprived of that right.

Regent Hales stated that it was his belief that the motion hits at the heart of the faculty's right to do what they wish and seems to attack the whole concept of collective bargaining. He stated he felt it would be damaging to this Board to stop that kind of bargaining, and for that reason, he intended to vote against the motion.

The question was put on the proposed substitute resolution, and it failed on a roll call vote, with Regents Dixon, Fish, and Neshek voting "Aye" (3), with Regents Barkla, DeBardeleben, Hales, Lavine, McNamara, Pelisek, Renk, Sandin, Solberg, Walter, Williams, and Zancanaro voting "No" (12), and with Regent Thompson absent.

Regent Neshek moved that the resolution be amended by adding, at the end of paragraph 1., the following sentence: "The Regents take no position on the advisability of authorizing other forms of collective bargaining for the University of Wisconsin System faculty and academic staff." The motion was seconded by Regent Fish.

Regent DeBardeleben inquired as to the meaning of the phrase "other forms of collective bargaining" as used in the amendment. Regent Neshek responded that the original resolution said that we concurred with the Task Force finding that collective bargaining as it currently operates in industry and public employment may not be compatible with the shared governance tradition, and the amendment says that we take no position on forms other than those in industry and public employment.

After a short discussion, the question was put on the proposed amendment, and it failed on a roll call vote, with Regents Fish and Neshek voting "Aye" (2), with Regents Barkla, DeBardeleben, Dixon, Hales, Lavine, McNamara, Pelisek, Renk, Sandin, Solberg, Walter, Williams, and Zancanaro voting "No" (13), and with Regent Thompson absent.

Regent Solberg moved to amend the first sentence of paragraph 1. of the resolution after the word "education" to add the words "and would not be in the best interest of higher education in the State of Wisconsin"; amend paragraph 2. to strike the words "to give consideration to", and substitute "to mandate"; and strike the words "endorses and supports the Report of the Regents Task Force on University Governance and Collective Bargaining which recommends", and substituting the following: "If the State Legislature is to mandate some form of collective bargaining for the University of Wisconsin System, the Board of Regents recommends legislation separate from state and municipal collective bargaining laws, with limited scope of bargaining and which recognizes and protects the tradition and practices of shared governance in the University of Wisconsin System. The University of Wisconsin System is authorized to submit a legislative proposal to implement the report." The motion was seconded by Regent Williams.

The proposed amendment failed on a roll call vote with Regents Sandin, Solberg, and Williams voting "Aye" (3), with Regents Barkla, DeBardeleben, Dixon, Fish, Hales, Lavine, McNamara, Pelisek, Renk, Walter, and Zancanaro voting "No" (11), and with Regent Thompson absent.

Regent Fish moved to table the resolution, and the motion was seconded by Regent Neshek. The motion to table failed on a voice vote.

The question was put on the principal motion, Resolution 1000, and it was voted, with Regents DeBardleben, Hales, Lavine, McNamara, Pelisek, Renk, Sandin, Solberg, Walter, Williams, and Zancanaro voting "Aye" (11), with Regents Barkla, Dixon, Fish, and Neshek voting "No" (4), and with Regent Thompson absent.

- - -

(The meeting recessed into Executive Session at 2:05 P.M. to consider a personnel matter.)

---

(The meeting reconvened at 2:13 P.M.)

President Pelisek reported that the following resolution had been adopted in Executive Session:

Resolution 1001: That, upon recommendation of the President of the UW System and the Chancellor of UW-Whitewater, Edwin G. Speir, Jr. be appointed Vice Chancellor and Dean of Faculties, UW-Whitewater, beginning August 1, 1975, at an annual salary of \$32,500.

- - -

The meeting adjourned at 2:14 P.M.

J. S. Holt, Secretary

5/5/75

(NOTE: Copies of the President's Report to the Board of Regents in response to the Governor's Request on Reducing the Scope of the University of Wisconsin System and the Report of the Regents Task Force on University Governance and Collective Bargaining are on file with the papers of this meeting.)

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING  
of the  
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

Madison, Wisconsin

April 18, 1975

This is a summary of the major actions taken by the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System on the above date. Full minutes of the meeting will be available within a month at the main library or archives on each campus of the University System and the Legislative Reference Bureau of the State Capitol.

Subject Index

	<u>Pages</u>
A. REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM	
1. Report to the Board of Regents in Response to the Governor's Request on Reducing the Scope of the University of Wisconsin System	1-2
2. Report of the Regents Task Force on University Governance and Collective Bargaining	2-3
Executive Session Action (Appointment of Vice Chancellor UW-Whitewater)	3



SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING  
of the  
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

Madison, Wisconsin

Held in the Clarke Smith Room, 1820 Van Hise Hall  
Friday, April 18, 1975, 9:05 A.M.

President Pelisek presiding.

PRESENT: Regents Barkla, DeBardleben, Dixon, Fish, Hales, Lavine, McNamara, Neshek, Pelisek, Renk, Sandin, Solberg, Walter, Williams, and Zancanaro.

ABSENT: Regent Thompson.

- - -

A. REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

1. President Pelisek stated the purpose of the Special Meeting was to hear the report of the President of the System in response to our directive to him to provide the necessary studies and appropriate report that we might subsequently transmit to the Governor of the State of Wisconsin and the Legislature in response to the Governor's request of January 8, 1975, to bring to him and the Legislature a plan for phasing out, phasing down, or consolidating institutions and programs, including the proposed language to be inserted in the 1975-77 biennial budget, authorizing implementation of our proposed plan.

President Weaver's statement and the discussion which followed will be found in the full minutes on file in each library.

Regent McNamara moved adoption of the following resolution, the motion was seconded by Regents Lavine and Sandin, and it was voted:

Resolution 999: That, upon recommendation of the President of the System, the Board of Regents approves the "President's Report to the Board of Regents in response to the Governor's Request on Reducing the Scope of the University of Wisconsin System", dated April 18, 1975, as its formal submission to the Governor and the Legislature and directs the President of the Board to transmit it accordingly.

2. President Pelisek called upon Regent Lavine to present the Report of the Regent Task Force on University Governance and Collective Bargaining. The report of Regent Lavine, the discussion which ensued, and the Report of the Task Force will be found in the full minutes on file in each library.

Regent Lavine moved adoption of the following resolution and the motion was seconded by Regent Walter:

Resolution 1000: That the Board of Regents concurs with the Report of the Task Force on University Governance and Collective Bargaining finding that "collective bargaining as it presently operates in industry and in public employment may not be compatible with the 'shared governance' traditions and practices of higher education." Therefore, the Regents do not endorse the extension of those forms of collective bargaining to the University of Wisconsin System; and

That, if the State Legislature is to give consideration to some form of collective bargaining for the University of Wisconsin System, the Board of Regents endorses and supports the report of the Regents Task Force on University Governance and Collective Bargaining, which recommends legislation separate from state and municipal collective bargaining laws, with limited scope of bargaining and which recognizes and protects the traditions and practices of shared governance in the University of Wisconsin System. The UW System administration is authorized to submit a legislative proposal to implement the report.

During the discussion which followed, a substitute resolution by Regent Fish, a substitute resolution by Regent Neshèk, an amendment by Regent Neshèk, an amendment by Regent Solberg, and a motion to table the resolution were all defeated.

The question was put on Resolution 1000, and it was voted, with Regents DeBardeleben, Hales, Lavine, McNamara, Pelisek, Renk, Sandin, Walter, Williams, and Zancanaro voting "Aye" (11), and with Regents Barkla, Dixon, Fish, and

Neshek, voting "No" (4), and with Regent Thompson absent.

- - -

(The meeting recessed into Executive Session  
at 2:05 P.M., to consider a personnel matter.)

---

(The meeting was reconvened at 2:13 P.M.)

President Pelisek reported that the following resolution had been adopted in Executive Session:

Resolution 1001: That, upon the recommendation of the President of the UW System and the Chancellor of UW Whitewater, Edwin G. Speir, Jr. be appointed Vice Chancellor and Dean of Faculties, University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, beginning August 1, 1975, at an annual salary of \$32,500.

- - -

The meeting adjourned at 2:14 P.M.

J. S. Holt, Secretary

4/25/75