

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING, FEBRUARY 16, 1981

ATTENDANCE

Present: Ackley, Bacon, Barnard, Barritt, Baumgarten, Berg, Bishop, D.B. Brown, K. Brown, M. Brown, Browne, Burdi, Cares, Cassidy, Cohen, Crane, Morrison, Duderstadt, Eckert, Esteban, Fraser, Frost, Gordon, Becker, Groves, Hilbert, Hildebrandt, Hinerman, Holland, Martin, Hultquist, J. White, Kelsey, Kirkpatrick, Koran, Naylor, Loup, Lynch-Sauer, Maassab, McClendon, Meyer, Millard, Mosher, Nagy, Nisbett, O'Meara, Parkinson, Pollock, Powers, Romani, Rowe, Rush, Senior, Sisman, Verhey, Vinter, Weiner, N. White, Wyers, Rothman.

Absent: Beck, D.R. Brown, Carpenter, DeKornfeld, Fearn, Flener, Friedman, Gray, Ehrlich, Haddock, Liepman, Lynch, Root, Tek.

MINUTES

The minutes of the Senate Assembly meeting of January 19, 1981 were approved as written.

ANNOUNCE-
MENTS

1. Chairman Naylor announced that Vice President Frye would begin his remarks at the beginning of today's session instead of later as was published in the agenda.
2. Professor Naylor announced that Vice President Brinkerhoff's office has prepared a report on the State Auditor General's report on the University budget (referred to by Professor Kaplan at the January 19, 1981 Assembly meeting). He invited interested Assembly members to read the copy of Vice President Brinkerhoff's report in the SACUA office.

REMARKS
BY VICE
PRESIDENT
FRYE

Chairman Naylor introduced Vice President for Academic Affairs Billy E. Frye who was invited by SACUA to address the Assembly on the subject of redirection.

Mr. Frye began by observing that he had seen a very significant change in attitudes in the community about the University's financial situation since he took office last summer. At that time he had the feeling that many members of the faculty still had a wait-and-see attitude about the financial circumstances, and felt that there was little likelihood that anything was going to change. He said that few members of the University community are now unaware that circumstances have precipitated some very serious budget reductions and program reviews. He added that the question no longer seems to be

one of whether we must make changes, rather will the changes associated with the shrinkage that we are undergoing be better or worse for the University.

Vice President Frye said that he is quite optimistic about the future and would share some of the reasons for his optimism in his remarks. He then made some statements about the current financial situation and some of the attitudes that seem to be developing in the community about this situation.

He reminded the Assembly that by July 1, 1981, the General Fund budget base must be reduced by \$11.2 million below the current year's budget. In the meantime, a number of important changes will have occurred or have been put into motion by the University to deal with this situation:

1. Expenditures for research support, construction and renovation of facilities, purchase of equipment, etc., will have been restricted during this year by more than \$8 million below what we might have spent under normal circumstances.
2. Preparation will have been made for the discontinuation of over 500 staff and faculty positions.
3. A substantial number of programs, both academic and non-academic, will have come under review for either major reduction or even possible elimination.

Mr. Frye then spoke briefly on the long range out-look with respect to the fiscal situation we are in now. He said that although our immediate responses are in a sense stimulated by the immediate short-fall of the State appropriations that we suffered this year, we have to bear in mind that the responses that we are undertaking are a part of the longer range scenario of what we can expect for the University.

In answer to the question - can't we just tighten our belts until the short-term crisis passes? - he said that there are a number of reasons why he felt this solution would be ill-advised

First, he noted that the University has already been through a number of years of "belt-tightening" that has created serious problems in the institution and we cannot afford to extend these problems further. As an example, he mentioned the published figures that show how we have already accumulated a substantial and damaging deficit in our salary programs that we cannot allow to deteriorate any further. He referred to the similar situation with respect to equipment and renovations.

Second, Mr. Frye said that there is no reason to believe tha

the present fiscal difficulties are of the short-term type. He noted that the trend in State appropriations in higher education has been gradually but relentlessly downward for a decade. He said that it would be unrealistic in the present economic climate and given the competing social needs to expect the State to reverse itself sufficiently to resolve our problems even with the best of attitudes toward higher education.

He said that even with positive increments in revenue (i.e., State appropriations, tuition), inflation is likely to continue to erode buying power appreciably faster than growth for the next few years.

Another reason why Mr. Frye felt that we must take strong steps now and not just wait the situation out, has to do with the demographics of the college-age population of the State. He told the Assembly that the 18-22 year old group, from which we draw students, will decline about 20 percent in the next two decades. This leads the Vice President to believe that our traditional sources of revenue will shrink as a result of this decline in two ways.

1. The overall number of students in the University will decrease, with the resulting loss of tuition revenue.
2. The increase in competition among universities and colleges in the State and across the nation for the smaller pool of college applicants will place restraints on the amount of tuition increase that can be levied to make up for the loss in revenue due to a diminishing number of students.

He noted that although we may hope that State appropriations for higher education will not be directly driven by the demographic decline, at least that decline will diminish to some extent the force of our argument that State support should be restored to its former level.

Returning to the general point concerning the need to begin to make adjustments now, Mr. Frye noted that we must not underestimate the constructive value of the psychological pressure created by our present hardship. He said that past experience suggests that we are far more likely to accept the problems that we face, and do something about them, while we are under duress, than we may be if we perceive that the situation has moderated. Mr. Frye added that given the longer range out-look, it would be tragic if we were to lose the force of the current opportunity to constructively address our own future.

Vice President Frye then began his remarks about how we should respond to the situation. In responding to the short and long-term

circumstances, he felt that we have at least four choices. He suggested that the solution for our problems would involve a mixture of all four.

Before discussing those four strategies, he mentioned three objectives that the University should have before it which he felt ought to influence the choice of strategies in coping with the future.

1. We must preserve those units and activities that are most central to our primary goals and missions an an institution.
2. We must at all cost maintain and build the quality of our faculty and of our student body.
3. We must continue to have some capacity (more than we now have) to support important and exciting new developments within the academic realm, and to support growth in those areas where the need for graduates is high or increasing, and the need for new ideas is great.

Vice President Frye then listed four ways in which we might respond to the present deteriorating fiscal situation.

1. Starvation - we could accept low salaries, cease to expend funds to maintain our libraries, laboratory equipment, etc. He believes that this approach would be disastrous in terms of our ability to fulfill the forementioned objectives.
2. Across-the-Board Reductions (or Shrinkage) He said that this has been going on at modest rates for some time and will continue to be a legitimate part of the adjustments we must make in our "smaller but better" future. He said that quality is not the same thing as size, and many of our units can afford to shrink some without the loss of quality, provided that we plan well and provided we make it possible for enrollment to be reduced commensurately with redirections in faculty and staff. He added that he felt that this approach alone provides us little opportunity to recognize differences in need and merit, and provides relatively little support for new program developments at the University. Mr. Frye felt that this approach alone is not a sufficient strategy.
3. Planned Program Reduction Mr. Frye said that we have talked about this for years, we are only now beginning to review programs comprehensively across the University and to decide whether there are some activities that we could justify diminishing or eliminating in order to divert resources to other higher priority needs. He

believes that this is one of the most important components of our adjustment to the future, and the momentum of this mode of decision making must be maintained and even intensified over the next several years.

4. Possible Changes in Funding Sources Mr. Frye reminded the Assembly that it must be kept in mind that the shrinkage that we are talking about is primarily in General Fund supported units, and that it is entirely possible that much of the effect of this enforced shrinkage can be offset if we can identify other funding sources in ways that are commensurate with the over-all objectives of the University. He said that private support must be dramatically increased, and that we must enhance the over-all research environment at the U-M, so that the faculty will have every possible incentive to realize their potential for obtaining support for their scholarly work (teaching and research) from industry, foundations and other private sources as well as from federal and state agencies.

Mr. Frye said that President Shapiro has recently asked Vice President Overberger and him to develop a comprehensive agenda for review and revision of University fiscal and administrative policies that pertain to the research environment and he hoped this would produce some benefits for the matter under discussion.

As an aside, Vice President Frye made it clear that it is his view that this emphasis on research is not tantamount to a de-emphasis on teaching. He feels that anything that can be done to improve the research environment fosters, not hinders, the welfare of teaching at this institution.

Anxieties in the University Community

Mr. Frye then turned to the subject of the anxieties that are inevitably developing within the University community. He said that the circumstances that he had been discussing have produced a great deal of productive discussion. He was particularly grateful to SACUA for the discussions that have centered around their "working paper" on redirection. But he was aware that these circumstances have also created some serious and potentially destructive anxieties in the community. He mentioned several reasons for this:

1. There is uncertainty about the magnitude of the reductions being discussed.
2. Perhaps there is some contagious anxiety among those units that have been identified for review for possible reduction.
3. Legitimate differences in view point about the process

by which the reviews are carried out, and about what the best choices are for ultimately making the necessary reductions.

4. Perhaps lack of clarity by administrators about why we are going through these procedures.
5. Perhaps failure of the administration to give a clear indication of what they believe to be the positive potential of the University to cope constructively with the fiscal problems that we face, to point out the relative well-being of the U-M in comparison with peer institutions and to give some indication of what we believe to be the positive potential of the University to obtain support from other sources.

Mr. Frye said that President Shapiro and he had discussed their reasons for this legitimate anxiety and hope to change the balance of their remarks and communications in order to address some of these concerns and at the same time continue to push forward with the basic objective of redirecting the University.

Reasons for Optimism

Vice President Frye said that he remains very optimistic about the future of the University.

He indicated that although nobody can produce exact figures to indicate how much reduction will have to take place, he realizes that it will be hurtful and difficult. Yet, he felt that the figure is not large enough to generate the level of anxiety that seems to be developing in some areas of the University. Mr. Frye, after thinking about the magnitude of the necessary cuts, believes a figure of perhaps 10-12 percent of the General Fund base might have to be reduced over the next five to ten years. In order to put the amount in perspective, he reminded the Assembly that we are talking only about the General Fund, which is only about one-third of the total budget. Therefore, he feels that the reductions in terms of the total budget is a much smaller percentage, and it is not likely that changes of that magnitude are going to severely damage this institution, particularly as the funds are to be constructively reallocated.

Mr. Frye's second point on his optimism about our future was that the adjustments we are making are volitional. He recognized that the short-fall being experienced this year is certainly not entirely volitional, but after this year, our efforts should be very carefully directed toward what we consider our highest priorities as we continue to undertake the adjustments that he believes we ought to undertake - choices that will be volitional, because he

believes that within the next year or so the State funding situation will improve enough that we will no longer have a catastrophic short-fall as the sole incentive for programmatic shrinkage. He said that the appropriation will not be adequate, but it will not be the negative situation that we are facing now. Mr. Frye noted that even this year when our problem has been aggravated by a negative state appropriation, we must bear in mind that at least \$3 million of the problem we are facing now was generated because we opted for a 9 percent salary program knowing full well that a substantial portion of that program might have to be funded from internal resources. This shows that even now our situation is not entirely driven by circumstances that were beyond our control.

Examples of Positive Choices That We Shall Have to Make

Vice President Frye then discussed several examples of choices that will have to be made on a volitional mode:

1. Augmentation of Annual Salary Program. He said that we must make the choice of whether to further use internal funds to augment our annual salary program in an effort to make up for the slippage that has occurred over the past decade.

Mr. Frye does not yet have university-wide figures on the amount required for this, but had calculated that just in the College of LSA alone it would take in excess of \$1 million to begin to solve the problem of salary slippage during the past ten years.

2. Graduate Student Support. Mr. Frye said that he has received increasingly frequent complaints that the University is unable to provide sufficiently attractive support packages for extraordinary graduate student applicants. This means that we may be less frequently recruiting such individuals. He feels that we must spend a great deal of money for recruiting more competitively with our peer institutions in this area.
3. Urgent and Continuing Need to Upgrade Equipment, Laboratory Facilities, Libraries & Buildings. Vice President Frye said that although many of the major projects that face us will have to be done through special State appropriation, there are vast numbers of intermediate and lower priced projects that will have to be supported by University resources.
4. Understaffing Where Enrollment Growth is Occurring - and Ought to Occur. Mr. Frye said that there are a number of areas in the University (i.e., engineering, economics, business, computer sciences, etc.) where the demand for enrollment is high, the quality of students is high, and

the employer demand is high. He feels that it would be a mistake if the University did not address itself to provide high quality instruction for the increasing number of students in such areas. It must be accomplished by reallocating some instructional resources from some part of the University to other areas of the University. In his opinion, we cannot depend upon external support to handle this situation.

Mr. Frye's final point was one that he considered the most important area of all - the capacity for new program development.

He said that even in a difficult year such as this, he is continually being made aware of important new research and teaching thrusts that must be given a chance to develop on this campus.

The Vice President summarized his remarks by reminding the Assembly that the problems that we are experiencing now, and will be experiencing for the next 10-20 years, stem from a confluence of circumstances that have eroded our traditional sources of revenue that include:

1. A decline in State appropriations.
2. Inflation.
3. An incipient demographic decline.
4. An aging faculty and facility that have reduced our traditional flexibility to reallocate internally.

He said that the confluence of these factors at this time means that we must respond and we must shrink in size.

Secondly, Mr. Frye said that in the expression used, "smaller and better", the word better can and must be the governing objective whereas "smaller" is a means to an end.

He said:

"That end is to better to pay our faculty and staff, to provide better resources in support of the educational research recruitment of the faculty and students, and to be better able to support the new intellectual thrust within the community so that it does not drift toward being a mere custodian and transmitter of knowledge, but continues to sustain its primary function of generating new knowledge and new ideas".

His third point was that he would add another adjective to the phrase "smaller and better" - different. He said that we will be a different institution in at least two regards.

1. We will have a modestly different mixture in balance of

programs and activities than those which have characterized the University over the past few decades.

2. We must be different to some degree in the ways in which the University is supported. He said that although we will continue to depend heavily upon tuition and State appropriations, we must alter our policies and our attitudes in order to be better able to exploit other resources.

Vice President Frye concluded his address by saying that while these adjustments will be tedious, difficult, and sometimes damaging, he has very confidence that the faculty and administration of this University will manage them well enough to minimize the damage and maximize the opportunities that the circumstances present to us. He felt that there is no cause for pessimism about the future of The University of Michigan.

Chairman Naylor then invited Assembly members to ask questions of Mr. Frye.

Professor Barritt asked how the University is going to save money by cutting back small units - such as the Geography Department.

Mr. Frye said that he would not be drawn into a discussion on areas now under review for possible reduction or discontinuance. He did respond to the question tangentially by indicating that there is a possibility that immediate savings would not be great - but the savings would perhaps be not insignificant. Therefore, the closure of a smaller program won't provide an immediate major savings, but over the longer run, such reductions or discontinuance will likely lead to long term savings. He added that it is obvious that we cannot rely entirely or even predominately on reduction in the academic units for the resources that we will need in the future.

Mr. Frye pointed out that his previous statement about the relationship between the General Fund Budget and tuition is true for the larger college or unit, the relationship is often not true for subdivisions within those units.

Professor Gordon asked Mr. Frye to give a brief run-down of the extent to which there have been cut-backs in non-instructional areas this year and in recent years - and plans for cut-backs in the future.

Mr. Frye said that he did not have data in hand on the subject, but would be happy to make the information available. He made a general assertion that the non-academic units during the period of the Priority Fund (i.e., the last 3-4 years) were cut at a rate which exceeded the rate of reduction of academic units. He explained

how this year, the non-academic units are taking a much more serious reduction in proportion to the total University fiscal problem.

Professor Weiner asked if it is correct that even if the Michigan economy rebounded dramatically in the next year or two the plans for the University that are envisioned for the next two years would not change dramatically. Mr. Frye said that the best predictions he has heard on this matter are that this state simply cannot rebound fast enough to catch up with inflation.

Mr. Dunn (audience) noted that most of the cuts being discussed are in the service delivery level, and asked where cuts are being made at the administration level.

Vice President Frye reminded the Assembly that all units are cutting back 6 percent at the present time, including service and support, but also academic and administration units too. He added that most or all of the vice presidential areas are making every effort to reduce their staffs. He noted that President Shapiro is reviewing the possibility of reducing the size of his office by 20-40 percent.

Mr. Breakstone (audience) asked if it might not be more dangerous than advantageous to act under duress than to wait and see what the long-term picture might be after the current crisis passes? Mr. Frye repeated his belief that we must act now, and not repeat the delays that occurred at the University from 1974-79 when there was much talk about necessary shrinkage while in actuality there was actual growth in several areas. He said that once the duress is gone, the motivation to change is gone. He believes that the duress is not excessive enough to force us to make ill-judged decisions if we get the process going now.

Professor Loomis asked that if it is true that academic salaries account for less than one-half of the General Fund, is it reasonable to expect that non-academic allocations will be less than one-half of the General Fund rather than more than one-half as it currently is?

Mr. Frye agreed that this is a reasonable premise. He said it doesn't really matter whether the non-academic support is more or less than half of the General Fund, but we should be investigating whether at this time, the ratio between the support staff and faculty is what it ought to be. Mr. Frye noted that in many areas, it is the faculty that have pressed the hardest for increases for support staff on the grounds that valuable faculty time is too often spent on jobs that could be done as well as, or better, by well-trained support staff.

Vice President Frye was asked to elaborate on his statement

that "we will have to alter our policies and attitudes in the pursuit of new sources of funding".

Mr. Frye responded by saying that there is a wide-spread perception among the faculty that while this institution is not deliberately standing in the way of obtaining various resources, the policies are a severe impediment. He reiterated that President Shapiro has asked himself and Vice President Overberger to develop a comprehensive agenda as to where faculty concerns lie and how we can improve the research climate at the University. He felt that there are several areas where policy reformation should take place, such as research support space, incentive programs (i.e., overhead return policies) and personnel policies. He added that in some fields, such as in engineering, opportunities for funding from the private sector have never been greater.

Chairman Naylor thanked Vice President Frye for his remarks and his answers to questions from the Assembly and the audience.

REDIRECT-
ION OF
THE
UNIVERSITY-
CONTINUED
DEBATE
ON
RESOLUT-
IONS A
AND B

Professor Naylor said that Resolution "A" was on the floor and asked that the debate on the resolution continue.

Professor Kathleen Brown introduced herself as an Assembly member representing the College of LSA, but indicated that she was speaking as an assistant professor in the Department of Geography. Speaking to Resolution "A" and the Regental Guidelines on discontinuance, she felt it appropriate that she inform her colleagues outside of LSA about Geography's experience with the implementation of the guidelines and of the Department's participation in the discontinuance procedures. Professor Brown was invited to approach the podium, where she read the following statement into the minutes.

"To date, our experience with the implementation of the Guidelines for Program Discontinuance has not been good. In particular, we question the College's failure to include us in prior consultation to targeting geography for discontinuance. The damage caused just by targeting the Department of Geography has been severe, to say the least, regardless of the outcome of the College review. We strongly protest the fact that we had no prior consultation with the College in this critical decision and I urge all of my LSA colleagues to attend tomorrow's special meeting on this very issue.

Moreover, to this date, we still don't know anything about the process by which we were targeted. For example: Was there a vote taken by the LSA Executive Committee? What comparisons with other units were made, and if there were,

what sets of data were used? No comparisons to other units were made [in the charge to the Review Committee] other than a remark alluding to the Social Sciences. Was a Social Science specifically targeted, or were other divisions considered, too?

Upon our request, and after Geography was targeted for possible elimination, Dean Rabkin's office [in charge of Long Range Planning in LSA] made available the list of criteria used in opening our discontinuance review. We question the vague and general wording of criteria used to target this academic unit. "Place" and "centrality" are such general terms as to include anything and nothing. Much more specific criteria and some sense of the relative importance of one to another are needed.

Again, after the decision to consider Geography for discontinuance and upon our request, Dean Rabkin's office also made available a copy of the data that were presented to the LSA Executive Committee for our review. Faculty vitae were out of date (in some instances, by several years), enrollment figures were misleading and highly questionable, and other accompanying data were piecemeal and incomplete. This is not surprising considering that the College administration did not consult with the department in assembling the materials. For the University to allow important decisions to be made on the basis of poor information is unfortunate. This is not the way a community of scholars ought to proceed.

In conclusion, Geography's experience with implementation of the guidelines and the College's failure to actively involve the Geography faculty in the decision to consider discontinuance suggests grave problems in the interpretation of the guidelines and in an understanding of what constitutes "timely and active participation of the faculty" in these proceedings. I urge the Assembly members to keep in mind Geography's recent experience when they vote on the two resolutions".

Professor Gordon commented that when he introduced Resolution "A" at the January Assembly meeting he tried to make it clear that the proposal has to do with long-term policy of the University, and that only after the Assembly has made a decision regarding the long-term goals of the University, would the Assembly be in the position to address mechanisms through which that policy can be achieved.

Professor Deming Brown felt that in order to put the discussion in the proper perspective, it might be helpful to carefully re-read Resolution "A". He said the Resolution has nothing to do with what the Geography Department is objecting to.

Professor Barritt then rose to offer a substitute motion for Resolution "A", and read the motion into the Assembly minutes.

"The following is moved as substitute for "Resolution "A" offered by SACUA January 19, 1981:

"Senate Assembly as the representative body for all University of Michigan faculty wishes to support President Shapiro and the central administration during this time of financial difficulty. The Assembly appreciates President Shapiro's timely and thoughtful assessment of the situation as presented on June 23, 1980. It notes his candid discussion of the options available to us:

1. Tuition increases.
2. Reduction of the administrative burden of the University.
3. The making of profitable investments.
4. The "1974-75 strategy".
5. Program reduction.
6. Shared austerity.

Senate Assembly believes that the correct response to the financial difficulties foreseen during the next five years should include a mix of these and other strategies as a means of maintaining quality in all of the University's diverse programs. We should foreclose no option now since we cannot know how matters will unfold in the future. Senate Assembly expresses its firm belief that only by pursuing a mixed policy with maximum flexibility will the University be able to respond in all of its diverse units in a manner deemed appropriate.

Finally, Senate Assembly believes that in deliberations about redirection the faculty must place a key role in decision making. - Senate Assembly believes that by adhering to open and orderly procedure we will come through the difficult years ahead with our diversity and quality unimpaired".

The motion was seconded by Professor Eckert.

In answer to a question of clarification of parliamentary procedure by the chairman, Parliamentarian Hildebrandt advised that the motions be discussed simultaneously and that the Barritt motion may be perfected by amendment as well as Resolution A. He said

that ultimately a decision will have to be made as to whether Resolution "A" should be replaced by the substitute motion. If this decision is affirmative, the substitute motion becomes the main motion.

Professor Barritt said that his motion speaks for itself, but felt that the remarks by Vice President Frye were a happy coincidence in that the substitute motion and Mr. Frye both consider alternative solutions for retrenchment. He said that in effect, Resolution A rules out the possibility of following some of these alternatives and expressed his belief that it would be a mistake to move in that direction.

Professor Gordon disagreed that Resolution A rules out all of the other alternatives, and felt that the substitute motion does not offer any suggestions or guidance as to how the University ought to proceed in retrenchment.

Professor Vinter asked if the Assembly is being asked to vote on only the resolution proper (i.e., three lines of the Resolution A document), or the rest of the verbiage attached.

Chairman Naylor answered that it is the intention of SACUA that the verbiage is a part of the motion.

Professor White said that he was concerned that the substitute motion may contradict itself and that it seems to waffle on the fact that, as he sees it, some programs do need to be reduced or eliminated.

Professor Powers said that he was still disturbed with the phrase "smaller-but-better" in Resolution A. He would prefer that we do not appear to be suggesting to the public that the University has been carrying "fat", and that now we intend to improve by becoming smaller. He then made the following amendment to the substitute motion:

"The Senate Assembly endorses a policy for the University of Michigan of becoming a smaller University through selective program reduction and discontinuance in order to attempt to maintain academic quality".

Assembly Parliamentarian Hildebrandt suggested that the amendment is really an amendment to Resolution A and is therefore out of order at this time.

Professor Fraser asked if the Assembly was moving toward a vote on the substitute motion. Chairman Naylor said yes, whereupon Professor Fraser asked that Professor Deming Brown read Resolution A. He did so.

Professor Weiner asked Professor Barritt to explain his philosophy in support of his substitution motion. Professor Barritt said that he is trying to achieve some kind of mix of strategies for retrenchment because he does not believe that SACUA's Resolution A is helpful - particularly in view of what has happened during the past month.

Professor Weiner said that he understood that the meaning of Resolution A is not that the "smaller-but-better" option is the only way to proceed in retrenchment. He felt that the intent of Resolution A is that the Assembly supports selective program reduction and discontinuance as one of the mechanisms that could be followed. He thought that listing other alternatives as is done in the substitute motion, would exclude additional possible options not listed.

Professor Gordon said that Resolution A does exclude the strategy of "shared poverty" (or "across-the-board" cuts).

Professor Vinter suggested that a phrase be added to Resolution A, such as, "and other reasonable alternatives", so that it would be clear that the program reduction and discontinuance option is not the only option acceptable to the Assembly.

Professor Berg asked for a clarification for what is meant in the substitute resolution by "...maintaining quality in all of the University's diverse programs", and to, "...be able to respond in all of its diverse units...". He asked if this is intended to preclude closure of any program or unit. Professor Barritt indicated that he felt that the wording may be contradictory, but said that the real issue is to decide if the substitute motion is better than Resolution A.

The substitute motion was then brought to a vote. The motion was defeated. (favor-12, opposed-40, abstain-0).

The chairman declared that Resolution A was now under consideration.

Professor Weiner offered another substitute motion:

"That the Senate Assembly endorses a policy of selective program reduction and discontinuance as one mechanism of maintaining academic quality for The University of Michigan".

The motion was supported.

Professor Romani asked if it was the intent of the motion's author to eliminate any reference to restrictions on the utilization of program reduction and discontinuance. He called attention to the limitations included in the Resolution A document. He felt that

if the new motion was a simple substitute for Resolution A, and the limitations of Resolution A were eliminated, it would have the effect of providing broader opportunities to reduce without reference to even these minimum criteria.

Professor Weiner thought that his resolution would stand alone, but that it would be necessary to have further separate resolutions with respect to mechanisms.

Professor Nagy wanted clarification as to whether the substitute resolution would replace just the first paragraph of Resolution A or the entire document.

Professor Weiner was still not sure whether the entire document (Resolution A) is a resolution, or are the last ten paragraphs just an expression of the philosophy of the resolution.

Professor Morton Brown asked Professor Weiner if he would be willing to change his substitute motion to an amendment to Resolution A.

Professor Cares said that he felt that Professor Weiner's amendment emasculates Resolution A, and therefore he supports it. He indicated that his colleagues were not in favor of Resolution A. He explained that they want more time to consider the motion. He felt that Resolution A indicates that program reduction and discontinuance is the way the Assembly wishes the administration to proceed, and that the resolution does eliminate some other options.

After some discussion concerning whether Professor Weiner's motion was a separate motion to be voted upon, or whether it was a friendly amendment to Resolution A, Parliamentarian Hildebrandt indicated that the vote would be on the question - "should the Assembly add the Weiner resolution to Resolution A"?

Chairman Naylor added that it was his understanding that along with the addition of the Weiner resolution to Resolution A, the first paragraph of Resolution A would be eliminated. There were no dissenting views.

Professor Powers urged the Assembly not to omit an indication of why it is considering reductions and discontinuance as an option to reduce the size of the University. He felt that failure to do so would be suggesting that, "...we have at last seen the error of our ways and are now going to correct them". He said that it should be made clear that we are obliged to do something because of our financial problems, but to act in such a manner that we do not suffer a loss in quality.

The Secretary then read Professor Weiner's motion which was

then brought to a vote. The motion passed. (favor-30, opposed-22, abstain-0).

Chairman Naylor then invited discussion on the amended Resolution A.

Professor Eckert asked, given what has happened since we first began discussing the issue, why are we doing this? She wondered if there was some kind of an assumption that if we actually vote some kind of support for a policy of program reduction "suddenly we will be allowed to join the club?"

Professor Browne felt that it is wise to try to spell out all of the implications of this endorsement of selective reduction and therefore thought that it would be inadequate to pass only the first paragraph of the resolution. He added that although what we are doing might seem moot, yet policies are being implemented as we speak. He said that SACUA saw its role which is now the Assembly's role, as bringing the entire matter to the attention of the entire faculty so that the faculty, the administration, and the whole community would be under no illusions that we did not know what policies we were endorsing when we voted on the resolution.

Professor Hilbert expressed his view that the Assembly should, in addition to suggesting program reduction, spell out other ways to solve our problems. In view of the events that have taken place [in program reduction] since the last Assembly meeting, he urged the Assembly not to pass the motion, as it presents only one way to solve the problem.

Professor Weiner felt that Professor Eckert's question as to "why are we doing this?" was very legitimate. He said that he proposed the amendment to make it clear that while the administration has thought of program reduction as one mechanism for coming to grips with these economic realities, he felt that by passing the amendment, we will have said that the faculty also realizes that this is one mechanism to help solve our problem.

He suggested that the resolution be viewed only as the first step. He hoped that an additional resolution would be proposed and passed by the Assembly that would clarify that we pinpoint this option because it is a non-traditional approach, and would also clarify a mechanism for faculty responsibility in the manner in which it is carried out.

Professor Gordon said that he supports the resolution because he does not believe that it is adequate for the administration to make policy for the University. In his opinion, the faculty should make policy for the University. He warned that if the Assembly remains silent on this issue, it is to say that we are willing to

leave it to the administration to make the policies.

Professor Baumgarten asked what the implications would be if we:

1. Voted against Resolution A.
2. Voted specifically to disapprove of the redirection and discontinuance option.
3. Voted for a resolution with the reduction and discontinuance option with specific criteria developed by the governing body of the faculty.

He said that if the implication of our voting one way or the other is that nothing different would happen, then Professor Eckert's question, "what are we doing", is a valid one.

Professor Brown felt that it would be appropriate for the Assembly, if it decided against selected program reduction, to discuss ways in which to implement that decision - how to influence the administration to stop the procedures that are already in motion and convince them that our decision is the proper direction to take.

Professor Barritt noted that SACUA had already considered a motion concerning the issue of becoming smaller through selective reduction in June, 1980 - before President Shapiro addressed the Assembly in the subject of retrenchment the same month. He felt that we have not come very far in seven months.

He argued against the motion, saying that it is poorly drafted, and pointed out several items under the document's headings of limitations and premises with which he strongly disagreed.

Professor Barnard expressed her concern about the issue of the initiation of review of units for possible reduction or discontinuance in light of what occurred in that process regarding the Geography Department. She felt that the Regents guidelines were not carefully followed in that the faculty of that unit were not involved in the initiation of the review. She said that based on this example, there is a risk that other programs may have the same experience.

Professor Nisbett responded to the question by saying that he felt that Resolution B would cover that situation.

Professor Weiner urged the Assembly to delay the vote on Resolution A.

Chairman Naylor recommended and called for a motion to postpone definitely until the March, 1981 meeting of the Senate Assembly.

It was so moved by Professor Hildebrandt and seconded. The motion passed.

ADJOURN-
MENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

Charles C. Kelsey
Senate Secretary