

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SENATE ASSEMBLY

MINUTES OF ASSEMBLY MEETING, FEBRUARY 17, 1975

ATTENDANCE

Present: Professors Berki, Bishop, Brockway, Pooley, Brown, Cassidy, Baker, Crawford, Danielson, DeKornfeld, Dernberger, Eisley, Evaldson, Beaver, Gikas, Goldman, Goodman, Hoffman, Horsley, Hymans, Ilie, Jameson, Johnson, Kaplan, Kell, Kish, Lands, Larkin, Lehmann, Livermore, Loomis, Lytle, Magrill, Mohler, Murphey, Nesbitt, Oberman, Ostrand, Rowe, Scott, Seligson, Matejka, Sudarkasa, Terwilliger, Van Der Voo, Williams, Wilson, Leonard, Hoch, Cohen

Absent: Professors Adams, Anton, Baublis, Caldwell, Cartwright, Cornell, Creeth, Deskins, Floyd, Flynn, Harrison, Kachaturoff, Kelsey, Lyjak, Schmickel, Sibley, Springer, Taren, Vander, Vaughn, Weeks

Guests: Vice-President Rhodes, Professors Harold Shapiro, Bennett Cohen, Jack Rothman, and Dr. Howard Finkbeiner

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Cohen at 3:20 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Though having no special announcements to make, the Chairman reminded the members of the Assembly that they were invited to comment upon, or seek further information with respect to, any matters that appeared in the minutes of SACUA. Professor Ilie thereupon took occasion to inquire concerning an item in the minutes of January 6, 1975 pertaining to a conversation between the SACUA chairman and Vice-President Rhodes concerning advance planning in connection with possible work actions arising out of the GEO negotiations. In responding, Chairman Cohen reiterated SACUA's ongoing concern with preserving the University's educational program in the face of emergencies, the committee having therefore sought assurance from Vice-President Rhodes that schools and colleges were being advised to prepare appropriate contingency plans.

PROPOSED
SENATE MEM-
BERSHIP FOR
PRIMARY RE-
SEARCHERS

On referral by SACUA, the Research Policies Committee had studied the question of Senate membership for primary researchers. Having recommended a change in the Senate membership rules, Professor Bennett Cohen was invited to speak to his committee's proposal.

The proposed change, Professor Cohen explained, was simply intended to grant Senate membership to the small group of research personnel who are without professorial titles but have comparable professional stature, as determined under the system of peer review. Currently the Research Policies Committee was responsible for review of such members of the staff, though on occasion its members had found themselves sufficiently unacquainted with the particular professional field as to necessitate consultation with the candidate's colleagues. Having eventually assured itself that the peer review system was working effectively, professional competence being adequately evaluated at the level of department, school, and college, the Research Policies Committee had come to see its own additional review as an unnecessary step.

Assisted by Dr. Finkbeiner, Assistant to Vice-President Overberger, Professor Cohen pointed out that, though 166 persons were involved, some were already members of the Senate, so that one was concerned here with only 114 additional names. While the mode of their representation in the Assembly remained to be determined, the Research Policies Committee had suggested they might either vote with their respective units, if part of an instructional program, or be represented as a group, if members of centers or institutes.

Members of the Assembly sought further clarification with reference to the category of primary researcher, Professors Danielson and Scott, for example, inquiring with respect to the extent to which those in this status currently participate in the governance activities of their respective units, where such matters as curricular issues are decided, questions which would seem outside their purview. Professor Bishop, on the other hand, had some concern with granting Senate membership automatically, wondering whether the Research Policies Committee had ever rejected candidates. Further questions concerning aspects of the review procedure were raised by Professors Cassidy, Oberman, and Lands, while Professor Livermore sought assurance that if the names of the particular researchers were brought forth, members of the Assembly would recognize their merit. Professor Bennett Cohen and Dr. Finkbeiner provided the relevant responses, whereupon Professor Brockway offered a motion, seconded by Professor Johnson, that the change in the Senate membership rule proposed in the Research Policies Committee report of January 20, 1975, be adopted. The motion carried by a vote of 25 to 13, and the Bylaws Committee will accordingly be requested to propose to SACUA the manner in which representation in the Assembly is to be accomplished.

COMPULSORY
IDENTIFICA-
TION CARDS

The matter of compulsory identification cards for University use had been discussed by the University Council some time ago, brought to SACUA for consideration, and subsequently referred to the Civil Liberties Board. Having received from the Board a resolution on the subject, SACUA had sought to capture its essence in language actionable by the Assembly. Professor Magrill therefore offered the following resolution for consideration by the Assembly:

"Resolved, that Senate Assembly assents to initiation of a mandatory, campus-wide photo identification card system for security purposes, provided that regulations governing the issuance and use of such identification cards be subject to approval of the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs."

Invited by Chairman Cohen to comment on the latter, Professor Rothman, Chairman of the Civil Liberties Board, indicated that his Board had had no objection in principle to the issuance and use of such cards, assuming the concern with security to be a valid one. What did seem to matter was how such a procedure was to be implemented, that is, who would be authorized to request display of such cards, what action would be taken in the case of refusal to comply, and related questions. Speaking in favor of the Board's resolution, Professor DeKornfeld reminded the Assembly that the matter had been discussed at length by the University Council, seen as in the best interests of the University, and regarded as particularly necessary in controlling the use and abuse of University facilities.

In the subsequent discussion Professor Sudarkasa expressed reservations on two counts, the resolution's sole concern with security, as contrasted with other purposes, but, more especially, the proposal that SACUA, rather than the Assembly, review the regulations governing identification cards. Other considerations were raised as well, Professor Lehmann inquiring about the earlier motion of having such means of identification double as library cards, an amendment subsequently offered by Professor Jameson and seconded. While there seemed no objection to dual purpose cards, members of the Assembly questioned the technical feasibility of the proposal. The Jameson amendment later passed by a vote of 23 to 22 (Chairman Cohen casting the dispositive vote). Cost was, indeed, a concern of the Assembly, as was also the question of whether the cards would really serve their intended purpose. Opinion was divided, Professor Gikas, for example, having found that their use at the Medical School seemed to have made no noticeable difference, while Professors Jameson and Rowe reported satisfactory results in their respective units. Other questions were raised as well--whether existing identification cards would not serve the necessary purpose, how one would insure the habit of carrying the proposed identification cards, whether the card system would be instituted in advance of specification of the regulations governing their use. Though some members of the Assembly preferred to defer action pending fuller information on some of these matters, so that the advantages of the card system could be assessed against its cost, there was reluctance to table the issue. Professor Sudarkasa therefore proposed an additional amendment to the resolution, to insure that the regulations that were to govern the identification cards be brought to the Assembly for initial discussion prior to their becoming the responsibility of SACUA. Her amendment, which was seconded, passed. Subsequently the Assembly voted on the twice-amended resolution, which now read as follows:

"Resolved:

That Senate Assembly assents to the initiation of mandatory, campus-wide, faculty photo-identification card system, for security purposes,

provided that

regulations governing the issuance and use of such identification cards be subject to the approval of the University Senate Assembly,

and provided also, that

such cards be machine readable and suitable for use as University Library Cards."

DISCUSSION
OF BUDGET
PRIORITIES

On behalf of the Assembly, Chairman Cohen expressed appreciation for the opportunity to hear directly from Vice-President Rhodes and Professor Shapiro, Chairman of the Budget Priorities Committee, with respect to this basic aspect of University affairs. Expressing his indebtedness to Professor Shapiro for the major role the latter had played over several very busy months, Vice-President Rhodes proceeded to present an overview of the process by which critical decisions were being reached.

That the task of setting priorities had been no simple one was evident from some telling figures--a budgetary reduction of 1.5% already ordered by the legislature, another of comparable magnitude expected within the present fiscal year, and a reduction of as much as 4% in the present budget base foreseen for 1975-76. How best to respond? Whatever the ultimate decisions prove to be, they will have been arrived at by the use of procedures developed after campus-wide consultation and in conjunction with relevant University committees.

Explicit criteria have been applied in accomplishing the reductions, Mr. Rhodes reported. The principle of severity of consequences has been basic; what can readily be deferred should have lower priority. Equally central to the decision-making process has been the principle of allowing maximum responsibility and flexibility at the unit level. Throughout, every effort has been made to be open, fair, and equitable. And from the beginning it has been agreed that there should be no reduction in either enrollment or financial aid.

Vice-President Rhodes left little doubt that achieving the reductions demanded by the legislature will exact a price. While across-the-board cuts would constitute the simplest way to effect the necessary savings, it is, he declared, not the approach of choice, and, though part of the reduction is to be accomplished in such a manner, greatest reliance will be placed upon differential reductions, with some units being cut more than others. The latter type of decision is a complex one, and it is to this end that the Budget Priorities Committee and the administration have aimed at developing explicit criteria for making the necessary judgments, among them the following: (a) the University's instructional and research commitments are being accorded a central role (though the service function is not to be downgraded); (b) units are being compared not with each other but with their counterparts in peer institutions selected by them; (c) Term III is being scrutinized with respect to patterns of appointment and enrollment as well as other features; (d) every effort is being made to avoid layoffs.

At this point, then, the budgetary reductions developed have been communicated to Deans, Directors, and Vice-Presidents, who may, if they wish, take advantage of an appeal mechanism that has been created for the purpose. Hence, Mr. Rhodes stated, it would be premature to discuss specific figures. At the same time, however, he indicated that certain functions--the library, computing center, and statistical laboratory--would sustain minimal cuts, while administrative services are expected to absorb a maximal reduction.

The Assembly was informed of the series of policy questions now needing to be addressed, including, among others, such matters as the following: (a) the relationship between research institutes and instructional programs; (b) incentives for academic programs; (c) the proper balance between centralization and decentralization of functions and responsibilities; (d) the progressive erosion of the current accounts and equipment budgets, with the consequent effect on faculty effectiveness. That such concerns are more than theoretical at this point was made clear by the series of figures cited by Vice-President Rhodes. Thus, in addition to the built-in deficit

of \$645,000 in this year's budget to support the 8% salary increase program, one must reckon with an increase of \$530,000 in financial aid, \$400,000 in higher insurance costs, and a rise of \$700,000 in utilities (despite decreased use). If the present year poses some hard budgetary decisions, Mr. Rhodes concluded, even more difficult problems lie ahead. He hoped for, and felt certain one could count on, the necessary understanding and cooperation from all concerned.

Commending Vice-President Rhodes for the manner in which the budgetary exigencies are being addressed, Professor Shapiro added some further comments from the perspective of his Budget Priorities Committee. As many as 30 meetings have been held in the process of developing the necessary budgetary recommendations, one with each unit head and some with clusters of institutes. Each such occasion provided opportunity for the parties to make their respective cases before the group consisting of Vice-President Rhodes and representatives of the State Relations Committee and Budget Priorities Committee (both students and faculty representatives of the latter participating on a rotating basis). The meetings have been frank, with a premium placed on factual evidence; the appeals procedure, to which Vice-President Rhodes had alluded, was to be conducted in the same spirit. Across-the-board cuts, Professor Shapiro pointed out, do not require too much information; selective cuts, however, have high informational requirements, thus demanding the exhaustive series of meetings out of which the final budgetary recommendations are to be developed.

The ensuing dialogue aired some further considerations. Professor Kaplan, for example, saw a dilemma in maintaining present enrollment while concomitantly absorbing budget cuts; however necessary enrollment is as a source of income, he declared, simply accepting the situation as a matter of course might well lead to further disparities in the years ahead. Given the present situation, others continued to be concerned with the degree of faculty involvement and representation in the decision-making process, Professors Lands and Larkin feeling that such participation was now more necessary than ever. Units vary considerably on this score, Professor Shapiro observed, there being extensive faculty involvement in some, much less in others. Be that as it may, Professor Hymans declared, there is reason to believe that colleagues in some other institutions may well envy the degree to which our faculty has been party to the decisions being reached in the present instance.

Raising a question that had surfaced in earlier Assembly meetings, Professor Johnson wondered to what extent reductions would be felt in the professional and administrative category, a group in which the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty had noted a sharp rise in the recent past. Granting the latter, Vice-President Rhodes and Professor Shapiro pointed out, however, that units outside the academic and research areas were, indeed, sustaining the maximum budgetary cut and had presented extensive documentation with respect to plans for economizing. Asked what he and his committee would do differently next time, Professor Shapiro concluded that, on the one hand, there now exists a clearer idea of the informational requirements needed in the present complex decision-making process and, on the other, it has been observed that the most persuasive cases have been presented by units in which there has been extensive faculty involvement in arriving at the far-reaching decisions needing to be taken in these difficult times.

GEO DE-
VELOPMENTS

The two special sessions of the Assembly notwithstanding, the strike threatened by the Graduate Employees Organization was now a reality. Hence, the members of the Assembly appreciated the opportunity to be brought abreast of current developments by Vice-President Rhodes, who prefaced his remarks with thanks for the Assembly's efforts and with regret that events had taken the present turn. As he noted, the situation not only clearly affects the instructional program but also poses the unfortunate possibility of a rift between faculty and graduate students. It was the administration's hope that the work action could be avoided by continued bargaining in good faith by both sides. That hope having failed of fulfillment, a public disclosure of pertinent details now seemed in order.

A number of matters have, for all practical purposes, been settled, Mr. Rhodes reported, among them the issues involving affirmative action, non-discrimination, and a definition of fractional appointments. Agreement was near on several others, yet some significant issues remained unresolved. Of these, economic matters, class size, and the questions of an agency shop were among the most critical, and Vice-President Rhodes addressed himself to each in turn.

The economic demands of GEO, however justified they be, need to be considered in the context of the overall budgetary difficulty in which the University finds itself, Mr. Rhodes asserted. Additional monies will not come from the legislature; they must be found either through an increase in fees or by cutting back the total University operation. The administration is not unmindful of the need to improve salary and working conditions, he declared. To that end an 8% increase retroactive to September 1, 1974, had already been approved. Taking into account salary, fringe benefits, and the cost of tuition, and comparing average income under the new rate with situations elsewhere, would have our Teaching Assistants ranking eighth, and our Research Assistants ranking third, among 23 peer institutions. Taking net income into account, the new rate would have our Teaching Assistants ranking third and our Research Assistants ranking first among the Big Ten schools. The administration had further proposed a raise of 5.6% in September 1975 (or an increase comparable to that of the faculty, whichever is larger) as well as a reduction in tuition to \$440, for those with more than eight hours of credit, and \$353 for students carrying six hours of credit. These concessions, Mr. Rhodes stated, represented the best compromise the administration was in position to make.

The matter of class size was a major item, he declared; not only did it have direct economic implications, but it also raised questions of educational policy. Class size is a matter to be determined by the governing faculty, taking into account the instructional needs of the students, course content, advances in instructional technology, and related considerations.

On the question of an agency shop, Mr. Rhodes granted that such a provision exists in a number of other contracts. GEO, however, represents less than half of the Graduate Student Assistants, he pointed out, representation being strongest in LSA but modest to small elsewhere. To impose the requirement of joining the union or of paying a service fee had undesirable implications.

Such specific issues aside, Vice-President Rhodes expressed particular concern over some recent events associated with the strike, though he made it clear that he was not imputing blame to the GEO itself. In any event, he deplored such activities as unlawful, rather than legal, picketing procedures, the setting of a large number of false fire alarms, a bomb threat, making it necessary to call off a previously scheduled examination for a large class, and vandalism in such forms as tire-slashing.

It was all too clear that the present strike interfered seriously with the educational program of students wishing to pursue their studies, Mr. Rhodes concluded. The administration thus reiterated its desire to resolve the current dispute, feeling that intensive negotiation could bring about a settlement in short order. He regretted that during the week GEO had been willing to meet only two hours per day, insisting in addition on open meetings which normally produce less movement than closed sessions. The administration, for its part, was prepared to meet as many hours as necessary in order to reach a settlement. Meanwhile, in answer to queries from members of the Assembly concerning a policy barring academic reprisal of one kind or another for activities in connection with the strike, Mr. Rhodes reiterated his earlier conviction that such a course would be foreign to our values.

Chairman Cohen expressed to Vice-President Rhodes the appreciation of the Assembly for his detailed account of the current status of the negotiations.

NOMINATIONS
AND APPOINT-
MENTS

On nomination by SACUA, the Assembly voted unanimous approval of the following appointments:

- Professor Gerald Abrams to serve as a replacement of Professor Gosling on the Budget Priorities Committee;
- Professor Elizabeth Rowlands to serve until September 1, 1975 as a replacement for Professor Bardwick on the State Relations Committee
- Professor Robert A. Martin to serve until September 1, 1976 as a replacement for Professor Field on the University Relations Committee;
- Professor Raymond N. Elliott to serve until September 1, 1975 as a replacement for Professor Edwards on the Senate Advisory Review Committee.

NEW
BUSINESS

In connection with the activities of the Association of Michigan Collegiate Faculties, Professor Kaplan informed the Assembly that the faculty would shortly be receiving an informational bulletin dealing with the State budget.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the Assembly adjourned at 5:43 p.m.

Erasmus L. Hoch
Secretary