

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Assembly Meeting, February 21, 1977

- ATTENDANCE Present: Members Adams, Angus, Aupperle, Brazer, Christensen, Cohen, Corpron, Cosand, Crawford, Crichton, Deskins, Downen, Edwards, A., Easley, Elving, Goldman, Gordon, Gray, Browne, Harris, R., Horsley, Kachaturoff, Caldwell, Lands, Leary, Lehmann, Livermore, Lytle, Merte, Millard, Heers, Murphey, Fowler, Portman, Rabkin, Scott, Sherman, Votaw, Weeks, West, Winans, Colburn, Williams
- Absent: Members Baublis, Bornstein, Browder, Cartwright, Child, Coon, Cornell, DeKornfeld, Diamond, Edwards, O., Faulkner, Fekety, Flynn, Harris, J., Hildebrandt, Johnson, Jones, Kish, Lindberg, Nesbitt, Proctor, Seger, Simonds, Soucek, Stross, Northcutt, Zorn
- Guests: Professor Bruce Friedman, Chairman, Civil Liberties Board
Professor William Neenan, Chairman, Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty
- CALL TO ORDER Professor Williams called the February meeting of Senate Assembly to order at 3:20 p.m. Professor Williams thanked all those for attending and noted the importance of today's meeting.
- CHANGE IN AGENDA Professor Williams asked that items four and five on the agenda be reversed so that a discussion of the document concerning Program Discontinuance might be introduced. Members of the Assembly agreed with the proposed agenda change.
- CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES The minutes of the January 17, 1977 Senate Assembly meeting were approved as distributed. Professor Elving did comment on the SACUA meeting minutes of January 17, 1977 in which reference to his concern over voting for SACUA appointments to various University committees was noted. He explained his position and asked that if the procedure cannot be changed that he would appreciate more detail on the individual and assignment being considered. Professor Williams noted that more information will be provided in the future.
- ANNOUNCEMENTS Professor Williams announced that the report on financial aid which members of the Assembly asked the Academic Affairs Committee to prepare and discuss at the March Senate Assembly will not be finished in time for that particular meeting. A month's extension was requested and granted.
- REPORT ON IMPACT OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ON FACULTY COMPENSATION Professor Williams introduced Professor William Neenan, Chairman of the Committee on Economic Status of the Faculty, who reviewed the report prepared by CESF. The report was distributed to all members of the Assembly. Professor Neenan noted that the November 15, 1976 charge to his Committee by the Assembly was met in time only through the diligent assistance of Jon Hakken, a graduate student in Economics, and of Libby Birdsall of the CESF staff.

Professor Neenan reviewed the report under three sub-headings:

1. Summary of Findings
2. Mechanisms for Union Impact
3. Review of Empirical Literature

His remarks were taken directly from the written report and followed the organization pattern of the report.

In his review of the currently available empirical information, Professor Neenan covered the impact of unions upon wages earned. He specifically reviewed the impact of unionization of faculty groups upon faculty compensation. He noted that while this was the highlight section of the report one should be cautious of taking the data too seriously. Professor Neenan said the experience is of a relatively recent past and that few major research universities are included in the empirical literature. On the basis of case studies and statistical analyses, it would appear that the impact of unionization upon faculty compensation is not entirely clear. In fact, there was even a hesitance in assigning causality in the compensation and unionization relationship. Professor Neenan said that the research indicates that unionization does appear to have the impact of increasing faculty compensation in the immediate years following formal organization, but that a leveling off effect is noted over a longer period of time. This observation was supported in a number of the studies reviewed by the Committee.

Professor Neenan went into some detail in reviewing the studies included in the CESF Report. He showed the relationship between the studies available and the general conclusion that the impact of unionization, over the long term, on compensation is minimal.

Questions from the floor were received and the first was from Professor Brazer who commented on the impact of unionization on salaries of the various professorial ranks. Professor Brazer noted that the assistant professor rank is in flux because of the many changes in personnel on the campus. He said that it seemed logical to analyze data on a rank by rank basis in order to determine the impact of unionized faculties.

Professor Gordon commented on the Garbarino (1973) study which noted that Civil Service employees and unionized faculty groups received approximately equal pay increases. He said that the study needed careful analysis. He argued that it was not easy to generalize from the findings of the study.

Professor Cohen asked if the Committee's study indicated that any large university system is now considering unionization. He specifically asked about the Big Ten. Professor Neenan said he knew of no efforts to unionize in the Big Ten. Professor Gordon said that he had been informed of some activity on the Wisconsin campus. He said he was unclear as to the status of efforts to unionize the faculty, but that some efforts toward that end had been made.

Professor Elving asked about the effect of other university families organizing and leaving the faculty as the only non-unionized group on campus. Professor Neenan said he was unaware of any study dealing with this question. He continued by observing that he was also unaware of any specific information on the impact of other unions upon the compensation programs for faculty on the Michigan campus.

Professor Gordon asked about a statement in the report that higher wages may lead to fewer numbers of faculty members. Professor Neenan agreed that some models do in fact come to this conclusion. Professor Elving asked how tenure and seniority would fit into this particular situation. Professor Neenan said that turnover was the answer but that it does take time "to work through the total system."

Professor Portman asked if one were to analyze the salary program in one industry over a period of years rather than averaging data across all industries would the results provide a clearer picture. Professor Neenan said he would not speculate. He did add, however, that the cross sectional analysis was appropriate because it centered upon the impact of unionization and not just a particular industry trend.

Professor Cosand observed that one must be careful when trying to apply data from smaller universities to the situation at Michigan. He said that there was a need to secure information from larger universities where the faculties had become unionized.

Professor Livermore asked if there is any data relating to the secondary school experience in collective bargaining, if so, could it be applied to higher education. Professor Neenan said that he did not see these kinds of studies.

Professor Williams thanked the Committee for their diligent effort and for their excellent report. There was no final or concluding action taken by the members of the Senate Assembly.

PROGRAM OF
DISCONTINU-
ANCE

Professor Williams introduced the topic of the procedures for handling a faculty review of the document concerning Program Discontinuance. He asked the Assembly members to separate the Population Planning Department closure from the draft document which is written to deal with program closure in general. Professor Williams gave a brief background of the importance of this document.

Professor Lehmann moved that the Assembly suspend the rules so that a special meeting might be called on February 28, 1977 to discuss this important document. The motion was seconded and discussion opened. Professor Lehmann said that suspension of the rules was necessary because the Assembly Bylaws call for a ten-day notification period for special meetings. He said that SACUA felt that there was some urgency in this matter because the Office of Academic Affairs had planned to take a final draft of the document to the Regents in March. He also noted that the Spring Recess was near and that a large number of faculty members would not be able to meet during the vacation period. The question was called for and Professor Williams asked for the vote. The motion carried unanimously. Professor Lehmann then moved that the Assembly meet in special session on February 28 at 3:15 p.m. This motion also carried unanimously. Professor Williams urged attendance so that this important matter might be given careful attention.

PROPOSED
REVISION OF
RECRUITMENT
AND EMPLOY-
MENT GUIDE-
LINES

Professor Williams introduced Professor Bruce Friedman, Chairman of the Civil Liberties Board, who presented the Board's rationale for the statement on Recruitment and Placement Guidelines. He noted that the current statement had actually grown out of the work the Board had done on the Freedom of Speech document. Professor Harold Johnson during his year as Chairman of the Senate asked that a previous document on recruiting be revised in light

of changing concerns for rights of access, freedom of speech and policies of non-discrimination. Professor Friedman said that the current revisions are presented as a response to Professor Johnson's charge.

Professor Friedman reviewed the specific changes in the recruitment policy proposed by the Civil Liberties Board. He noted that there had been some misunderstandings on campus as to the intent of some changes and he was hopeful that these misunderstandings could be alleviated. He said that it was clearly the Board's position that the University should not allow those who discriminate to utilize career planning and placement services at The University of Michigan.

Following his very careful review, Professor Friedman said he would entertain questions from the floor.

The first series of questions from the floor centered on how the University should respond to requests to interview from a particular country with a known policy of discrimination. Professor Gordon was the first to articulate the concern. He asked what would happen if such a request was received. Professor Friedman said that if a country does come to interview, their representatives must pledge that they do not discriminate. If they do not make this pledge, they will not be allowed to interview on this campus.

Several individuals had written to SACUA asking permission to speak on the proposed topic. Professor Cohen, who had noted these communications in his Assembly packet, asked if they should not be allowed to speak. Professor Williams agreed that requests had been received from several individuals who wished to address the Assembly. He asked if there was objection. No one raised objection and Professor Williams invited guest speakers to address the Assembly.

Mr. John Steinbach was first to speak, and he said that we are looking to an issue of morality and ethics. He said that there is discrimination in various countries of the world and that the University had neglected to draw up a list of those countries who do discriminate. He argued that more work was needed before passage of the statement was considered.

The second guest, Mr. Bazel Allen, noted that he was representing himself and the Commission on Minority Affairs and Barbara Murphy of the Commission for Women. He said that there does seem to be a contrived link between the Freedom of Speech Statement and the Statement on Recruitment. He urged separation. He went on to say that it was his judgement that countries who do discriminate "will not make a good faith recruitment effort." He asked for a clear system of monitoring and screening in any procedures finally adopted. He said it was to be made clear that a policy of non-discrimination must be apparent before campus facilities are made available. He closed by restating his earlier request that the Assembly not confuse employment procedures and issues of freedom of speech.

Mrs. Eunice Burns took the floor next, but just to confirm that Mr. Allen was speaking in behalf of the Commission for Women. She said that the Commission did endorse the remarks of Mr. Allen.

Following these presentations Professor Corpron moved that the Civil Liberties Board statement be adopted. The motion was seconded and formal discussion was opened to the floor.

The discussion turned to a matter that had not been reviewed by the Board in their discussions of the policy. Professor Rabkin asked what appeared at first to be a relatively simple, straightforward question, "What is meant by Placement Service"? The discussion which followed centered on this point as well as whether sending a student's dossier should be considered as a placement service. Concern was expressed that the document, as written, applied solely to the actual place of interviewing and arrangements for interviewing and not related services.

Professor Crawford said that the matter of how one defines placement services is pivotal and that he was not prepared to vote until it was resolved. Professor Friedman said that the Board was thinking of the actual act of interviewing and not the various "record keeping" functions.

Professor Brown said that he too was concerned with the lack of specificity in the document. He said that the matter of monitoring is not clearly discussed in the document and that several other important points were equally unclear.

Professors Elving, Merte, and Goldman raised additional points of concern. Professor Elving was worried that enforcement was not clearly stipulated. The lack of a specific "complaint procedure" troubled Professor Merte. The actual wording of certain portions of the document were unsatisfactory to Professor Goldman.

These concerns led to a motion that approval of the document be set aside until the March 21 Senate Assembly meeting by which time the Civil Liberties Board will have considered the concerns expressed over the present wording. The motion was moved by Professor Gordon and seconded by Professor Browne.

The motion was passed unanimously.

No further business was considered.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

C. William Colburn
Secretary