

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Assembly Meeting, March 17, 1975

ATTENDANCE Present: Professors Adams, Berki, Brockway, Caldwell, Cosand, Crawford, Eisley, Evaldson, Beaver, Floyd, Goldman, Goodman, Hoffman, Horsley, Hymans, Ilie, Jameson, Kachaturoff, Kaplan, Kell, Kelsey, Kish, Lands, Larkin, Lehmann, Livermore, Loomis, Lytle, Magrill, Mohler, Murphey, Nesbitt, Oberman, Ostrand, Rowe, Scott, Seligson, Matejka, Springer, Sudarkasa, Taren, Van der Voo, Weeks, Williams, Wilson, Leonard, Hildebrandt, Hoch, Cohen

Absent: Professors Anton, Baublis, Bishop, Pooley, Brown, Cartwright, Cassidy, Cornell, Creeth, Danielson, DeKornfeld, Dernberger, Deskins, Flynn, Gikas, Harrison, Johnson, Lyjak, Schmickel, Sibley, Terwilliger, Vander, Vaughn

Guests: Vice Presidents Henry Johnson and Frank H. T. Rhodes; Professor Merrill Flood

CALL TO ORDER The meeting was called to order by Chairman Cohen at 3:19 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES The minutes of the special Assembly meeting of February 7, 1975, the special Assembly meeting of February 10, 1975, and the regular Assembly meeting of February 17, 1975 were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS This being the last regular meeting of Assembly members whose terms expire, Chairman Cohen took occasion to extend sincere appreciation to those involved for their dedicated service and noteworthy contributions.

The members of the Assembly were reminded that the University Senate would be meeting on April 7, 1975.

STUDENT AFFAIRS Having been invited to apprise the Assembly of developments in the Office of Student Services, Vice-President Johnson presented an overview of the functions of his office as background for the remarks to follow. Basic areas of responsibility, as listed, included the following: a) facilitation of the educational and developmental processes of students; b) maintenance of an optimal physical and emotional environment; c) responsiveness to the broader University community;

d) integration of the Office of Student Services program into this broader environment; e) assessment of the degree to which the service delivery mechanism meets student needs. To these ends, six OSS divisions contribute, namely: 1) housing--concerned with building and maintaining the quality of housing and with coordination of housing efforts; 2) health care--having both health and safety aspects; 3) career planning and placement--with attention to career families and concern with such aspects as career needs of minority students; 4) counseling services--of an interpersonal sort, as contrasted to academic counseling; 5) student programs--affording opportunities for student participation in the planning, execution, and follow-up of such programs as those of WCBN and UAC; 6) community services--allowing students to interact with the non-campus community in such efforts as Project Community, with its tutorial assistance, and extension into such areas as hospitals and correctional institutions, advocacy programs, and mediation services.

Expressing satisfaction with the degree of faculty and student involvement to date, Vice-President Johnson did not, however, wish to leave the impression that no problems exist. Housing, for one, carries its share, with demand outweighing facilities, and the recently instituted lottery procedure has drawn a full measure of attention. On another front, problems remain as well, as evidenced by the recent sit-in of minority students, who feel that, while some attempt has been made to honor the commitments agreed to at the time of the Black Action Movement, the effort has fallen short. The situation is currently being actively discussed with the relevant constituencies. Students in general continue also to be interested in appropriate involvement in governance, and the report of the Commission to Study Student Governance is being reviewed in light of the response of the Assembly. All things considered, Vice-President Johnson nevertheless expressed confidence that, with continuing student and faculty support, current and future problems could be addressed constructively and resolved appropriately.

Apropos of the recent sit-in, Professor Kaplan wondered whether the Office of Student Services had had any advance indications that such was to take place. To some extent, Mr. Johnson declared, though one could not predict when and where something might occur and what form it would take. It was apparent, though, that the students felt they needed somehow to remind the University forcefully of its commitments to minority students.

Interest in the future of the report of the Commission to Study Student Governance was expressed by several members of the Assembly. Vice-President Johnson was reminded by Professor Scott, for example, that the report had spoken of the involvement of students in University governance, while it had been intended to deal with their involvement in student governance. What students really seek, Mr. Johnson explained, is a more viable and predictable involvement in decision-making, particularly at the school and college level. Granting that clarification of this sort was needed, Professor Brockway suggested, however, that the language of the report itself be carefully scrutinized in the current review, adding the hope that the revised version could be distributed to the Assembly prior to its consideration by the Regents.

From a more philosophical point of view, Professor Ilie wondered whether the concept of student held by the Office of Student Services was one of a mature person competent to participate in University affairs or of a somewhat helpless individual needing support. Vice-President Johnson saw no necessary contradiction here. There are, indeed, certain respects in which students require assistance, housing being one, health care another, career planning and placement a third. But his office does not presume to act in loco parentis; legally it cannot, and, for that matter, the students would hardly countenance such a posture. It should be recognized, too, the Vice-President added, that, in relation to peer institutions, our Office of Student Services is typically spoken of as the bellwether for the Big Ten.

Following a few remaining comments, Chairman Cohen thanked Vice-President Johnson for his informative presentation, expressing appreciation on behalf of the Assembly for the opportunity to exchange views in this important area of University activity.

SENATE
ASSEMBLY
NOMINATING
COMMITTEE

SACUA being the executive committee of the Assembly, the manner of its composition is not to be taken lightly, Chairman Cohen noted in introducing the report of the Nominating Committee, which had been appointed some months prior in preparation for the elections to be held by the Assembly on April 21, 1975. Expressing appreciation for the work of Professor Brockway and his committee, the chairman called attention, too, to the statement on alternative voting procedures, prepared by Professor Flood, who was also thanked for his efforts. One technical matter to be resolved, both the chairman and Professor Brockway pointed out, lay in the fact that the slate

of six proposed by the Nominating Committee contained two candidates from LSA. Since the Rules governing SACUA allow no more than three of its members to be from LSA, and since the committee includes two continuing members, at most one additional member of LSA could be added to SACUA at this time. However, Chairman Cohen suggested that, prior to considering how to deal with this procedural program, the Assembly might wish to hear from Professor Goodman, who had agreed to comment on the proposals of Professor Flood with respect to alternative voting procedures. The latter had been clearly spelled out in the Flood memorandum, which detailed five procedures, ranging from that now in use, through several intermediate possibilities, to one titled "value voting", which would take into account the relative preference strengths of voters with regard to the respective candidates.

In arriving at its proposed slate of nominees, Professor Goodman pointed out, the Nominating Committee had made use of the various procedures described by Professor Flood, having actually dealt with 22 slates from which the one being proposed had ultimately emerged. The new procedures being admittedly more complicated than that normally used, Professor Goodman was not suggesting that the Assembly itself move immediately to this more complex process. Nevertheless, he and Professor Flood wished to pose the various alternatives, so that, by a process of evolution, the Assembly could gradually move toward more fully meaningful voting procedures.

Uppermost in the mind of the Nominating Committee, Professor Goodman emphasized, were the elements of representativeness and balance as prospective slates were developed, themes to which other members of the Assembly responded as well. In the subsequent discussion it became evident that the committee had striven diligently to arrive at slates balanced with respect to units represented, sex, age, and areas of interest of candidates as well as their presumed position on the liberal-conservative dimension. Were the Assembly itself gradually to move toward a more comprehensive voting procedure, Professor Goodman pointed out in response to some questions, nominations from the floor would still be possible, though, for example, if one alternative--voting on trios--were adopted, nominations from the floor would likewise need to be by trio.

For the present, however, the Assembly faced the more immediate decision of how to deal with the present slate of six nominees, from which three were to be elected in April,

with at most one of the two LSA candidates among them. Professor Brockway proposed a simple solution. Should both of the LSA candidates prove to be among the three top vote-getters, only one of the two (the nominee with the higher vote) would be declared elected, the third place on SACUA then going to the person who had ranked fourth in the count. It is possible, then, that the latter might have garnered comparatively few votes, an eventuality that left some members of the Assembly feeling uneasy.

Chairman Cohen therefore presented an alternative which had tentatively been considered by SACUA. Under that procedure, a slight variant of the former, the initial vote would be counted to determine the three top candidates. Should two LSA nominees be among them, the one with the higher vote would be declared elected, along with any receiving an equal or higher number of votes. The remaining vacancy (or two vacancies if the LSA candidates had finished one-two) would then be filled by re-balloting, with no further LSA candidates eligible. This alternative procedure was subsequently adopted by the Assembly by a vote of 19 to 17 and will be employed at the meeting of April 21, 1975.

DISCUSSION
WITH VICE-
PRESIDENT
RHODES

In the face of incomplete and conflicting reports from Lansing, Vice-President Rhodes had been invited to meet with the Assembly in order to provide whatever clarification might be possible under the circumstances. This was no easy matter, Mr. Rhodes implied, since the legislative scene remains unclear, though, at best, the prospects have hardly brightened, and the future continues to look bleak. In any event, in consultation with the Budget Priorities Committee a series of emergency measures has been instituted. Among other things, there is a freeze on all pending position requests for this year (though provision for appeal regarding exemption exists). Too, there is a hold on the purchase of equipment, especially with respect to major capital items. Building renovation and major capital construction from general funds have been placed under tight control. The same degree of control is being requested of units with respect to their current operating accounts. Despite these painful realities, Vice-President Rhodes was pleased to add, the administration has received a remarkable degree of cooperation and understanding.

One can but speculate on the character and fate of the Governor's budgetary recommendations, Mr. Rhodes pointed out,

or on the consequent action of the legislature. It is possible that a reduction of as much as 6% in our operating base may have to be absorbed. Under the circumstances, it is felt that it would be unwise to lift the current freeze. Funding an adequate salary program will not be simple. One could further reduce positions or increase fees, neither of which is an easy choice. In any case, the administration is working closely with the relevant committees in the matter.

In the ensuing discussion Professor Kaplan wondered whether, in the absence of the further 2% cut which had been expected but has not materialized, retention of the present freeze might not allow the legislature to conclude that we can actually do with less. On the other hand, Vice-President Rhodes felt, the current freeze allows units the opportunity to review current vacancies in the interest of more effective decision-making with respect to next year. The freeze applies only to vacancies during the current year, he reiterated. Further, in response to a query from Professor Hoffman, Mr. Rhodes pointed out that, while policies vary among the schools and colleges, LSA has not foreclosed on assistant professorships which are voluntarily terminated, that is, whose incumbent is not recommended for tenure.

Recognizing the scope of the problems needing to be faced, Chairman Cohen thanked Vice-President Rhodes for his willingness to communicate so frankly and openly with the Assembly in these difficult times.

DISCUSSION
WITH
PROFESSOR
HYMANS

By way of apprising the Assembly of developments on another front, Professor Hymans had been invited to review the current efforts of his Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, activities which he saw as covering at least four areas. Supplementing the income of annuitants was certainly one, and active efforts are proceeding in this sector. With the help of Vice-President Pierpont, questionnaires have gone to pre-1958 retirees, a 70% return already having been achieved. With the necessary data in hand, alternative plans will be priced out and recommendations subsequently made to the Regents for supplementing the income of this group of colleagues, who had retired before the University was covered by social security and with only a meager pension.

In quite another area CESF has been collecting information concerning unionized and non-unionized faculties by way of assessing the effects of unionization. The matter is not a simple one, Professor Hymans noted. One should not be led

to believe that only salaries are affected; other factors enter as well. In any case, the issues are being carefully weighed, and information is being collected with the help of Olivia Birdsall, who serves as Administrative Assistant for CESF.

CESF continues active in a third area, the development of modular fringe benefit packages. With the assistance of the Office of Staff Benefits, its subcommittee is working toward the creation of a flexible fringe benefits program that would allow faculty members to opt for packages suiting their individual needs. Completely free choice is not feasible; social security, for example, is not optional and there are problems of actuarial soundness to be considered. Nevertheless there are inviting possibilities, and they are being actively studied by the committee. The eventual recommendations may well involve a basic fringe benefits program, superimposed on which would be a variety of modular packages providing the desired flexibility.

In the matter of compensation, Professor Hymans shared Vice-President Rhodes' frustration at the uncertainty of the legislative picture at the moment. Regardless of the actual fraction eventually available for salary increases, however, he emphasized the concern of CESF with the place of faculty compensation in relation to overall University priorities. While CESF cannot set such priorities, it is determined to make the best possible case for a satisfactory faculty compensation package to the Regents and the administrative officers. For, while the Governor and legislature decide on the budget to be allotted to the University, he pointed out, the administration itself has the autonomy to decide how the available funds are to be divided among the competing claims. And in this regard CESF is concerned with how much is required to keep faculty salaries in line with those of relevant peer institutions. Apropos of fringe benefits offered by the latter, Professor Hymans had occasion to point out in the subsequent discussion that CESF is aware of, and concerned with, such possibilities as tuition benefits for children of faculty, dental care, and other features deserving of further study.

On behalf of the Assembly, Chairman Cohen expressed appreciation for this opportunity to be kept current with developments in the area of this important committee's activities.

INTRODUCTION

Before proceeding to the next item of business, the chairman took the opportunity to introduce as guest of the Assembly, Dr. Bernhard Wiebel, Chancellor of the Pedagogische Hochschule, Ruhr (Dartmund), who was greeted with applause.

GEO IN
RETROSPECT

Having served, with Professors McKeachie and Olken, as a representative of the faculty on the Advisory Committee to the University Negotiating Committee in the recent GEO deliberations, Professor Lehmann was invited to comment on the matter in retrospect. In doing so, he assured the Assembly that its representatives had been well received and their contributions respected. Throughout the process, considerable moderation was practiced by both parties, he felt. On the other hand, he added, the genuineness of the administration's efforts was never properly credited by either the Daily or GEO. The weakest link in the whole process, however, seemed to have been that of communication with units, misinformation and lack of information having been the order of the day. These past considerations aside, the fact of the matter remains that, with formally organized groups now competing for finite resources, increased competitiveness is to be anticipated, he concluded. Were one to ask him whether the strike had achieved real gains, Professor Lehmann felt he would have to answer emphatically in the negative. In terms of basic values, neither GEO nor the educational process had won. In his estimation the mood before the strike was better than at its conclusion, and more, rather than less, would have been gained without it.

Chairman Cohen expressed the gratitude of the Assembly for the contributions of Professors Lehmann, McKeachie, and Olken; Professor Lehmann, in turn, appreciated the insights which the experience had provided.

OLD
BUSINESS

The chairman called attention to the fact that the Faculty Handbook, so long in preparation, was now in near final form, copies of the penultimate draft having recently been distributed for final comment to Deans, Directors, administrative officers, faculty committees, and the Assembly. He took occasion to comment once again on the massive editorial effort involved, paying particular tribute to the contribution of Professor John Arthos.

Though no action was required, several members of the Assembly offered supplementary comments, Professor Lands, for example, suggesting that here again was an opportunity

for constructive dialogue at the unit level, with the Handbook serving as a springboard for discussion. Professor Brockway added the further suggestion that, in moving toward the final edition, attention might well be paid to such stylistically sexist features as the use of inappropriate pronouns, while Chairman Cohen concluded that, worthy document that it is, the manual should not be saddled with the prosaic title of Handbook but accorded the dignity it deserves as "Faculty Enchiridion".

NEW
BUSINESS

Having previously called attention to the timeliness of the informative bulletin entitled "News from the Lansing Scene", prepared by the League of Women Voters on behalf of the Association of Michigan Collegiate Faculties and the Michigan Conference of AAUP, Professor Kaplan expressed the continuing hope that copies could be sent not only to the Assembly and its committees but to the whole faculty as well.

ADJOURN-
MENT

There being no further business, the Assembly was adjourned at 5:27 p.m.

Erasmus L. Hoch
Secretary