

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Regular Assembly Meeting, March 18, 1974

ATTENDANCE Present: Allen, Anton, Bishop, Brockway, Brown, Cohen, Cooperrider, Ehrenkreutz, Evaldson, Farrand, Adams, Heller, Hymans, Jameson, Bernard, Kaplan, Kelsey, Leonard, Lands, Iglehart, Lloyd, Loomis, Magrill, Mohler, Nystuen, Ostrand, Paul, Rowe, Sana, Seligson, Sibley, Springer, Falls, Taylor, Vaughn, Williams, Zweifler, Kincaid, Goodman

Absent: Berki, Buning, Caldwell, Cartwright, Cassidy, Colburn, Danielson, Darvas, Dernberger, Floyd, Gikas, Harrison, Berkove, Higgins, Hoffman, Ilie, Creeth, Kell, Kerr, Kish, Fader, Krachenberg, Lehmann, Kline, Oberman, Flinn, Schmickel, Terwilliger, Vander, Wilson, Hildebrandt

Guests: Professor Frizell Vaughan, Chairman, SARC; Ed Bordin, Vice-Chairman
Dean Charles G. Morris, Chairman, University Council
Professor Brymer Williams, Chairman, Proper Role

CALL TO ORDER Chairman Goodman called the meeting to order at 3:22 p.m. in the Rackham Amphitheatre.

MINUTES APPROVED The minutes of the February 18 meeting were approved subject to the following correction: On page 4, in the paragraph before the last one, the words "seconded by Professor Rowe" should be replaced by "seconded by Professor Paul."

SACUA'S LETTER TO LEGISLATURE Chairman Goodman drew attention to the letter to members of the State Legislature from SACUA concerning money for salary increases, copies of which had been passed out before the meeting. He said that the timing of Appropriation Committee meetings was such that it was important to get the letters out during the preceding week, which had made it impossible to discuss it with the Assembly in advance. Copies of the letter had been sent to appropriate persons at 12 other Michigan colleges and universities with the suggestion that they might want to write to their own State representatives and senators along similar lines. He had placed calls to some of these persons on the morning of the Assembly meeting, but had found that the letters had either not yet been received or had just arrived and had not yet been responded to.

ANNOUNCEMENTS Chairman Goodman reminded the Assembly, or rather those members of it who would be continuing in the new Assembly, that new SACUA members would be elected at the April meeting. He said that the nominating committee would present six names for the three vacancies, and that any additional nominations from the floor should be accompanied by suitable prepared statements from the nominees.

CONTINUATION OF BUSINESS RELATED TO SARC The next item on the agenda concerned the Senate Advisory Review Committee, and Chairman Goodman recommended that this should be taken up in a quasi committee of the whole, since SACUA and SARC had run out of time in attempting to word a proposal that could be presented to the Assembly for action. Professor Cohen, with a second by Professor Anton,

moved that the Assembly should go into a quasi committee of the whole for fifteen minutes to discuss this question; the motion was passed without opposition.

QUASI
COMMITTEE
OF THE
WHOLE

Within the quasi committee of the whole, Professor Fritz Vaughan, the chairman of SARC, reminded the Assembly that one set of issues had been taken care of at the preceding meeting. The remaining question pertained to the definition of a unit. Since the consideration of a complaint by the whole faculty of a unit would remove the complaint from SARC's jurisdiction, a decision on this point was necessary.

Chairman Goodman said that the phrase "regentally recognized teaching unit" could be taken as referring to either a school or a department. If a unit was taken to be a school, almost all cases could go to SARC, since almost all schools would be too large for the entire faculty to consider a case. Even if the uncertainty caused by some departments not being recognized as formal entities were clarified by using language like "regentally recognized departments," other difficulties could arise. For example, if a promotion was recommended by the faculty of a department and overruled by a college executive committee, it would be unreasonable to say that such a case could not go to SARC simply because the faculty of the department had treated it as a body.

Dr. Falls said that in his opinion any individual who could not get satisfaction within his own unit should have access to SARC. Chairman Goodman pointed out that this approach had been discussed at the previous Assembly meeting and turned down. Dr. Falls said that he thought the matter should be reconsidered.

Professor Cooperrider said that the appropriate unit in each case was the one where the decision was made that was being objected to. He felt that the language, as revised at the previous meeting, implied this. Professor Lands said that he felt SARC's job was to be sure that the faculty was in on any disputed decision. Professor Cohen said that he felt the language of the SARC constitution must cover variations in procedures among schools. He said that the previous discussion had indicated that SARC should concern itself with procedures rather than the substance of complaints, and asked whether procedures could be reviewed at any level. Professor Cooperrider said that SARC was clearly in the business of substantive review if a case had not already been reviewed by the appropriate faculty unit. Professor Hymans pointed out that if a faculty member had the right of appeal within a unit, the appellate group had to have proper procedures.

Professor Brockway said that the dean of LSA was not concerned about SARC, because that college had such well-defined grievance procedures that there would be little occasion for cases to go there.

QUASI COMMITTEE
OF THE
WHOLE RISES

Fifteen minutes having elapsed, the Assembly rose from the quasi committee of the whole.

Professor Vaughan said that he still had no sense of direction from the Assembly. Professor Loomis asked whether SARC could come in with a series of alternative proposals for consideration by the Assembly at the next meeting.

Chairman Goodman said that he sensed considerable sentiment for the notion of finding the level where decisions were made, and linking the concept of "unit" to the locus of each grievance.

After a brief discussion, during which Dr. Falls reiterated his belief that SARC should always be able to hear appeals, Chairman Goodman called for an informal show of hands to determine the Assembly's support for developing a definition which would define "unit" in such a way that it referred to the group which made the critical decision in a particular case. This indicated that most Assembly members favored the general idea that he had advanced. He then assured the Assembly that a specific proposal would be presented at the next meeting.

LEGISLATIVE
AND
BUDGETING
QUESTIONS:
PROFESSOR
WILLIAMS

At Chairman Goodman's invitation, Professor Brymer Williams, chairman of the Proper Role Committee, came forward to report on current legislative and budgeting questions.

Professor Williams opened by saying that much of the information he had to convey had been gathered by others, specifically Dr. Fincher and Professor Kaplan. They had gone to a meeting in East Lansing the previous Saturday that they might want to comment on.

With regard to the current status of the State budget, there had been a severe cut in the projected capital spending budget of which half, or \$30,000,000, was assigned to higher education. This included no funds for new construction, only for ongoing projects. At the University funding included the Architecture and Design building, Engineering I-A (Water Resources), General Library renovation, and work on the Health Sciences building.

As for operating funds, the Governor had recommended a six percent increase in compensation. As was pointed out in the letter from SACUA that had been distributed, for the last two years the Legislature had based its calculations on "net state" appropriations rather than the total budget, which meant that in the case of the University the increase would fall short by about \$2.4 million of the amount needed for a six percent increase.

Professor Williams said that the Governor's message was ordinarily first considered by the Senate Appropriations Committee, which would hold hearings in the next week or two. The House Appropriations Committee was further along, and the University had already made presentations to them. He had been told that the case had been very well presented by Vice-President Fauri and his staff, and had been well received by the legislators. However, they had pointed out that the State was in a severe monetary bind this year. Past experience indicated that the Legislature generally appropriated at a level close to the Governor's recommendation. However, it would do no harm for faculty members to follow up the letter from SACUA with individual letters of their own.

In answer to a question from Professor Lands about alternative ways of presenting the data to clarify the point, Dr. Fincher said that such approaches had been used but, as yet, to no avail. The technical aspects were not generally understood by legislators; only the total dollar figures were significant.

Professor Loomis asked about the Program Budget Evaluation System (PBES). Dr. Fincher replied that pure program budgeting no longer was being used in the Executive Office, but that the Legislature was beginning to take an interest in it.

Professor Kaplan said that there had been a meeting a year previously in East Lansing about PBES, the proceedings of which were now off the press. He added that there had been a symposium the previous Saturday about the coordination of higher education in the State. The issues had been vigorously debated, with speakers from Illinois and Wisconsin who described the systems in operation in those states. Congressman O'Hara had also addressed the meeting, and had spoken out strongly for the principle of low tuition. Altogether the meeting had been very worthwhile.

Professor Lands brought out the point that the University helps the State in ways other than teaching. Professor Williams agreed that this was important, and mentioned energy research in particular. Dr. Fincher noted that the Proper Role Committee has worked on this issue.

Professor Hymans said that we needed to make more hard decisions on our own about priorities, such as between faculty compensation and building, rather than appealing to the Legislature. Professor Williams pointed out that capital dollars could not be exchanged for operating expenses, and Chairman Goodman reminded the body that the legislative decision had not yet been made, and that we were trying to influence it at this point. In closing the discussion, he said that SACUA would meet again on the question.

CAMPUS
SECURITY
RECOMMEN-
DATIONS:
DEAN MORRIS

Chairman Goodman reminded the Assembly of previous discussions during the past year about University security. Members of the University Council, which was directly concerned with security matters, had taken part in these discussions. The Council had now come forth with its recommendations, and he had invited Dean Charles Morris, the chairman of the Council, to bring the Assembly up to date.

Copies of the Council's recommendations had been placed on the chairs of Assembly members prior to the meeting, and Dean Morris' remarks were in large part a review of these. He reminded the Assembly that the existing University unit of the Ann Arbor Police Force had been set up rather hastily when the Legislature forced the termination of the previous system of direct contributions from the University to the City's police budget, which had been in effect for many years. Late in 1972 the Council had asked President Fleming for a review of the situation. Mr. Davids, the Director of Safety, had already sent him a proposal to set up a separate University police department. As a result of these requests, an outside consultant, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, was hired to examine the situation and make recommendations. The primary recommendation was that a separate University police force should be set up. However, a number of alternative suggestions were also presented. The University Council decided to recommend rejection of the idea of a separate police force, but to adopt several of the other recommendations. The Council proposed moving forward slowly and re-examining the situation after a year or so. Since security seemed pretty good in the hospital and housing units, they proposed leaving those under the present jurisdictions for the time being. However, they were adopting the suggestion of IACP that the Burns contract should be phased out and replaced by a security program under the Department of Safety.

As for the Ann Arbor Police Department, the Council recognized some of the problems that had arisen, but felt that these had been partly resolved, and had made a number of specific recommendations.

Dean Morris then went over the summary of the Council's recommendations point by point, and closed by inviting questions.

Professor Loomis asked whether the financial difficulties of the City were one of the factors in the long response times to calls that had been noted. Dean Morris replied that he couldn't tell whether recent financial problems had exacerbated the difficulties, but that it was a fact that the City had never replaced the officers who were pulled out of the City system to go into the University unit, and this results in their doing double duty.

Professor Anton said that there had been some skepticism earlier about the validity of the information that was available, and he asked whether the Council was setting up a monitoring system. Dean Morris replied that they were taking some steps in that direction.

In response to a remark from Professor Kaplan urging attention to the experience of other universities, Dean Morris said that one of their reasons for going slow was to give themselves time to gather such information.

Chairman Goodman said that he and the Assembly appreciated the willingness of the Council to return to the Assembly with the issues.

ELECTION TO
INTERVIEW-
ING BOARD
FOR THE
COURT OF
APPEALS

The next item on the agenda was the election of members of the Interviewing Board for the Court of Appeals (University Judicial System). SACUA had submitted the following nominations:

Stanford Ericksen, Sr. Research Scientist, CRLT
Warren Norman, Professor of Psychology
John J. Voorhees, Assoc. Professor of Dermatology

There were no nominations from the floor, and SACUA's nominees were accepted unanimously.

SECRETARY
RETIRING;
VOTE OF
THANKS

Before proceeding to further business, Chairman Goodman reminded the Assembly that the Secretary, Professor Kincaid, was ending his term, expressed his appreciation for his services, and suggested a vote of thanks. This was promptly given. He also thanked the outgoing members of the Assembly for their contributions during their terms.

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS;
COMMENDATION
FOR
COACH ORR

Under new business, Professor Vaughn, with a second by Professor Anton, proposed a vote of commendation for Coach John Orr for the outstanding performance of the basketball team during the past season. The motion was unanimously and enthusiastically adopted.

Professor Rowe asked whether it was possible to save paper by printing material sent to the Assembly on both sides of the paper. Chairman Goodman replied that SACUA had been working on this. Unfortunately, most of the material had to be prepared in a hurry, and the choice of printing facilities had to be made on this basis.

VICE-PRESIDENT Vice-President Allan Smith asked for an opportunity to respond to some
SMITH of the concerns that had been expressed earlier in the meeting.

First, he said that the letter to the Legislature from SACUA was not all that was being done. President Fleming had sent his own letter to Lansing, and personal contacts were being pursued. They were giving the first priority to getting more dollars, and were giving the Legislature all the data at their disposal. If they did not succeed it would not be for want of trying.

As for making hard decisions, Vice-President Smith said that there would be plenty of opportunity for those after the appropriation was settled. The only other major source of funds was tuition, and no one had much stomach for further increases after the large ones of the current year.

ADJOURNMENT The Assembly adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

Wilfred M. Kincaid
Secretary