

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Regular Assembly Meeting, March 19, 1973

ATTENDANCE: Present: Rutledge, Allen, Anton, Asgar, Birch, Bowditch, Brockway, Caldwell, Cartwright, Cassidy, Cooperrider, Crawford, Danielson, Ehrenkreutz, Evaldson, Farrand, Floyd, Goodman, Johnson, Scholl, Jameson, Jensen, Kerr, Weber, Larkin, Loomis, Marshall, Meyer, Ostrand, Ice, Lagler, Rowe, Ryder, Sana, Gikas, Vaughn, Colburn, Goldstein, Wilkes, Williams, Zweifler, Mohler, Magee, Hildebrandt, Kincaid, Hinerman

Absent: Buning, Cohen, Cornish, Darvas, DeKornfeld, Fader, Franken, Krackenberg, Hertzler, Higgins, Taylor, Hymans, Creeth, Lands, Lloyd, Nelson, Nystuen, Oberman, Overseth, Sawyer, Deskins, Sears, Vander

CALL TO ORDER Chairman Hinerman called the meeting to order at 3:21 p.m. in the Rackham Amphitheater.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES The minutes of the February 19 meeting were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS Chairman Hinerman announced that the Regents had voted to approve the Rules of the University Community that had already been agreed to by Student Government Council and the Assembly. In another action, the Regents had turned down a proposal to place racial identification on employment application forms. This was the same proposal that the Assembly had expressed its opposition to at the February meeting. Both actions of the Regents were by split votes.

Chairman Hinerman drew attention to a symposium on Program Budget Evaluation Systems and Higher Education to be held at the Kellogg Center in East Lansing on Saturday, March 31. He said that the symposium was very timely in view of the efforts being made to impose program budgeting on all higher education in Michigan.

Chairman Hinerman reminded the Assembly that the spring Senate meeting would take place on April 9 in the Modern Languages Building.

RECOMMENDED CHANGES IN CESF The Assembly next took up the changes that had been recommended in the structure and operation of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty. The Committee's recommendations read as follows:

1. Appointments to the Committee run from September to September instead of July to July. The Committee believes its work which necessarily includes summer inputs will be facilitated by having new members begin and end their term in September.
2. The size of the Committee should be expanded from 10 to 13 members (3 year terms for 12 members with 4 expiring annually plus one SAGUA liaison person). Better faculty representation and greater faculty resources would result from this change.

3. Future chairpersons should be granted released time from a portion of their teaching responsibilities thereby enabling them better to direct the expanded duties of the Committee.
4. The date for issuing the Committee's Annual Report should be changed to September from April. A September report would enable the report to relate what has been accomplished relative to economic status of the faculty as well as what is recommended; i.e. salary and fringe benefit decisions for the coming year will be finalized by September.

Chairman Hinerman said that SACUA had discussed these recommendations, and felt that all of them should be adopted except the third, which called for released time for future chairmen of the Committee. Which regard to that recommendation, the feeling was that action on it should be deferred until the work loads of all committees could be considered together.

Professor Pilcher came forward and spent a few moments reviewing the Committee's recommendations. The first and fourth recommendations stemmed from the fact that the budgetary process was not keyed to the academic year. More committee members were needed because the work load was high. The recommendation for released time was related to this, and was also intended to permit the chairman to work more effectively with the staff assistant.

In answer to a question from Professor Weber about the chairman's work load, Professor Loomis pointed out that the committee included eight sub-committees, and Professor Pilcher said that he tried to get to half of the sub committee meetings, with the result that he was spending about 15 or 16 hours a week on committee business. The Committee had in mind that the released time would amount to about half time. He pointed out, in addition, that this was the third year in a row that the committee had made this request.

Professor Weber asked whether other committees would be encouraged to make a similar claim. Professor Pilcher said that he would argue that this committee was of great importance and was asked to do a great variety of tasks. Professor Loomis asked whether the added duties imposed upon the committee by the Assembly this year were a factor. Professor Pilcher said that the current year might be atypical, but that the work load was twice what it had been before.

Professor Brockway moved that the Assembly should accept all the Committee's recommendations. After the motion was seconded, Professor Wilkes moved to amend it by striking the third recommendation. His amendment was seconded, and a substantial discussion followed.

Professor Colburn raised the question of what budget the released time should be charged to. Professor Crawford said that there were several other committees, of which SACUA was one, that were also quite time-consuming. Professor Anton said that while there might be a good case for granting released time, the issue should be considered for all committees at once, not for this one separately. Professor Cooperrider asked when SACUA would have completed its review of committees; Chairman Hinerman replied that it would be sometime after he left the chairmanship, possibly this June. Professor Cooperrider suggested that the issue could be raised again at that time.

Professor Wilkes made a motion to close debate, which was seconded and passed. The amendment was passed, and the motion as amended was then passed unanimously.

REPORT ON
BUDGET AND
PLANNING
COMMITTEE

Chairman Hinerman read SACUA's progress report on the Office of Budgets and Planning and its substantive committees. The report follows:

In response to the charge made to it by Senate Assembly May 15, 1972, SACUA recommends the continuation of the Long-Range Planning, Program Evaluation, Budget Priorities, and Steering Committees as constituted until the regular Assembly meeting in November, 1973. At present, SACUA finds no reason to doubt the value of goals outlined and procedures being followed by these committees, nor their ability to interface with appropriate Assembly committees. SACUA, however, does not feel that there has been sufficient action by these committees, or indeed sufficient time for such action, to justify a full evaluation.

SACUA believes that such an evaluation must be made before it can recommend continued support of these committees through appointment of faculty membership on them on a long term basis.

REPORT ACCEPTED

The report was accepted unanimously by the Assembly.

PUBLIC
DISCLOSURE
OF PERSONAL
DATA; MOTION
BY SACUA

Chairman Hinerman presented the following motion from SACUA:

Resolved: That the Senate Assembly endorses the University's resistance to the suit recently brought against the University by the Student Government Council, The Michigan Daily, et al., calling for disclosure of personal data.

Chairman Hinerman said that much of the information requested in the suit referred to was already available in a book prepared by the University, "An Analysis of Salaries Paid to the University of Michigan Instructional Staff, 1972-73". Professor Weber said that this data was not broken down by departments, and mentioned some disparities between departments that she felt should be brought to light.

There was some discussion about the use of the terms "public" and "personal". Professor Crawford said that the data was public, but that the dispute was over the disclosure of it. Professor Anton said that he thought that salaries were public but that other information such as ethnic group backgrounds was not, adding that some of this information would be very hard to dig out. Moreover, heading "h" of the suit, asking for "other information of a like or similar nature" was open-ended and invited a fishing expedition.

Professor Weber asked whether the motion could be split, since she did not oppose disclosure of salary data. Professor Mohler said that a survey in the Music School indicated that most faculty members approved of the disclosure of salaries, but it was hard to isolate the separate items named for disclosure, and he disliked the suit.

Chairman Hinerman said that the University, as the defendant in the action, had no power to separate one item from another. That could only be done by the plaintiffs or the judge.

Professor Ryder maintained that the Assembly could distinguish the items even though the suit did not. He said that the University was a public institution, and that states, cities, and also Michigan State and some other universities published salaries. He felt that publishing salaries would be a constraint on favoritism and produce pressure to rationalize salary differences. In private industry, where salaries and wages became known as a part of collective bargaining, the effect had been to remove distrust.

Professor Kerr said that while the Assembly could go on record as favoring the release of salaries, that would call for a separate motion. The suit had either to be opposed or conceded.

Professor Ehrenkreutz said that he had been instructed by his colleagues to make a statement favoring disclosure of salary data.

Professor Crawford said that the issue was one of the principle of privacy. Could a tax supported institution withhold any information? What about reprimands in a person's file? Professor Ryder said that he agreed that personnel files should be private; however, he felt that salaries should not be.

Professor Cooperrider said that industrial analogies were not good, because there was a hierarchical structure in industry. Personally, he would be less distressed at his salary's being known that he would be about knowing what his colleagues were paid. Professor Evaldson concurred, saying that all the benefits claimed from disclosure could be achieved by more detailed breakdowns of data, without releasing individual salaries.

Professor Marshall said that a judge or jury could decide what items were to be considered public.

MOTION
PASSED

Professor Asgar, seconded by Professor Crawford, moved to close debate. This motion carried. The resolution offered by SACUA was then put to a vote, and carried with 34 votes in favor to 7 against.

Professor Marshall asked whether there was any way of introducing a motion favoring disclosure of salary data. Chairman Hinerman replied that it could be introduced under new business, but could not be put to a vote at the same meeting except after a two-thirds vote.

NOMINATIONS
AND
APPOINT-
MENTS

Chairman Hinerman now presented two nominations from SACUA as follows:

- a. Financial Affairs Committee - 2-year term,
Mary C. Bromage, Professor of Written Communica-
tions, Business Admin. (replacing James Gage)
- b. Student Relations Committee - 2-year term,
Donald R. Deskins, Ass't. Professor, LS&A, and
Director, Commission on Geog. & Afro-America.
(replacing Jens Zorn)

There were no additional nominations, and each nomination was accepted unanimously.

REPORT
ON
CESF

Under old business, Chairman Hinerman called on Professor Pilcher to report on the activities of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty.

Professor Pilcher said that CESF had met with the Regents and administrative officers. They had presented their role to the Regents on an informal basis. The Regents had expressed sympathy with their objectives, and there had been a worthwhile interchange of ideas.

The Committee was sending a questionnaire to faculty members, asking for their views about compensation and other issues.

Professor Pilcher reviewed briefly the Committee's proposals for compensation, which had been passed out at the beginning of the meeting. He pointed out that the Committee had not been asked to decide how the proposed increases were to be funded.

There was considerable discussion about the appropriateness of the figure proposed for promotions. Professor Ryder said that he felt the document was very well prepared.

In response to a question from Professor Goldstein about the chances of achieving the program, Vice-President Smith said that he didn't know, since there were a number of uncertain factors. One of these was how severe the problems created by President Nixon's budget cuts were going to be. The Governor's bill purported to put in a 4.4% increase, which was inadequate. Possible sources for increased funds were an increase by the Legislature in the Governor's proposed budget, about which he was pessimistic, and an increase in student fees. On the other side, the University faced a \$1 million loss in revenue from fees because a considerable number of non-resident students had qualified for residency by staying in Michigan six months without going to college. There were also massive needs for additional student aid. He was looking to the Budget Priorities Committee for suggestions on how to come up with a respectable salary increase in the face of these difficulties. Vice-President Smith closed by remarking that the need to meet competition could be sold better than the need to make up for low increases in the past, and that no one should be worried about the annualization of last year's salary rates; it would be done.

MOTION ON
SALARY
DISCLOSURE

Under new business, Professor Anton moved, with a second by Professor Larkin, a resolution to the effect that the Assembly favored the release of salary data on an individual basis. Professor Kerr moved to postpone discussion of the resolution until the next meeting. His motion was seconded and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Assembly adjourned at 5:22 p.m.

Wilfred M. Kincaid
Secretary