

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Assembly Meeting, March 21, 1977

ATTENDANCE

Present: Members Angus, Aupperle, Baublis, Bornstein, Browder, Cartwright, Christensen, Cohen, Corpron, Heller, Crawford, Crichton, Edwards, A., Eisley, Elving, Goldman, Gordon, Gray, Browne, Harris, J., Harris, R., Horsley, Johnson, Kachaturoff, Caldwell, Kish, Lands, Leary, Lehmann, Lindberg, Livermore, Lytle, Merte, Millard, Heers, Nesbitt, Fowler, Portman, Rabkin, Scott, Seger, Sherman, Stross, Votaw, Weeks, West, Winans, Colburn, Williams

Absent: Members Adams, Brazer, Child, Coon, Cornell, DeKornfeld, Deskins, Diamond, Downen, Edwards, O., Faulkner, Fekety, Flynn, Hildebrandt, Jones, Murphey, Proctor, Simonds, Soucek, Northcutt, Zorn

Guests: Professor Bruce Friedman, Chairman, Civil Liberties Board
Vice-President Frank H. T. Rhodes

CALL TO ORDER

Professor Williams called the March meeting of the Senate Assembly to order at 3:20 p.m. He observed that the agenda had three important items for debate and consideration. Professor Williams urged the members of the Assembly to use their floor debate time judiciously in light of the rather lengthy agenda.

CONSIDERATION
OF MINUTES

Professor Gordon asked that the minutes of the Senate Assembly meeting of February 21, 1977 be corrected so that a point he made concerning the comparison of the salaries of civil service employees and the Michigan faculty would be represented accurately. In the fifth full paragraph, page two, a sentence should be added. The sentence: In Michigan, however, the evidence is clear that the salary increases for The University of Michigan faculty have been below increases given the state civil service workers. With this one correction the minutes were approved.

The minutes of the Assembly's Special Meeting of February 28, 1977 were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Professor Williams announced that the Regents have determined that the open meetings act applies solely to the meetings of the Regents. This position is consistent with the practice being adopted by the Regents of other state-supported universities in Michigan. Professor Williams said this view had been supported by the State Relations Committee.

DISCUSSION OF
PROPOSED RE-
VISION OF
RECRUITMENT &
EMPLOYMENT
GUIDELINES

Professor Bruce Friedman, Chairman of the Civil Liberties Board discussed the revisions in the proposed policy governing Career Planning and Placement Services. He noted that a change in the policy as distributed was necessary. The last sentence of the fifth paragraph was amended to read:

Sporadic requests from a prospective employer for relevant information concerning a named individual student or alumnus, and student or alumnus initiated requests that relevant information be forwarded to a named prospective employer will not be considered as a planning and placement service for the purposes of these guidelines.

Some discussion of this revision followed with Professors Weeks and Votaw urging Professor Friedman to make sure the "services" concept was clear.

Professor Johnson moved the proposed policy with the change shown above and his motion was seconded. In the discussion of the motion, Professor Elving asked if the intent of the entire policy was clear as to discrimination. Professor Baublis said he was concerned about the word "sporadic." Professor Baublis said the word weakens the statement. Professor Gordon picked up the point by saying that alternatives for avoiding the word entirely should be considered. Professor Friedman said he wanted the issue covered in its broadest application and that the wording seemed appropriate.

Professor Browne said that he was concerned about the lack of reference to foreign employers. He said he was hopeful that their involvement could be eliminated. Professor Friedman said that after a review of the concept of "legal discrimination" the Committee felt that all reference to foreign employers should be dropped. The vote was taken on the policy as amended and it passed.

GUIDELINES FOR
DISCONTINUANCE
OF ACADEMIC
PROGRAMS

Professor Williams opened the discussion of the Guidelines for Discontinuance of Academic Programs. In his review he noted the level of cooperation and effort between members of SACUA and the Office of the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. Professor Williams then asked Vice-President Rhodes to review the activities of the last month when the Assembly asked SACUA to give careful consideration to the document. Vice-President Rhodes came to the lectern to discuss the review of the Guidelines which have taken place. He opened by noting that the Guidelines had to find approval in three camps; with the faculty, with the Regents and with the Deans. He went on to explain with great care the necessity for such Guidelines. Next he discussed the various amended versions and the committee review given to each of them. He noted that version number five was taken to the Deans on March 16 and their approval was given. However, a final revision, number six, was completed on the day of the current meeting. The final draft was the result of the suggestions of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of SACUA.

Vice-President Rhodes thanked the faculty for their suggestions and involvement on this most important matter. Professor Williams took the floor and recorded his equal praise to the administrative officials for their cooperation and consideration.

Mrs. Downs distributed the latest version, draft number six, dated March 21, 1977. Professor Williams went through the document noting the changes which had been made since members of the Assembly had reviewed the Guidelines. Professor Williams noted that the changes which were made reflected the concerns of the members of the Assembly and of SACUA. He also said that he did understand that the latest changes incorporated into the March 21, 1977 draft had not been seen by the Deans. He agreed with Vice-President Rhodes that if the document was approved by the Assembly it would have to be taken to the Deans once again for their review and final support.

After Professor Williams finished his review Mrs. Downs distributed a one page flow sheet which diagrammed the procedures for the review discussed in the Guidelines. The flow sheet had been prepared by Professor Lehmann.

He took a few minutes to explain the chart. Professor Lehmann said he hoped that the flow sheet would be helpful to members of the Assembly in visualizing the process stipulated in the Guidelines.

Professor Williams again took the floor to say that SACUA unanimously supports the Guidelines as they now stand. He urged discussion of the latest draft.

Professor Lehmann moved the adoption of the Guidelines and his motion was seconded. With the motion the floor was formally opened for debate.

Professor Scott said that he wanted a further clarification of the term "financial exigency." He said "what is the financial condition which compels closure"? Professor Lehmann said that there are various points of view on the question. He continued to say, however, that the current document is clear in that it mentions that programs central to the University programs will not be closed.

Professor Gray asked about the statement found on the bottom of page two which had to do with the cost of a particular program. He was particularly concerned with the sentence which read, "Here the total resources, not just general and/or instructional funds, must be considered." He asked that this statement be clarified.

The ad hoc committee to review the budget would begin with the school or college as a point of departure in their analysis was the response given by Vice-President Rhodes. He said that we must view the school or college budget as a critical element in the initial stages of review.

Professor Gordon said that where tenured faculty are concerned we need a complete review of the entire University resources. He said it was his opinion that the school or college budget alone should not be the single determining factor when a decision to release faculty members was involved. He also asked if the open meetings act would apply to such meetings. In response to the question of whether the entire University budget would be reviewed Vice-President Rhodes said that "the resources" referred to at the top of page three were those of the particular school or college mentioned in the preceding sentence. Deans and executive committees of the various schools and colleges do make annual budgetary adjustments between particular programs, as does the Vice-President for Academic Affairs between the operating units on the campus.

Professor Christensen said that he wanted a brief review of Regents Bylaw 5.09 and Bylaw 5.10 before he was ready to vote. Professor Williams reviewed both sections in depth pointing out the substance of each section.

Professor Goldman said that the statement opening III-A-2 which said, "The University has never released tenured faculty members because of program closure", should be dropped. Professor Williams said that he thought the sentence has been included as a statement of historical fact. He said that he saw no reason to expunge the sentence.

Professor Gordon asked whether or not Bylaw 5.09 defined "financial exigency." Professor Williams said that the Bylaw did not define the term.

Professor Angus asked about the University's commitment to retain and relocate tenured faculty. His concern was for the precise commitment of the University. Professor Angus said the vagueness of section III-A-2 dealing with relocation was bothersome. Professor Williams said he agreed that there was vagueness but that the latitude given was valuable and the statement should stand. Professors Votaw and Johnson supported the commitments of Professor Williams.

Professor Elving said he felt this "document for academic housecleaning was about as good as we can expect." He went on to say that there should be some expression of concern for the prevention of problems which might lead us to one or another financial exigency in the future. He said we need a better method of "policing ourselves" and we need to take greater care in introducing new programs. Professor Elving said the current document was "probably as effective as we can get" but we need to look to the future. Professor Kish said he wanted to support the views of Professor Elving. He urged the Assembly to look to the future. He speculated that we ought to review current administrative structures as a method of saving. He asked, for example, "are departments necessary"? Professor Weeks endorsed the remarks of Professor Elving concerning the quality of the document. He urged support of the Guidelines as now drafted.

Professor Rabkin worried about a "sort of Machiavellian scenario" taking over the thinking of the University. He went on that it was therefore only logical that we all review, with the greatest of care the appeal procedures which were currently in place and those which were being proposed.

Professor Portman took the floor to express his concern for the rationale for and the timing of peer committee review. He argued that in his opinion, the flow chart authored by Professor Lehmann did not coincide with the procedures spelled out in the Guidelines. He said he would not support the document until his concerns were alleviated. At this point Professors Lehmann and Lands, and Vice-President Rhodes, all took time to clarify the steps of the review procedures and the role of the peer committee review.

A new concern entered the discussion at this time. Professor Gordon said that the sentence which included the idea that the Dean, faculty or Vice-President may recognize a program to no longer be viable was bothersome. He suggested the word recognize was inappropriate and that a better word might be hypothesize.

Professor Elving said that since we have some difficulty with the word recognize maybe the word consider would be more neutral and therefore more appropriate. Vice-President Rhodes said he would accept such a change and suggested that the final draft of the Guidelines would use the word consider.

Professor Gordon was the last speaker in the discussion of the Guidelines and he took the floor to say that he would have to vote "NO" on the current draft. He explained that it was his view that tenured faculty were not truly protected by the document and that the procedures, as spelled out, gave more power to the central administration than properly afforded them by the Regents Bylaws.

The question was called for and accepted by the Chairman. The vote was taken and the Assembly gave its approval to the March 21, 1977 version of the document entitled, "Discontinuance of Academic Programs."

REPORT ON THE
BUDGET FOR
1977-1978

The report on the budget picture was given by Vice-President Rhodes. He noted as he began his presentation that he was pleased to have the opportunity to discuss the prospects for the 1977-78 budget with the faculty. He observed that he has presented a similar report in each of the last two years and has found the reports helpful in communicating the budget situation to the faculty.

To assist in making points of the presentation clear, Vice-President Rhodes used 14 slides highlighting major issues and concerns. As each slide was shown, Vice-President Rhodes elaborated as to the meaning and implications of the information shown in the slide.

The first two slides showed Michigan's standing in a national ranking of how state governments supported their higher education institutions. Vice-President Rhodes pointed out that Michigan had slipped badly in the last few years. Our national ranking places us 37th in dollars appropriated per \$1000 of personal income. He said we are below the mean and there does not seem to be much hope that the trend of the last few years of losing ground will be reversed in the immediate future. The third and fourth slides carried information concerning Michigan's standing with other "Big Ten states" in terms of state support. Again the picture was not a happy one. Michigan was shown in last place in the data presented. The next few slides centered on how well The University of Michigan had been doing in relation to other state-supported educational institutions in dollar appropriations. The most disturbing information presented showed that the University was not only last in the percentage increases in state appropriations over the last decade, but when factors for inflation were accounted for we were actually losing ground much faster than any other state institution.

In discussing the ninth slide which showed the percentage of general fund revenue from student tuition Dr. Rhodes expressed deep concern. He noted that last year we received over one-third of our general fund from tuition. This is up from roughly the one-fourth figure of the past few years. Dr. Rhodes said that the trend toward bigger tuition increases is one that must be examined. He worried that the implications of such a trend may have grave consequences on the character of the University.

Slide ten displayed the line items which have seen the greatest change in recent years. The two areas which have seen the greatest increases were student aid and dollars spent for utilities. The areas which have suffered included plant improvements, supplies (current accounts), and equipment and book appropriations. The next slide was one that showed that we have been losing capitation and formula grant dollars in large amounts over the last two years. Dr. Rhodes pointed out that this only exacerbates the problem. Further he said there is every indication that these losses will continue in the next few years.

The last three slides were devoted to the 1977-78 budget. Vice-President Rhodes said that in the current 1976-77 budget our state appropriation fell far short of the additional \$13,650,000 we need to meet budget necessities. This information was clearly presented in slide number 12. In the next slide, the proposed 1977-78 budget was outlined. Dr. Rhodes said that we should have \$17,766,000 more than our current budget to meet our needs. This included needs of \$8,268,000 and a hypothetical but provisional 6% salary

increase which would equal \$9,498,000. The last slide showed what we would have to consider if the state appropriation was \$10,005,283 as has been suggested. Vice-President Rhodes discussed the options open to us if the appropriation was far below the needs that have been identified for the 1977-78 budget year. Dr. Rhodes said that Lansing has repeatedly told us that next year will be better in terms of our state appropriation. However, at this point he said he had "serious concerns" about the 1977-78 budget picture.

Following the presentation there was one question from the floor and that concerned faculty salaries. Professor Elving asked if the University should not consider budgeting money for faculty salaries which could be separated into money for promotions and money for cost-of-living increases. Professor Elving said that promotion increases are not cost-of-living increases and that this fact should be recognized. Vice-President Rhodes responded in a general manner in order to comment on faculty salaries. He said that the University had just undergone a difficult strike period just for that purpose. He continued to say that on the specific point raised by Professor Elving, the Deans and Executive Committees are charged with budget allocations for the schools and colleges. Decisions concerning the specific budget allocations rests with them.

OTHER BUSINESS Under the final item of the agenda, "Other Business", Professor Gray took the floor and asked to present a resolution concerning the review of the Department of Population Planning. The resolution read:

Whereas, the Board of Regents will have before it for action at its April meeting University procedures and criteria for discontinuance of academic programs, and

Whereas, the Board also has before it a recommendation from the Dean of the School of Public Health to terminate the Department of Population Planning, and

Whereas, the recommendation to terminate the Department was developed prior to adoption of University procedures and criteria, and served to alert the Senate Assembly to needed safeguards in the procedure which have so far been denied the Department,

Therefore, the Senate Assembly urges the Vice-President for Academic Affairs not to make recommendations to the Board of Regents regarding the Department of Population Planning until the University procedures and criteria have been adopted by the Board and have been applied fully and fairly to the Department.

The motion was seconded and the Assembly was asked if in fact they wished to consider the resolution at the meeting at which the resolution had been introduced. The motion to allow consideration, which requires a "yes" vote by two-thirds of those present, was formally moved and carried by the Assembly.

Vice-President Rhodes was asked to comment on the resolution at this point. He said that the current procedures described in the Guidelines for Discontinuance of Academic Programs had been followed in every respect save one, the timing of formal departmental notification. He said further that every effort had been made to insure that the review was complete and fair to the Department.

Professor Johnson took the floor to say that he felt a resolution of this magnitude should come to the Assembly with the support of the local unit. Since the resolution had not been discussed by the faculty of the School of Public Health, Professor Johnson moved to table the resolution. His non-debatable motion was seconded and a vote taken. The Assembly voted to table the resolution.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

C. William Colburn
Secretary