

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting of 15 April 1985

ATTENDANCE

Present: Bailey, Bassett, Beutler, Bissell, Briggs, Boyd, Carnahan, Checkoway, Chudacoff, Cohen, Comninou, Durrance, Easley, Green, King, Han, Hanks, Jacobs, Hacker, Kusnerz, Montalvo, Lehmann, Lewis, Lougee, Loup, Jackson, Margolis, Manis, McClamroch, Mermier, Meyer, Miller, Moerman, Moran, Mosher, Nadelman, Oleinick, Pierce, Radine, Reed, Rizki, Ross, Rutledge, Sanders, Schteingart, Sears, Wiseman, Brewer, Burdi, Malvin, Zelenock, Ross, Yocum

Absent: Ascione, Dahlke, English, Eschman, Farley, Glover, Gulari, Herbert, Howe, Kahn, Leonard, Lockwood, Lorey, Deshpande, McCarus, Olsen, Payne, Schauer, Scheele, Snyder, Stapp, Stebbins, Taylor, Todor, Warschausky, White, Zweifler

Professor Green convened the meeting at 3:20 p.m.

MINUTES

The minutes of 18 March 1985 were amended to show that Professor Gikas chairs the Big 10 Athletic Conference this year. They were then accepted.

MATTERS ARISING

Professor Green explained that this will be a new standard agenda item to handle matters arising from the minutes. Today there were none.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Lee Winkelman, Acting Chair, University Council, has offered to meet with SACUA to discuss work on the code of non-academic conduct. SACUA will do so after Council has completed its work.

2. Professor Radine and Professor McClamroch have created a computer conference for health care information. After signing on to MTS, type SO CESF:Forum, then follow instructions. The conference is available beginning this week.

#### OVERVIEW OF SENATE ASSEMBLY AND SENATE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

Professor Green stated that the Senate consists of all professorial and research staff, librarians and the University's Executive Officers. Senate Assembly is the elected representative body of the Senate, with members apportioned among schools and colleges, while SACUA is the executive committee elected by Senate Assembly.

There are six advisory committees, one for each Vice President, which report to both the Assembly and SACUA. Additional committees include: Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (CESF), the Civil Liberties Board (CLB), Rules, and Tenure Committees. SACUA maintains liaison with all these as well as with many others to which it nominates or appoints members. He encouraged all members to identify capable nominees and to forward their names by April 29 for consideration for the next round of appointments.

#### FACULTY GOVERNANCE: A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

Professor James L. (Jerry) Miller, Jr., Center for the Study of Higher Education, considered the differences between reality, professional mythology, and practicalities of organizational behavior as they relate to faculty participation in university governance. At present, faculty participation is a reality embodied in a set of constantly changing contracts, whether they are written or rewritten, between faculty and the University administration. This contrasts with both groups' preference for immediate, definitive answers to questions and issues made possible by a more stable Constitution - like arrangement where change comes through recourse to the judiciary or amendment to the Constitution.

The present reality also contrasts with much of the nearly 350 year history of American higher education. During most of this time colleges and universities were run by their presidents who, in many cases were most successful when they were the most autocratic. The great institutions were built by individuals, that is, presidents, who established ties with the sources of money, power and influence and who used those ties to assemble the elements which would make a successful university. These elements included the faculty who, through their academic excellence, were recognized as an important institutional resource and as having a major role in determining institutional character and structure. It has been less than 100 years since faculty formally asserted their right to involvement in university governance.

Currently, there are several organizational and social uses of faculty involvement in institutional governance and/or management. Faculty expertise in academic matters such as faculty selection, course design, and student admission, makes size and complexity manageable for the institution. A tradition associated with this use of faculty expertise is the protection of faculty decision-making against administrative intervention.

Changes in both the educational environment and the larger environment pose problems and can precipitate major issues. Prominent among these changes are those which constrain resources. Almost inevitably this creates a situation in which the administration is more amenable than is the collective faculty to adapting the institution to changing times. Issues involved included the boundaries of faculty decision-making, willingness of faculty members and groups to compromise, willingness of the administration to accept the principle of faculty participation in decision-making, administration commitment to an informed faculty and respect for responses it receives from that faculty. A strength which the several parts of the faculty and administrative mixture can create is a mutual balance act in which some parts complement others and there is a recognition that this benefits the University. The relationship of faculty and universities in America is based upon a contractual relationship which grows out of their need for one another. These relationships are, and always have been, constantly changing. Change is appropriate, it makes a difference whether those engaged in change are aware that it is taking place.

In response to questions from Professor Green and Professor Burdi, Professor Miller said that where unions have emerged, the relationship between faculty and administration has weakened. In general, where tradition is weak, more writing of the contract ensues. At institutions like Michigan, where the tradition is strong, faculty flexibility and involvement has helped the administration to perform better. It is very important for the University to honor unwritten contracts, otherwise it becomes necessary to commit them to writing, a situation which promotes an adversarial relationship.

#### REPORT FROM THE GOVERNMENT RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Professor George Cavender, Chair, reviewed the SACUA charge to the committee in its advisory role to Richard Kennedy, the Vice President for Government Relations, and reported on ten areas of committee effort during the year. These included:

1. Proposal C (Voter's Choice).
2. Nuclear Free Ann Arbor Proposal.
3. Impact of the faculty on state funding to the University.
4. Governor's Commission on Higher Education.
5. Committee name change.

6. Orientation to the University for new state legislators.
7. Animal rights legislation.
8. Supercomputer grant.
9. Engineering Research Center proposal.
10. Budget status of the University.

Professor Cavender thanked committee members for their service and concluded with two personal observations. In his view the committee must be allowed more advisory input in a broader series of issues and problems across the University spectrum. Limited input particularly after decisions are made compromises effectiveness and discourages potential involvement. Also for the chair to achieve maximum effectiveness, he urged the appointment be made for two consecutive terms.

In the ensuing discussion, Professor Comninou stated her objection to politicizing scientific evaluation in the awarding of research grants. Professors Cavender and Briggs noted that factors encouraging this trend include larger grants, inclination of legislators to be involved in the process and change in tactics among some peer institutions. Because the issue is unlikely to atrophy, the University will need to continue discussing and grappling with it. Upon request Professor Cavender will provide details documenting trends over the last year or two.

With respect to the supercomputer grant, Professor Bailey said it was a mistaken notion that U of M was the only big university to propose using a Japanese computer. All proposals included computers whose components are heavily Japanese. Professor Cavender disagreed, stating that U of M's proposal was the only one to specify Japanese equipment. Noting that all scientific societies oppose politicization of science, Professor Marc Ross stated that all procedures were followed in reviewing the specific proposals and hoped that Government Relations would not recommend "end running" the process. Professor Cavender replied that the committee did not intend to recommend such action but rather to draw attention to changing factors and practices.

Professor Cohen corrected an estimate of cost for breeding dogs for laboratory experiments. Each would cost \$1000 not \$150. This increase would have a significant impact on research. He applauded the committee's consideration of the issue, urged it to continue to do so and noted the need to educate the public at large to the implications of changes in the animal rights policy.

#### REPORT FROM THE BUDGET PRIORITIES COMMITTEE

Professor Richard Bailey, Chair, stated that BPC work follows the budget cycle. Because the FY 1986 cycle runs another two or three months, his report is not year-end but rather recounts BPC's purposes and activities to date.

The committee's goal is to build knowledge of General Fund expenditures so that it can advise Vice President Frye in his role as chair of the Committee on Budget Administration. The Vice President's willingness to listen, to discuss and be guided by advice accounts for the spirited involvement and dedication of BPC. This year BPC consists of thirteen faculty, two vice presidents, two deans, two students and one alumnus.

Efforts this year have included consideration of the Management Incentives Task Force Report, financial aid, minority aid, Regents' Fellowships and NSF Fellowships supplementation. One member has attended each school or college budget conference with the Vice President's office. BPC is also involved when schools and colleges are reviewed.

Professor Sanders asked Professor Bailey to comment on BPC's goal to be helpful to the Vice President in context with the reports represented by Professors Miller and Cavender. Professor Bailey replied that effectiveness, in his view, stems from trust rather than from tension resulting from polarized positions. Both BPC and the Vice President are thoughtfully adversarial. Much discussion in committee leads to consensus rather than to votes. In his view the Vice President wants healthy faculty input and governance and the University is fortunate to have him and President Shapiro at their levels. Ms. Kusnerz, BPC member, supported Professor Bailey's analysis and credited him with encouraging fair, open discussions and keeping BPC on track.

#### REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF THE ASSOCIATION OF MICHIGAN COLLEGIATE FACULTIES (ACMF)

Professor Charles Lehmann reported that he and Professor Maxine Perrine, UM-Flint, are elected representatives to ACMF which was established in 1971 and consists of two voting members from each public institution in the state. ACMF's goals are to influence legislators or representatives of legislative agencies, facilitate exchange of information, foster cooperation, study administrative practices and problems at the members' institutions, and speak on issues to agencies or individuals in higher education.

ACMF met April 12 and among other business met with Representative William Sederburg, chair of the Senate Select Committee, to discuss his report on the Governor's Commission on Higher Education and his Senate proposals for funding higher education. The group also met with Gary Sullenger (Senate fiscal agency) and Paul Reinhardt (House fiscal agency) to discuss formula funding of higher education.

#### OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

NEW BUSINESS

Professor Briggs reported that in a statewide survey of opinions, U of M was viewed as a special institution of high quality but not one having claim on special funding. Evidence is needed that the University is doing something unusual which justifies extra money.

Professor Muriel Ross reported that the Development and Communications Committee also discussed the loss of the supercomputer grant. This is a great loss for the whole University and merits an explanation in the Record. It is too easy to dismiss the matter as "pork barreling" and critical that Senate Assembly or SACUA take up the issue. Professor Green stated that SACUA will pursue it.

Noting the growing importance of computers in the University, Professor Carnahan asked why SACUA has no representative on the Computer Policy Committee. Ms. Nowack replied that the predecessor committee had SACUA input on membership and that the matter is an agenda item for SACUA's meeting with Mr. Van Houweling.

Professor Comninou proposed that animal rights be made an Assembly agenda item.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Patricia B. Yocum  
Senate Secretary