

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Regular Assembly Meeting, April 16, 1973

ATTENDANCE

1972-73 Assembly

Present: Allen, Anton, Asgar, Birch, Bowditch, Brockway, Caldwell, Cartwright, Cassidy, Cohen, Cooperrider, Cornish, Crawford, Danielson, Ehrenkreutz, Evaldson, Farrand, Floyd, Franken, Goodman, Johnson, Scholl, Higgins, Taylor, Hymans, Jameson, Jensen, Kerr, Larkin, Lloyd, Loomis, Marshall, Meyer, Nelson, Nystuen, Oberman, Overseth, Ice, Rowe, Sana, Sears, Vander, Vaughn, Colburn, Murphy, Wilkes, Williams, Mohler, Magee, Hinerman, Hildebrandt, Kincaid

Absent: Rutledge, Buning, Darvas, DeKornfeld, Kluge, Krachenberg, Hertzler, Creeth, Weber, Lands, Ostrand, Lagler, Ryder, Sawyer, Deskins, Gikas, Zweifler

1973-74 Assembly

Present: Berki, Bishop, Dernberger, Kaplan, Kell, Kelsey, Kindt (replacing Taren), Kish, Lehmann, Magrill, Schmickel, Seligson, Terwilliger

Absent: Brown, Harrison, Hoffman, Ilie, Johnson, Sibley, Springer, Taren, Wilson

Guests: Mr. Tom Clark, Professor Wilfred Kaplan, and Vice-President Smith

CALL TO
ORDER

Chairman Hinerman called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m. in the Rackham Amphitheater.

APPROVAL OF
MINUTES

The minutes of the March 19 meeting were approved as distributed. However, Professor Cohen pointed out that a correction was called for in the minutes of the SACUA meeting of March 12, as follows:

Announcements & Communications - third paragraph.

Dr. William Cash and Professor Carl Cohen had been asked by members of the Civil Liberties Board to meet with Dean Stokes in order to discuss the civil liberty ramifications of a data-gathering system now being designed by the Graduate School.

ANNOUNCE-
MENTS

Chairman Hinerman drew attention to the questionnaire that had been circulated by the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, and asked Assembly members to urge any of their colleagues who had not filled out the questionnaire to do so. Over 1600 replies had been received up to this point. The replies to one question, that on disclosure of faculty salaries, were pertinent to a later item on the Assembly agenda. There were 532 responses (33.0%) in favor of disclosure, 1,018 (63.1%) opposed, and 63 (3.9%) undecided.

RESOLUTION
ON DISCLOSURE
OF SALARIES

The next item on the agenda was the consideration of the following resolution, first presented by Professor Anton at the March meeting.

RESOLVED: That the Senate Assembly endorses public disclosure of all University salaries, individually and by name.

Before opening the resolution for discussion, Chairman Hinerman asked the members to bear in mind that the incoming Assembly had to convene after the current Assembly adjourned. It was therefore desirable that adjournment should take place not later than 4:45.

Professor Anton presented some arguments in favor of his resolution, remarking that its language had been slightly refined since the previous meeting.

He said that while some faculty members believed strongly that salary information was private, and while he respected this belief, he felt that as public employees, faculty members did not have the right to withhold this information. In addition, he felt that disclosing salaries would have some salutary consequences. There were great inequalities between salaries at present, and public disclosure would result in pressure toward equalization. He hoped that pressure would also develop in the direction of a more rational salary policy in general. At the same time, he felt that experience at other institutions indicated that the consequences of disclosing salaries would be neither disastrous, as some feared, nor tremendously beneficial, as some hoped.

Professor Larkin supported the resolution, saying that the current system fostered suspicion between individuals within a department, which would disappear when salaries were published, thus enhancing morale.

Professor Jensen said that most of the gains sought by the proponents of the resolution could be achieved by some sort of coded release of salary information without names attached. A properly designed tabulation would show each individual his own relative standing, and could also exhibit differences between units and the position of minority groups and women.

Professor Higgins said that a poll conducted in the School of Public Health had shown that 33 faculty members were opposed to the resolution, while there were 25 in favor and 3 abstentions.

Personally, he felt that while there was a case for publishing averages, ranges, and other statistics for various groups, disclosing salaries by name would be a needless invasion of privacy. It was likely to cause increased friction between faculty members, and represented ill-conceived, mischievous folly.

Professor Hymans said that he could live with either disclosure or non-disclosure. He felt that the term "University salaries" required clarification. Responding to Professor Anton's arguments, he said that a rational salary policy might well involve as much inequality as the present system.

Professor Ehrenkreutz said that he had been mandated by his colleagues to support the resolution. He reminded the Assembly of the fervent debate a year earlier over Professor Schuman's resolution concerning classified research projects. Part of the question was the meaning of the term "public". He concluded by saying that he was disturbed by the low salaries being paid some faculty members under the present system, which might be raised if salaries were disclosed.

Professor Evaldson expressed agreement with those who said that all the desirable consequences of disclosure could be achieved by suitable

statistical breakdowns. Since salaries were related to the sum-total of a faculty member's past contributions and could not be reduced, if salaries were disclosed almost everyone would see someone else who was getting more than he was and doing less.

He added that the analogy with industry mentioned by some was a poor one. For one thing, the Dearborn paper didn't print the salaries at Ford, while if salaries were disclosed here the Daily would be sure to run a special issue listing them. Should those whose salaries were below the median be subjected to humiliation?

Professor Mohler said that while he agreed with some of the sentiments that had been expressed in opposition to the resolution, he wanted to put on record the fact that a majority of the Music School faculty favored disclosure of salaries.

Professor Sana said that a poll of the Nursing School had revealed that most of its members opposed the resolution, although they felt that some values might be achieved by disclosure. The salary determination mechanisms within the unit had been revised recently, and the changes were generally regarded as an improvement.

Professor Anton said that he thought a coding proposal along the lines suggested by Professor Jensen could be worked out. He thought that most of those expressing opinions were more certain of the consequences of disclosure than he was; it had not been disastrous elsewhere, but neither had it been a panacea. He agreed with Professor Hymans' statement that rationality and equality were not the same thing. However, he felt that making salaries public might reduce some unhappiness, and might ultimately reduce the concentration upon monetary rewards.

In the remaining discussion, several persons indicated that an amended resolution along the lines suggested by Professor Jensen, that is, one calling for extensive disclosure of salary information without identification of individuals, would meet with their approval. However, time was growing short and no specific amendment was offered. A call by Professor Wilkes to close debate was passed, and the resolution was then defeated by a vote of 12 in favor to 34 against.

RESOLUTION
DEFEATED

REMARKS BY
VICE-
PRESIDENT
SMITH

Vice-President Smith had arrived during the preceding discussion, and Chairman Hinerman invited him to come forward and bring the Assembly up to date on budget developments.

Vice-President Smith's remarks were primarily concerned with the impact of recent federal budget proposals on the support of University programs. He said that every unit that had a problem was working hard on it, and that he was meeting with them as often as he could. He was going to go to the Regents that week with the suggestion that they should make a formal request for supplemental State support. In the past, the Legislature had not been responsive to requests for replacement of lost federal support, but the notion that federal revenue sharing had this purpose was now growing in Lansing.

The amount of support being lost was probably greater than \$9 million, divided roughly equally among student aid, traineeships, and instructional support. The strongest effort in Lansing would be to stress the importance of not dismantling instructional programs. This did not mean that student support should be belittled. In any squeeze, support for continuing students would have priority. This support might not take the most desirable form, but the University would do the best it could. What to do about new students was on the agenda for the Graduate School. He hoped that we would be able to prevent desired programs from disappearing.

In conclusion, Vice-President Smith pointed out that distressing as the situation was, very few other universities were able to live with the uncertainty as well as we could.

In answer to a question from Professor Ehrenkreutz, Vice-President Smith said about \$1,100,000 of overhead funds was being lost with the severance of Willow Run Laboratories. The administration intended to handle this by budget reductions without calling on individual units for help.

Professor Colburn asked whether a group of specific requests or one general request would be sent to Lansing. Vice-President Smith said that there would be some of both. In general, it was easier to get money for specific programs. He was pessimistic about getting additional money for student aid. In reply to a question about the Opportunity Program from Professor Marshall, he replied that it would not be affected; that decision had been made by the Regents some time ago.

REPORT BY
R. CLARK

The next item on the agenda was a report by Mr. Tom Clark, the chairman of The Site and Program subcommittee of ACRICS, on proposed new athletic and recreational facilities.

Mr. Clark began by saying the first question in people's minds was why we should talk about new recreational facilities when there was so little money in hand that existing buildings had to be closed on Sundays. The answer he gave was that expenses were now being paid out of general funds, while the proposal called for seeking other sources. One of these was Intercollegiate Athletics, which came out in the black at the University this year. Compared with other schools, we were well off in this regard. Second, some alumni gifts might be forthcoming, probably in small amounts. There were additional possibilities, such as benefit games.

Mr. Clark went on to say that ACRICS had been asked to consider sites rather than funding. They had been split on the question of location, but they now favored two sites, one on North Campus and one on Central Campus. There was some difficulty in reconciling the figures on square footage and costs that had been given out so far, and he felt that a sequential approach might make sense. He pointed out that on a long-term loan, interest payments were by far the largest part of the total cost. He suggested creating a building fund, and attending to the most pressing needs first; this would reduce the burden on the students.

Summarizing, Mr. Clark said that the main points were the shifting of expenditures away from general funds, and the need for making the best of limited resources.

RESOLUTION
PROPOSED

Professor Goodman, with a second by Professor Anton, moved the following resolution, which had already been distributed to the Assembly:

RESOLVED: That any faculty/staff user fee related to recreation and sports facilities at the University of Michigan be collected in a manner which facilitates payment, such as payroll deduction, in order to make it as easy as possible for faculty and staff desirous of supporting the program to do so.

In introducing his resolution, Professor Goodman said that he hoped the support engendered in this way would be substantial. In response to questions, he said that anyone who preferred to pay fees outright rather than through payroll deduction was welcome to do so, and there was no intention of imposing a tax on faculty members.

Vice-President Smith entered the discussion, saying that while there would be much resistance to a general tax on faculty, it appeared that there was considerable support for charging substantial users' fees. He said that he saw no difficulty in arranging payroll deductions.

RESOLUTION
PASSED

The resolution was put to a vote, and carried unanimously. Vice-President Smith said that he would convey the resolution to the Regents.

Professor Cohen said that Vice-President Smith, and the Regents, should realize that the faculty were actively interested in supporting the new recreational facilities, and that the reason the resolution had been passed with so little discussion was that a great deal had been said on the subject at earlier Assembly meetings.

Professor Nystuen said that he would like to support the idea of doing the first construction on the main campus, followed by the north campus, with construction near the arena left to the last. Professor Kell replied that the proposed construction on the athletic campus was closer to the Intra-mural Building than to the Crisler Arena, and the ice rink was in such poor shape that work on new skating facilities should proceed at once.

REPORT BY
PROFESSOR
KAPLAN

The next item on the agenda was a report by Professor Wilfred Kaplan upon a recent symposium on the Program Budget Evaluation System for Higher Education (PBES).

Professor Kaplan reminded the Assembly that they had received a pamphlet describing PBES in general terms. One feature of the budget organized by programs rather than by institutions was that it was very hard for any institution to find its own budget in the last document that was generated.

The symposium, sponsored jointly by the State Conference of the American Association of University Professors and by the Association of Michigan Collegiate Faculties, had been held at the Kellogg Center in East Lansing on March 31. The symposium had lasted all day, and speakers had come from as far away as California. The tone of the very thorough discussion had been sharply critical of PBES. It had been seen as exerting pressure toward centralization and towards an emphasis on vocational training.

Now it was important to keep in quite close touch with what was going on. Fortunately a good channel of communication had been established with the Governor's office.

In answer to a question from Professor Anton, Professor Kaplan said that direct communication with the Governor's office was the best route for faculty input, and that SACUA had been following developments closely. Chairman Hinerman confirmed this, and said that there were two members of the University administration who were quite expert in PBES and well acquainted with the planning.

Professor Cohen said that an attempt was being made to measure institutions by what happened to their graduates. He said that one way to respond was to say that almost all the graduates got jobs for which they had been trained because there were few activities for which they had not been trained.

In response to a question from Professor Caldwell, Professor Kaplan said that the proceedings of the symposium would come out in a month or so.

NOMINATIONS
AND
APPOINTMENTS

SACUA presented two nominations to fill vacancies in the Office of Student Services Policy Board, as follows:

William B. Stapp, Professor of Conservation
(replacing Richard English);

Frances W. Weber, Associate Professor of Spanish
(replacing Harriet Mills)

Both nominees were elected unanimously.

There was no old or new business.

Before the current 1972-73 Assembly adjourned, Chairman Hinerman said that he would like to express his thanks for everyone's kind cooperation. He felt that the Assembly had accomplished quite a lot in the area of faculty governance.

1972-1973
ASSEMBLY
ADJOURNS

Professor Franken called for a standing round of applause for Chairman Hinerman, saying that he had dealt with all sorts of people with great skill. Assembly members responded enthusiastically, and the 1972-73 Assembly adjourned on this note at 4:52 p.m.

1973-1974
ASSEMBLY
CONVENES

The members of the 1973-74 Assembly took their seats.

ELECTION OF
NEW SACUA
MEMBERS

The first and only item of business was the election of new members of SACUA. the following candidates were on the ballot:

Sally L. Allen (LSA)

Lee E. Danielson (Bus. Ad.)

Carl Cohen (LSA)

Paul W. Gikas (Medical)

C. William Colburn (LSA)

Thomas J. Larkin (Arch. & Design)

After a second ballot to resolve a tie, Professors Allen, Cohen, and Gikas were declared elected. Chairman Hinerman asked all members of SACUA to gather immediately following adjournment.

ADJOURNMENT

The Assembly adjourned at 5:09 p.m.

Wilfred M. Kincaid
Secretary