

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting, April 20, 1981

ATTENDANCE

Present: Barnard, Barritt, Beck, Bishop, Brooks, D. Brown, K. Brown, M. Brown, Browne, Caffesse, Carter, Dahl, DeKornfeld, Easley, Esteban, Fraser, Friedman, Frost, Becker, Groves, Hilbert, Hildebrandt, Holland, Martin, E. Cooper, Kelsey, Keren, Kirkpatrick, Loup, Lynch, Millard, Nagy, Naylor, Pollock, Regezi, Ringler, Rinne, Romani, Root, Senior, Sisman, Smith, Tentler, Vinter, Weiner, Wieland, Rothman, Young.

Absent: Ackley, Bailey, Burdi, Cares, Carpenter, Cassidy, H. Cooper, Crane, Dixon, Dobel, Duderstadt, Evans, Gray, Haddock, Hultquist, Liepman, Lockwood, Maassab, Meyer, Morash, Mosher, O'Meara, Tek, White, Wyers.

MINUTES

The minutes of the Senate Assembly meeting of March 16, 1981 were approved as written.

ANNOUNCE-
MENTS

Chairman Naylor announced that the appendix of the Rules changes noted in the minutes of the March 16, 1981 Assembly meeting were omitted from the mailing and was distributed on the seats.

ELECTION
OF SACUA
MEMBERS

Chairman Naylor asked for nominations from the floor. There were none. He then reviewed the procedures to be followed for voting for the three new SACUA members. The following Senate members were elected to serve a three-year term on SACUA.

Donald R. Brown
Herbert W. Hildebrandt
Andrew F. Nagy

REPORT OF
THE BUDGET
PRIORITIES
COMMITTEE -
CHAIRMAN
ROBERT G.
CRAIG

Chairman Naylor introduced Professor Robert G. Craig (Dentistry) chairman of the Budget Priorities Committee (BPC), who proceeded to report on the activities of that committee during the 1980-81 school year.

Professor Craig began by noting that the BPC has operated in relative obscurity until the current year, when it played an important role in the reviews of several non-academic activities for possible reduction or discontinuance.

He offered some background information about the BPC - indicating that the Committee met for its annual retreat on June 27, 1980 and continued the functions of the BPC that were established by President Fleming in February, 1972. The principal functions are:

1. To analyze, evaluate, and submit recommendations on strategic budgetary priorities issues.
2. To consider the following issues:
 - a. Priorities on inclusion of requests from operating units for new operating funds in the State budget request.
 - b. Priorities on State budget request for capital funds. (Professor Craig said that the Committee has not been involved in this area).
 - c. Priorities to guide the allocation of available additional discretionary funds and major reallocations of funds within the University budget.
 - d. The present allocation of funds between existing units, and the evaluation of the criteria in which these allocations are based.
 - e. The development of general work load and other criteria for use in judging the needs of operating units for funds.

He then reviewed the composition of the BPC, noting that there are 18 voting members, 11 faculty (1 each from U-M Flint and Dearborn), 3 students (2 U-M, 1 Flint), 2 deans and 2 vice presidents.

The 5 non-voting members include the SACUA liaison (usually SACUA chairperson), 1 executive secretary and 3 members from the administration staff. Professor Craig listed the individual members and identified their units to demonstrate the distribution of the make-up of the BPC. He made special mention of the U-M students on the Committee, adding that they were very deliberate and thoughtful in their approach to the work of the BPC.

Professor Craig then turned to the activities of the BPC during the 1980-81 academic year. He said that there were three major sets of activities.

1. The Committee was represented at the Unit Budget Conferences. He indicated that whereas the fall conference was related to how the units were going to manage a proposed 2% reduction in the current year budget, the spring conference is dealing with how to manage a 6% reduction in the 1981-82 budget.

2. Review of the non-academic units in Category I and II as publicized in the Record and elsewhere. The main efforts were in Category I.
3. Unit Budget Conferences concerning the proposed 6% reduction.

Regarding the 6% reductions and the reductions in non-academic units, he said that they have strived to provide some form of contingency funds for the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs to provide some relief to those units most severely affected so that excellence in those programs can be maintained. He felt that the amount of the contingency fund would be approximately \$1.5 million. He noted that this means that the 6% reduction is really not an across-the-board cut- it begins as an across-the-board reduction, but it is hoped that some adjustments can be made by using the fund to respond to some requests from departments.

Professor Craig then discussed the proposed new business for the BPC. He said that the Committee will begin in May to review and react to proposals by Vice President Frye's staff which will identify those units in the most dire need for support from the contingency fund.

He told the Assembly, that the BPC has invited the deans of the larger academic units to come before the Committee to present their plans for adjusting to the 6% budget reduction. Two deans have already appeared before the Committee.

Professor Craig next reviewed the Committee's work associated with the review of four non-academic units, Extension Service, CRLT, Michigan Media, and Recreational Sports. He explained how two faculty members and a student member of the BPC (and faculty and students from outside of the BPC) formed review subcommittees.

He then described the process of the reviews, because he felt that there had been some concern that the reviews were done too quickly. He said that the BPC often met every week, with the subcommittees meeting several times in between. The appointment of the review subcommittees was done in consultation with Vice President Frye. These subcommittees were presented with a charge which contained a target amount for reduction. He said that the subcommittees met with Vice President Frye and the BPC chairman and he noted that Mr. Frye's staff provided excellent support in the form of information requested by the subcommittees. In addition, the subcommittees met (some several times) with the directors of the units being reviewed. Open hearings were held, where any interested party was given an opportunity to express his/her view.

The subcommittees' reports were submitted to the BPC and to the directors of the programs. He explained that the directors were

invited to come before the BPC to express their reactions, then formulate their responses in the form of written reports.

Next, the BPC voted on the four recommendations and passed the approved reports to the Committee on Budget Administration (CBA). The chairpersons of the various review subcommittees and Professor Craig then met with the CBA to provide additional verbal information upon request. The CBA also held open hearings - and private meetings with the program directors. The reports were then placed in the University Library where they are available to everyone.

Professor Craig said that there has been a preliminary presentation on the material to the Board of Regents by the CBA, but no action has been taken. He expected that action would be taken at the May 1981 Regents meeting.

He then briefly discussed the widely publicized recommendations of the reports.

1. The BPC recommended the discontinuance of the Extension Service as an administrative unit. It was recommended that the conference program be maintained, however, and it be assigned to another administrative unit. He said that the Extension Service commitment of the University will not disappear. The deans of some units and school have agreed to take over the essential extension service and, in fact, many campus units have been doing that for a number of years.
2. He indicated that the recommendations for the Michigan Media and CRLT were essentially those of the charge to the review committees. The BPC approved the minority report of the Michigan Media review.
3. Speaking to Recreational Sports, Professor Craig, said that although it is not an academic program, there are clear indications that it is a very strong program in terms of the health of the University - the faculty, the student body and staff. As an example of the program's popularity, he mentioned that 87% of the U-M students use the facilities sometime during the school year. Therefore, the recommendation by the Committee was coupled with a recommendation to increase fees to faculty and staff by 50% to (nearly) maintain the same operating hours that existed in the past.

Professor Craig then turned to the BPC's concerns with the programs and activities in Category II of the administration's proposed targeted reductions. He said that the Committee is in the final stages of establishing a subcommittee to review Plant Operations of the University. It is hoped that a report of the review will

available by September, 1981. He pointed out that this is somewhat different from the other reviews, as the Plant Department does not report to the academic vice president. Therefore, the BPC will work with Vice President Brinkerhoff and his staff before the report is submitted to the CBA.

He concluded his remarks by informing the Assembly that the BPC has asked to be reactive, at least in the internal reviews, of the Housing Administration and Residence Halls Counseling, Purchasing and Stores, WUOM and WVGR, and the Personnel Office. Although the BPC has been extremely active this year, he felt that the level of activity would probably not be as high next year.

Professor Craig said that he was nearing the completion of his 3-year term on the BPC and wanted to take advantage of his opportunity to publicly thank the BPC members, and the members of the (review) subcommittees for their tremendous efforts of the past year. He then asked for questions from the Assembly members.

Professor Hildebrandt asked how the units, programs and activities of Category I and II were chosen to be reviewed. Professor Craig responded by saying that the document was submitted to the BPC with the subdivisions already decided upon by the administration. The Committee agreed that it was more appropriate for them to be active in the reviews of those areas under Category I.

Professor Vinter asked how the budget figures for reduction for the four activities in Category I were determined. Professor Craig said that the figures were developed by an internal staff committee of the academic vice president's office. He said that they actually reviewed all of the units, programs, and activities in both Category I and II for what they felt would be possible levels of reduction. He explained the basis for the target figures.

Chairman Naylor thanked Professor Craig for his presentation to the Senate Assembly.

REPORT OF
THE ACTIVITIES
OF THE TENURE
COMMITTEE -
CHAIRMAN
STEPHEN M.
POLLOCK

Chairman Naylor introduced Professor Stephen Pollock, chairman of the SACUA subcommittee on Tenure, who was invited to present to the Assembly the Committee's report, "How Tenure is Obtained at The University of Michigan" (April, 1981).

Professor Pollock began by reminding the Assembly that the charge to the Committee was to determine "How Tenure is Obtained at The University of Michigan" - not to determine what "tenure" actually means. He then proceeded to review the contents of the report with the use of projected text from the document. Each member of the Assembly also had a copy of the report.

He explained how the Committee examined written policy on tenure

by the units of the University, and analyzed information on un-written (traditional) tenure policy. This information was obtained by the use of a questionnaire, a copy of which was included in the report. He continued to review the information contained in the introduction of the report. He cautioned against the use of any hard statistics from the report, because only (roughly) half of the units responded. However, he felt that the report does reflect what goes on at the University regarding the granting of tenure.

Two results that were not expected were:

1. What to do with the returned questionnaire? (Copies of the documents will be available in the SACUA office).

At this point, Professor Nagy asked if the completed questionnaires were really legal documents. Professor Pollock replied that SACUA should study that issue.

2. The very asking of the question caused many units to realize that they did not have any tenure policy, and stimulated them to examine the issue.

Before Professor Pollock began his review of the actual report, he recognized the previous work done by earlier chairpersons of the Tenure Committee (Professor W. Robert Dixon and Professor Emily Cloyd) who directed much of the work in producing the report. He indicated that he was acting as the reporter for the Tenure Committee as a whole.

First, Professor Pollock read excerpts from the Regents Bylaws which pertain to tenure. Then he proceeded to present the entire report, beginning with the issue, "length, type and character of the Pre-tenure period" (Page 3). He discussed the issue of "counting time to tenure" at some length, explaining the difference between "clock time" and "ripeness". He also called attention to the fact that the Regents Bylaws and the Faculty Handbook are silent on the legitimacy of taking part-time or irregular service into account in determining "ripeness" for the tenure decision (page 4).

Professor Nagy asked Professor Pollock to define a "part-time" appointment. Professor Pollock said that the implication is that a person is "part-time" who has a 50% appointment with the University and does something else for the rest of the time. He said that the whole issue of "part-time", "dual" and "joint appointment" is still up in the air. He reminded the Assembly that he was just reading what the documentation says.

Professor Pollock continued to review each section of the report. He paid particular attention to the paragraph "Investigation and evaluation" (page 9) under subject of Regular Review Procedures.

He considered this the "guts of the review process" and read the entire passage to demonstrate the variety of what happens within our University.

Following his review of the findings of the Tenure Committee, Professor Pollock discussed the Committee's recommendation (pages 10-12). He highlighted the three general recommendations.

1. Each unit should be allowed considerable latitude in establishing criteria for tenure.
2. Improved communication is recommended between schools/colleges and their departments.
3. The current status of the 1977 memorandum by Dr. Virginia Nordby should be clarified by SACUA and by the administration.

He concluded his presentation of the report by reviewing the recommendations regarding the six issues concerning tenure that were addressed by the Committee (pages 11-12).

Professor Pollock then asked for questions from the floor.

Professor Rinne asked if Professor Pollock had any confidence that the recommendations of the report would be taken seriously. Professor Pollock said that they might be taken more seriously than recommendations in the past and referred to the judge's opinion in the Marwil case, where he believed that the judge said that he had to rule against Professor Marwil because he felt that there really were no traditions at the University regarding tenure.

Professor Vinter said that he felt that the Tenure Committee's report might be the best possible case of the prevailing arrangements for tenure procedures at the University. Not being sure of what the question meant, Professor Pollock said that if the Committee's collected materials on tenure represents the best possible clarification of what's happening here regarding tenure, he was not sure that it is not very good.

Professor Gordon asked for a clarification of the wording, "recommendation for tenure is only granted for those individuals who are either associate or full professor". He noted that the report does not say that tenure is always granted for those who are either associate or full professor. He asked him to speak to the issue of "associate professor without tenure". Professor Pollock said that the word always was not used because it is not true. He referred to Regents Bylaw 5.081.

Professor Donald Brown asked if it was true that one cannot

remain an assistant professor beyond the normal time (i.e., seven years) without being reappointed assistant professor with tenure. Professor Pollock responded by saying that one can serve indefinitely in the rank of assistant professor, but if someone wanted to terminate the appointment, the Regents Bylaws dictate that they would have to go through the normal procedures for a tenured person.

Professor Friedman, referring to the report's statement that, "most schools separate the promotional and tenure decisions" (page 10), asked what "most" means. Professor Pollock said that "most" means more than half.

Professor Friedman then asked if those schools where persons are promoted to "associate professor without tenure" speak to the issue of running the tenure clock for those with that appointment. Professor Pollock responded that the clock is usually not mentioned at all with such appointments.

Professor Weiner said that he didn't disagree at all with the need for diversity which the units have for attaining tenure, but he felt that we need no degree of diversity in the degree of mystery of how one attains that tenure. He said that we need a strong statement to dispel this mystery - that every unit/school must have a clear well-defined statement as to how one achieves tenure. Professor Pollock agreed with the comment.

Professor Nagy also agreed that such a statement of tenure policy should be made by each unit. He was puzzled that even after the Marwil case, there was still so much confusion about the procedures for attaining tenure.

Professor Pollock said that most of the schools and colleges have been/or are actively engaged in reviewing their tenure policies. He noted that two schools have prepared such documents since the Marwil case. Others are now working on their tenure policies.

Chairman Naylor thanked Professor Pollock for his presentation of the report. He also commended the Tenure Committee for the work that they have accomplished.

FOLLOW-UP
ON THE
SENATE
MEETING

Chairman Naylor explained that this item was on the agenda to give the Assembly members an opportunity to comment on the forum on redirection which was held on April 14, 1981. There was no response.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS

Professor Morton Brown made the following statement:

"Professor Naylor, as you end your term as chairman of SACUA, it is fitting that we of SACUA and the Assembly express our appreciation to you for your leadership during the past year. You have led the Assembly with grace, you have led SACUA with good spirit and represented the faculty with calm and impressive determination.

There is no doubt that faculty governance is stronger and more active as a result of your apparently tireless efforts. Arch, we are all in your debt, and we will be diminished by your absence".

Professor Naylor thanked Professor Brown for his comments and in turn said farewell and thank you to Professors Deming Brown and Jesse Gordon who were departing with him as members of the SACUA class of 1981. He also thanked Morton Brown for his service as Vice Chairman of SACUA. Professor Naylor concluded his comments by thanking the other members of SACUA and the members of the 1980-81 Senate Assembly - and his thanks also to Libby Birdsall.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:52 p.m.

Charles C. Kelsey
Senate Secretary