THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting of 20 April 1987


ATTENDANCE          Present:  Alpern, Bartholomew, Berent,
                              Bissell, Blane, Borcherts,
                              Borer, Marcelo, Lady,
                              DeCamp, Dobbins, Dressman,
                              Durrance, Edwards,
                              Eggertsen, Floyd, Gage,
                              Goldberg, Gray, Haefner,
                              Hinton, Hollingsworth,
                              Hudson, Hutchinson,
                              Inglehart, Kelsey, Kirking,
                              Lavoie, Lehmann, Lenaghan,
                              Lomax, Margolis, McCarus,
                              McClamroch, McDonald, Meyer,
                              Meyerhoff, Miller, Moerman,
                              Moore, Mosher, Ness,
                              Oleinick, Olsen, Olson,
                              Pierce, Reed, Rosenthal,
                              Seligman, Strang, Turner,
                              Warner, Whitehouse, Winn,
                              Wiseman, Wrobleski, Wulff,
                              Yocum

                    Absent:   Baird, Barlow, Birdsall,
                              Brewer, Burdi, Vorus,
                              Checkoway, Chudacoff,
                              Comninou, Craig, Pastalan,
                              Han, Hook, Ketefian, Manis,
                              Moran, Ross, Sargous,
                              Scodel, Weiler


     Professor N. Harris McClamroch convened the meeting at
3:20 p.m.

MINUTES

     The minutes of 16 March were approved.

MATTERS ARISING

     1.  Professor McClamroch reported on the new University
research policy adopted by the Regents on April 16, copies of
which were distributed at the start of today's meeting.  Senate
Assembly's interest now is to evaluate the policy in light of the
resolutions passed by the Assembly and other faculty governance
groups in the past year.  Many features of a research policy that

the Assembly supported have been included in the new policy. But there are also important differences in language, even for those areas where the Regents policy and Assembly resolutions are in general congruence. It is also clear that there are features in the policy, particularly as applied to classified research, that are not consistent with the resolutions adopted in the Assembly. Professor McClamroch assured members that SACUA and the Research Policies Committee will work hard on behalf of the faculty and with the Vice President for Research to implement the new policy in a way that is consistent with the desires of the Assembly. Further reports about implementation will follow.

2. Professor McClamroch moved, Professor Lehmann seconded, that Professor Ray Mosher be seated as a representative of the Annuitants Association. Motion passed.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Professor McClamroch urged members to submit nominations for the Distinguished Faculty Governance Award and to send these to the SACUA office.

WELCOME TO NEW SENATE ASSEMBLY MEMBERS

Professor McClamroch stated that as a result of the annual spring elections, one third of the Assembly members are new and he welcomed them to the body. In the Assembly they represent their units but will also attend to the interests of the University as a whole. He invited them to speak on issues, present reports from their schools/colleges, bring important issues to the attention of the Assembly, and become involved in an Assembly committee. He noted the procedures members should use when they are unable to attend a meeting and then introduced members of SACUA and of the faculty goverance office.

Referring to documents distributed to members, Professor McClamroch reviewed the governance structure. Components include: the Senate, consisting of all members of the professorial staff and certain members of the research and library staffs; the Senate Assembly, a representative body of 73 persons, elected by the faculty from the schools and colleges; and the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA), consisting of nine members elected by the Senate Assembly. SACUA is responsible for the functioning of the faculty governance system and represents the faculty on matters of University-wide interest in its meetings with the Regents, the Executive Officers and others. The faculty governance system also consists of numerous standing committees and is supported through the work of the Executive Assistant and office staff, and the Secretary, elected by the Senate. The system is organized to provide a democratic means for wide discussion of issues which affect the University community.

"COMPUTING ON CAMPUS; STATUS AND PROSPECTS."  DOUGLAS VAN
HOUWELING, VICE PROVOST FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Mr. Van Houweling stated that the Information Technology
Division has three goals.  1) Enhance the quality of intellectual
activities at The University of Michigan; 2) Improve productivity
through the use of technology; 3) Focus and coordinate resources
for economy and impact in the acquisition and use of information.

The Information Technology Division (ITD), created less than
two years ago, represents the joining of academic computing,
administrative computing and the telephone system.  Its senior
management group consists of Samuel Plice, Carolyn Autrey-Hunley,
Greg Marks, and the Director of CITI (Center for Information
Technology), all of whom report to the Vice Provost for
Information Technology.

Mr. Van Houweling then described the current status of
activities.  ITD has focused a large portion of its resources on
providing access to technology and will continue to do so.
Because the U of M was significantly behind other major
universities, ITD initially featured improving student access,
with satisfying results.  To date 7,000 undergraduate and 1,000
graduate students have asked for Computing Center request
accounts and there are now more than 700 public access sites
including 160 stations at 611 Church Street.  Faculty and staff
have more than 4,000 request accounts.  ITD has worked closely
with colleges and departments to establish workstations geared to
faculty and staff use so that 50% of the faculty now have access
close at hand.  It has worked with businesses to establish
policies for the purchase of microcomputers while bulk purchases
of software have allowed unit prices to be set.  To help users
with the new technology, ITD has provided support staff including
the Microcomputer Education Center and Information Systems
Services.

Telecommunications has posed many challenges.  There are
substantial financial incentives for the University to have its
own system, including the capacity to provide higher functions at
lower cost than if the capital investment had not been made.
With respect to voice transmission, the University is at the end
of the installation phase.  All Ann Arbor and UM-Dearborn
telephones are operational; cutover at UM-Flint will follow soon.
Now begins the service phase which will focus on providing high
quality voice transmission and on improving overall system
reliability.  Trouble calls are down by a factor of ten since
Fall 1986 and the system is performing like any public service in
this area.  Traffic volume has increased with more lines but
fewer busy signals.  ITD is also beginning to provide a new
capacity for data handling with 3,000 workstations wired into
UM-NET to support collaborative work among scholars across
campus.  It is also supporting the evolution of new computing
architecture.

Administrative computing has aimed at the support of end
users through academic allocations and information systems
services. Since last summer the Computing Center has been under
new management with Carolyn Autrey-Hunley serving as Director.
The Computing Center is moving away from time-sharing and to
networked personal computing. CITI has established contracts
with Appollo, Apple, and Northern Telecom. The EXPRES Project,
funded by a $1M NSF grant, aims to support the submission of
research proposals in electronic form. The U of M is working
with Carnegie Mellon to develop the new system which will provide
faculty, staff and students with the means to cooperate in the
production of intellectual output. He hopes that the technology
developed and used will become the backbone of scholarly
communication in this country and abroad.

It is important, he stated, that an advisory committee play
a fundamental role in information. Earlier this year, ITD held a
retreat for leaders of information technology activity across
campus. Together with other study, the retreat led to the
decision to create the Information Technology Activities
Committee (ITAC). An institution-wide group, ITAC will advise
ITD senior management and provide focus for institutional
technology strategy.

Mr. Van Houweling stated that a suitable infrastructure
(environment) on campus is key and a central organization has the
role of overseeing development of an information infrastructure.
In the near future technology will change from being centered on
large machines to being network centered and workstation based,
with workstations, more powerful than those at present, located
on individual desks. Such an environment is enhanced by services
available to the network and will be integrated through software
to make it manageable by users. ITD's focus will be on achieving
institutional coherence mainly through indirect means of policies
and services. It will place a priority on catalytic and
stimulative services and base pricing on institutional goals, not
cost-recovery.

Two factors mark the evolving computing environment. The
first is growth in communications which will increase
productivity and broaden scholarly contacts. The second is the
transformation of information into knowledge particularly through
expert systems. Ten years from today the technology of today
will be commonplace; the technology of tomorrow will be that
carried through expert systems which require distributed
architecture and will have their greatest impact on instruction.

Professor Pierce expressed appreciation for ITD efforts. He
also expressed concern about the planned architecture and the
question of contingencies. Where does one go to meet a need for
which there was no planning? Mr. Van Houweling replied that he
does not expect that ITD, and especially central ITD, will ever
supply a set of support services which are as adaptive as the
diversity in the University might demand. ITD must concentrate

and seek the greatest good for the greatest number of users. ITD
does have a set of faculty grant proposals for instructional
purposes but the timeframe needed to prepare these may not always
be amenable to taking advantage of short-term opportunities. Not
all support for information can come centrally. There will
probably be a need for support services at the college level
because that is where the understanding of needs exists.

Dr. Hollingsworth asked how ITD determines the cost of
services. If there is a concern or question, how is it resolved?
Mr. Van Houweling replied that ITD is very concerned about costs
and is engaged in a division-wide examination of costs and
pricing. Where problems exist, the first alternative is to
contact the director of the unit. If the inquirer is not
satisfied, he or she may bring the question to Mr. Van
Houweling's attention.

In reply to Professor Inglehart's question, Mr. Van
Houweling replied that only prototypes of the EXPRES system will
be available in the next half year and participation in the
project would be as a "pioneer."

Professor Meyer inquired about the relation of ITD to the
University Library and about where computing responsibilities
lie. Mr. Van Houweling stated that he and Dr. Dougherty,
Director of the Library and member of the Computing Policies
Committee, are in frequent contact. He agrees that the
relationship of ITD and the Library must be close. In that
regard ITD is providing advice to the Library on MIRLYN (Michigan
Research Library Network), the forthcoming online library system,
which is a joint venture. The Library is very good at helping
people find information while ITD is good at bringing systems in.
The two units join forces in cooperative work.

Professor Berent endorsed the U of M's efforts in computer
technology but found problems with practical maintenance. What
energies is ITD putting into such matters? Mr. Van Houweling
referred to the user services project which cuts across the
Division. ITD is close to creating a single source of user
referral so that there is one place the user can call for
assistance. The office would track problems and connect the user
to a source which can resolve them. Such is not now the case but
he hoped to improve the situation by early September.

Professor Ness expressed delight with the new computing
systems and noted that they make it easier to recruit good
graduate students. He stated that there is a need to adapt
technology at the local level if graduate students are to remain
atop the situation and asked if ITD is considering directing more
resources to the local level. Mr. Van Houweling replied that
ITD's focus is on creating plans and implementing programs to
make it easier for units to have the kind of expertise Professor
Ness described. Such efforts include providing more online help
for users and training sessions for resource people such as

graduate students. The University is so large though that trying to respond to every individual problem is difficult. In the future, departments and colleges will likely be expected to reallocate resources to help address such needs, with ITD trying to provide some matching money.

"1987-88 COMPENSATION STATEMENT," PROFESSOR EUGENE FEINGOLD, CHAIR, COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE FACULTY

Professor Feingold said that CESF made its annual presentation to the Regents on April 16. Its report, based on AAUP data, indicate that average U of M salaries show a general decline from 1982 to the present in relation to salaries at our private peer institutions. Also, average U of M salaries have declined since 1985 in relation to our public peers. A decade ago U of M faculty salaries were approximately equal to those at private peer institutions and were higher than those at public peer institutions. Both positions were lost about five years ago, with the deficit occurring in the ranks of full professors. In its presentation to the Regents, CESF also reported on faculty opinions about their salaries and careers. Data for this report resulted from a special 1985-86 CESF survey of the faculty. Professor Feingold then referred to material distributed to Assembly members and noted that lengthier reports have appeared in both the April CESF Newsletter and in issues of the Record.

Professor Bartholomew noted that full professors generally have been at the U of M for a long time while assistant and associate professors have not. Is it possible that salaries of the latter reflect market competition while salaries of full professors do not? Professor Feingold agreed that that seems to be the case. Because full professors are less likely to leave, their salaries are less likely to reflect market pressures.

Professor Alpern suggested that this was the wrong sort of image for the University to be projecting. We should not encourage young professors to come here, make their names and then go off to Harvard. Professor Feingold reported that CESF has made this point repeatedly with the Regents, encouraging the University to look at the long term effects of such a salary program.

Professor Borer suggested that the process must be similar at other universities. Some adjustments must be made elsewhere that are not made at the U of M because market forces are a factor. Professor Feingold agreed.

In reply to Professor Ness' question, Professor Feingold stated that the data have not been age-standardized.

Professor Bissell asked if the Regents accept the notion of peer institutions (particularly the private institutions) and to what extent the Regents are committed to competing with these. Professor Feingold said that he cannot speak for the Regents. He

noted that President Shapiro has asked CESF about the list of peers used by CESF in their salary comparisons and Provost Duderstadt has recently asked each department to define its peers. The resulting collection is not likely to be uniform across the University. It is his judgment, Professor Feingold stated, that the Regents accept the idea that the University must be competitive.

Professor Durrance asked if the individual schools and colleges at the U of M are keeping pace with their counterparts in peer institutions. Professor Feingold said that data which would answer that question are not collected.

Professor Turner asked if the University Administration interprets the data to mean that U of M faculty are overpaid or underpaid. What is the baseline and how is it used? Professor Feingold replied that he could comment only from personal experience. From that he concluded that Central Administration is concerned about paying salaries that are competitive in order to keep the U of M competitive.

Professor Feingold then offered a summary of faculty opinions expressed in the 1985-86 CESF survey. Questionnaires were sent to all eligible faculty members. The response rate was high, with 69% of the questionnaires being returned and no school or college having less than a 60% response rate. In the report to the Regents, summary results were grouped into the following categories: satisfaction and equity; merit criteria and review procedures; and funds allocation among schools. The full reports now total fifty pages available for distribution. The single most important factor affecting one's salary appears to be the school one is in.

Noting that minority faculty members expressed greater dissatisfaction than their majority colleagues, Professor Ness asked if an analysis along gender lines reveals similar dissatisfaction. Professor Feingold stated that the differences along gender lines are much less pronounced and more variable.

Professor Miller asked if the differences between schools and colleges break along specific lines. Professor Feingold noted that the three schools which recently underwent review show greater dissatisfaction than others. It also appears that schools which have clear review processes and well paid faculty score higher in faculty satisfaction while schools which have less clear processes and whose faculty are poorly paid show higher dissatisfaction. There are also schools which fall in between these. Salary level emerges as the most important factor. For example, the Law School lacks a clear process but faculty report being well paid and satisfied with their compensation. The Library falls on the other extreme. Even though it has a clear, bureaucratic process, librarians registered dissatisfaction.

REMARKS ON RECENT ISSUES SURROUNDING RACISM ON CAMPUS

Professor McClamroch stated that we have all been affected
by the racist incidents of the past Winter. The University
community must take these incidents seriously and reaffirm our
commitment to a racially diverse campus. But there is a feeling
that new efforts are also needed to deal with these persistent
problems.

Special programs are being developed for students and non-
academic staff. SACUA, representing the Assembly, hopes to work
with the Affirmative Action Office, the Deans and members of the
Black faculty to respond to the need for some kind of faculty
self-evaluation program. Discussions are just beginning. There
is a sense of urgency but also a desire to proceed in a way that
effectively deals with the problem. He invited Assembly members
who want to be involved in this process or who have suggestions
about effective approaches to contact the SACUA office or a SACUA
member.

He noted that during recent discussions about racial
incidents and the racial environment on campus, the perspective
of the faculty, and especially the Black faculty, has been given
too little attention. SACUA has invited Professor Percy Bates,
School of Education, to offer a few remarks about these issues.

Professor Bates stated that many individuals could offer
remarks and many issues could be addressed. He chose one which
stands out in his mind: the visit of the Reverend Jesse Jackson
to campus in March. Professor Bates recalled that on Sunday
morning, March 22, he received a phone call informing him that
Reverend Jackson wished to meet with the Black faculty members at
10:30 p.m. Believing the issues to be important, Professor Bates
agreed to join the group. Reverend Jackson wanted first though
to meet with students and then separately with Black students.
It was well after midnight before the meeting with faculty began.
During that meeting Mr. Jackson listened very carefully and at
length to learn what the central issues were as perceived by the
distinct groups. No conclusions or solutions, however, were
reached and as late as the following morning, Professor Bates had
no idea what would result from the 11:00 a.m. meeting of Reverend
Jackson and President Shapiro. Yet by 4:30 p.m., there was
agreement on six points. Accordingly, the University agreed to:

1.   Create a position of Vice Provost for Minority Affairs.
2.   Establish a permanent and autonomous budget for a Black
     student union, with first year funding of $35,000.
3.   Establish a grievance procedure for racial harassment
     and appoint a senior Black administrator in the Office
     of Affirmative Action.
4.   Provide budgetary incentives for attracting and
     retaining Black faculty members.

5. Annually evaluate the efforts of Deans and Department
Chairs on Affirmative Action.

6. Create a Presidential Standing Advisory Commission
that will include representatives from Black faculty,
students, administrators and members of the community.

Professor Bates found Reverend Jackson to be extremely
successful in cutting through the issues which led to these
agreements and firmly believes that had Reverend Jackson not been
here, the University community could still be thrashing over the
issues.

In response to questions posed by Professor McDonald and
Professor Floyd, Professor Bates stated that other issues
discussed in the two days included budgetary matters and the
heavier committee load Black faculty are often asked to shoulder.
He was not aware of any discussions on a code of non-academic
conduct.

Professor Moerman commented on reports that Black students
do not feel comfortable at the University and that Black faculty
members do not feel at home here. Professor Bates noted that the
number of Black students and faculty members is one aspect of the
problem. As the number of either declines, it becomes harder for
students to feel comfortable, according to their statements.

Professor Ness referred to CESF Faculty Salary Survey
results pertaining to minorities. Although salary equity is
supposed to be operating, respondents expressed dissatisfaction.
Is this dissatisfaction real? What efforts would help reduce it?
Professor Bates stated that the dissatisfaction is indeed real.
Despite efforts to address it, many Black faculty members feel
that when merit is accorded they do not have what counts toward
it. Professor Floyd noted survey results which show that
minority faculty feel their roles are spread over a limited
number of people. Service, such as committee membership, earns
little financial reward; research effort is the ultimate
determinant.

Professor Bates concluded by asking if we have learned
anything since the early 1970's or will we only repeat
unsuccessful efforts? Through discussion, he thinks, we have
heard reasonable answers. This is not a minority problem; it is
an institutional one. We cannot make the problem just one
person's job or assign a committee to work on it. Rather, the
efforts of all University members will be needed if we are to
change the environment of the institution.

OLD BUSINESS

Professor Oleinick expressed concern about some of the
phrasing and substance of the Regents new research policy and

asked if SACUA was present when the Regents discussed potential policies. Professor McClamroch concurred with Professor Oleinick's concerns and noted that interpretations remain to be worked out. In its efforts to represent the Assembly, SACUA in March forwarded to the Regents all written material developed up to that point, met with the Regents in informal discussion, and made a formal statement at the Regents meeting. In April SACUA submitted written material regarding the language of various drafts the Regents were considering. Some of these drafts were quite different than the faculty resolutions offered earlier. SACUA had hoped to speak directly to the Regents at their April meeting but an opportunity did not arise before the Regents adopted the new policy. Although the influence of faculty governance was not as great as we may have liked, he believes that it did have an impact on the policy adopted. SACUA and the Assembly will continue to address the matter.

Professor Ness asked if there is a large gap between the faculty position on research policy and the position of the University Administration. Professor McClamroch expressed reservations about the validity of such a comparison. He is not aware of a public position the Administration holds on the matter and suggested that the pertinent comparison is between the position Senate Assembly adopted last November and the policy the Regents adopted in April.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia B. Yocum
Senate Secretary