

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting, May 19, 1980

ATTENDANCE

Present: Barnard, Barritt, Bishop, D.R.Brown, K.Brown, M.Brown, Burdi, Cares, Crane, Dixon, Duderstadt, Esteban, Flener, Friedman, Gordon, Bashshur, Hinerman, Hollinger, Hultquist, Kelsey, Kirkpatrick, Koran, Loup, Lynch-Sauer, Maassab, Meyer, Millard, Mosher, Nagy, Naylor, Nisbett, Parkinson, Pollock, Root, Rowe, Carter Senior, Tek, Verhey, Weiner, Wynne.

Absent: Ackley, Bacon, Baumgarten, Beck, Berg, D.B.Browne, Carpenter, Cassidy, Cohen, DeKornfeld, Eckert, Fearn, Fraser, Frost, Gray, Green, Groves, Gull, Haddock, Hildebrandt, Holland, Kahn, Liepman, Lynch, McClendon, O'Meara, Powers, Romani, Sisman, Vinter, White, Wyers.

Guests: Harvey Brazer, Robert Debrodt, Norman G. Herbert, Wendell R. Lyons, Chandler W. Matthews, Alfred S. Sussman

MINUTES

The minutes of the Senate Assembly meeting of April 21, 1980 were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Chairman Naylor began the meeting by observing that the experimental method of "no pre-determined seating" for the meeting was obviously not successful, as the members, were widely scattered throughout the lower half of the amphitheater.

2. The chairman asked that the members check their mailing addresses on a handout to be certain that they are correct.

3. Chairman Naylor announced that the agenda for the meeting would be changed to allow Acting Vice President Alfred Sussman to respond to comments to be made on behalf of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (CESF).

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF

Chairman Naylor introduced Professor Harvey E. Brazer, immediate past chairman of CESF, who appeared before the Assembly to express the committee's concerns about the apparent lack of consultative negotiations between CESF and the administration.

THE FAC- Before turning the floor over to Professor Brazer,
ULTY Professor Naylor reminded the Assembly of CESF's role during
ON CONSUL- the past year in getting the administration to attempt to
TATIVE get at least a 10 percent raise in faculty compensation
NEGOTIA- for the year 1980-81. He credited CESF for this effort
TIONS - and added that the administration should be recognized for
PROFESSOR responding to the input by CESF.
HARVEY
BRAZER

Professor Brazer noted that this was the third time that he had the opportunity to address the Assembly on behalf of CESF during the current academic year, and that he considered this, "a good thing." He felt that in the past, the communication between the committee and the body to which it is responsible has been too independent and inadequate.

Professor Brazer expressed his belief that the governance of the University is a peculiar thing, because the administrators have the responsibility for all of the major operations of the institution, "but only as much authority as you can get away with." He is not concerned about the amount of administrative responsibility but with their authority, and, "the role of the faculty, vis-a-vis the executive officers in the pursuit of the authority of the officers."

Mr. Brazer reviewed the role of CESF in the past, when the committee seldom met and had little effect on influencing the administration on matters of faculty compensation. The committee thought that they had progressed favorably beyond the procedures when they met with Acting Vice President Alfred Sussman on March 13, 1980, and expressed their view that the recent years' practice of CESF presenting its request for salary increase for the forthcoming budget year early in the Fall Term was a procedure that caused the request to be submitted too late, because by this time, the executive officers had already established the budget. He used the procedures followed on the Fall of 1979 as an example and noted that even some Regents questioned this procedure.

Professor Brazer said that during the past several years, CESF has taken seriously the 1972 Senate Assembly charge to the committee that the committee engage in a process of consultative negotiations on faculty salaries with the executive officers. CESF felt that the procedures used this year and in recent years, was, in Mr. Brazer's words, "Something of a charade." The committee felt that in order to be effective in carrying out the Assembly charge to engage in consultative negotiations, CESF had to be involved in the budget process at the outset of the process. This

means being involved in March, April and May of the preceding year, not in September or October. The committee believes that they should be involved in the process of consultative negotiations in April or May of 1980, in the preparation of the budget for the year beginning on October 1, 1981.

It was agreed at the March 13 meeting that CESF would be involved in the early stages of the budget preparation for the year 1981-82. Professor Brazer said that at a meeting of the Academic Affairs Advisory Council, the Deans and Directors and the Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs, a budget proposal was presented that provides for a 10 percent compensation increase for staff and faculty in 1980-81 and also provides for a suggested 8 percent increase for 1981-82. This came to the attention of CESF for the first time at their meeting in late April, 1980. The reaction of the committee was expressed in a letter from CESF chairman, Ronald L. Teigen to Acting Vice President Alfred Sussman (May 7, 1980) a portion of which was read by Mr. Brazer to the Assembly. The letter expressed the committee's surprise and dismay about not being informed or consulted about the two-year compensation projection. It was written to request a clarification of the role of CESF in the formulation of faculty compensation projection in the future.

Professor Brazer said that his dismay and disappointment over this was a matter of procedure, not personality, and was deeply concerned that this event may be a sign of things to come under a new president. He understood that it had been suggested that CESF might function through consultation with the Budget Priorities Committee, made up of faculty, students, and staff. He strongly rejected such a proposal for the Budget Priorities Committee is responsible to the executive officers and the president, not to the faculty.

Professor Brazer noted that he had been assured by Acting Vice President Sussman that his (Brazer's) views in this matter were "overly pessimistic." Mr. Brazer couldn't accept this, because this is a critical time, as the administration of the University is undergoing change at the highest level. He hoped that Mr. Sussman, in his comments to follow, would represent not only his views on the subject, but also the views of incoming Vice President Frye and President Shapiro.

Acting Vice President Alfred Sussman was then introduced by Chairman Naylor to respond to comments made by Professor Brazer.

REMARKS
BY ACT-
ING VICE
PRESIDENT
SUSSMAN

Mr. Sussman began by saying that the matter at hand involves the current budgetary difficulties, and, for the first time, the University is making meaningful plans for more than one year. He noted, in response to Professor Brazer's remarks, that in the very week that he presented the two-year plan (now the three-year plan) to the Deans and Directors, he also testified before the Budget Priorities Committee and SACUA about the same plan. "Whatever fault there is in terms of failure to touch base with CESF," said Mr. Sussman, "was my fault, and not the President's, nor is it his wish to dodge consultations with the appropriate faculty group." He acknowledged the error in not contacting CESF about the matter, and assured the Assembly that he still subscribes to the principle of "consultative negotiations," and will recommend it to his successor.

Mr. Sussman said that the issue, however, is a broader one - planning. He explained the problem by asking how one plans, "touches base" with appropriate committees, and give a sense of being forthcoming, and at the same time adjusts to almost daily changes in events that will affect the budget of the University.

As an example of the difficulty in planning under these circumstances, he used the proposed faculty compensation of 10 percent for this year as an example. This figure is not yet fixed, because of the delay in formulating the budget due to the dramatic changes in the State's financial problems. It is these environmental factors that makes it so difficult to plan. We do not even know when the University budget will be made final by the State, in fact, it may not be fixed until after the election.

Mr. Sussman added that the 8 percent proposal for faculty compensation for the year 1981-82 was used only as a model, based upon assumptions, for the purpose of computing a future budget. He explained why models must be used in planning for budgets for at least two years in the future during difficult financial times.

In response to Mr. Sussman's remarks Professor Brazer said that some of the difficulty may be due to an "inadvertent use of language." He read a memorandum from R. Sauve, dated April, 1980 to the Deans and Directors, which included the phase "budget proposals," and noted that the eight percent figure for faculty salary compensation for 1981-82 was part of the budget proposal. He said that the wording may be inadvertent, but when CESF learned that the 1981-82 compensation figure was in the proposed budget, the committee felt that "they might as well fold their tents and go home."

He added that if the eight percent figure is not a budget proposal, but only an illustrative number used for planning, then we might have a communication problem that may be at the heart of the issue.

Mr. Sussman answered by agreeing that it might be a communication problem, but again, stressed the fact that the budget document was headed by a section labeled "Assumptions." He said that in all of his presentations on the subject, he made careful qualifying remarks to the effect that the figures are not fixed due to many unknown factors which might affect future budgets. He acknowledged that CESF was not consulted with about the initial two-year proposal but said that we cannot extrapolate from that and say that there has been no communication with the faculty. This would be incorrect, because faculty groups were informed on these matters.

Professor Brazer expressed his discomfort about other groups of faculty being informed about faculty compensation matters, with the exception of CESF. He said that there is only one group charged on behalf of Senate Assembly and SACUA with consultative negotiations responsibility in the matter of faculty compensation, and that group is CESF.

Mr. Sussman responded that when planning the budget, it was the administration's assumption that the Budget Priorities Committee (BPC) was the group that should be consulted with in connection with the overall budget, where faculty salary increase was to be modest. CESF did get the planning document, as did SACUA. Again, Acting Vice President Sussman acknowledged that CESF should have been consulted.

Chairman Naylor then asked the Assembly members for comments or questions about the issue.

Professor Gordon congratulated Professor Brazer for the assertiveness and advocacy of CESF as demonstrated by their work on behalf of the faculty during the past year. He also acknowledged Professor Sussman for the openness with which the budget-making process for 1981-82 has been proceeding. He said that perhaps some of the current controversy is due to the fact that we are seeing these procedures in the same manner as they were carried out in the past, that is, when the budget became public only after it had been finalized. He hoped that the openness concerning the planning of future budgets will continue.

Professor Dixon noted that the University operates on a non-adversary relationship between the faculty and

administration regarding salary. He asked what has been happening to administrator's salaries in relation to faculty salary in items of positions in the Big Ten universities or nationally.

Vice President Sussman answered by informing the Assembly that under a policy applied by the President for the past two or three years, U-M administrators have been held to relatively low increases in compensation.

Professor Dixon asked if it seems appropriate for such data to be made available. Mr. Sussman noted that data on all University salaries are available. Professor Brazer commented on the question by stating that he had examined the salaries of administrators and found very little to be concerned about.

Professor Friedman, referring to Mr. Sussman's comments on "new rhythms" and "fast-breaking news," felt that the current rapidly changing factors that affect budgetary planning is part of our present problem, in that the faculty is not accustomed to events happening so quickly. He suggested that now, more than ever, we need better communication in regard to financial affairs. Professor Friedman believes that it is SACUA's perception that this is the key issue among the faculty. He feels that we should be exploring new methods of communication, such as letters to the faculty or a recurring column in the Record, dealing with financial affairs.

Vice President Sussman was in general agreement with this suggestion, but reminded the Assembly that like the issue being discussed today, public announcements of the exact models being used lead to assumptions that these are real figures, but they are real only in the sense of planning. This may lead if expectations which cannot be met.

Mr. Sussman mentioned that a document for the faculty is being prepared that will present the assumptions upon which the models are developed for future budgets.

Professor Weiner commented that there will always be uncertainties in budget planning, and that these should be taken into account in consultative negotiations with CESF, so that the problems discussed today will not re-occur.

Chairman Naylor thanked Acting Vice President Sussman and Professor Brazer for their participation at today's meeting.

USE OF
ENDOW-
MENT
FUNDS

Chairman Naylor introduced the subject by reviewing the history of the question of how to best use funds endowed to the University. He related that Acting Vice President Sussman came before SACUA a few months ago and announced that the University had \$200-\$300,000 per year available from an endowment, the use of which was not specifically designated by the donors, and asked for suggestions for the most effective use of these funds. CESF has also discussed this subject with Mr. Sussman. A list of possible uses of endowment funds was distributed to each Assembly member prior to the meeting, and Chairman Naylor asked for comments and additional suggestions so that SACUA may be better informed in replying to the request by the administration. He added that during the discussion with Mr. Sussman, SACUA expressed great concern over the present status of faculty compensation, and felt that any way endowment funds could be used to improve the situation should be considered.

Professor Naylor introduced Norman Herbert, Chandler Matthews, Wendell Lyons, and Robert Debrodt, who were asked to serve as resource persons on behalf of the University administration during the discussion.

Professor Pollock began the discussion by asking about the magnitude of the monies available from the endowment funds. Professor Duderstadt asked if there was a relationship between this discussion and the planned capital campaign. He felt that while faculty participation in determining the use of funds may not seem important if the amount is in the range of a few hundred thousand dollars, faculty input is essential if we are talking about the millions anticipated from a successful capital campaign. Professor Naylor responded by saying that it is possible that larger amounts of money might become available through the capital campaign if a donor gives a large gift without restrictions.

Jean Loup expressed her opinion that some of the endowment funds should be spent on the recommendations regarding affirmative action in the document by the Senate Assembly Advisory Committee on Academic Affairs of April 25, 1980.

Professor D. R. Brown was also concerned that the Assembly was being asked to comment and make suggestions on the use of funds without knowing the amount available. He felt that the members were unable to speak to the issue in an intelligent manner without such information. Professor Naylor said that SACUA is asking for help in determining priorities for the possible use of this money, and believed

that this was a reasonable exercise.

Professor Barritt objected to the manner in which the subject was brought before the Assembly. He said that he had no idea what was supposed to be done with the document, and felt that little is likely to happen no matter how much the subject was discussed. He noted that SACUA did not come with a proposal upon which to act. He added that because there is no way of knowing what could or should be done with the endowment money, he felt that the discussion was a waste of time.

Professor Root, recalling Chairman Naylor's earlier comment that faculty salary was a critical issue, wholeheartedly agreed with the statement and agreed that we use any possible means to improve faculty compensation.

Professor Duderstadt said that faculty input is going to be essential in identifying targets for the use of such funds. He felt that the list presented by SACUA may be too detailed, but that we should critically evaluate the possibility of placing a high priority on, for example, faculty salaries or fellowship funds. If this is impractical, we might want to establish named professorships. He explained that faculty input on this issue is critical.

Professor Gordon said that the questions raised by Professor Barritt were legitimate. He questioned the practicality of using endowment funds for faculty salaries because the relatively small amounts of such funds would have little real effect in increasing compensation. He suggested other ways in which the monies could be used to benefit the faculty, such as in providing financial support for travel during sabbatical leaves.

Professor Weiner said that the various units of the University have different priorities, so perhaps rather than setting overall priorities for the use of endowment funds it might be more effective to allow the funds to be used at the discretion of the individual units.

Professor Nisbett wanted to return to the issue of "what are we doing here" and suggested as a point of order that there be no further discussion on the subject. Chairman Naylor answered by explaining that the Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs came to SACUA and asked for suggestions from that faculty body for the possible use of endowment funds. He noted that SACUA had made several suggestions, but was concerned as to whether or not SACUA was representing

the entire faculty in the matter, and decided to bring the question to the Assembly for broader faculty input. He explained that this is only a first step, and that those with particular concerns could continue to communicate with SACUA about them.

Professor D.R. Brown said that it is necessary in order to discuss the subject intelligently, to know if the Assembly is being asked how to use \$2-300,000 on a one-time basis, or what the faculty would suggest to do with a much larger sum that might be raised for specific purposes. Chairman Naylor reiterated his earlier statement that SACUA was asked for a suggestion for possible uses of approximately \$2-300,000 in endowment funds. The question was then expanded to the use of endowments that were received without commitments.

Professor Pollock then made the following motion.

"That SACUA make decisions on the uses for the small amount of money from endowment funds, as the elected representatives of the faculty and feel free to express the sentiments of the faculty. However, if large amounts of money are provided, a suitable questionnaire be devised and circulated to the entire faculty in order to obtain wider input on the use of such funds."

The motion was supported.

Professor Nagy said that the questionnaire is a useful device to get a "feeling" from the faculty and wondered if perhaps a committee could be formed to formulate and distribute the questionnaire. Professor Pollock responded by saying that probably most of us have certain feelings about the issue, and that these feelings are not likely to be changed or modified by open discussion. He felt that a committee's action would probably not change one's preferences.

Professor M. Brown pointed out that the original question had come from the administration to SACUA, who made some suggestions, then brought the question to the Assembly for further input. It is now suggested that the question be taken further - to the entire faculty. He took the position that the Assembly is the duly elected body of the faculty, and therefore a reasonable body to make suggestions for the use of endowment funds.

Professor Esteban asked why the use of endowment funds

for faculty compensation was so important and yet is not on the list of suggestions brought to the Assembly by SACUA. Chairman Naylor explained that the list in question was formulated by the administration not SACUA. He added that it was SACUA's suggestion to use the funds to improve the faculty's financial position.

Professor Barritt again expressed his opinion that SACUA should come to the Assembly with a motion, which then, in parliamentary fashion, would be openly debated and acted upon. He felt that a diffuse discussion such as is occurring today is an ineffective use of Assembly's time.

Professor Friedman expressed his bewilderment in that as a member of SACUA, he recalled receiving criticism in the past from those who felt that Assembly meetings were no more than "boring informational sessions," lacking in input from the members through open discussion. He did not feel that a motion from SACUA was necessary to elicit input on the subject from this representative body.

Professor Nagy said that the use of the money from endowment funds for faculty salary increases would be a mistake. He felt that it is possible that the administration might use the funds for such a purpose, but it would not improve compensation beyond the usual increase, because they would just provide less support from state funds, and make up the difference from endowment funds. He also expressed the idea that putting money into student fellowships instead of professorships is a more efficient way to get professors.

Professor Barnard moved the previous question. After some confusion involving parliamentary procedure, Professor Barnard said that she did not want to speak to the motion on the floor, but thought that the problem was that we do not have clear goals, making it difficult for her to establish priorities. She would like to have the goals identified before making decisions as to where endowment funds should be used.

Professor Kirkpatrick expressed her view that the list provided was too confusing, including a wide range of possibilities, many of which had little to do with the improvement of faculty compensation. Professor Naylor said that this was an attempt on the part of SACUA to get some feedback from the Assembly instead of waiting for someone else to tell us how the funds will be used.

Professor Root said that he was not confused about the

issue, and wants to see things done to improve the economic position of the faculty, whether it be the establishing of chairs or only to support travel.

Professor Carter offered an item to the list that he thought would enhance the financial status of some of the faculty, one that might help in bringing in new younger faculty - the creation of a specific fund to support early retirement. This might take the form of full-time personal research as a transitional period for a person close to retirement.

Professor Cares objected to the apparent laxity in following parliamentary procedures in Assembly meetings. Chairman Naylor accepted the criticism.

Professor Dixon asked if the faculty ever goes to the administration to request that an attempt be made to generate endowment funds for things which the faculty sees as important. Wendell Lyons answered by stating that it frequently occurs. He informed the Assembly that in the preliminary table of needs for the capital campaign, there is 35 million dollars in faculty support (25 million for endowed professorships, 10 million for visiting professorships, named professorships, endowed faculty support, directorships and endowed seminars). He added that when dealing directly with a donor who expresses an interest in an endowment for some particular program, the administration involves a faculty representative in the discussion and moves to get the donor to communicate with that faculty person.

Professor Nagy said that it was his impression that The University of Michigan, compared with its peer institutions, has a very low number of endowed chairs. He asked Mr. Lyons if this was correct, and if so, is it because the administration feels that there are better ways in which to spend endowment funds? Mr. Lyons responded by saying that it seems to be traditional for tax-assisted universities to have fewer endowed chairs than at private schools. He called attention to his previous statement that 25 million dollars has been itemized for endowed chairs in the proposed capital campaign.

COURSE
EVALUA-
TION

Chairman Naylor called attention to the SACUA document, Student Evaluation of Instruction, and suggested that it be only discussed at today's meeting, then voted on during the next Assembly meeting. He then asked Professor M. Brown to present some information on the document prior to the

discussion.

Professor Brown reviewed the history of the proposal, mentioning that in February, 1978 the Civil Liberties Board (CLB) proposed a list of guidelines concerning student evaluation of courses and faculty, motivated by the recognition of the increasing weight being placed by administrators on such evaluation, the heterogeneity of such practices within the University, and the potential for abuse by all concerned. After some discussion by Assembly it was decided the the ten guidelines were, "too descriptive." The proposal was held over until the March, 1978 meeting, at which time there were two proposals before the Assembly, one a modification by SACUA of the CLB proposal, which attempted to define a smaller number of basic principles on the subject. The right not to participate in the evaluations was suggested as a preeminent issue at that time. The other proposal was one submitted by the Academic Affairs Committee which suggested a university-wide system of course evaluation to be administered by CRLT. There was an attempt to keep these two issues separate.

The Senate Assembly did not react favorably to a university-wide student course evaluation and the subject has not come up again. He said that there seemed to be a general endorsement of the SACUA-CLB basic principles but there was great concern with the precise wording of the guidelines as they would affect the individual units.

After two years, SACUA has come forth with another attempt to address this issue. Professor Brown said that the purpose of this document is to put into place a minimal number of basic guidelines which leave the general format, details and procedures to the individual units. The goal of the first guidelines is to prevent units from requiring participation in student evaluation as a condition of employment. The other two guidelines are intended to insure that whatever the decision (whether or not to have such a system for the student evaluation of faculty) should be done in a democratic way and with knowledge by the faculty to what is being done.

Professor Weiner asked what would happen if a unit voted 51% to 49% in favor of adopting the student evaluation procedure. Would the 49% still have to participate in the evaluation?

Professor M. Brown answered by pointing out that under

guideline #1, no individual would have to participate. However, refusal to participate may lead the unit authority (e.g., executive committees) to draw certain conclusions about that individual's teaching. This, said Professor Brown, "is a little different from saying if you don't participate, you will be fired."

Professor Barritt was in general agreement with the proposed guidelines, but expressed his concern about the rights of students and taxpayers. He asked if there was any thought in writing a fourth principle that would represent the competing interest of that group.

Professor Brown recalled that in the original proposals (1978), there were protections for students and others, but the matter became very entangled, so SACUA tried to deal with one aspect of the problem - the protection of faculty rights. He added that there was no intent to avoid the issue of student rights.

Professor Pollock interpreted the first guideline as one that does protect the student, because the students can carry out an evaluation if they wish as long as it is not done during class.

Professor Berlin, chairman of the CLB, reflected upon the issue as it was part of the committee's business during the 1979-1980 school year. He commented on the CLB proposal from the student evaluation of teaching that was presented to SACUA in March, 1980. While there was a high level of agreement on the Board involving the central issues, there was a sharp division on one question - the subject involved in item #1 of the SACUA proposal. Some members felt that it would not violate anyone's civil liberties if the unit makes a majority decision that it shall be binding for all to participate in an evaluation program, whereas others felt that everyone should have the right to "opt out" of such evaluations by students. Professor Berlin felt that both documents have addressed the issue of student interest (and protection) in the context of trying to view the evaluation of instruction by students as being linked directly to the improvement of instruction. As a final point, Professor Berlin expressed his personal view that although all previous emphasis has been placed on student evaluation of instruction we should try to examine the civil liberties implications of evaluation, without reference to who is doing the evaluation.

Professor Gordon encouraged Assembly members to discuss the SACUA proposal with their constituencies in order to

make a decision as to whether the refusal to participate in student evaluation is a fundamental right connected to academic freedom or whether it is not. He drew the attention of the members to the preamble of the SACUA draft, where some of these issues are addressed.

Professor Friedman, speaking as a previous chairman of the CLB, expressed his personal view that a faculty member does not have a right to get out of any kind of evaluation. He said that it is important to understand that in these times of fewer tenured "slots," it will be increasingly difficult to get tenure, and that deans will be looking at teaching ability, so it is important to have meaningful parameters such as the ones suggested here instead of a few students submitting evaluations.

Professor Barnard felt strongly that any guidelines for student evaluation of teaching must protect the faculty. She believes in the use of such evaluation, but warned that there are definite risks to the faculty, depending upon how the evaluations are used. Chairman Naylor said that SACUA is suggesting that faculty non-participation in a particular formal system would not be grounds for dismissal.

Professor Barritt said that he would be satisfied if item #1 was changed to reflect Professor Naylor's statement. He also agreed with Professor Friedman in that the faculty should be evaluated, and further, should be evaluated by students. However, he didn't feel that someone should be required to use any particular instrument. Professor Barritt suggested that item #1 in SACUA's document be changed to incorporate Professor Naylor's last statement and that it should also state that each faculty member has a responsibility to be evaluated by students.

OLD AND
NEW
BUSINESS

There was neither old nor new business.

ADJOURN-
MENT

The Senate Assembly meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Charles C. Kelsey
Senate Secretary