

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting, May 19, 1981

ATTENDANCE

Present: Ackley, Barnard, Barritt, Beck, Bishop, Brooks, M. Brown, Browne, Burdi, Caffesse, Carpenter, Cassidy, H. Cooper, Crane, Dahl, Dixon, Easley, Esteban, Friedman, Becker, Martin, Hultquist, Kincaid, E. Cooper, Lockwood, Loup, Maassab, Meyer, Millard, Morash, Mosher, Nagy, O'Meara, Ringler, Rinne, Romani, Root, Smith, Vinter, Young.

Absent: Bailey, D. Brown, K. Brown, Cares, Carter, DeKornfeld, Dobel, Stevenson, Evans, Fraser, Frost, Gray, Groves, Haddock, Hilbert, Hildebrandt, Holland, Keren, Kirkpatrick, Liepman, Lynch, Pollock, Regezi, Senior, Sisman, Tek, Tentler, Weiner, White, Wieland, Wyers, Rothman.

Guests: Lester T. Rutledge, Carlos H. Arce, Thomas J. Anton.

MINUTES

The minutes of the Senate Assembly meeting of April 20, 1981 were approved as written.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Morton Brown introduced himself and the other members of SACUA present. He also introduced Professor Wilfred Kincaid, who will serve as secretary for the May and June Senate Assembly meetings.

REPORT OF
THE RE-
SEARCH
POLICIES
COMMITTEE,
CHAIRMAN
LESTER T.
RUTLEDGE

The next order of business was the report of the Research Policies Committee on the survey of the research environment at The University of Michigan. Chairman Brown opened the discussion by giving a recent history.

In June of 1979, the Academic Affairs Committee issued a report to Senate Assembly on the research environment. The committee suggested that the environment for research seems to have deteriorated in recent years, that there were numerous "negative incentives" for research within the University. The committee perceived

other difficulties in the area of graduate student support, interdisciplinary research, and in the administration of sponsored research. In October, 1979, SACUA responded, suggesting (a) open forums in Assembly (several were held) (b) a review of the Division of Research Development and Administration (this was done by the President's Ad Hoc Committee to Review DRDA, chaired by Ray Kahn) (c) a re-examination of indirect cost recovery policy (this was subsequently done by the Research Policies Committee) (d) an examination of the problems of interdisciplinary research (this was subsequently reported on by the Academic Affairs Committee). In January, 1980, President Shapiro in his address to Assembly, identified the problem of the research environment as "a critical problem". Finally, the Research Policies Committee has held a number of forums with individual units and has undertaken a survey of faculty aimed at identifying more precisely the areas of faculty concern with the research environment.

Professor Brown then introduced Professor Lester T. Rutledge, Chairman of the Research Policies Committee. Professor Rutledge had before him a draft of the committee's report on its recent survey. He said that it would be reviewed and retyped after which copies would be distributed to Senate Assembly members; at the same time, appendix tables, the questionnaires and the computer data files would be made available to SACUA. Professor Rutledge's subsequent remarks were taken from the report.

Professor Rutledge said that the idea of making a survey of the entire faculty arose after the forums that the committee had conducted failed to produce much in the way of hard data. The questionnaire used in the survey went through several revisions, the last one after a preliminary version was sent out to a random sample of faculty members.

Professor Rutledge introduced Dr. Carlos Arce, a member of the committee, who is associated with the Survey Research Center. He was very helpful in directing the survey. Dr. Arce said that nearly 3,700 questionnaires had been sent out on the initial mailing. From this mailing and one reminder, the committee ultimately received 2,086 responses. By following up a random sample of 126 non-respondents by telephone, the committee satisfied itself that the results were unlikely to have been seriously distorted by non-responses. Moreover,

many of the non-respondents were not really part of the population to which the survey was addressed. Responses came from about 75 percent of the latter.

As one might expect, the greatest involvement in sponsored research was found among respondents in Engineering, Life Sciences, and Physical Sciences while low rates were associated with Law, Business, Humanities and Art.

Taking up some specific items, Dr. Arce noted that many of the respondents to Question #2 thought that they spent too much time in committee work and service activities, and too little time in sponsored and non-sponsored research. In response to Question #3 many thought that efforts in student advising and non-class instruction were not adequately recognized in determining pay raises.

One point on which several members of the Assembly had questions, notably Professors Root, Vinter, and Cooper, concerned the definition of sponsored and non-sponsored research. Professor Rutledge said sponsored research, for the purposes of the questionnaire, was research sponsored by outside agencies such as the National Science Foundation, while non-sponsored research was research for which non-university support in the form of fellowships or special awards, was received. Research for which no outside support was received was not covered by the questionnaire. He said that the reason for not including this latter category of research was that when it was asked about in a previous questionnaire, there were few responses and they were difficult to make sense of. Professor Vinter thought that he had included such research in his response to Question #2f and that he suspected that a number of other respondents had done the same.

Professor Burdi asked whether there had been any thought of asking administrators their opinions on Questions #2 and #3. Professor Rutledge replied that there had not been, but that the committee might be able to dig something out on these points.

Among some specific points emphasized by Professor Rutledge were the following:

Under Question #4, faculty travel funds seemed to

be a big problem area. The committee will recommend that all faculty members should be informed about the availability of travel funds. There was also considerable dissatisfaction with DRDA. The responses to Question #13 included many negative comments about service units. On the other hand, the responses to Question #14 indicated that most faculty members were satisfied with the research administration service from their schools and departments. Questions #4 and #10, concerned with indirect costs, produced numerous negative responses from faculty members involved in sponsored research, and many of the written comments were angry and bitter. Another serious problem area was interdisciplinary research. There were many complaints that graduate research assistants were too expensive because so much money was needed to pay tuition.

In response to a further question from Professor Vinter to the effect that respondents replied "No" on Questions #6 and #7 and regarded research in a different way, Dr. Arce said breakdowns could be made from the computer files.

Chairman Brown thanked Professor Rutledge and the members of his committee, particularly Dr. Arce, on behalf of the Assembly.

REPORT OF
THE REPRESENTATIVE
TO THE
INTERCOLLEGIATE
CONFERENCE
OF FACULTY
REPRESENTATIVES,
PROFESSOR
THOMAS
ANTON

Professor Thomas Anton, the Faculty Representative to the Intercollegiate Athletics Conference, now took the floor.

Professor Anton said that the whole concept of faculty governance of intercollegiate athletics had been on trial this year. He emphasized that the members of the Assembly were themselves an important part of faculty governance of athletics. Beside electing the faculty representative, they had a part in selecting the Board in Control of Intercollegiate Athletics. This Board, like those at the other Big Ten schools, has a faculty majority. The Big Ten Conference itself consists of ten faculty representatives of whom Professor Anton is one.

Professor Anton said that the main challenge during the past year had come from the University of Illinois. The issue had generated five feet of written documentation. A court suit of 72 million dollars is pending against

the Big Ten. The issue centered around a young man who transferred to Illinois from Fullerton Junior College in California. He was recruited as a football player in 1980. Of 36 transfer credit hours accepted by Illinois, 12 or 16 (depending on interpretation) were in football, or physical activity courses, with 20 credit hours in academic courses in which he had earned low grades. He was reported to be a student in agriculture, which is a difficult curriculum at Illinois. The Big Ten Conference representatives thought he should take a year to get his feet on the ground. Accordingly, they said that he should have two years of financial aid, but only one year, the second year, of athletic eligibility, provided he accumulated 78 credit hours toward his degree in agriculture.

When the Illinois athletic director was informed of this action, he called a local attorney, who initiated a law suit challenging the decision in court. This surprised the other faculty representatives since the University of Illinois had taken part in setting up the rules under which the faculty representatives were to decide such cases.

According to Professor Anton, there was a whole pattern on non-cooperativeness exhibited by Illinois in this case. Incomplete and inaccurate information was furnished; there was a high school transcript from the wrong student, for example. The legal situation is quite complex; a judge issued an injunction forbidding the Big Ten to impose its rules, then lifted it. University of Illinois lawyers insisted that the University's eligibility judgments were superior to those of the Conference. This position, if upheld, would destroy the Conference and the whole idea of faculty control. Someone said it was the most serious threat to the Big Ten in 30 years.

At a recent meeting in Minneapolis, the Big Ten representatives imposed significant sanctions on Illinois, which can result in the loss of six hundred seventy thousand dollars in Conference revenue in 1981-82. This action caught the attention of the authorities at Illinois, and some useful negotiations were held a week previously in Bloomington. President Ikenberry and Chancellor Cribbet of Illinois made good statements, which indicated that they understood and accepted the basic principle of faculty control. As a result, imposition of the

sanctions was postponed until September 1, with discussions to continue in the meantime.

Professor Anton said the second big issue concerning the Conference was that of women's athletics. (The Big Ten Conference now includes only men's athletics). A special task force had been set up a year ago at the request of the Council of Ten. The task force report was discussed and accepted by the Council at a meeting on May 4 and 5. The report called for a developmental effort for a period of four years and for ten alternate faculty representatives to be selected, one from each institution. How these were to be selected was not yet clear, as were many other details. To bring women's sports into the Big Ten, six of the ten institutions would have to agree. If and when that happens, rules would be applied to the women's sports similar to those currently applying to men's sports.

Finally, Professor Anton spoke about money. He said that the Conference is now generating large sums of money, especially from television contracts. The value of the Rose Bowl contract, for example, will yield each Conference institution some one hundred eighty thousand dollars this year. Television revenue from basketball, currently twenty one thousand dollars per game, will soon go up greatly. The "bad news" is that business dealings on this scale require much larger time commitments from faculty representatives.

In response to a question from Professor Friedman, Professor Anton said it was not the intention to expand the current faculty group with ten women. The additional members would be concerned with women's issues, and it was hoped that some women would be among them. The situation was deliberately left ambiguous; he pointed out that he did not represent only males.

Professor Barritt remarked that it sometimes had been suggested that we should stop supporting non-revenue producing intercollegiate sports and save money for recreational sports instead. He asked whether this had been considered by the Big Ten representatives. Professor Anton replied that it is discussed at almost every meeting. He said that many schools across the country had recently eliminated varsity competition in sports like baseball and golf. Could we keep them alive? So far we have done so. As for the reaction of the Board

in Control, they would be sympathetic to the need to maintain an active recreational sports program but unlikely to offer financial support for such activities without very careful consideration.

In response to a question from Professor Burdi about what future was in store for students engaged in intercollegiate athletics, Professor Anton said that apart from the few superstars who would make it as professionals, the aim was to keep student athletes within reaching distance of their degrees as they used up their eligibility. For example, 19 of the 25 seniors on the Michigan football team this year have their degrees, and the remaining six have already accumulated 105 credit hours which means they will achieve their degrees next year, when their eligibility expires. He saw this as evidence that the stringent Big Ten rules on academic performance of athletes were effective.

Professor Cooper asked whether the 10 alternates to be appointed to attend to women's athletics would have voting rights. Professor Anton replied that they would only vote in the absence of the faculty representative, but would also serve and have votes in committees. The possibility of getting them all a vote had been discussed, but it was felt to be too cumbersome.

Professor Dixon asked what had happened to the faculty representative from Illinois during the discussions involving his school. Professor Anton said that he had been placed in an ambiguous and difficult position. He had warned the Illinois counsel that they were taking the wrong path. University attorneys ignored his advice and at one point advised him not to participate in Conference deliberations. Altogether his position had been most uncomfortable.

Chairman Brown thanked Professor Anton for his presentation.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Wilfred Kincaid
Interim Senate Secretary