

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Regular Assembly Meeting, May 20, 1974

ATTENDANCE Present: Adams, Allen, Anton, Baublis, Bishop, Browder, Brown, Caldwell, Cartwright, Cassidy, Cornell, Baker, Crawford, Danielson, DeKornfeld, Dernberger, Deskins, Eisley, Evaldson, Floyd, Flynn, Gikas, Goldman, Goodman, Harrison, Horsley, Ilie, Jameson, Johnson, Kachaturoff, Kell, Kelsey, Kish, Lands, Lehmann, Loomis, Downen, Mohler, Nesbitt, Ostrand, Rowe, Schmickel, Scott, Selingson, Soucek, Springer, Marsden, Terwilliger, Van Der Voo, Vaughn, Weeks, Williams, Leonard

Absent: Berki, Brockway, Creeth, Fader, Hoffman, Hymans, Kaplan, Krachenberg, Iglehart, Livermore, Borkin, Murphey, Oberman, Sibley, Taren, Vander, Wilson

CALL TO ORDER Chairman Cohen called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m. in the Rackham Amphitheatre.

MINUTES APPROVED The minutes of the Senate Assembly meeting of April 15, 1974 were approved.

OPENING REMARKS Assuming the role of Chairman, Professor Cohen assured the members of the Assembly that SACUA wanted very much to be guided by their wishes during the coming year and that help in any form would be most welcome. He pointed out, especially for the benefit of new members, that as the steering committee of the Assembly, which is the legislative arm of the Senate, SACUA seeks to contribute the wisdom of the faculty in University decision-making processes. Thus, the chairman and vice-chairman (Professor Loomis) of SACUA (or their delegates) regularly attend meetings of the Budget Committee and, where appropriate, participate in discussions of the Board of Regents. On recent occasions, for example, the SACUA representatives have spoken on such issues as salary disclosure, the use of University facilities for film showings, and the matter of retirement options, to name a few. In any case, Chairman Cohen reiterated, SACUA would be grateful for continuing input from members of the Assembly, so that the committee could feel assured it was reflecting the collective wisdom of the faculty.

JNIVERSITY
CLUB

Having been invited to report to the Assembly on the current status of the University Club, Professor Hinerman, chairman of its board, indicated that while the Club had been successful during its first year of operation, it was currently suffering a deficit. A late membership drive, resulting in a decrease of some 400 members at a cost of \$15,000-\$20,000, had been responsible in part. Complicating this situation further was the combination of increased rent, more expensive labor, and higher food costs. Meanwhile, attempts to lower overhead by such measures as reducing the hours of operation during the summer will at least result in a decrease in the anticipated deficit.

Having canvassed the faculty, the board of directors notes active interest in continuance of the Club, though there is appreciable sentiment for reviewing the dues structure, so that the current graduated arrangement may need to yield to a system of flat dues. Professor Hinerman expressed the hope that the faculty would rally to the Club's support, making it a solvent and viable enterprise. He urged non-members to join, taking advantage of the reduced summer rates, and hoped members of the Assembly could bring their influence to bear in persuading their respective units to hold their social and business affairs in the University Club rather than at off-campus establishments.

COMMITTEE
ON THE
ECONOMIC
STATUS OF
FACULTY

Chairman Cohen invited Professor Johnson, chairman of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, to make whatever supplementary remarks he wished in connection with the CESF reports, copies of which had been sent to the members of the Assembly. In so doing, Professor Johnson pointed out that the CESF proposal submitted to the Regents in October 1973 has now been updated and that, in addition, a letter of May 14, 1974 to the President and the Regents from SACUA's chairman and vice-chairman underscored the serious extent to which inflation has eroded the disposable income of our faculty. By way of illustration, Professor Johnson noted that while our salary schedule still ranks ahead of those of other schools in the state, our faculty has, on a relative basis, gained the least of any of them during the period from 1966 to the present. Hence, the aforementioned letter of May 14 strongly urged the President and Regents to consider the toll which inflation has taken, doing everything in their power to rectify the serious financial situation in which the faculty finds itself.

In the ensuing discussion Professors Weeks, Caldwell, and Evaldson expressed interest in learning how other schools handle their situations in these times of financial exigency, while Professor Lehmann pointed out that in our own case we have witnessed administrative positions growing at three times the rate of faculty positions, a fact that could make one wonder whether the former were not growing at the expense of the latter. Subsequently Professor Lehmann rose to commend Professor Johnson and the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty for their diligence and effectiveness in dealing with the complicated affairs with which they had been charged, sentiments that were heartily endorsed by the members of the Assembly.

SENATE
ADVISORY
REVIEW
COMMITTEE

By way of refreshing everyone's memory and putting the problem in perspective for the new members especially, Chairman Cohen summarized the actions, or lack of actions, taken within the past several months with respect to amendment of the charter of the Senate Advisory Review Committee at the latter's request. Primarily SARC had hoped to become more readily available to grievants where appropriate. While some clarification had been written into two sections of its charter by action of the Assembly on February 18, 1974, the question of readier access to SARC had still not been clearly resolved. The Assembly now had before it three proposals dealing in their several ways with the issue, and Chairman Cohen suggested that Proposal #1, as the most far-reaching, be dealt with first; if adopted, the matter would be resolved, and, if not, the Assembly could turn to Proposals #2 and #3.

At the commencement of discussion, Professor Rowe voiced the feeling that problems relating to teaching and scholarly work are primarily the province of one's department, secondarily that of one's school or college, and only lastly the concern of a review body such as SARC, which should have no part in substantive review and enter the picture only in cases of procedural deficiencies. In this spirit he endorsed Proposal #2 and its suggested definition of "unit" rather than Proposal #1 and its "complaint department" character, as he saw it. In reply, Chairman Cohen emphasized that his intent was not to urge Proposal #1 as such but rather to suggest that, being the farthest out of the proposals, it was procedurally efficient to have it discussed initially. Consequently, the chair ruled that Proposal #1 was under discussion, pointing out that he could be challenged on this by the members if they so wished.

Puzzled as to the course of discussion, Professor Dernberger indicated his understanding that the matter was to have been brought back to the Assembly for a definition of "unit" rather than for the broader question of access to SARC, an issue he felt had been properly addressed at the February meeting. Professor Kell concurred. Pointing out that the ruling of the chair could be tested, Professor Lands suggested doing so in the interest of advancing discussion. The ruling of the chair was supported (20 to 17), and the Assembly proceeded to discuss Proposal #1.

Pointing to the plight of someone denied promotion year after year in a unit having so few members that the decision could hardly be circumvented, and noting the wide range of governance structures existing within the University, Professor Lehmann urged the adoption of Proposal #1, which would give widest access to SARC. The motion, having been seconded, passed by a vote of 30 to 12, and the charter of SARC will be amended accordingly.

USE OF
UNIVERSITY
FACILITIES
FOR FILM
SHOWINGS

As Chairman Cohen pointed out, though the matter of rental of University facilities for film-showing purposes was not a clear item of business, SACUA could, as always, profit from the Assembly's views on the subject. Referring to matters reported in the SACUA minutes of April 30, 1974, the chairman recapitulated the events to date, with particular reference to the committee's suggested emendations of the resolution brought by President Fleming to the meeting of the Board of Regents at which Chairman Cohen had appeared. To Professor Danielson's query concerning the legal aspects of the situation, the chairman responded that, as he had reminded the Regents, the issue at this point was not primarily a legal one but rather one of settling on the wisest policy.

In response to Professor Seligson's suggestion that various aspects needed to be separated out -- including, for instance, the use of film-showing proceeds for political purposes -- the chairman indicated that SACUA had so advised the administration, suggesting the need to disentangle a technical matter, the use of University facilities, from the moral issue, as it were, the determination of whether certain films are, on their substantive merits, suitable for viewing.

Since in the current affair much has been made of the matter of image, and since, as Professor Mohler noted, the Assembly itself had a few minutes earlier expressed some concern about the University's image in regard to comparative salary figures, he hastened to add that the State

Street area in general has done little to help our image over the past ten years. Professor Baublis, on the other hand, expressed some apprehension about tailoring policy with an eye to one's image. In his opinion the University image has probably been more affected by students' political activities than by the film-showing episodes of the moment. Were the Regents therefore to feel a need to control these political activities, he, for one, would be troubled. For Professor Baublis, then, pornography per se was a non-issue in the present situation.

The remaining discussion dealt with various specific details, such as the legal need of the University to assure itself that the age limits with respect to viewing certain films are observed. In response to Professor Cassidy's question as to whether films were to be shown for educational purposes but not for profit, the chairman described the aim as being one of restricting showings to groups which plow back whatever resources accrue into further film showings or related purposes. With reference to Professor Nesbitt's interest in the role of faculty members in the enterprise, Chairman Cohen referred to the activities of the Film Resources Committee, on which faculty members serve. In connection with Professor Mohler's concern about meeting possible deficits, Professor Bishop indicated his approval of the auditing of film society books but not necessarily through the mechanisms that have been suggested, while Chairman Cohen pointed out that, by and large, the film societies have acted responsibly in meeting their obligations.

In concluding the discussion, Professor DeKornfeld, feeling that the pre-scrutiny of films was not only technically difficult but actually a repugnant notion in a free University, expressed agreement with the posture adopted by SACUA and its chairman and the manner in which they had proceeded in the matter.

NEW
BUSINESS

The Assembly approved SACUA's nomination of Professor Nishiyama for a three-year term on the Board for Student Publications.

OLD
BUSINESS

Asserting that the physical cleanliness of the University has left much to be desired over the past eight months, Professor Seligson wondered what steps might be taken to insure a more wholesome working environment. A letter addressed to SACUA on the subject would, Chairman Cohen assured her, be brought to the attention of the proper persons.

ADJOURN-
MENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Erasmus L. Hoch
Secretary