

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Regular Assembly Meeting, May 21, 1973

ATTENDANCE Present: Allen, Anton, Berki, Bishop, Brown, Buning, Cartwright, Cassidy, Cooperrider, Danielson, Dernberger, Ehrenkreutz, Evaldson, Easter, Floyd, Franken, Gikas, Harrison, Scholl, Higgins, Hoffman, Hymans, Adams, Creeth, Jameson, Johnson, Kaplan, Hildebrandt, Kelsey, Kerr, Holbrook, Lands, Lehmann, Lloyd, Loomis, Vainstein, Mohler, Oberman, Rowe, Sana, Sawyer, Schmickel, Seligson, Taren, Lynch, Terwilliger, Vander, Williams, Wilson, Zweifelner, Goodman, Kincaid

Absent: Brockway, Caldwell, Cohen, Colburn, Darvas, Hertzler, Kish, Krachenberg, Lagler, Iglehart, Marshall, Nystuen, Ostrand, Ice, Sibley, Springer, Vaughn

Guests: Members, Academic Affairs Committee  
Members, Communications Review Committee

CALL TO ORDER Chairman Goodman called the meeting to order at 3:22 p.m. in the Rackham Amphitheater.

CORRECTIONS TO MINUTES There was one correction to the minutes of the April 16 meeting. Professor Higgins said that on page 2 the first sentence of the 6th paragraph should read as follows: "Professor Higgins said that a poll conducted in the School of Public Health had shown that 33 faculty members were opposed to the resolution, while there were 25 in favor and 3 abstentions." The minutes were approved subject to this correction.

ANNOUNCEMENTS Chairman Goodman made the following announcements:

A letter had been sent out to the chairmen of committees asking for information and suggestions for improved functioning. Several helpful responses had been received.

Three faculty positions on the Board in Control of Intercollegiate Athletics were expiring, and SACUA had sent six names to the Board of Regents. The Board had tabled these for further discussion at their next meeting. It was Chairman Goodman's hope that the question would soon be resolved satisfactorily.

A SACUA retreat had been held at Inglis House on May 9. The Secretary had written up some of the discussion. It had been agreed that steps should be taken to ensure that proposals for action coming from Assembly committees should receive full discussion in the Assembly. Considerable thought had been given to improving the effectiveness of Assembly debates, and it had been agreed that having a definite proposal to place before each Assembly meeting would be helpful.

REPORT BY PROFESSOR GIES In accordance with the agenda, Chairman Goodman invited Professor Thomas Gies to talk about the report by the President's Ad Hoc Communications Review Committee, (hereinafter referred to as the Gies Committee) which he had chaired.

Professor Gies said that the occasion for the report was the fact that technology had been moving forward rapidly in the area of audio-visual presentations, and President Fleming had asked the committee to think through the implications of this fact for the University.

The committee had made three basic recommendations. First, large scale experimentation should be undertaken upon a voluntary basis. Second, to promote this experimentation they were asking the University administration to undertake a modest administrative reorganization of the University broadcasting facilities. Third, they were suggesting some modest budget shifting to permit experimentation with new modes of teaching. This was not, of course, intended to exclude obtaining outside support. Professor Gies closed by inviting questions and comments from the Assembly.

Chairman Goodman pointed out that since the report of the committee was directed to the President and not to the Assembly, it was not up to the Assembly to accept or reject their report. Rather this was an invitation for them to make their feelings known on the subject.

Professor Kaplan asked to what extent experimentation could be replaced by sending observers to other institutions where some of the techniques referred to in the report were being tried. Professor Gies said that this observation was pertinent, but that he thought there was a greater need for development of software than of hardware.

Professor Brown suggested that the use of communications satellites should be explored, saying he understood that the Dental School had already been selected as a participant in one such study. Professor Gies replied that this approach might indeed be useful in some areas. There was the possibility of serving a number of institutions simultaneously in this manner.

Professor Anton asked what we could look forward to in the next three to five years if the proposals of the committee were in fact adopted by the University. Professor Gies replied that he hoped that a few department chairmen would pick out one or possibly two courses whose content was sufficiently well established so that materials could be prepared embodying the content of the courses and put on the shelf, so to speak, for students to study on their own, coming back to the faculty only when they had got through this relatively standard material.

Professor Cassidy asked how copyright laws applied to such materials. Professor Gies replied that a committee chaired by Professor Peckham had studied this question about a year previously, and he referred the question to him. Professor Peckham said that the recommendations were before the Regents, and would be considered at their June meeting. The recommendations simply followed the copyright law, and were intended to provide faculty members with protection if their material became outdated and they wanted to withdraw it, or if they moved to another university. He emphasized that no one was being forced to do anything, and that the desire was simply to open a few doors for those who might be interested in using the new technology.

Professor Seligson expressed some concern about the one-door concept, remarking that the Classics Department, of which she was a member, had appointed a young man whose chief function would be developing materials

of the type being considered. She hoped that no monopoly of expertise in this area was being proposed. Professor Gies said that that was not the intention; the one-door proposal was intended as an improvement over no doors, not as a closing off of alternative sources of advice.

Professor Lloyd asked, in this connection, whether units that made use of CRLT's services would be charged for them, or whether the cost would be absorbed in the budget as a whole. Professor Gies said that the thought had been that CRLT should be supported as the Library was now, without specific charges to users. He added that this question had largely been left for later consideration. Professor Stanford Ericksen pointed out that an instructional improvement fund was proposed that would in some ways be parallel to the present Rackham Research Fund, but would be limited to proposals concerning teaching instead of research. He said that audio-visual services were currently provided on a fee-for-service basis, and it was important to get away from that.

Professor Holbrook remarked that the report seemed to be directed more toward reducing teaching costs than toward improving the quality of instruction. He expressed some doubt, however, whether either goal would in fact be attained. Professor Gies replied that while no one could be sure what would happen, his hope was that if experimentation was done a little at a time, improvements in quality would occur, followed perhaps somewhat later by a decrease in costs.

COMMENTS BY  
MRS. DUNLAP

Chairman Goodman said that the report of the Gies Committee had been transmitted to the Academic Affairs Committee for study. Although this had been done at the time of final examinations, the committee had been very cooperative and had set up a subcommittee to go over the report carefully. Their comments had been distributed to the Assembly. Chairman Goodman called on Mrs. Connie Dunlap, the chairman of the Academic Affairs Committee, to come forward and make whatever remarks she cared to.

Mrs. Dunlap said that the committee felt that the issues raised by the report were much too important to ignore. However, they had tried to steer clear of political and organizational questions.

The committee felt very strongly that instructional innovation should not be tied solely to technology. Innovational teaching methods should also be considered, but there was a danger, particularly in view of the short timetable, that such possibilities would be forgotten. They also felt that any new proposals should be supported in terms of educational principles and that methods of evaluation should be established at the outset.

She added that the committee, far from being opposed to change as such, felt that the report was not radical enough. She repeated that their chief concern was that the report was too biased in the direction of technology. Finally, she said that the committee would be happy to meet further with the Gies Committee.

With reference to the resolution contained in the report from the Academic Affairs Committee, Chairman Goodman said that at a meeting on May 16, which some members of both committees had attended, a slight change in the wording of the resolution had been agreed to.

Professor Lloyd then moved the revised resolution, worded as follows:

Be it resolved that, in principle, Senate Assembly supports the interest in reviewing the efficacy of innovative teaching techniques at the University of Michigan, including instructional use of audio-visual, broadcasting and television technology, and in developing their further use as indicated in the President's charge to the Ad Hoc Communications Review Committee, where appropriate. Senate Assembly also requests that before any major program changes are made there be substantial consultation with the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee in the broader context of educational principles, research techniques, and evaluative procedures.

Professor Goodman said that the purpose of the resolution was to ensure faculty involvement as the proposals of the Gies Committee went forward in administrative circles.

Professor Franken asked what was meant by the words "substantial consultation". Professor Lloyd replied that since the proposed reorganization would put broadcasting under the aegis of the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, it seemed appropriate that the advisory committee to that vice-president should be closely involved in all subsequent steps. Mrs. Dunlap read part of the function statement of the Academic Affairs Committee to indicate the appropriateness of their involvement. Chairman Goodman said that since a number of committees might have a legitimate interest in the matter at hand, it seemed important to fix the responsibility upon one of them, and the Academic Affairs Committee seemed to be the most logical choice.

Professor Cooperrider said that it was not clear to him that academic, as distinguished from administrative, decisions were required. Professor Hayward said that the committee had felt that their involvement was necessary if faculty members were to become aware of what was going on and were to be able to make effective use of any new techniques that were developed. Professor Cooperrider then asked whether the proposed organizational changes were agreed to by all the units that would be affected. Professor Felbeck assured him there was no significant opposition to the shift, which was indeed regarded as 10-15 years overdue.

Professor Anton asked whether he was correct in supposing that the term "major program changes" referred to educational rather than administrative changes. Professor Goodman said that more than one interpretation was possible. Professor Anton asked if it was correct to say that the resolution did not take a position one way or the other on the question of reorganization. Professors Goodman and Gies said that this interpretation was substantially correct. Professor Danielson inquired further whether the reorganization might be speeded up or slowed down by the passage of this resolution. Chairman Goodman replied that he foresaw no such effect. He said that all the resolution did was to increase the odds that there would be faculty input at appropriate points.

Professor Kornblum said that the preceding discussion led to the question of whether acceptance of the resolution necessarily implied acceptance of the Gies Committee Report. Professor Goodman said that the resolution was not intended to have that implication, and pointed out that it was accompanied by a statement from the Academic Affairs Committee that criticized several

aspects of the Gies Report. He reiterated that the committee had no power to approve or disapprove, merely to advise, and that it was in this light that their critique should be read. If the administration wanted to adopt any or all of the recommendations in the Gies Report, it was certainly free to do so. The resolution was intended simply to ensure that faculty views would not be overlooked.

Professor Cooperrider said that he was still left uncertain whether the Academic Affairs Committee was expected to begin its input before or after the three agencies were put together in one unit under the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. Chairman Goodman replied that it was hard for anyone present to answer the question, since it referred to a very delicate set of dynamics between the administration and the faculty. Professor Vander suggested that in view of the extent of confusion about the meaning of the proposed resolution, it might be preferable to accept the report of the Gies Committee as it stood.

Professor Taren asked why the Academic Affairs Committee was involved in the question at such a late stage. Chairman Goodman replied that during the past year SACUA had asked President Fleming about the status of the Gies Committee a number of times. It finally appeared that the committee had been set up originally on an ad hoc basis by taking some people from the Broadcasting Committee and adding others. SACUA tried to keep up with what was going on, and when the report finally came out, SACUA was faced with a choice of doing nothing and hoping that everything worked out for the best or of trying to expose it to a review, late though it might be.

Professor Hymans said that he saw two issues. The first was that of designating some committee to keep track of what was going on. If so, was the Academic Affairs Committee the best choice? The other question was whether, in the context of the resolution, the mere acceptance by the administration of the ad hoc committee's report would constitute a major program change, and if so whether the Assembly wanted the Academic Affairs Committee to have an input at that point. Chairman Goodman replied that he didn't feel that we could tell what "acceptance of the report by the administration" meant. Acceptance might or might not entail subsequent action. This question, though, was close to the central issue that was discussed at the joint meeting on May 16--was the Academic Affairs Committee trying to inhibit the adoption of the seven recommendations of the ad hoc committee or some subset of them? He felt that at the very least they were saying that they wanted to go over them very carefully and make sure they had the chance to present their own interpretation of them. Professor Hymans responded that he wanted to know whether the Assembly resolution was trying to give approval to this directly or by the back door. Chairman Goodman said that that was a very germane question.

Professor Hoffman said she felt that the ad hoc committee's report played up possible technological solutions to teaching problems and played down possible non-technological solutions such as changes in teaching techniques. She felt that this was one of the things that the Academic Affairs Committee's response was saying. Chairman Goodman said that in his opinion the Academic Affairs Committee was calling for a less purely technological approach to educational issues than was the ad hoc committee, and that adoption of the resolution would imply an endorsement of this broader point of view. Each recommendation of the ad hoc committee report would be subject to examination by and consultation with the members of the Academic Affairs Committee.

Professor Lands suggested that besides the question posed by Chairman Goodman the Assembly should perhaps consider the advisability of adding yet one more responsibility to one vice-president's office. Chairman Goodman replied that he shared that concern, but did not feel that the interpretation should be read into the resolution.

Professor Danielson said that it was his understanding that the Academic Affairs Committee was supposed to be consulted on major changes as of now, and asked whether it was correct to say that passage would merely reenforce this position. Professor Goodman said that he felt the proper answer was yes, even at the risk of putting a brake on implementation of the ad hoc committee's recommendations. Professor Vander said that it was for this reason that he was opposing the resolution; he didn't feel that brakes were called for at this time.

Mrs. Dunlap said, in response to a number of remarks that had been made, that the first concern of the Academic Affairs Committee was to avoid a focus on technology to the exclusion of other forms of educational innovation. Their other major concern was that mechanisms should be included for the evaluation of the effect upon learning of any innovative techniques being considered.

RESOLUTION  
PASSED

Chairman Goodman called for a vote on the resolution. It was passed with 32 votes in favor and 9 opposed.

Chairman Goodman thanked the members of the two committees both for their presentations on this occasion and for the great amount of preparatory work they had done earlier.

REPORT BY  
PROFESSOR  
KAPLAN

The next item on the agenda was a brief report by Professor Kaplan on the activities of the Association of Michigan Collegiate Faculties.

Professor Kaplan, noting that members of the Assembly had already received a memorandum on the subject, said that he wanted to stress that the Association, although only two years old, was important and worthy of support. They had held three meetings during the past year, each extending from the afternoon late into the night, and they were planning to replace these with two-day meetings during the coming year.

Item "d" on the second page of the summary might call for some clarification. "Preparation of Recommendations on Ceilings on Fringe Benefits" referred to a state law that applied to the former teachers' colleges in the state, which used to be under the State Board of Education and in that capacity came under a state employees' retirement plan. The state law currently limits the employer's contribution to fringe benefits to 11%, including a contribution to Social Security. Consequently, other contributions had to go down as the contribution to Social Security went up. A bill in the current Legislature to raise the limit to 13% was being supported by the Association; they were hopeful that it would pass.

There was also a reference to a faculty exchange program, which was being considered by the Council of State College Presidents. The idea was to start with about 25 professors at state institutions, who would accept visiting appointments at other colleges within the state, and there were hopes of building this up eventually to as many as 50 faculty members. The purpose was to get the faculties to know each other's institutions better. The hope was that this proposal, which seemed to enjoy considerable support among the college presidents, would be funded.

NOMINATION TO VACANCY The next item on the agenda was the nomination of Professor Leonard Greenbaum to replace Professor Roger Hackett on the Board for Student Publications. The nomination was accepted unanimously.

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS Under new business, Professor Oberman said that he would like to see the procedure for electing SACUA members changed so that the members of the Assembly would have a better idea who they were voting for. He said that one thought that had occurred to him was that the previous year's SACUA should serve for three or four months after the convening of the new Assembly before an election was held.

Professor Kerr said that these matters had been spoken of at some length within SACUA, and that the present nominating procedures ensured a careful selection of candidates, thus covering some of the concerns expressed.

Professor Oberman then formally moved that SACUA should report to the Assembly by the September meeting with a plan for the election of new members of SACUA by a more democratic process. The motion was seconded by Professor Berki.

Professor Kerr asked what sort of provision was being asked for. Professor Oberman said that it should be such that the body politic would have a better acquaintance with the six eligible candidates.

In answer to a question from Professor Mohler, Professor Goodman said that the new members of the Assembly were given the same resumés of SACUA candidates that the other members received. Professor Bishop said that as a new member he had received the resumés and felt well-informed about the candidates. Professor Hymans said that he favored the motion. While some new members of the Assembly had the opportunity to get acquainted with the SACUA candidates before the election, others did not, and he thought it would be desirable to have some opportunity to see the candidates in action in the Assembly before having to cast a vote. He also envisaged the possibility of making newly-elected members of the Assembly eligible for election to SACUA.

Professor Anton said that he thought it would be desirable to give SACUA the responsibility for working out a concrete proposal rather than trying to prepare one on the floor. Chairman Goodman replied that that was what the motion called for.

Professor Hoffman remarked that she had been newly elected to the Assembly, but that she had not been present at the April meeting where the vote was held because she had not realized that her attendance was expected before the May meeting. Chairman Goodman explained that delays in the colleges commonly produce difficulties of this sort.

MOTION PASSED The motion was passed on a voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT The Assembly adjourned at 4:43 p.m.

Wilfred M. Kincaid  
Secretary