

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Assembly Meeting, June 15, 1970

CALL TO
ORDER

Chairman Knauss called the meeting to order at 3:25 p.m. in the Rackham Assembly Hall.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Abrams, Alston, Barnes, Bassett, Bertolaet, Bett, Bishop, Bole, Brown, Coon, Cornish, Crawford, Dowson, Galler, Gilbert, Handler, Hauenstein, Hinerman, Jensen, Kish, Lind, Longone, Meyer, Michelsen, Morqan, Nelson, Norman, Stolz, Ryder, Wood,

Absent: Ašgar, Birch, Bowditch, Bowman, Carter, Castor, ~~DeKornfeld~~, Eggertsen, Frye, Goodman, Graebel, Hooper, Huntington, Iglehart, Kahn, ~~Knauss~~, Krachenberg, Lloyd, Magee, Marsden, Bishop (Robert) Overseth, Pollack, Porter, Richards, Rigan, ~~Rucknagel, Sandalow~~, Scherer, ~~Schulze, Schuman~~, Sears, ~~Shappirio, Sinnott, Sonntag~~, Votaw, Weinberg, Wilkes, ~~Yagle, Portman~~

APPROVAL

The following minutes were approved, as distributed: March 18, 1970, March 25, 1970, April 20, 1970, and June 1, 1970.

REPORT OF
SACUA ACTIVITIES

Professor Crawford, reporting for SACUA, said SACUA had held seven meetings between May 24 and June 5. Two of them were all day affairs, one on Sunday, May 24, the traditional annual all day meeting devoted to long-range planning, at which questions of University governance and techniques for improving Assembly procedures were considered, among others. The other all day meeting, June 3, was devoted to committee nominations. On May 25, SACUA dealt with questions concerning resources allocation and the strike policy. On May 26, the Tarrant case was considered at the request of the central administration and whether the University should appeal the court ruling. On June 5, SACUA held its monthly meeting with President Fleming

at which the following questions were discussed: political action, strike policy and policies governing the appointment of acting deans. On June 10, SACUA continued a review of committee nominations.

COMMITTEE
APPOINTMENTS

Chairman Knauss, in presenting the list of SACUA nominees for various committees, outlined the criteria followed in making such nominations. These included Assembly representation, recommendations from past and present chairmen of committees, interests expressed by faculty members in the survey conducted by SACUA and the need for younger faculty members. Additionally, Chairman Knauss said, SACUA encouraged nominations from the floor.

The following nominations for committee appointments were placed before the Assembly and approved by the Assembly:

Academic Affairs: Deming Brown, LS&A; Finn Michelsen, Engineering; Sylvan Kornblum, MHRI; Marguerite Hood, Music.

Campus Planning: Wilbert McKeachie, LS&A; Melvin Reinhart, Medical.

Classified Research: Ralph Hiatt, Engineering; George Jourdian, Medical; George Kish, LS&A.

Research Policy: No vacancies, committee being restructured.

Proper Role: James Conklin, Medical; Ejner Jensen, LS&A; A. R. Krackenberg, Dearborn.

Student Relations: Richard Balzhiser, Engineering; Brice Carnahan, Engineering; Frithjoh Bergmann, LS&A; Harriet Mills, LS&A.

University Relations: T.V. Fisher, Medical; Ernest Woodman, Natural Resources.

Bylaws: George McEwen, Engineering; Charles Rehmus, LS&A.

Tenure: Daniel Katz, LS&A.

Civil Liberties: Carl Cohen, LS&A;

Economic Status: James Pilcher, Business Administration.

STRIKE
P. [CY
ACTIONS

Chairman Knauss said some confusion existed on the Assembly action taken with respect to the strike policy. He said the majority of SACUA members do not feel that the Assembly statement is inconsistent with the Deans' statement. He said in part we're reacting in a negative way to the strike policy statement.

Chairman Knauss offered as a motion of SACUA that the Assembly support in principle section 4 (1) on page 2 in the document, "Summary of Strike Policy Actions". That motion reads:

The Assembly supports the principle that the University cannot make payment of wages and salaries to individuals who choose to withhold the services for which they are employed.

Professor Alston proposed a ten-minute limit on discussion of the motion since, he said, we've already spent much time on the matter.

Chairman Knauss said the statement proposed is much broader since it doesn't focus on the question of strikes. He said it is simply a principle, leaving the matter to the schools and colleges.

Professor Brown asked where would our statement go. In reply, Chairman Knauss said the statement would go to the executive officers, the Regents and to the schools and colleges.

Professor Galler said he didn't understand what is meant by withholding of services. Who is to decide, he asked. Vagueness is dangerous, he said.

Chairman Knauss said he doubted one could define withholding of services in any document which appeals to all schools.

Professor Norman said the statement is much broader and also more circumscribed. He said the statement addresses itself to those who voluntarily withhold services.

Professor Sinnott said the policy here is a no-work, no-pay policy. How it is to be implemented, he said,

is up to the individual schools. He said he had talked with deans and they said they could live with it. He said he can't see implementation worked out on a global policy; it has to be worked out on an individual basis.

Professor Bertolaet moved as an amendment that specific proposals for implementing of a University-wide procedure be brought before the Assembly for consideration. The amendment was seconded.

Professor Crawford said the enforcement problems would be at the college level. Professor Bertolaet said we'd like to see these proposals. Professor Crawford said he doubted any action would be taken without faculty involvement.

Professor Brown said if the amendment passes, we haven't said much. He said we should leave the matter to the schools and colleges.

In a voice vote on the Bertolaet amendment, the motion carried.

In discussion on the original motion, questions were raised as to who are the individuals embraced in Section 1. Are they teaching fellows and instructors? Professor Sinnott, in reply, said we can only speak for the faculty, for those we represent. Professor Norman said it would not be presumptuous to speak about others employed in the University.

Professor Shappirio moved to change the term, "individuals", to "Senate members" in the policy statement. His motion was supported.

Professor Abrams said we're ducking the issues, that we don't want to talk about others.

In a vote on Professor Shappirio's amendment, the motion was defeated.

In a vote on the original motion, the motion was carried.

Dr. Sylvan Kornblum, speaking for the Ad Hoc Committee on Political Activity, summarized the report of the

Committee distributed to the Assembly. He said the report has two major sections, one a short preamble and the second portion followed by a set of recommendations. The preamble, he said, carries the spirit of the Assembly in setting up the committee. With the exception of the question of calendar revision, he said, the committee recommendations were unanimously supported. The majority, he said, endorsed the proposals for calendar revision. He said the plan proposed does not call for a two-week recess, does not involve loss of time and does not involve any cost.

Chairman Knauss suggested we split the broad questions, on the request that if the report is adopted, that we back Section I and that we urge the University to implement the statement. No doubt, he said, the controversial proposal deals with the calendar revision.

Professor Sandalow said he's not clear about what Section I involves. He said the primary virtue is that it does not say that the University as an institution should become involved on either side for fostering political activity. He raised a question about the legal aspects and inquired what is the status of institutions making such recommendations.

Chairman Knauss said he hesitated to make a statement. He said he had attended a meeting in Washington last week where the specific question of tax status came up, whether a donor could claim tax status if the University is involved in political activity. The answer, he said, is no, he can't. He said a set of guidelines is being prepared. This document would endanger the tax status of the University.

Professor Sandalow said he agreed; we're a state institution and we don't have the same problems as Princeton, a private school.

Dr. Kornblum, on the matter of proposals for calendar revision, said the impetus was the Princeton Plan. He said the committee had time to consider the pros and cons which are summarized in the report. He said the thought about legal implications did not seem to put the University in jeopardy. One question raised was whether students

and faculty would take advantage of such plans. He said whatever sentiment was expressed at the meeting was rather diffuse and diverse. He said an informal poll of SGC indicate a majority are in favor. The general sentiment was that even a majority might not take advantage of a revision. The reason chosen for the days suggested, he said, was to maximize the time spent.

Professor Crawford noted there was no attempt to get a representative committee but rather thoughtful people. Therefore, he said, the committee endorsement is not germane.

On a question as to whether a student referendum was considered, Dr. Kornblum replied that due to the enormous time spent in preparation and in background work by the committee, there wasn't time for a referendum. In future years, he said, where there is ample time, a student referendum would be almost mandatory.

Mr. Steve Chapman, the student chairman of the committee, said student registration has already taken place at the University, that this type of referendum is not feasible at the present time.

Professor Pierce, of the Committee, commented that the calendar change proposed would involve some financial costs, on the Office of Housing, for example.

Professor Cecil Nesbitt, of the Mathematics Department, asked whether Labor Day can be made a class day and the day after Thanksgiving which is a paid vacation day.

Dr. Kornblum said he talked with Mr. John Feldkamp, of University Housing, and was told that any extra costs incurred would be nominal enough. Regarding Labor Day and the day after Thanksgiving, he said there was no legal question involved.

One comment was made from the floor that many students won't attend school on Labor Day or the Friday following Thanksgiving.

Professor Barnes said he questioned the merits of these particular days -- the substitution of two of the most

important traditional holidays which would take the students out of their communities.

Professor Galler said he had mixed feelings. He said when you talk to young people, they express disillusionment with the system. There is an opportunity for them to work within the system. He said it was important to encourage young people to believe in the system.

Professor Alston said he was sensitive to the calendar revision, but if the University adopted these recommendations, the University would have done this in advance of University pressure. He said it might change the image of the University in the minds of some students and might result in less disruption and less loss of class time.

Professor Longone said it isn't possible to change the existing calendar without great cost. Financial costs, he said, are really very large. He asked whether students will consider adjusting their plans. Even if changes could be made, he said, he doubted we would achieve the effects we're seeking. Two other points, he said, are philosophical. One is elitism; the University should not change the calendar out of the notion that we're something special. Another reason, he said, goes to the heart of the charge to the committee by Lind. He thought there was some way to challenge students to positive results to relieve the frustration of students. The calendar revision will do little; the last three days will find students disappointed, frustrated. He said he would rather do other things through education. He said you can't be active for a few days and months and negate a lifetime of activity on the part of others. He said we ought to start now to plan for 1972. He said he was not sure the calendar revision will answer any questions we're looking for.

Professor Nelson said the proposals while being non-partisan are non-ideological, that we will be against continued involvement in Indochina, but how will the rest of the community view our action?

Professor Lind said the resolution passed by the Assembly was not his own. He said we have elitism because we're not doing anything about it. He said we should not be surprised by recommendations from a small body of faculty and students; it's really more an opportunity than a direction. One difficulty, he said, is that people will have to use their hours differently, that it won't necessarily result in a unanimous surge into the political arena. He said he got comments from legislators that student efforts are worthwhile, that the effort here would be to broaden participation by students.

Professor Sandalow moved as a substitute motion that the Assembly recommend that each school should respond sympathetically to any request from its student body for accommodations in class, including adjustments in schedules, to permit participation in political activities this Fall.

The motion was seconded by Professor Brown.

Professor Sandalow explained that the calendar in the Law School is not the same as in the committee report. He said it would be difficult to get expression from Law students on the calendar revision. He said the Law faculty feels students ought to be heard on this matter. He said the adjustment of schedules may not be necessary at the school level. If some schools decide not to participate, the decision should be made, there, he said.

In a vote on a motion to substitute, the motion was carried.

In the vote on the substitute motion itself, as proposed by Professor Sandalow, the vote, on a show of hands was: for, 19; against, 6.

Professor Sinnott moved adoption of Motion 2 in the report, which reads, "We recommend that faculty members cooperate with students wherever possible by refraining from scheduling examinations, papers, reports and other special assignments during election week." The motion was seconded and carried.

Professor Nelson moved to strike Motion 5 which reads, "We recommend that departments, colleges and schools offer courses under existing course descriptions, which are new, experimental, and inter-disciplinary offerings dealing with political activities." The motion was supported.

Professor Alston moved to substitute a new motion for Motion 5 adding the word, "appropriate", after the word, "existing". The substitute motion was carried.

Professor Bowditch moved to substitute the word, "electoral", for the word, "political". The motion was seconded but on a vote failed.

Professor Galler moved to amend Motion 6 to read as follows: "We recommend that the Assembly appoint a committee to implement the above recommendations and take appropriate action and measure their effectiveness with a guide to the future." The motion was seconded and carried.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Ben Yablonky
Secretary