

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Regular Assembly Meeting, June 17, 1974

ATTENDANCE

Present: Allen, Anton, Berki, Caldwell, Hayward, Odbert, Crawford, Danielson, DeKornfeld, Deskins, Floyd, Flynn, Gikas, Goldman, Goodman, Harrison, Hoffman, Hymans, Jameson, Johnson, Kachaturoff, Kaplan, Kelsey, Krachenberg, Lehmann, Livermore, Loomis, Magrill, Mohler, Nesbitt, Ostrand, Rowe, Scott, Soucek, Taren, Terwilliger, Williams, Cohen, Hildebrandt, Hoch

Absent: Adams, Baublis, Bishop, Brockway, Browder, Brown, Cassidy, Cornell, Creeth, Dernberger, Herzog, Evaldson, Fader, Horsley, Ilie, Kell, Kish, Lands, Iglehart, Borkin, Murphey, Oberman, Schmickel, Seligson, Sibley, Springer, Marsden, Vander, Van Der Voo, Vaughn, Weeks, Wilson, Leonard

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Cohen called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.

MINUTES
APPROVED

The minutes of the Assembly meeting of May 20, 1974 were approved.

DISCUSSION
WITH
PRESIDENT
FLEMING

Having been invited by SACUA to discuss with members of the Assembly various aspects of the forthcoming negotiations with the Graduate Employees Organization, President Fleming was introduced by Chairman Cohen, who expressed appreciation for this opportunity to exchange views and information.

In his opening remarks President Fleming pointed out that he would be addressing the procedural, rather than substantive, aspects of the process and that he was concerned in large measure with the spirit of the negotiations. This he hoped would be amicable and constructive rather than primarily adversary in character. He realized that, in the nature of things, agreement could hardly be expected on all points but trusted that the relationship between the parties would be essentially that of colleagues and future colleagues working out problems of mutual interest.

In preparation for the negotiations, the administration has constituted two groups--a University negotiating committee and an advisory committee to this negotiating committee. The Assembly was informed of the composition of both, as follows:

University Negotiating Committee

Spokesman: James R. Thiry, Staff and Union Relations

Instructional Staff Member: Professor Lawrence W. Jones, Physics
School and College Representatives:

LSA--Professor Harold K. Jacobson, Political Science

Professor Hayden K. Carruth, Speech Communication and Theatre

Engineering--Professor Maurice J. Sinnott, Chemical and Materials
Engineering
Medicine--Professor John A. Jacquez, Physiology and Biostatistics, SPH
Music--Professor Robert A. Warner
University Attorney: William P. Lemmer
Assistant to Vice-President for Academic Affairs: Charles M. Allmand
Personnel Representative: John D. Forsyth

Advisory Committee to University Negotiating Committee

Co-chairmen: Allan F. Smith, Vice-President for Academic Affairs
Frank H. T. Rhodes, Dean, College of Literature, Science
and Arts

Membership:

Deans of all Schools and Colleges, Dean of Graduate School, and
Directors of Research Institutes utilizing Graduate Student Assistants
Alvin F. Zander, Assistant Vice-President for Research
Professor Lawrence W. Jones, Instructional Staff Member
James R. Thiry, Staff and Union Relations
William P. Lemmer, University Attorney
Charles M. Allmand, Assistant to Vice-President for Academic Affairs

As President Fleming pointed out, one of the experienced negotiators, in this case Mr. Thiry, serves as spokesman for the negotiating committee at the bargaining table. This committee will take cognizance of the recommendations of the advisory committee, which will have discussed the nature of the demands, aspects of the bargaining process, and positions recommended to be taken by the University. While the Executive officers are responsible for making final decisions on behalf of the University, President Fleming assured the Assembly that the counsel provided by the two committees will receive the most serious consideration.

Professor Jones, who is to serve on both committees, has agreed to devote the coming months to gathering and organizing information and data pertinent to the forthcoming negotiations. On this basis he will serve as a resource person to the parties, being particularly knowledgeable about the significant differences that exist among schools and colleges in connection with graduate assistants. With respect to the matter of faculty representation in general, President Fleming informed the Assembly that, if it wished so to recommend, he would be pleased to include its designated representatives on the respective committees, adding one to the negotiating team and one or two to the advisory committee. Thereupon he invited questions and comments in general.

At the time of the election in connection with GEO, a set of guidelines urging discretion had been circulated to the University staff. In response to Professor Lehmann's query as to whether similar precautions would again be urged, Mr. Fleming expressed the hope that schools, colleges, and departments will exercise appropriate restraint, guarding against making commitments they cannot keep.

Several further matters seemed to the President likewise to rest largely with the faculty. Professor DeKornfeld wondered, for example, whether faculty would be identified with the side of management or be seen in a more neutral role. This, suggested Mr. Fleming, was for the faculty

itself to determine. The situation is somewhat anomalous, he added, for faculties have always felt that many of the functions normally considered to be the affairs of management reside properly in their own hands. In the present case, he noted, the faculty is certainly close to the problem and will be listened to carefully. Asked whether he cared to speculate on the course which the faculty itself might take in the area of collective bargaining, Mr. Fleming declined, indicating that he has on past occasions outlined the pros and cons. The actual decision remains with the faculty.

Several matters relating more directly to students were raised for consideration. Chairman Cohen wondered, for example, whether the fact that students now typically sit on departmental committees might present some embarrassing situations. Possibly, the President felt. A departmental executive committee considering matters related to the GEO negotiations might wonder whether it should avoid substantive discussion or ask its student members to absent themselves during such periods. Since one cannot sit on both sides of the table in matters of this sort, some awkward situations can be foreseen. So too in the case of graduate students who have not joined GEO, hence are not directly represented. Were the administration to involve itself in this aspect, Mr. Fleming felt, it could be seen as using a divisive tactic. Such students, it is hoped, will make their wishes known to the faculty.

The question of whether, when an agreement appears near, provision will be made for endorsement by the faculty was raised by Professor Taren. This is not now contemplated, indicated the President. The Advisory Committee will, of course, have had ample opportunity for prior input and, if desired, periodic progress reports could be issued. It is not anticipated, however, that the faculty will be asked to approve or disapprove the specific proposals being negotiated. Nor is it anticipated that the legislature will provide special funds to offset any pay raises that may eventuate. Such monies will need to be found elsewhere in the University Budget.

Having asked to speak, and receiving the permission of the Assembly, Ms. Sandra Silberstein, of GEO, indicated that she had had no response from the President's office to a recent letter requesting a meeting. Mr. Fleming, who had not yet seen her letter, assured her that such would be arranged. Ms. Silberstein wondered further what advantages the faculty would see in sitting across the bargaining table from graduate students, their prospective colleagues. In response, President Fleming reiterated his previous hope that the negotiations, whatever their mechanics, would proceed without acrimony, attempting to resolve matters of mutual interest in a spirit that fosters trust and good will.

Chairman Cohen expressed appreciation for Mr. Fleming's participation and, on the President's departure, opened the meeting to general discussion, whereupon a motion by Professor Kaplan, seconded by Professor Berki, led to prolonged debate concerning the proper role of the faculty in the forthcoming negotiations. It was the sense of the Kaplan/Berki resolution that the faculty assume a position of neutrality, serving as willing consultant and resource, even as actual observer at the bargaining table, but not involving itself actively in the negotiations per se. While there seemed a good deal of sentiment for the neutral-but-helpful role, there was an equally apparent concern about the nature and meaning of neutrality. Professor Krachenberg pointed out the difficulty of talking about the faculty "as a

body" when it represented a spectrum of individual views; he, for one, wished to reserve decision, not foreclosing on any of the issues. In a somewhat related fashion, Professor Hymans saw neutrality as needing clearer definition. If the GEO negotiations are related to resource allocation within the University, as President Fleming had indicated, and if the faculty as such did not wish to become actively involved, then at the very least faculty members serving on University committees dealing with resource allocation should be represented on the advisory committee.

The definition of neutrality continued to bother various members of the Assembly. There is a dilemma, Professor Livermore asserted, in our claiming neutrality when we direct the activities of graduate students and such activities now become negotiable. Professor Goldman urged further that one distinguish clearly between two sets of considerations--the faculty has economic interests; it is also concerned with educational goals. On the latter count it can ill afford to be entirely neutral. For Professor Anton the proposed resolution smacked of withdrawal in the face of uncertainty. Urging that we learn to tolerate a certain amount of ambiguity, he suggested that the faculty not adopt a do-nothing stance prematurely. Reminding the Assembly that a number of faculty may see themselves on the side of the students, Professor DeKornfeld further observed that binding oneself to neutrality could be seen as being "neutral" on the side of management.

In defending his resolution, Professor Kaplan pointed out that failure to pass any resolution could be interpreted as having no view; its passage would indicate the desire to maintain an impartial, neutral, yet helpful role. The intent would be to contribute as a resource group, providing facts and information as needed but not pressing for a particular solution. As Professor Hymans saw it, the faculty would be represented in the role of observer, not assigned to either team, but having an interest in many aspects, such as the number of students in a class, for example. At present, Professor Hayward observed, the faculty has no elected representative. True, the appointment of Professor Jones, who will be a knowledgeable consultant in the negotiations, was concurred in by SACUA but he cannot ipso facto be seen as the faculty representative, not having been elected by the Assembly.

Based on the preceding discussion, and with no objections from the floor, Chairman Cohen attempted to clarify the resolution on which action needed to be taken, phrasing it thus:

Resolved that in the forthcoming negotiations with GEO there be no official representative of the faculty as a body on either bargaining team.

The ensuing discussion prompted further reservations on the part of some. The intent and spirit of the resolution were clear to Professor Lehmann; he felt, however, that delicacy would be needed lest the faculty be perceived as abdicating its role in governance. Furthermore, Professor Scott observed, adopting a posture of true neutrality would require that the faculty offer its services as consultant to GEO as well.

This diversity of views having been heard, Professor Taren moved (seconded by Professor Goldman) that the resolution be tabled. The motion to table carried by a vote of 25 to 8.

Subsequently a motion by Professor Terwilliger, which was seconded, carried by a vote of 27 to 2, to wit:

That SACUA be instructed to seek formal representation on the Advisory Committee to the University Negotiating Committee - Graduate Student Assistants.

A further motion, presented by Professor Nesbitt and seconded, was passed unanimously, to wit:

That the faculty formally request that there be a faculty observer at the actual negotiations as a representative of the Assembly.

COMMITTEE
ELECTIONS

For the benefit of the new members of the Assembly in particular, Chairman Cohen described the procedure whereby SACUA arrives at nominees to fill committee vacancies. Great care is taken, he emphasized, in deriving representative slates from the pool of names solicited annually from the faculty when they are asked to volunteer for committees on which they are interested in serving or for which they wish to propose candidates. In several protracted sessions devoted exclusively to the purpose, SACUA then chooses sets of nominees intended to provide a healthy balance with respect to pertinent variables--school or college, age, seniority, tenure status, interests, sex, and ethnicity, among others. In addition, he reminded the Assembly, nominations could still be made from the floor, provided the nominees had indicated willingness to serve, if elected. In this connection, Professor Rowe suggested that in the future it would be helpful to inform new members of the Assembly of this provision in advance. An alternative, recommended by Chairman Cohen, was to have members of the Assembly propose nominees to SACUA for consideration, subsequently nominating such persons from the floor if they did not appear on slates presented.

Following these introductory remarks, the Assembly proceeded to elect the persons whose names appear in the appendix under their respective committees.

FACULTY
COMPENSA-
TION

Invited by Chairman Cohen to comment on the faculty compensation situation, Professor Johnson indicated that there was nothing further to report at this point inasmuch as the legislature was a month behind schedule. He anticipated that the annual report of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty will have been completed by the end of August and will be available for the September meeting of the Assembly.

ADJOURN-
MENT

Chairman Cohen announced that while the Assembly meetings scheduled for July 15 and August 19 were not now being cancelled, it was anticipated they would not be held. Unless a special need were to arise, in which case the Assembly would be notified, the two meetings can be regarded as having been formally cancelled.

Extending the wishes of SACUA to the members of the Assembly for a pleasant summer, Chairman Cohen adjourned the meeting at 4:25 p.m.

Erasmus L. Hoch
Secretary