

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Regular Assembly Meeting, June 18, 1973

ATTENDANCE

Present: Allen, Bishop, Brown, Buning, Caldwell, Cartwright, Cassidy, Colburn, Cooperrider, Danielson, Evaldson, Gikas, Lucchesi, Hoffman, Hymans, Adams, Dunlap, Johnson, Kaplan, Kell, Millard, Kerr, Holbrook, Lands, Iglehart, Lloyd, Loomis, Magrill, Froseth, Oberman, Ostrand, Rowe, Sawyer, Seligson, Terwilliger, Vander, Williams, Zweifler, Kincaid, Hildebrandt, Goodman

Absent: Anton, Berki, Brockway, Cohen, Darvas, Dernberger, Ehrenkreutz, Easter, Floyd, Franken, Scholl, Hertzler, Higgins, Creeth, Kish, Krachenberg, Lagler, Lehmann, Marshall, Nystuen, Ice, Sana, Schmickel, Sibley, Springer, Taren, Lynch, Vaughn, Wilson

Guests: Professors Robert Burt and Ray Kahn

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Goodman called the meeting to order at 3:19 p.m. in the Rackham Amphitheater.

MINUTES APPROVED

The minutes of the May 21 meeting were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Goodman made the following announcements:

Attendance at Senate meetings had declined to the point that it was embarrassing to be on the platform as chairman or speaker. Reforms, including abolishing the meetings, were being considered by SACUA. Anyone who had a suggestion for improving matters was urged to present it.

The Regents, who had postponed the appointing of faculty members to the Board in Control of Intercollegiate Athletics at their previous meeting, had now accepted three of the SACUA's nominees, namely Professors Cruzat, Goldberg, and Sinnott.

SACUA had distributed a memorandum on the abuse of library borrowing privileges. The memorandum included this sentence, "SACUA supports the recommendations and will urge implementation thereof if there are no serious objections raised at the June Assembly Meeting." Chairman Goodman quoted some startling and alarming figures indicating that the problem had become much more serious recently. He went on to say that this was the time to raise objections to the recommendations in the memorandum and that silence would be interpreted as approval. Professor Kerr relayed a comment from a colleague who asked whether telephone messages might be resorted to in addition to written notices. This would take care of situations in which a faculty member was charged with a book that had been taken out by someone else. There were no other comments, and Chairman Goodman declared that the recommendations would go into effect. Professor Vander asked whether the rules would apply to all libraries, and received an affirmative answer.

ELECTION OF
COMMITTEE
MEMBERS

The next item on the agenda was the election of members to Senate Assembly committees. Chairman Goodman drew attention to the list of continuing members and SACUA nominees that had been distributed with the call to the meeting. He reminded the Assembly that there had been a slight change in the procedure this year, and that SACUA had invited Senate members to suggest names of colleagues for committees as well as volunteering on their own behalf. He said that of the 41 nominees, 51% had volunteered, 24% had had their names submitted to SACUA by others, 12% were present members of committees who had served for short periods as replacements and were being nominated for full terms, and 12% (5 persons) had been approached directly by SACUA, usually after others had declined.

The Assembly then took up the nominees for each committee in turn. There were no nominations from the floor, which meant that SACUA's nominees were elected. The University Council formed an exception, since there were two nominees, Professors Thomas J. DeKornfeld and Ivan F. Duff, for one position.

A list of those elected follows:

Academic Affairs

John Arthos
Alfred C. Raphelson
Gerda Seligson

Financial Affairs

Thomas E. Moore
Marvin W. Peterson
Lester Rutledge

Proper Role

Wilbur D. Hart III
(vice Spenser Havlick)
Charles N. Davisson
(TR for Judith Bardwick)
Brymer Williams
William V. Caldwell
Frank Whitehouse

Research Policies

Karina Niemeyer
Ernest Fontheim
Fred Davenport
Alan B. MacNee

Student Relations

Christina Neal
Zelda Gamson
Raji Rammuny

University Relations

Ejner Jensen
Kenneth A. Kooi
John Field

Bylaws

Harriet Jameson
Charles G. Child

Civil Liberties Board

Norma Diamond
Edward G. Voss .

CESF

Arthur Bloom
George I. Haddad
Sylvan Kornblum
George I. Mavrodes
William McKeachie
Rose Vainstein

SARC

Paul Ilie
(vice Sylvia Thrupp)
Edward S. Bordin
William C. Stebbins
Robert Weeks
Judith Lynch
Thomas A. Green
T. V. Fischer
Frizell Vaughan-Elected as chairman
Edward Bordin-Elected as Vice-chrmn.

Tenure

Ronald Bishop
Robert H. Super
Lorraine Nadelman
Robert W. Dixon

University Council

Thomas J. DeKornfeld

Michigan Union Board of Directors

John H. Wiley

Professor Cassidy raised a general question about the representativeness of the committees, remarking that the Medical School seemed under-represented. Chairman Goodman replied that SACUA tried very hard to achieve balanced representation on committees, but that in many cases their first choices turned them down.

REPORT ON
CAMPUS
SECURITY
PROBLEMS

The next item on the agenda was a report on campus security problems by Professors Robert Burt and Ray Kahn.

Professor Burt, who was just retiring as chairman of the University Council, said that the purpose of the report was to inform the Assembly that an outside consultant, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, has been hired by the University at the instigation of the University Council to study campus security. He also hoped to generate reactions from Assembly members and others who had ideas to present in this area. He then turned the podium over to Professor Kahn, the chairman of the Council's subcommittee on law enforcement.

Professor Kahn began by reminding the Assembly that the University Council was set up by Regents' Bylaw 7.02, which provided that Administration, faculty, and students should all be represented. Among the duties of University Council was one specifically assigned by the Regents, namely to advise the President of the University on the use of law enforcement agents. On campus there were really three aspects to security. One, currently maintained by the Burns Company, was building security, involving building patrols and fire-watching. The second aspect was the normal police function of guarding against burglaries, robberies, assaults and the like. The third aspect, which was currently of lesser importance, but had been the major reason for setting up the University Council, was crisis control or emergency planning. The early activity of the University Council had led to the appointment of Colonel Fred Davids as Director of the Department of Safety, and to the preparation of emergency guidelines, which had been accepted by President Fleming in April 1971.

A long-standing system of annual payments from the University to the City for police protection, which had amounted to \$1 million in 1970, had been terminated at the behest of the State in 1971. Colonel Davids had recommended that the University should set up its own police force, but the University had arranged instead to pay the salaries of one lieutenant, two detectives, and 19 policemen of the Ann Arbor police force, and had bought three police cars. The cost was \$400,000, and was currently rising to \$500,000. Also, the Burns Security Agency had been engaged; they were primarily fire-watchers, with no police powers. Their services cost \$425,000, and another \$110,000 was allocated to security at special events and the like, making a total of close to \$1 million.

Professor Kahn presented slides showing losses to the University from thefts and the like of \$247,000 in 1971 and \$254,000 in 1972, and showing a rapid rise in total crimes reported in Ann Arbor.

Confronted with this rise in both costs and losses, University Council had recommended the hiring of outside consultants, and this had been done, with the International Association of Chiefs of Police being chosen as the consultant. Representatives of the IACP were on campus at present. Dialogue with them was encouraged, and anyone who had ideas to transmit was welcome to call Colonel Davids to arrange an appointment. The questions on which it would be desirable to have faculty members thinking include the need for better identification of staff members and students, and the desirability of limiting access to certain buildings at certain times.

In answer to a question from Professor Loomis about fire insurance, Professor Kahn said that the University carried such insurance and also paid for fire protection on each occasion when equipment was sent to the scene of the fire.

In answer to a question by Professor Zweifler, Professor Kahn said that the consultant's report was due on September 1. This report was to be an overall survey of needs and possible alternatives. After the University had digested this report and decided what direction it wanted to go, a detailed set of recommendations could be prepared.

Many members of the Assembly participated in the active discussion that followed. It was made clear that the current working arrangement between the city police and the University presents serious difficulties, of which Colonel Davids is well aware. Also, the role of the Burns Agency has not been adequately clarified. Financial trade-offs are not the only consideration, since many crimes involve violence to persons. The name of the IACP could be misleading; it is considered the most liberal of the consulting groups concerned with law enforcement, and operates in a low-key fashion. It does not have a great deal of campus experience, however. Once again, contact between them and interested faculty members was strongly encouraged.

DISCUSSION
OF ASSEMBLY
PROCEDURES

The next agenda item was the discussion of Assembly procedures. The first topic to be taken up followed from the motion by Professor Oberman passed at the May meeting, which directed SACUA to develop a more democratic process for the election of new members of SACUA.

When presenting his motion, Professor Oberman had suggested that the election of new SACUA members might be held in September instead of in April. Chairman Goodman said that this suggestion had turned out to present more difficulties than was apparent at first sight. The most serious of these concerned the selection of new members of committees. If this was to be done after the new members of SACUA took their places as in the past, considerable delay would result, since lengthy SACUA meetings for this purpose would be much less practicable in September than in May. As a result new committee members could not be elected until the November Assembly meeting, which would mean that the committees could not get started on their business before Thanksgiving. The only way of retaining the present schedule would be for the selection of nominees to be made by the previous year's SACUA.

Chairman Goodman went on to say that it became apparent in discussions of this question that an awkward and confusing feature of the present

arrangement was the way in which newly elected Assembly members took their seats near the end of the April meeting, immediately before conducting the SACUA election. The question was then asked: Why not terminate the old Assembly before the April meeting, and have new members take their seats at the beginning of the April meeting? This suggestion was embodied in a draft resolution distributed with the call to the current meeting. It could be considered as a motion from SACUA, and read as follows:

RESOLUTION
ON ASSEMBLY
SEATING

RESOLVED: That the term of office of new Assembly members will begin with the April meeting of the Assembly. The term will be considered concluded immediately prior to the start of the April Assembly meeting.

This resolution fell within the current rules of the Senate, the Assembly, and SACUA. However, it left unchanged the method for selecting SACUA members. To achieve a change in the direction of democratization as instructed, SACUA was proposing a change in Article III, Section 5 of the rules, which had also been distributed with the call to the meeting to read as follows:

PROPOSED
NEW RULES
ON SACUA
ELECTION

(1) Procedure. Before the end of the term in which elections occur, the newly constituted Assembly shall organize for the ensuing year and shall choose from its membership the members to serve on the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA). Members of SACUA shall be elected by the Assembly from a slate listing nominees submitted by a Nominating Committee composed of the three outgoing members of SACUA and three outgoing members of the Assembly elected by the Assembly, plus nominations from the floor. The names of the nominees chosen by the Nominating Committee must be transmitted to Assembly members at least two weeks before the meeting at which the vote is to take place.

Professor Oberman said that he would support both of SACUA's recommendations.

Some discussion followed, with both agreements and reservations expressed. Professor Kerr said that he supported the change in nominating procedure for SACUA members, but that important business coming before the April meeting should still be handled by the old Assembly. He had found that coming into the April meeting as a new member and listening to the proceedings a valuable experience. Chairman Goodman said that if the old Assembly terminated in March, it would have to finish off its major business by the close of the March meeting. Professor Holbrook suggested the possibility of holding two Assembly meetings in April, one of the old Assembly and one of the new. Professor Loomis emphasized that the proposals, if passed, would leave unchanged the election of new SACUA members by the members of the new Assembly.

The other topic to be taken up under this agenda item was a rule change proposed by Professor Allen and seconded by other SACUA members to clarify the apportionment of Assembly seats. The change in Article II, Section 1 of the rules had been distributed with the call to the meeting, and read as follows:

PROPOSED NEW
RULES ON
APPORTIONMENT

(1) Elected members. There shall be a Senate Assembly which shall consist of sixty-five Senate members apportioned among the various schools and colleges according to the number of Senate members in each unit, as determined by a head-count. In any school or college this count would include full-time Senate members, those with a fractional appointment in only that unit, and those with fractional appointments in two or more units whose largest fractional appointment occurs in that unit. Senate members with equal fractional appointments in two or more schools or colleges (and with no larger fractional appointment in any other unit) shall choose one of the units for voting in an election and shall be counted with that unit for the purpose of determining representation. The Assembly shall make a reapportionment every three years . . .

Professor Allen spoke briefly about the proposed rules change, and also drew attention to a report prepared by a subcommittee of SACUA that she chaired. She said that the proposed rules changes were intended to remove ambiguities that the Bylaws Committee had found confusing when setting up reapportionments in the past. The proposed wording might seem complicated, but removed the ambiguity.

She went on to say that the subcommittee had found that several units lacked formalized procedures for the election of Assembly members. In five units, there was no real choice in the election, since the number of nominees was the same as the number of seats. In three units, nomination and election of Assembly members was carried out in a single faculty meeting. Full professors were over-represented and assistant professors under-represented in the Assembly. The largest unit, on the other hand, had quite formal procedures for nomination and election, and tried to address imbalances in representations.

The subcommittee had found out a lot about the image of the Assembly in the course of their investigation. In many quarters it was not taken seriously, and this was the root of the problems referred to. The subcommittee had presented a set of recommendations beginning of page 7 of its report. The first of these was embodied in the proposed rules change.

There was a brief discussion of the subcommittee's recommendations. In answer to a question by Professor Vander, Professor Hildebrandt explained that using full-time equivalents as a basis of representation would be too complex to carry out, and described the difficulties of obtaining information during the last reapportionment.

Chairman Goodman closed the discussion by saying that the most important single objective was to make the Assembly worthwhile, and asked for cooperation in focusing the wording of the proposals to facilitate this.

There was no old or new business.

ADJOURNMENT

The Assembly adjourned at 5:13 p.m.