

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting of 18 June 1985

ATTENDANCE

Present: Bassett, Beutler, Briggs, Boyd, Chudacoff, Cohen, Comminou, Cornell, Durrance, Hanks, Hacker, Jacobs, Kusnerz, Larson, Lehmann, Lewis, Lougee, Loup, Lusk, Manis, McCarus, Mermier, Meyer, Miller, Moerman, Moran, Mosher, Oleinick, Radine, Muriel Ross, Sanders, Schteingart, Stebbins, Taylor, Warschausky, Wiseman, Zelenock

Absent: Ascione, Bailey, Bissell, Brewer, Burdi, Carnahan, Checkoway, Dahlke, Easley, King, English, Eschman, Farley, Glover, Gulari, Han, Herbert, Howe, Kahn, Lavoie, Leonard, Lockwood, Lorey, Deshpande, Malvin, Margolis, McClamroch, Nadelman, Olsen, Payne, Pierce, Reed, Rizki, Marc Ross, Rutledge, Schauer, Scheele, Sears, Snyder, Southwick, Stapp, Todor, White, Zweifler

CALL TO ORDER AND MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:21 p.m. by Professor Green. The minutes of the meeting of 20 May were approved with one correction: on page 6 line 9 "faculty" to "administrators."

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Vice President Frye's address to the Senate Assembly on the University's budget, originally scheduled for today, has been postponed to early in the Fall term.
2. Some people received incomplete copies of the latest CESF Newsletter. They should return these to the SACUA office by campus mail, and they will then receive complete copies.
3. (a) SACUA will congratulate former Regent Eugene Power on his 80th birthday. (b) Professor Green announced the recent marriage of Peggy Kusnerz

and Michael Sanders, both of whom are members of the Assembly. (c) He also announced the birth of Philip Blass, son of Acting Senate Secretary Andreas Blass.

4. SACUA will soon have its annual retreat, to take a longer view of its and the Assembly's activities and agenda. It will also meet with the chairs of the other Assembly Committees. The theme for the retreat is to be: How can we be more effective and articulate spokesmen for academic values as external forces determine so much of our future and our activity?

REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Professor Muriel Ross began her report by remarking that her predecessor as chair of the committee, Professor Raymond Grew, had been a very effective leader; she recommended that the Assembly put him on committees again.

Although today's report concentrates on faculty solicitation for the capital campaign, several other aspects of the committee's work were briefly mentioned first.

1. The committee recommended that commencement be moved from the stadium to a location on Central Campus. The administration and SACUA were unenthusiastic, partly because of the difficulty of making arrangements in case of bad weather and partly because of safety concerns.

2. The committee looked at the proposed Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct.

3. The University Relations Office has reorganized its publications program and now produces a single publication, Michigan Today, intended to appeal to graduates, other alumni, and potential donors. It is distributed to 285,000 people, six times per year. Production costs about 15¢ per copy, and distribution is also inexpensive.

4. The University Relations Office has assigned staff members to personally visit the major news media to focus attention on the important news involving the University. Faculty are encouraged to bring newsworthy items to the office's attention.

5. The committee discussed minority student recruitment.

6. The committee discussed the University's failure to get a supercomputer. It felt that greater efforts should be made to inform the faculty of such news through the Record before they read it in the newspaper.

The committee expects the University's broadcasting to be one of its major concerns in the near future, but has not yet focused much on it.

The Capital Campaign was launched on 14 October, 1983, at a luncheon to which the University Relations Committee was invited. Professor Ross considered it unfortunate that very few faculty were present at this luncheon, since she wished that the faculty felt as enthusiastic about the campaign as she felt after the luncheon.

In March, 1984, the committee sent to all faculty a letter about the campaign. In response, faculty members suggested 8 to 10 potential donors. The committee also sent to all faculty (a faculty edition of) two brochures that were being sent to potential donors. (The faculty edition combined the brochures into one and was printed on less expensive paper.) Professors Sharp and Edington drafted a follow-up letter in the Fall, about projects like the Tappan Hall renovation and the Music School String Quartet in Residence.

Of three possibilities considered for overseeing faculty participation in the campaign, giving the oversight role to SACUA or to the University Relations Committee itself seemed best to the committee, but SACUA felt that this role was outside their purview. A subcommittee, chaired by a member of the University Relations Committee, will therefore be appointed to work with deans and directors on the faculty aspects of the campaign. It is expected to spend 6 to 9 months on planning before implementing the campaign in late 1986 to coincide with the alumni solicitation.

Faculty participation is important to encourage others. The Medical and Business Schools are already involved and could serve as models for other units.

The campaign's target is \$160 million. As of 31 May 1985, \$95,590,559 had been received.

Professor Ross concluded her report by introducing her committee's resolution concerning the campaign, which had been distributed with the agenda of today's meeting.

DISCUSSION

Professor Sanders asked whether the committee's concern in the supercomputer matter was with the ineffective communication of the bad news to the faculty or with the possibility that poor communication led to a weak proposal. Professor Ross replied that both were of concern. She said that the matter is important to all faculty and that a clearer statement is needed of what actually happened.

Professor Cohen asked how the University campaign is related to the campaigns in the individual schools. Professor Ross replied that we want to ensure that all faculty have an opportunity to participate, learning from the efforts of some schools.

Professor Green asked whether the \$95 million mentioned earlier included money raised by the schools. Professor Ross replied that it included the Business School's campaign; Vice President Cosovich, who was in the audience, said that it included all the schools' campaigns.

Professor Bassett asked whether "faculty solicitation" meant solicitation by the faculty or of the faculty. Professor Ross replied that both were included. Professor Green said it would be solicitation of the faculty, by the faculty, and, broadly, for the faculty.

Professor Cohen said that the Medical School had solicited not just faculty but also other employees; he suggested that the University campaign do the same. Professor Ross said that she hoped to involve the staff also, but her primary concern is to get the faculty enthusiastic and involved.

The committee's resolution, encouraging the faculty's active participation in the Campaign for Michigan and supporting the concept of a faculty solicitation program as part of the campaign, which Professor Ross had moved, was seconded by Professor Briggs and passed unanimously.

COMMITTEE NAME CHANGE

A motion to change the name of the University Relations Committee to "Senate Assembly Committee on Development and Communication," to match a change in the title of the vice-president it advises, was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

BIG TEN FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES

Professor Green explained that in the past the faculty representatives, the athletic directors, and the presidents were the voice of the universities in the Big Ten Conference. Recently, the rise of women's athletics led to the introduction of co-representatives. (It is likely that this system will be changed, since a study found it working poorly.) The two faculty co-representatives are nominated by the Board in Control of Intercollegiate Athletics for endorsement by SACUA. The Board has nominated Professors Paul Gikas and Gwendolyn Cruzat. Endorsement of these nominations was moved and seconded.

Professor Cohen, noting that some organizations favor turnover while others prefer stability, asked about the Big Ten's preference. Professor Green replied that Professor Plant had served as our representative for 22 years and his successor, Professor Anton, served for one 3-year term. Then co-representatives Gikas and Cruzat served one term so far.

Professor Manis asked whether the four people (president, athletic director, and co-representatives) who represent the University all attend Big Ten meetings and whether they vote as a bloc. Professor Green replied affirmatively to the first question and negatively to the second. He added that the presidents, the athletic directors, and the faculty representatives have separate meetings, and that the presidents are becoming more involved in Big Ten matters.

Professor Chudacoff asked whether staggered appointments, for the sake of continuity, had been considered. Professor Green replied that they probably had, but not by anyone responsible for such matters. Professor Gikas's original appointment happened to coincide with the introduction of co-representatives.

The motion to endorse the nominations of Professors Gikas and Cruzat was approved unanimously.

DEFERRED MAINTENANCE

Professor Green introduced J. P. Weidenbach, Director of Business Operations, who had consented, on short notice, to present to the Assembly a film, about the problem of deferred maintenance, that had been shown to the Financial Affairs Committee, the deans, and the executive officers. Mr. Weidenbach said that he reports to Vice President Brinkerhoff and supervises the Purchasing Department, the Plant Operations Department, the Department of Public Safety, and the Department of Occupational Safety and Environmental Health. The Plant Operations Department is by far the largest of these, and its purview includes maintenance. Its director, R. Reister, introduced the film, "The Hidden Enemy," and added some comments.

Mr. Reister said that universities, including Michigan, are still suffering from the effects of the recession, because of large scale deferral of maintenance during the recession years. Deferred maintenance at Michigan totaled \$3 million to \$4 million only five years ago; now it is nearly \$40 million. It is hard to find the money needed to get the buildings back in shape.

The film was prepared by the University of Washington, whose problems in this area are similar to ours. After showing the film and distributing a sheet of figures on the ratio of building space to staff for maintaining and cleaning that space, Mr. Reister continued his comments.

He said that, in the good old days when the University had money, there

were funds left over at the end of each year and these were used to take care of maintenance that had been deferred during that same year, so the money available for maintenance was even more than the budget showed. Then, in bad years, the University (like government, industry, and homeowners) deferred maintenance as a way of cutting expenses. But deferring maintenance makes it more expensive, so it is time to restore the maintenance budget.

DISCUSSION

Professor Lehmann remarked that only the staff gets "smaller but better;" the University keeps adding space. Mr. Reister agreed and added that the new space is harder to maintain because of greater sophistication. For example, air conditioning doubles maintenance costs.

Professor Hanks asked for a comparison of the costs of work done by the Plant Department with work done by outside contractors. Mr. Reister replied that contracting would not reduce overall costs. It is cheaper for some jobs but more expensive for others. The University does not want to lose the capacity to do this work on its own, because once it got out of the maintenance business it would find it difficult to get back in if costs changed.

Professor Durrance asked about the possibility of hiring students for some of this work. Mr. Reister replied that a fair number of students (about 80) are hired during the summer, but there would be problems with the union contract if students were used more extensively.

Professor Schteingart asked whether the workers are working at a satisfactory level of efficiency. Mr. Reister said that they are and that the Plant Department is about as efficient as an outside contractor would be.

Professor Cohen asked what priority should be lowered to provide the needed funds for maintenance. Mr. Reister suggested salaries, including but not limited to faculty salaries. He noted that salaries have been the University's top priority for 5 or 6 years and are competitive. He also pointed out that non-functioning labs can cause faculty to leave as well as low salaries can.

Professor Ross asked whether faculty are allowed to paint their own offices. Mr. Reister replied that, technically, they are not, but if the Plant Department doesn't know about it...

Professor Lusk asked about cutting back on frills like landscaping in order to fix leaky roofs. Mr. Reister said that landscaping has been cut back, but we try to maintain a few plantings. His first priority is to maintain the functional integrity of the buildings. Washing of walls and windows has also been cut back.

Professor Warschausky asked whether The Campaign for Michigan, which includes an \$80 million goal for construction and renovation, will help with maintenance problems and, if not, whether the Plant Department had made a presentation to campaign officials. Mr. Reister replied that it would help indirectly, as renovation means that we don't have to keep patching a building. But it also includes money for new space without any money to pay for its maintenance. Deferred maintenance is not listed in the campaign budget. Mr. Weidenbach added that it wasn't even considered as a priority because it isn't glamorous enough.

Professor Larson asked whether the people who donate money for buildings could be asked for maintenance money too. Mr. Reister said that it has been discussed but not pressed.

Professor Stebbins asked whether Michigan has plans to make a film like the Washington one shown today. Mr. Reister said that it does not. Plans are to continue using the Washington one within the University. Professor Stebbins suggested showing it to state legislators too.

Professor Zelenock asked for a comparison of our maintenance costs with those of other universities and industry. He also asked about priorities, noting that, for example, failure to remove ice outside the Hospital can lead to costly lawsuits. Mr. Reister replied that our costs are about average for universities, but that is because many universities are in the same trouble we are in. We are, for example, 50% higher than the accepted standard of 20,000 square feet per custodian. As for the hospital, the Plant Department acts as a contractor there, and to any unit not on the general fund. Professor Zelenock said that hospital administrators say that central campus controls their maintenance level, but Mr. Reister said that it does not.

Professor Sanders asked how much money was needed to rectify the maintenance situation and at what level of the administration the money was being denied. Mr. Reister said that it was being denied by the executive officers. A direct appeal to the legislature is impossible, since the University does not want the state dictating how it spends its money. Mr. Weidenbach added that the Budget Priorities Committee has decided that salaries are more important than maintenance.

Professor Cohen asked about the impact of rising regulatory standards on maintenance costs. Could we ask the state to cover the costs of meeting new codes? Mr. Reister replied that data are being gathered on costs related to asbestos. Other cases are harder to identify.

Professor Moerman pointed out that the \$40 million needed for deferred maintenance is unlikely to be budgeted all at once, and it is desirable in any case to increase the base budget for maintenance. He asked how large an

increase in the annual maintenance budget would be needed to solve the problem. Mr. Reister said that \$2 million to \$3 million per year would be needed to start making headway, but one would also need the \$3 million to \$4 million in year-end closing money that used to be available without showing up in the budget.

Professor Chudacoff asked about cooperation between the building and maintenance departments, to try to build in lower maintenance costs for new buildings. Mr. Weidenbach said that it is his job to referee this matter. Donors and deans want as much "program" as possible for the money. For example, ceramic cooling towers last forever, but we can't afford them, so we replace cooling towers every 20 years.

OLD BUSINESS

Professor Oleinick suggested that CESF consider the possible effect of deferred maintenance on the health and safety of the faculty. Professor Green promised that SACUA would consider the suggestion as part of its regular "Matters Arising from Senate Assembly Meeting" agenda item. Professor Beutler suggested that the matter could be referred to the Budget Priorities Committee, which has already considered maintenance problems.

NEW BUSINESS

The next Assembly meeting will be on 23 September (which was not the date originally announced).

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Andreas Blass

Andreas Blass
Acting Senate Secretary