

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

MINUTES OF 18 JUNE 1990

ATTENDANCE

Present: Hollingsworth, Anderson, Angus, Billi, Bord, Brown, Burdi, Cameron, Chesler, Crandall, Croxton, Debler, Diana, Drabenstott, Duell, Eggertsen, Fellin, Gazda, Goepfinger, Green, Greenwood, Gross, Grosse, Hayashi, Jacobs, A. Jensen, E. Jensen, Jones, Kabamba, Larson, Levy, Loveland, Marcelo, Miller, Mosher, Olson, Radine, Raper, Saxonhouse, Schwank, Senkevitch, C. Smith, L. Tentler, T. Tentler, Warner, Williams, Yang, Stein; Kilham, Heskett, Savory, Schessler.

Absent: Borgsdorf, Brooks, Didier, Dirks, Douthit, Foss, Friedman, Gilgenbach, Kimeldorf, Koopmann, Lomax, Mignolo, Morley, Montalvo, Morris, Mosberg, Ness, Papalambros, Penchansky, Potter, Razzoog, Rosenthal, Ross, Russell, G. Smith, P. Smith, Markus, Wheeler, Woods, Yano, Ocasio-Melendez, Gull.

Dr. Hollingsworth convened the meeting at 3:15 p.m.

MINUTES

The minutes of May 21 were amended and approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Dr. Susan S. Kilham is resigning as Senate Secretary to take a position elsewhere. Dr. Hollingsworth thanked her for her service to the University Senate, Senate Assembly and SACUA.

2. Pamphlets were provided by Dr. Eugene Henderson of the state Office of Minority Equity describing the King/Chavez/Parks initiatives were distributed.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

A number of additional committee appointments were presented to Senate Assembly. The appointments are:

BUDGET PRIORITIES COMMITTEE

David J. Anderson, Electrical and Computer Engineering, for a 3 year-term.

Frank Andrews, Psychology, for a 3 year-term.

MEDICAL AFFAIRS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Byron Doneen, Biology, continuing for a 1 year-term.

RESEARCH POLIICIES COMMITTEE

Nicholas Steneck, History, for a 3 year-term

Robert Zand, Biological Chemistry, for a 1 year-term to
replace Tadataka Yamada, Internal Medicine, who has
resigned.

Approval was unanimous.

APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY CO-REPRESENTATIVE TO THE BIG-10

Professor Arthur Coxford, Chair of the nominating committee, announced the nomination of Professor Percy Bates for the position of Faculty Co-Representative to the Big-10 Conference. Professor Coxford also expressed thanks to the outgoing Faculty Co-Representative, Gwen Cruzat, for a job well done.

Dr. Coxford explained the selection process in some detail (distributed in packet). He pointed out an inconsistency in the guidelines for selection. The Regents' Bylaws state there should be one representative, although there is a 1983 Regent's approval for a Co-Representative, which the Board in Control has followed since that time. The Regents' Bylaws need to be amended to reflect the present practice.

All four nominees for the position were interviewed by the nominating committee. Representation for the needs of women's athletics was of particular concern. Professor Coxford detailed Professor Bates' credentials, including service on the Board in Control of Intercollegiate Athletics and as Chair of the Academic Performance Committee, and his national reputation as an authority on equity issues.

Professor Burdi: I would make the observation that this is an excellent report. Obviously, the Committee examined in detail the necessary procedures. There is precedent for one of the Co-Representatives being a woman, so I am concerned about this nomination.

MOTION

Professor Warner: I move to accept the nomination of Professor Percy Bates as the Faculty Co-Representative to the Big-10 Conference. (second: E. Jensen).

Professor Miller: Having Co-Representatives of both sexes is important, although I see how the present decision was arrived at. I urge that we give attention to the gender issue in the nominating process next year.

Professor Burdi: That implies that there would be a Big 10 Representative vacancy to fill.

Professor Diana: The Board in Control will discuss setting a policy this coming fall.

Professor Burdi: I would like the advice of the Chair as to what basis we should use in making our selection.

Dr. Hollingsworth: We generally take the advice of our committees because we know we are getting good, sound, ethical advice.

The motion to appoint Professor Bates was approved unanimously by voice vote.

FUNDAMENTAL TENETS OF MEMBERSHIP IN THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

The redrafted statement was distributed in the packets.

MOTION

Professor Burdi: I move to approve this statement.
(second: T. Tentler).

The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Hollingsworth: This statement will be sent to the Executive Officers, and we will hope to see it widely distributed in the University Community.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE BUDGET PRIORITIES COMMITTEE (BPC)

Professor Stebbins, Chair of the BPC, presented the annual report. After detailing how the committee operates, Professor Stebbins outlined the major issues that were discussed in 1989-1990.

The Michigan Mandate: The committee urged the Provost and the President to produce a more operational statement of the Mandate that could more easily be put into practice. In particular, there should be greater accountability in the hiring and retention of women and minorities.

Given the appalling budget projections, especially with regard to the State budget, the committee was faced with some tough choices. We took the middle road and selected three major priorities and asked that the Provost put into effect a three-year plan to address these unmet needs.

1. Faculty and Staff salaries: specifically targeted groups in selected units should receive salary adjustments.

2. Infrastructure: The committee suggested that certain criteria be used in setting priorities: items that would lead to greater efficiency; items that would enhance morale; and items that would reduce larger costs of replacement.

3. Student support: We strongly affirmed the need for greater graduate student support (e.g. the Cross Report) and more support for continuing rather than incoming students. There should be continued funding for undergraduate initiatives.

MULTICULTURAL UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT

Professor Beth Reed, Chair, presented the report, which was distributed in the packets. Basically, the committee is just getting organized and has spent most of its time generating agenda items for the coming year.

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON PARKING FEES

A revised draft of the resolution originally submitted by Professor Bert Hornback and discussed at the May meeting was distributed and discussed.

Professor T. Tentler: I suggest two changes. One is highlighted in the handout to replace the part set off by parentheses. The other change is to rewrite items 1 and 2 into one and reword item 3:

1. That they consider the new fee structure for parking permits is unfair and inappropriate as University policy; and

2. That they join with the three thousand non-academic employees who have proposed a graduated parking fee structure.

MOTION

Professor Crandall: I move to accept the wording changes. (second: E. Jensen).

Professor Jacobs: These are just wording changes.

Professor Crandall: I think that is the intention. I want to call attention to the fact that a graduated fee is not the same as a percentage of salary. I personally prefer the percentage of salary.

Professor T. Tentler: I don't think this can be considered as a regressive tax. A graduated fee seems at least to be reasonable.

Professor Saxonhouse: We have to think about what people are willing to pay.

Professor Williams: I don't see what is different about the present fee structure, especially if there are some moral grounds being suggested.

Professor Senkevitch: We all presently pay a flat fee.

Professor Diana: I think we are saying there is a social policy involved in this resolution.

There was some argument about what the present fee structure will be over the next few years, which was resolved by William Krumm: The parking fee for the present year is \$200, and will rise by 12.5% over the next five years, making next year's fee \$225. There will also be a \$50 fee charged to the units for each sticker, which will also rise by 12.5% each year.

Professor Brown: The Medical School should be heard. The recommendation is for no new parking spaces to be built, therefore sooner or later parking will be rationed. We already have a graduated fee structure, with free parking, the normal parking fee and a special space permit (double the normal fee). The Medical School feels that it is already subsidizing the main campus. I think the resolution is counterproductive and closes some of the options for the future.

Professor Senkevitch: I would like to hear the rationale for the \$50 fee charged to the units.

Krumm: The level of needed renovation is critical. Given our costs, each sticker should be \$640 in order to just maintain the present parking structures.

MOTION

Professor Brown: I move we table this resolution until September. (second: Senkevitch).

Professor Williams: I think the new members of Senate Assembly need more time to learn about this issue.

Professor Senkevitch: I agree that the fee structure, alternatives, and rationales need to be more closely examined.

Professor Miller: We prepared an exhaustive report which is available. The report should be reviewed and information extracted from it for distribution.

The motion to table was carried by acclaim.

Professor Warner: We should place discussion of this issue in a larger context. We are agonizing over the general issue of access. The entire transportation system should be part of any future discussion.

PROPOSED DISSOLUTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The draft of the proposal to dissolve the Development Committee was distributed.

MOTION

Professor E. Jensen moved to accept the proposal.
(seconded)

Professor Olson: Senate Assembly committees are vehicles for faculty concerns to University policy makers. I am concerned that we are abrogating an important faculty input. Are we sure that other arrangements will provide the necessary input?

Dr. Hollingsworth: This is not an abrogation. The faculty input as to how the funds raised will be allocated is the responsibility of other offices in the University to which we have excellent access.

The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

SAFETY AND SECURITY TASK FORCE REPORT

The report of the task force and supplemental materials were distributed. Professor Harris McClamroch introduced the other two faculty members on the task force: Dean Paul Boylan (Chair) and Professor William Zimmerman. Two other faculty members provided expertise to the task force: Professor James Snyder and Professor Ronald Inglehart. William Krumm, Associate Vice President for Business Operations, was also present to respond to questions.

Questions that would be addressed in the Alpha Group discussions had been detailed on the message system.

[Professor Radine volunteered to assist anyone with learning to use the message system]

The Alpha Groups considered the task force report.

Alpha 1: We were concerned about whether or not increased police powers on campus would improve safety. It may be that improved lighting and a greater presence of security personnel would be a better use of limited resources. We were also concerned about the general lack of hard documentation of just how serious the problem actually is.

Professor McClamroch: The results of the survey and other information convinced everyone on the task force that crime is a serious problem on the campus. The level of required safety is higher on the campus than in the city at large.

Professor Snyder: One problem is that determining the incidence of crime is difficult. There is no way to really tell what the crime rate actually is because of the multiple places crimes are reported. The University of Michigan appears to be near the top of its peer institutions in terms of seriousness of crime. As for police presence, we are one of the few schools in Michigan or in the nation that doesn't have a police force on campus. The desire for increased security measures is very strong on our campus: 80% overall and 91% for women.

Professor McClamroch: The task force supported other measures to increase safety as well, such as improved lighting.

Alpha 2: We have three questions. How can armed police more effectively handle such high incidence crimes as date rape, larceny, etc? In concluding that faculty were the least concerned, were female faculty asked about this? Does the University have an explicit responsibility to ensure a higher level of security than the community?

Professor McClamroch: Professor Inglehart can break out various groups within the survey sample in any way necessary. The task force did conclude that the University has an explicit responsibility to provide higher levels of security on campus.

Professor Snyder: There is a Safe Building Act. In the past it has been difficult to sue the University for loss of safety, but recent court rulings have made this easier. Therefore we have a legal and financial, as well as a moral, responsibility to maintain the quality of University life. As for the question, "do armed officers make a difference?": security people on campus cannot arrest even for misdemeanors. The Ann Arbor police force is simply not sufficient. Armed officers can go into dangerous situations. An armed police unit would operate under the University's operating procedures.

Alpha 3: Our major concern was for efficiency. Can we increase the level of protection from Ann Arbor police and have more frequent involvement of the Ann Arbor police with our campus security at a lower cost? We also think that there should be a single office in charge of security and safety on the campus. We might then know what the actual situation on campus is with respect to such things as the safety of women. Is this a perception or an actuality? Perception is important and enhanced presence is important.

Professor Boylan: Ann Arbor police officials do not seem sensitive to the idiosyncracies of the campus. The campus area is not a priority for them. It has been impossible for the University to get an accounting for services. An armed force would be accountable to the University and responsive to the unique needs of the campus.

Alpha 4: We have three questions: While we agree that the present security situation is not the best: too little, too late and an attitude problem- how exactly do we plan to increase security?

Professor Snyder: There are a number of problems that must be addressed. Security people on the campus do have some police training, in fact, the University supports this. We actually lose our security people once they are certified. We believe that both Academy training and University training will be necessary. Mutual aid pacts with the city would also be necessary.

Krumm: The first hurdle would be Academy certification. Then, additional profiling and interviewing would deal with the specific University needs for personnel.

Alpha 4: We have the feeling that assault crimes are happening but we are not hearing about them. Are there plans for making information more widely available?

Professor Boylan: Yes.

Alpha 4: You have identified that males and females are very different in their perceptions, yet most policy-makers on this campus are male. Are there plans to sensitize the policy makers to these concerns?

Professor McClamroch: That is why we are here today.

Alpha 5: We would like evidence. We were skeptical about the nature of the facts. There wasn't much information on the actual incidence of the problem. Are crimes being committed by armed people on the campus, thus necessitating armed officers?

Professor Boylan: Serious crime does exist on this campus.

Professor McClamroch: The University does try to collect such information, but does not widely disseminate it.

Professor Snyder: In 1987 there was a report on UM safety that said that in that year there was 1 murder, 4 rapes, 11 robberies, 30 assaults, and several other felonies. We estimate that less than half of such crimes are actually reported. More than \$1 million worth of University property

is stolen each year. There is a recommendation for a top-notch crime reporting system.

Alpha 5: How is the campus defined?

Professor Snyder: People actually feel least safe in the areas immediately adjacent to the campus.

Alpha 5: Is there a relation between crime rates and alcohol?

Professor McClamroch: That connection is potentially very important.

Professor Snyder: On other campuses as well as our own, about 80% of incidents involve alcohol. Alcohol is the biggest problem on our campus.

Alpha 6: We addressed two categories: law enforcement and policy. Under the first, how is our contract with the city enforced? Could there be a mini-station or two on campus? Could we avoid this whole issue by getting better service? Under policy: where exactly is the problem? What are the proportions of various incidents? Are the crimes being carried out by people in the University community or by outsiders? What about the issues of property rights and trespass? Is the Dearborn campus different because it has a defined campus area? Could the boundary between campus and city be made clearer somehow?

Professor McClamroch: One possibility is to improve the existing system, but the task force thought that a more drastic change was necessary.

Krumm: The University has been trying to negotiate a contract with the city for over 20 years without success. We actually built a building for a mini-station. The city has been very reluctant to provide any information about the actual duties of the people on the police force the University pays for: 7 officers, 2 investigators and one third of a commander.

Alpha 7: We felt that more organization was necessary. Perhaps a change in responsibility for the various security levels would help. Intermediate technical measures may make a measurable difference (e.g. security cameras). We also saw a problem with crime in the areas adjacent to the campus. How would an armed campus force impact on that situation? Wouldn't our problems with the city be worsened by pulling \$500,000 out of the budget?

Professor Boylan: We feel that a centralized authority and consistency of policy is absolutely essential. Technical

measures should be investigated. A mutual aid agreement would have to address the last issue.

OLD BUSINESS

Senate Assembly would like to commend Gwen Cruzat for her excellent service as the Faculty Co-Representative to the Big-10 Conference. This received unanimous acclaim.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan S. Kilham
Senate Secretary