

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Regular Assembly Meeting, June 19, 1972

ATTENDANCE

Present: Rutledge, Allen, Bowditch, Buning, Caldwell, Cassidy, Cornish, Crawford, Danielson, Ehrenkreutz, Evaldson, Franken, Goodman, Graebel, Heller, Higgins, Hymans, Jameson, Kerr, Kish, Lloyd, Loomis, Marshall, Rothman, Nystuen, Oberman, Ostrand, Overseth, Paul, Sana, Schuman, Vaughn, Colburn, Williams, Zweifler, Kincaid, Hinerman

Absent: Anton, Asgar, Birch, Brockway, Cartwright, Cohen, Cooperrider, Darvas, Bohr, Fader, Reade, Floyd, Krachenberg, Hertzler, Taylor, Jaini, Jensen, Lands, Larkin, Magee, Hafter, Preston, Rowe, Ryder, Sandalow, Sawyer, Moore, Simpson, Vander, Votaw, Wilkes, Mohler

Guests: Chairman, Economic Status of the Faculty Committee; Members, Academic Affairs Advisory Committee and Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Hinerman called the meeting to order at 3:22 p.m. in the Rackham Amphitheater.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the May 3 special meeting and of the May 15 regular meeting were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Hinerman made the following announcements:

1. Professor Porter had been elected to the at-large post in the Steering Committee. The Committee had held three meetings and was well underway. Chairmen of the three substantive committees had been chosen as follows: Professor Dunn, Budget Priorities; Professor Bulkley, Program Evaluation; and Professor Bernstein, Long-Range Planning.

2. Two reports prepared by the Commission on Resource Allocation, dealing with budgetary process and with indirect costs were available in the SACUA office. The final report of the Commission had been sent to President Fleming, and would be mailed to Assembly members in due course.

3. On May 22, the Rackham Student Government had voted to withdraw from the Graduate Federation. In accordance with the constitution of GF, this resulted in its dissolution. Since this left SGC as the sole source of student nominees to Assembly committees, SACUA had decided to accept SGC's nominees to such posts for the time being.

4. SACUA had spent many hours with legal minds exploring the issues raised by the proposals for consultative negotiations. The "Franken Report", which had been distributed to Assembly members, presented Professor Franken's interpretation of a verbal presentation to SACUA by Professor Harry Edwards. It appeared very unlikely that any more definitive information could be obtained from a formal legal opinion.

5. On the list of nominees to committees that had been distributed, the name of Professor J. C. Mathes should replace that of Professor Ernest Young on the Classified Research Committee. Also, the name of Professor Harriet Jameson should be added to the list of new nominees for the Bylaws Committee, as a replacement for Professor Charles Rehmus, who was resigning.

SACUA
REPORT

Professor Peter Franken gave the report on SACUA activities as follows:

Since the last Assembly meeting, SACUA has held a retreat at Inglis House (May 17), five regular meetings (May 22 and 31, June 5, 12, and 19), two joint meetings with other committees (Academic Affairs, Economic Status, and Rights and Responsibilities) on May 25 and June 12, a meeting with President Fleming on May 25, and a meeting with the Regents on June 15.

The most prominent topic was "R & R". The meeting of May 22 was attended by Professor Harry Edwards of the Law School, who outlined the pertinent legal issues in a very helpful way. The joint meetings on May 25 and June 12, and parts of other meetings, were devoted to the same topic. A compromise proposal agreed to at the June 12 meeting is being presented to the Assembly.

Committee appointments involved a major effort. One could ask whether it was necessary, and whether SACUA did a good job. Since the alternative was to carry out the selection in the Assembly as a whole, which was completely impractical, the answer to the first question was yes. As for whether we did a good job, we certainly tried our best, but some of us are thinking of ways to improve the process.

Other topics considered included student representation on committees, health care, University theater planning, provisions for retirees, and a change in terms for the Board in Control of Inter-collegiate Athletics. This latter topic was also the subject of the meeting with the Regents.

Some of the same topics were taken up in the meeting with President Fleming. In addition, the Opportunity Program and the status of Willow Run were discussed.

The retreat at Inglis House, which was a very pleasant affair, did not result in specific decisions. However, the members got acquainted with each other's thinking, and SACUA was a better committee in consequence.

ELECTION
OF SACUA
REPLACE-
MENT

The next item on the agenda was the election of a SACUA member to replace Professor Terrance Sandalow for the coming year. Professor William Kerr placed in nomination the names of Professor Sally Allen and Professor Tom DeKornfeld, vitae for whom had been distributed with the call to the meeting. There being no further nominations, the nominations were closed and the ballots were distributed.

ELECTION OF
ASSEMBLY
COMMITTEES

It was now time to elect members to Senate Assembly committees. The list of SACUA nominees had been distributed with the call to the meeting; there was one nominee for each vacancy, with the exception of the University Council, for which four nominees had been provided for two vacancies. Professor Loomis moved, with a second by Professor Higgins, that a vote should be taken for all nominees at once, with the exception of those for the University Council. However, Professor Schuman said that he had additional nominations for the Classified Research and Research Policies Committees. Professor Loomis then modified his motion to separate those two committees also. The remaining nominees were then elected unanimously.

Professor Schuman then said that he wished to nominate Professor Marc Ross of the Physics Department to the Classified Research Committee. He had brought copies of Professor Ross' vita, which he distributed to Assembly members. He said that his reason for nominating Professor Ross was that Professor James White, one of the SACUA nominees, had indicated on the statement that he had given the Assembly that he favored classified research. Professor Schuman recalled the previous month's discussion on classified research, and said that he would prefer to have someone on the committee who was more clearly committed to the rules recently agreed to by the Regents and the Assembly. The nomination was seconded by Professor Rutledge. Professor Schuman asked whether Professor Ross could be proposed specifically as a substitute for Professor White, but the Chairman ruled that the new nominee could merely be added to the list of four already proposed.

Professor Franken suggested that the candidate receiving the smallest number of votes might be made an alternate member of the Committee, who could vote if any of the other members were absent. Judging from recent experience, this might be a frequent occurrence. Professor Hymans, with a second by Professor Kerr, put this suggestion in the form of a motion.

Professor Crawford said that he liked the idea, but he thought it might create some difficulties if adopted at this time. He suggested that the students might ask for alternate members. Professor Nystuen thought that it would be better to enlarge the committee. The motion was put to a vote and was defeated.

The discussion of the merits of the candidates proceeded. (Actually it was intertwined with that reported above.) Professor Colburn said that he knew Professor White, and that it was unfair to single him out for criticism, since he was sure that he would be conscientious in basing his judgments on the guidelines. Professor Schuman asked why one of the present committee members was reappointed. Chairman Hinerman said that it was desirable to preserve continuity, and that the Committee was not expected to remain in existence much longer.

Professor Oberman expressed concern that the other candidates had not stated their positions on classified research. Professor Schuman asked if the election could be postponed until statements were obtained. Chairman Hinerman pointed out that the candidates had not been requested to make statements, but that Mrs. Downs had read the rules of operation to each prospective nominee and had asked him if he could abide by them; he asked whether written responses were desired. Professor Schuman said that he was not concerned with individuals, but felt that he did not have sufficient information. Professor Marshall asked much the same question.

Chairman Hinerman pointed out that the Assembly was not likely to meet again until September, and Professor Franken stressed the urgency of filling the committee posts so that effective votes could be taken on proposals arising during the summer. The fluid situation at Willow Run made this even more necessary. Professor Crawford agreed with this remark, and said that while the Committee was an advisory one, that was much better than having no committee at all. He pointed out that SACUA had tried to achieve some sort of a balance in its four nominees, and that replacing one candidate might disturb that balance.

There being no further comments, Chairman Hinerman directed that the ballots should be distributed.

Professor Schuman moved, with a second by Professor Zweifler, that the election of members to the Research Policies Committee should be postponed while statements were obtained from the nominees on classified research. In the meantime, the terms of the present members of the Committee should be extended.

Professor Overseth objected, saying that the Assembly had now had the names before them for a considerable time.

The motion was put to a vote, and was defeated.

Professor Kerr then moved that nominations to the Research Policies committee should be closed. The motion was passed, and the Secretary was instructed to cast a unanimous ballot for the SACUA nominees.

ALTERNA-
TIVE PRO-
POSAL,
PART A,
RIGHTS &
RESPONSI-
BILITIES
REPORT

Chairman Hinerman proposed that consideration of new proposals in the area of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities should be begun in a Quasi Committee of the Whole. The Assembly agreed and went into Quasi Committee of the Whole at 4:20. The Assembly rose from the Quasi Committee at 4:41. (During the Quasi Committee of the Whole, Professors Rehms, Goodman, Tice, and Mrs. Dunlap, described the history and current status of the issue.)

After considerable parliamentary discussion, Professor Goodman moved, with numerous seconds, to substitute the recommendations contained in the June 9 memorandum to the Assembly from some members of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee, the Academic Affairs Committee, and SACUA for Section A of the proposals of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. The motion was passed unanimously.

Professor Hymans said that while he could understand the motivation for the June 9 proposals, he was worried about their substance. He objected to what he saw as a blank check given to the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, saying that its duties were much too vaguely stated. Its constituency was not defined, nothing was said about what kind of information would be asked for, and the ultimate initiating authority for setting individual faculty salaries was not specified. In particular, responsibilities in connection with "inequalities" were mentioned, but "inequities" admitted several interpretations.

Mrs. Dunlap said that some vagueness was inevitable until relations between CESF and the new presidential committees were worked out, but that CESF would not be concerned with individual salaries. Professor Tice agreed that there was a certain amount of vagueness in the document but maintained that it by no means amounted to a blank check; a complete specification of duties would require several volumes. Professor Eggertsen said that the chief change from the past was that CESF was called upon to get definite answers to its proposals.

Professor Rehms, in a lengthy statement, maintained that the Committee would be concerned with the overall level of faculty compensation as related to the discretionary funds available, to other demands upon them, and to comparative levels at other institutions. It would not be concerned with individual salaries or with comparisons between units. This statement was questioned, however, by Professors Tice, Eggertsen, and Bowditch, and Mrs. Dunlap, all of whom felt that CESF should not ignore the allocation of funds between units.

Professor Crawford traced the reference to "inequities" to Paragraph 2(c), page x of the original R & R report, which he quoted as follows:

"CESF should be charged with responsibility for considering the compensation of faculty members as individuals rather than as a mere group of averages, and should be charged to uphold the rights of every member of the University faculty to fair economic treatment in comparison with his peers. It must, therefore, develop procedures for working with the several schools, colleges, and departments to prevent and to overcome inequities suffered by less advantaged faculty members."

Professor Kerr said that the proposal was an attempt to move a little way from consultation toward negotiation, and was a good compromise in this respect. There was a certain amount of ambiguity in the directives to most committees, which was desirable since a committee would soon learn more than was known when it was set up. The most sensible procedure was to let the Committee get started and see how things went.

About this point in the discussion, a number of members expressed uncertainty on what proposition was actually before the Assembly. Accordingly, Professor Franken, with a second from Professor Kish, moved again that the June 9 document should be substituted for Section A of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities report.

The motion to substitute was passed. Professor Franken then moved that the June 9 document be adopted as the official policy of the Assembly; Professor Kerr seconded the motion.

Professor Hymans reiterated that the report could mean anything to anybody. Professor Crawford said that it would be more appropriate to consider Parts B and C of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities report, before attempting to approve a portion of the report. He then asked for a quorum call. The chairman responded, and could count only 31 members present, insufficient for a quorum.

While this information was being absorbed, Chairman Hinerman announced the results of the balloting. Professor Sally Allen was elected to the SACUA vacancy, and would replace Professor Sandalow when he left. Professors Tickle, Longone, White, and Mathes had been elected to the Classified Research Committee. Professors Pooley and Weeks had been elected to the University Council.

Professor Lloyd asked whether the question before the Assembly could be voted on by a mail ballot. Chairman Hinerman agreed that this would be desirable since it was important that CESF should start its work right away. Professor Goodman asked whether there could be an informal show of support or lack of support. Professor Hymans suggested asking the Committee to come up with a clearer document. Professor Franken urged that a vote should be taken nevertheless. This was done, and there were 25 votes in favor to 5 opposed.

Professor Bowditch said that he was impressed by the degree of agreement exhibited, and Professor Colburn suggested, in line with Professor Lloyd's remarks, that SACUA should prepare mail ballots for distribution. Professor Hymans asked whether SACUA could improve the wording of the document before distributing it. Professor Goodman agreed, but Professor Tice said that he was not impressed by the argument for improved wording.

Professor Sana asked whether there was any way of providing alternates for the Assembly members who were not present at meetings. Chairman Hinerman replied that if a member expected to be absent for two meetings, his college was charged with selecting a substitute.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:38 p.m.

Wilfred Kincaid
Secretary

RESULTS OF
BALLOTING

QUESTION
OF MAIL
BALLOT FOR
PART A,
R & R
REPORT

QUESTION
ABOUT
ALTERNATES
FOR ASSEMBLY
MEMBERS

ADJOURNMENT