

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Senate Assembly Meeting of 17 September 1984

ATTENDANCE

Present: Aberbach, Ascione, Bailey, Beutler, Blass, Briggs, Boyd, Bulkley, Burdi, Burt, Catford, Chudacoff, Cohen, Dahlke, Easley, King, English, Eschman, Green, Glover, Gulari, Hilbert, Hopwood, Howe, Jacobs, Janecke, Kahn, Kaplan, Kelsey, Knudsvig, Kusnerz, Larson, Lehmann, Leonard, Lorey, Loup, Lusk, McClamroch, Mermier, Meyer, Moerman, Mosher, Nadelman, Payne, Powell, Radine, Rae, Reed, Rucknagel, Rutledge, Sanders, Schauer, Schteingart, Sears, Stapp, Stebbins, Whitehouse, Zweifler, Heitshu

Absent: Barald, Bassett, Courant, Danielson, Farley, Fellin, Grosse, Hanks, Herbert, Kalisch, Lawrence, Lockwood, Ludema, Luther, Margolis, Robinson, Scheele, Simon, Snyder, Solomon, Southwick, Borders, Warschausky

CALL TO ORDER AND MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:19 p.m. by Professor Hilbert, and the minutes of the meeting of 21 May 1984 were approved.

REMARKS BY CHAIR

1. Members of the Assembly are encouraged to bring to the Assembly the attitudes, concerns, and interests of their constituents.

2. Professor Jonathan King is serving as an Assembly representative of the College of Architecture and Urban Planning, in the absence of Professor Leonard Eaton.

3. Professor Blass's term as Senate Secretary ends next month. Professor Hilbert thanked him for his work and announced that Patricia Yocum, head of the Natural Science Library, had agreed to serve as Senate Secretary starting next month.

4. Faculty who know of newsworthy activities by students are asked to inform Janet Mendler, of the University Communication Services, at 4-7260.

5. Professor Hilbert announced that two former members of the Assembly, Norman Nelson and Carol Holbrook, had died recently. The Assembly stood for a moment of silence in their memory.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Professor Hilbert made two corrections to the list of continuing and proposed new committee members. Under Financial Affairs, "Murphy" should read "Murray", and under Research Policies, the name of continuing member Professor Thomas Schriber (Business Administration) was inadvertently omitted. Professor Bailey moved that SACUA's nominees be approved. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

FACULTY ADVISORY PANEL

Professor Hilbert introduced SACUA's proposal to establish a faculty advisory panel to assist faculty affected by program reduction. Professor Kaplan said that he considers the proposal excellent and hopes that it will be well publicized. Professor Hilbert said that this was his intention. Professor Bailey moved adoption of the proposal. His motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Virginia Nordby, Director of Affirmative Action, spoke to the Assembly on affirmative action at The University of Michigan. The following is a summary of her report.

Faculty support and involvement is essential if affirmative action is to work. One goal of the Affirmative Action office is to make information widely available; it publishes the affirmative action report to the University community, the minority student report, a quarterly newsletter, and four federal affirmative action compliance programs (one for each campus and for the hospital). It also develops information on a request basis.

Over the last five years, the percentage of Asians among the tenured and tenure track faculty increased from 3 1/2% to 5%. The corresponding percentage of Blacks remained at 3% (the highest in the Big Ten, but not among our peer institutions), and the percentage of women increased from 15.7% to 16.6%. Last year, 12.4% of new faculty were minority and 29% were female. For several years, the Affirmative Action Office has been concerned that female assistant professors are being denied tenure at a slightly higher rate,

and are leaving before tenure reviews at a much higher rate, than male assistant professors.

The non-instructional work force, which is larger than the instructional, is divided into job groups, for which affirmative action goals may be set when necessary. The University has significantly reduced the number of such cases. The Affirmative Action Office monitors layoffs. Women and minorities are being laid off proportionately to their numbers among the work force, but too many older people are being laid off.

At the level of the higher administration, progress has been slow. Although blacks are represented, the University has never had a female executive officer.

There is serious concern about the number of minority students. From 1973 to 1983, the percentage of minority students remained 10 1/2%, but the percentage of Blacks decreased from 7% to 4.9%. The percentage of Asians increased, while the (very small) percentages of Hispanics and Native Americans remained unchanged. The percentage of Black students increased in Business Administration, medicine, and dentistry and remained the same in undergraduate Engineering. We hope for increased Black enrollment this fall, as a result of intensive work that began two years ago and included adjustments in financial aid packages and their timing, the appointment of a new associate vice president for academic affairs with primary responsibility in this area, and reorganization of certain minority-oriented programs. A serious problem is the precipitous decline in the number of Black and Hispanic Ph.D's. To interest more Black and Hispanic students in research will require faculty effort; counselors cannot do the job alone.

The situation with regard to women students can be described as partially a success and partially still a problem. The number of women students is increasing in the professional areas but still surprisingly small in non-traditional areas like the natural sciences. There is a Women in Science program to interest women students in the sciences, partly through pre-college efforts and partly by funding lecture visits by women scientists.

The University has received information from the state on handicapped high school students, and there is a preliminary report on the University's ability to serve them. There is a special University bus for wheelchairs. Recent construction has improved the accessibility of Rackham and the Social Work library (the last library needing such improvement). A task force on campus accessibility has prepared a report for the handicapped.

The Affirmative Action Office monitors applications, admissions, graduation, hiring, termination, promotion, purchasing, and subcontracts. It

is doing a longitudinal cohort study to understand patterns such as the early departure of female assistant professors. This year it is doing a faculty salary equity study, the first since 1979. It prepares an annual report on sexual harassment (of which there are only a few cases, but even one case is a matter of major concern). Last year, it reported on the treatment and the perceived treatment of homosexuals on campus, and the report led to a policy statement by the president.

The University is asking for proposals for events to mark the end, next year, of the International Women's Decade. There will also be events, in connection with Martin Luther King's birthday next January, to recognize King's concerns for the health care problems of Blacks.

Two years ago, the federal government began a major Title IX review of the Athletic Department. It was interrupted but then resumed, and it has led to some changes. There are 10 intercollegiate sports at the University for women and 11 for men. The situation is not perfect, but on the right track toward parity. Every federal grant of \$1 million or more requires a Labor Department review of the University's compliance programs; two such reviews are in progress.

The University's policy is to engage in affirmative action not only to satisfy the government, but also for the University's own purposes. A first-rate university cannot ignore the need for diversity among students and researchers. I am committed to administering affirmative action so as to merge, not conflict, with academic excellence. There are no quotas to be met at all costs. Affirmative action involves, first, carefully identifying the qualifications and criteria for a position, second, searching vigorously to bring women and minorities into the pool of candidates, and third, choosing the best qualified candidate, with affirmative action candidates preferred in case of equal qualifications. We endeavor to make affirmative action work within the University's decentralized structure. This requires the cooperation of the faculty.

DISCUSSION

Professor Kaplan asked about changes in the federal government's attitude over the last few years. Nordby replied that, although the regulations are unchanged, investigations have become faster and more global. She expressed regret about the restricted interpretation of Title IX in the Supreme Court's decision in the Grove City College case. Investigators will now trace federal dollars and ask about students only in the programs receiving these funds; our computer system is unable to answer such questions efficiently.

Professor Payne asked whether the departure of female assistant professors is a result of better offers outside the University or negative signals about

tenure chances. Nordby replied that most move laterally, and some go to non-peer institutions. Many leave because their husbands get a position elsewhere. Any complaints are thoroughly investigated. There is no pattern of refusal to review for tenure. Professor Payne asked whether decisions not to review people for tenure are being monitored. Nordby replied that procedures are being changed to cover these; in the past, only denials of tenure were monitored. The longitudinal study should also provide information about non-reviewed cases.

Professor Bailey asked about the lower rate of sabbatical-taking among eligible female faculty than among male faculty. Nordby replied that this problem, which surfaced 1 1/2 years ago, was in one school and appears to have been solved after a talk with the dean.

In reply to a question from Professor Nadelman, Nordby explained that the last salary equity review was conducted five years ago, for the federal government. It involved a multiple regression analysis of faculty and research staff salaries. Outliers were investigated with the deans, and numerous adjustments were made. Because of information contained in CESF's report, planning was begun for a new study, which will probably take all year.

In connection with minority recruitment, Professor Rucknagel asked whether the University's financial aid package has kept up with the times. Nordby replied that Associate Vice President Sudarkasa is working on this. The undergraduate part of the study has been completed, and the graduate part is in progress.

In reply to a question from Professor Stapp, Nordby said that the University's internal report on affirmative action is available to the public. Professor Stapp asked about the retention and graduation rate of minorities. Nordby did not recall the exact rates but said that they are in the report. The graduation rate is calculated for 5 years, as well as for 4 years, after admission, since many of the less well prepared students are advised to take lower course loads. Last year's minority graduation rate equals the previous year's majority graduation rate; the overall rate is a problem.

Professor Lusk asked whether the Nursing School is excluded when percentages of female faculty are computed. Nordby replied that the computation is done both with and without the Nursing School.

Professor Larson asked whether the percentage of women students is increasing here as it is nationally. Nordby replied that the percentage may be up slightly overall.

VICE-PRESIDENCY FOR RESEARCH AND RACKHAM DEANSHIP

Professor John Knott, who chaired the Committee to Study the Merger of the Vice Presidency for Research and the Deanship of Rackham, presented the Committee's report.

He began by saying that the reports of the three subcommittees, one on the Office of the Vice President for Research, one on the Rackham Graduate School, and one on the reporting relationship of centers and institutes, had been important factors in the overall report. Although the Johnson committee had recommended that the offices be merged, President Shapiro's charge to the planning committee left open the possibility of not merging them. Professor Knott had served on the Johnson Committee. The Planning Committee heard from deans and executive officers and received comments from peer institutions that were satisfied with systems in which the two offices in question were combined.

The first two of the subcommittees expressed doubt about the value of the merger. The Planning Committee proposed three models; the first of these, supported by a majority of the committee, keeps the two offices separate. There were three reasons for recommending against the merger. First, the increasing importance and complexity of the job of the vice president for research would create a risk of inattention to the graduate area. Second, there was reluctance to give up the position of Rackham dean; its structural weakness could be compensated for by integrating the dean into the provost's staff. (All three models retain the deanship in some form.) Third, both the Office of the Vice President for Research and Rackham must interact more with the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Although it keeps the two offices separate, Model 1 is not just the status quo. It adds a mechanism for interaction between them and the Office of the Provost.

DISCUSSION

Professor Hilbert announced that the Research Policies Committee had reviewed the report of the Planning Committee and had endorsed Model 1.

Professor Bailey asked whether the return of more indirect cost recovery funds to the units would weaken the vice president for research by decreasing the money he controls. Professor Knott replied that the subcommittee wanted more of these funds to go to the units. Professor Bailey said that the report also called for increased money for non-sponsored research and that only this would get the deans' attention to the vice president for research. He mentioned the loss of money by the School of Public Health when the federal government's emphasis shifted away from the School's strengths. Professor

Knott replied that the two recommendations are not incompatible, since the Committee recommended a larger budget for the vice president for research. By contrast, it recommended that Rackham be streamlined by reducing the number of associate deans.

In reply to a question from Professor Hilbert, Professor Knott said that the Committee's report had been given to President Shapiro and had been discussed at AAAC and probably elsewhere. Professor Hilbert said that a decision by the executive officers is expected soon, so that a search (or searches) can begin.

Professor Stebbins asked about the addition, to the already heavy workload in the Academic Affairs Office, resulting from the addition of the Rackham dean to that office. Professor Knott said he was aware that there are already many people around the table in that office, but he added that the vice president for academic affairs already interacts with the dean of Rackham.

Professor William Dawson, who chaired the subcommittee studying Rackham, listed some of the issues considered by that subcommittee. There was concern about the welfare of the humanities if the merger reduced the ability of Rackham to nurture them. The subcommittee recommended that duplication of work by Rackham and the registrar's office be eliminated. It hoped that the Rackham dean would be able to project Rackham issues (many of which are academic) into the academic affairs office. There was concern that graduate studies might be lost in the sorting out of issues in a merged vice presidential office. Although it realized that one cannot separate graduate studies and research, the subcommittee is comfortable with not merging the two offices.

Professor Cohen asked whether the proposed committee on graduate studies and research could make communication more difficult. Professor Knott said that it is essential that communication occur and issues are addressed jointly. The President and the Provost must choose an appropriate mechanism.

Professor Bulkley asked what the recommendations of the subcommittee on centers and institutes, accepted by the present committee, were. Professor Knott replied that the subcommittee suggested a rationale for where these units should report. Those that are primarily for service would report to the vice president for academic affairs; those that are primarily research oriented would report to the vice president for research. For a few existing centers and institutes, this would mean a shift to the vice president for research.

In reply to a question from Professor Janecke about the system used at peer institutions, Professor Knott reported that Wisconsin has a powerful graduate dean who functions as a research vice president, Stanford has a vice

provost for graduate studies and research. Illinois is comfortable with a merged system. Ohio State and Iowa have also merged the positions. Many private schools have less centralized research offices.

Professor Bailey recalled that the Ackley Committee, on which he had served, had found Rackham ineffective in service to other units. It seems to have improved, and now renders effective service to small and inter-disciplinary programs. Rackham also has an important role in reviewing graduate programs. Keeping the deanship will strengthen Rackham in these activities. Professor Knott said that, although Rackham is not intended to replace the units in reviews, its viewpoint is valuable for quality-control. The Rackham dean should be as involved in promotions as the Academic Affairs staff now is.

Professor Ascione asked about interdisciplinary research planning. Professor Knott says that the central administration has a role in stimulating interdisciplinary research by bringing people together, providing seed money, etc. But the major role belongs to the faculty.

At Professor Hilbert's invitation, President Shapiro made the following comments: A decision about the merger proposal is expected to be made in a week or so, so that a search can begin. Indirect costs are not now budgeted largely to the office of the vice president for research, so that office would not be strongly affected by returning some of this money to the units. The question is simply which parts of the University need more money now; we have complete freedom in allocating resources.

I think we won't merge the two offices. The main reason is that we can build on a non-trivial tradition. The merger idea seems to offend everyone, though for different and sometimes unclear reasons. I expect that the role of the Rackham dean will be enhanced, for example in connection with promotions. I am unsure about committee structure. Anyone who has concerns about this plan should say so.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Andreas R. Blass
Senate Secretary