

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting, September 18, 1978

ATTENDANCE

Present: Members Aupperle, Barnett, Baumgarten, Berg, Brazer, D. Brown, M. Brown, Clark, Searse, Caldwell, Cooper, Crichton, Diamond, Dingle, Eckert, Edwards, Elving, Flener, Fowler, Gay, George, Gordon, Rush, Hinerman, Hungerman, Jones, Lyon, Koran, Leary, Lindberg, Lynch-Sauer, Merte, Naylor, Parkinson, Porter, Portman, Powers, Rabkin, Romani, Rowe, Simonds, Burckhalter, Tilly, Tonsor, Trojan, Grassmuck, Verhey, White, Zorn, Livermore, Schulze

Absent: Angus, Blumenfeld, Cohen, Coon, Corpron, Dabich, Downen, Fekety, Gull, Harris, Herbert, Morley, Nisbett, Ostrander, Penner, Poznanski, Abdel-Massih, Vasse, Winans

Guests: Vice-President Shapiro; Professors W. Robert Dixon and Emily Cloyd

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the Senate Assembly meeting of June 19 were accepted as written.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Livermore reported on the progress of the Program Discontinuance document, and promised further discussion by SACUA and the Executive Officers.

Copies of the Regents' Bylaws will be generally available in October or November. Mrs. Downs has prepared fifteen copies for Assembly members who need them now.

Recommendations on changes in the University Calendar that would make fall terms longer and more regular are being discussed by both the Deans and the students.

Two replacements on SARC are required immediately. The Assembly approved SACUA's request to allow SACUA to make the appointments now and seek Assembly approval next month.

The next meeting of the Assembly will be October 23.

Livermore postponed announcement of the procedures for nominating the Faculty Committee on the Presidency until after Vice President Shapiro's remarks. He then introduced Vice President Shapiro.

REMARKS BY VICE-
PRESIDENT FOR
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS,
HAROLD SHAPIRO

The Vice-President described his intention to review some of the major issues before the Deans and the Executive Officers this year. He began with an outline of the budget, referring to a report that had been previously distributed to Assembly members. He pointed out that a deficit of one million dollars is shown, and that adjustments will have to be made through the year to erase that deficit. He summarized the principal changes from last year's budget. Almost a half million dollars more will be spent on books for the Library, and over four hundred thousand dollars more on teaching and research equipment.

He then highlighted five items. First, he said that tuition grants for Graduate Student Teaching and Research Assistants had increased by 50% as compared to last year. Second, he explained that two kinds of reallocation of funds have occurred: from administrative to instructional uses, and from personnel to non-personnel (i.e. library books and teaching equipment) costs. Third, he noted the enrollment decline among MA and PhD students in the Graduate School. The decline over the last five years was between 10 and 15%, and was in his opinion probably not affected by the 1977-78 fee structure. He thought that changes in budget allocation to those departments whose programs have shrunk is coming. Fourth, he pointed out a beginning of the effort to increase research incentives. Beginning January 1, GSRA tuition grants will be instituted. There will also be minor improvement in the amount of indirect costs returned to research units. Finally, he referred to the report of the allocations of the Priority Fund.

Mr. Shapiro then turned from the budget to other issues. He began by citing his fundamental interest in the quality of undergraduate education, and his concern that, in terms of the various measures used in admissions, the quality of our students has not been rising. While our in-state students have shown some improvement, our out-of-state students, the pool that traditionally supplies many of our best, have declined according to various measures. Whatever the explanation--and many exist--action seems necessary. He intends, therefore, to institute a recruitment program aimed at attracting some of the best students throughout the country. A merit scholarship plan will be an essential part of the program. He will encourage aggressive recruiting, however, in a variety of ways.

Another issue, the Academic Calendar, is in process of examination. He promised that his staff will soon make sample calendars available to the entire academic community for comment. He hopes to have the issue resolved as early as possible this academic year so that a new calendar may be instituted either next September or the September following.

Mr. Shapiro then turned to longer-range matters. He said that American universities were in transition. He cited demographic changes as one primary factor in the changes being experienced by nearly all universities. This has led in most cases to little or no growth, and a restriction on hiring. Further, our faculties are gradually growing old together. A second factor of change has been the new role of governmental and accrediting agencies in shaping university programs and policies. He called the role an "intrusion" into matters of the content, size, and personnel of academic programs, and predicted that there would have to be some resistance on the part of the academy. He said that accrediting agencies appear to have become advocates of their own special field, and have begun to hang the issue of accreditation upon the issue of achieving sometimes massive increases in support. A third factor for public universities has been the dwindling of their portion of the resource base. Legislatures have shifted their spending priorities away from higher education. Finally, there has been a revolution in scientific instrumentation. The equipment for doing research in some fields has become extremely expensive and short-lived and universities simply cannot afford to keep up in every respect. He said he foresaw the development of a pluralism of institutions for conducting the nation's research, particularly in applied technology. Non-university laboratories will do a larger share of research.

Mr. Shapiro then attempted to read these factors of change into the special circumstances of the University of Michigan. We are now experiencing, he said, the cumulative effect of a series of budget cuts over a period of seven or eight years. The cuts inevitably came at the margins. Those items like books and equipment, visiting professorships, or support for innovative programs, that could be deferred, were deferred. The result has been a severe reduction of our flexibility. And there is no catch-up in sight, no new funds to restore what we have given up.

Yet, we must restore at least some of the things--for example our library and teaching equipment--that are necessary to a great university. The question is how to accomplish this.

Mr. Shapiro said he thought the solution had to come in the form of a better balance between our activities and our resources. We must narrow our focus and do fewer things. The various means by which we concentrate our energies, however, will have to be found by the units rather than by the central administration. The decisions are too complex. At the same time, he recognized, he said, that the call for decentralized decision-making would require incentives that only the central administration could sup-

ply. He promised that his own office will offer a variety of incentives for change.

Mr. Shapiro now invited questions from the Assembly. Professor D. Brown asked for an illustration of the intrusion of accrediting agencies into the content, size, and personnel of our programs. The Vice-President cited a recent report on the School of Pharmacy that recommends a doubling of the amount of clinical experience afforded students. The entire curriculum would have to be changed to accommodate this change. In general, he said, the accrediting bodies have undertaken a dual mission: to monitor and evaluate existing programs, and to advocate better conditions for, or conditions more favorable to the development of their own field of teaching and research.

Professor Brazer asked why the faculty should expect the central administration to approve anything but across-the-board cuts. Shapiro answered that across-the-board cuts were terminated two years ago. The Deans have the responsibility to make the policy of differential cuts felt at the departmental level.

Professor Elving said that it appears that control increases as money decreases. What faculty role, he asked, will there be in setting University goals and policies? Hasn't the faculty role also decreased? Shapiro replied that the best way to meet the fact of restricted funds is through decentralized decision-making. The vehicles to be used are not yet clear. Their choice will depend upon the faculties in the schools and departments.

Elving continued. How can the faculty act? He pointed to the fact that while the central administration allowed 6.5% for salaries this year, LSA approved only 6.15%. At the same time, teaching responsibilities were increased.

Shapiro pointed out that it was the LSA Executive Committee, an elected body of faculty, that chose to withhold .35%. He also recalled that the faculty has direct control of graduate admissions and a strong influence on undergraduate admissions. Increased teaching responsibilities, in other words, reflect at least in part faculty decisions.

Professor Dingle expressed gloom at the picture painted by the Vice-President. He thought that the expansion of the community college system in the State was principally to blame for the loss of support for the University. He asked, now that that system has been built, will there be a return of interest in the University? Shapiro replied that he did not share Professor Dingle's gloom. He thought

we could be better, that there are many ways in which the University might be made a better place. It is tempting, he said, to think that we can increase the flow of resources, that more money from outside is the solution. If he were a betting man, however, he would not rely on that.

Professor Naylor then asserted that the best thinking and the most inventive things are done in the University by small groups of colleagues, that where there are incentives, even of an entrepreneurial kind, we are likely to get the best results. Given this, he asked, why has there been such an emphasis recently on program discontinuance? Mr. Shapiro agreed with Naylor's assertion about creative thinking. But in response to the program discontinuance issue, he suggested that all innovation carries risk. We must be careful to take the right ones.

Professor Cooper asked why the Dean or Administration should initiate program discontinuance when the Bylaws delegate responsibility for academic programs to the governing faculty. He read at length from the Regent's Bylaws and described the relationship of the faculty to the Administration as a dynamic dialogue--at least ideally. The Vice-President affirmed that such a dialogue is necessary to the operation of the University. The Dean and the Executive Committee should not be the only initiators of program discontinuance. On the other hand, hard decisions must be made somewhere. He speculated that program discontinuance will not be the chief method by which changes are made, that internal adjustments within departments and schools will be more important. The faculty will in fact in the end be responsible for decisions.

FACULTY COMMIT-
TEE ON THE
PRESIDENCY

Chairman Livermore thanked Vice President Shapiro for his remarks. He then turned to the last of his announcements. SACUA has accepted the request of the Regents to constitute a fifteen member committee to search for a new President. A SACUA subcommittee chaired by Margaret Leary has made a report outlining certain principles and procedures that should govern the nomination and charge of the committee:

1. That the committee be composed of fifteen members of the Senate chosen by SACUA from nominees submitted by the community at large. SACUA will also choose the chairman and vice chairman of the committee;
2. That the committee be broadly representative of the members of the Senate;
3. That it include no member from SACUA;

4. That the call for nominations be widely publicized;
5. That all nominations must be in writing, with or without accompanying vita and recommendation;
6. That nominations close sharply at 5:00 p.m., October 6, 1978 and that SACUA announce the membership of the committee by 5:00 p.m., October 13, 1978;
7. That SACUA charge to the committee include that its chairman make a monthly report to the Assembly, that the committee maintain close communication with the Regents and other search committees, and that confidentiality be maintained respecting the names of candidates for President.

SACUA will follow all these procedures and has officially named the committee the Faculty Committee on the Presidency. Livermore added that in his own conversations with Regent Nederlander, chairman of the Regents' Committee, he was assured that a well-managed search would prove very influential and yield "few surprises" when the new President was eventually named.

Professor Elving asked if the Regents were going to ask the committee for an ordered list. Livermore replied that no specific charge had been made yet to that point. He reminded the Assembly that the Regents have the right to choose whom they wish, and are determined to exercise their right freely and in the best way they know how. The main problem with ordered lists, he said, is the embarrassment and potential for damage to relationships that could come from publication of such a list.

Professor M. Brown asked why SACUA has removed its own members from eligibility. Livermore admitted that this was a departure from 1966 when SACUA was represented on the committee. This year SACUA members thought it best to keep functions separate.

Professor Lyon asked what coordination would exist among the various search committees? Livermore replied there were no formal ties, but that eventually there would be considerable sharing of information.

Professor Cooper asked if faculty members were limited to nominating members of their own units, to which Livermore responded negatively. The faculty may nominate any member of the Senate.

Professor Zorn said that he thought rank-ordering candidates would be very important. Chairman Livermore reiterated his description of opposing viewpoints on the matter. Someone asked if Flint and Dearborn would be represented on the committee. Livermore declined to answer specifically, but said there are many ways to construe the term "broadly representative".

Professor Elving then argued for a strong faculty voice in the selection process. Livermore assured the Assembly that the Regents have assured him that the work of this committee will be indispensable.

NOMINATIONS
AND APPOINT-
MENTS

The following appointments were approved by Senate Assembly:

1. University Relations Committee - 3 year terms

Margaret L. Clay, Ass't Prof., Psychology/Psychiatry
Glenn F. Knoll, Prof., Nuclear Engineering
H. Dean Millard, Prof., Dentistry
Rosemary C. Sarri, Prof., Social Work

2. Program Evaluation Committee - six appointments

Morton Brown, Prof., Mathematics - 3-year term
Harold Jacobson, Prof., Political Science - 3-year term
Malcolm Lowther, Prof., Education - 2-year term
John Lyon, Prof., Elec. & Comp. Engineering - 3-year term
Harvey Reed, Prof., Psychology - 2-year term
Daniel Sinclair, Prof., Physics - 2-year term

3. State Relations Committee - one year term

Peggy Ann Kusnerz, Head Librarian, Extension Service

4. Financial Affairs Committee - one-year term

Alan B. Macnee, Prof., Electrical Engineering

PROPOSED TENURE
POLICY

Chairman Livermore introduced Professor Robert Dixon, immediate past-chairman of the Tenure Committee, to continue his report to the Assembly. He also introduced Professor Emily Cloyd, the new chairman of the Committee, and explained that the purpose of the report was to receive advice from the Assembly so that this year's Tenure Committee can prepare a final policy statement.

Professor Dixon then continued the report he began last June, focussing discussion today on Sections 2 and 3.

Professor Rabkin called attention to 2a. line 27, concerning scholarly leave of absence and its role in the matter of counting time towards a mandatory tenure decision. He thought the tenure policy should be explicit in declaring what sorts of leave may be taken that will not be counted in the probationary time. Dixon called attention to another problem--that of counting years spent at another institution.

Professor Jones said he was unhappy with the generosity of rewarding years spent elsewhere, and Professor Naylor expressed surprise that the University officially recognized such time. Livermore said that credit for experience was usually a subject of negotiation at the time of hiring. Professor Caldwell asserted that, unless it is deemed specifically otherwise, previous experience is not counted as part of probationary time.

Professor Berg then called attention to the difficulty of making all-inclusive statements in the language of 2b. It implies that he as a faculty member must give the candidate reasons for opposing his tenure immediately after preparing his recommendation. Dixon assured him that was not intended and that the language was only intended to assure the candidate of the maximum opportunity to seek reconsideration.

Professor Simonds argued that a statement on procedures for reconsideration was badly needed. Professor Elving advised the Committee to specify who was to give the candidate knowledge of his rights, and to advise him of decisions.

Professor Dixon then went on to 2c, which merely states existing policy. There was no comment. In reference to 2d. he noted a controversy on his own committee. Professor Rabkin spoke in favor of the idea of early notification of termination. Professor Porter referred the Committee to the LSA procedures as a model. Professor Grassmuck asked what the requirements were for granting reconsideration to a candidate for tenure. Professor Dixon replied that, if requested early enough, reconsideration would be routinely granted.

Professor Dixon passed to 2f. Mary George asked if both the Tenure Committee and SARC need to be empowered to hear cases concerning tenure. Professor Dixon explained that the Tenure Committee is charged with hearing cases brought by faculty members who have already been granted tenure. SARC has heard, on the other hand, cases where the failure to grant tenure has occasioned an allegation of injustice.

Professor Dixon now turned to Section 3. Assembly members called attention to the lack of specificity as to the source from which formal notification of termination comes and the person to whom a candidate may address his requests. Professor Elving, appreciating the inclusion in the report of a statement on the rights to which tenure entitles a faculty member, suggested that an additional statement ought to be included on the obligations to the University that the granting of tenure entails.

PRIVACY
GUIDELINES

Chairman Livermore thanked Professor Dixon. Because the time was growing late he asked the Assembly for its pleasure regarding the last item on the agenda, Privacy Guidelines. The Assembly agreed to postpone discussion. SACUA will give the Guidelines special attention during the next month.

ADJOURNMENT

The Assembly adjourned at 5:22 p.m.

Earl J. Schulze
Senate Secretary