

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Assembly Meeting, September 20, 1976

ATTENDANCE Present: Professors Angus, Aupperle, Baublis, Bornstein, Brazer, Browder, Cartwright, Christensen, Cohen, Coon, Corpron, Crawford, Crichton, Diamond, Downen, Edwards, A., Edwards O., Eisley, Elving, Fekety, Goldman, Gordon, Gray, Browne, Harris, J., Harris, R., Hildebrandt, Horsley, Johnson, Jones, Caldwell, Kish, Lands, Leary, Lehmann, Lindberg, Livermore, Lytle, Merte, Millard, Heers, Murphey, Nesbitt, Olson, Portman, Rabkin, Scott, Seger, Sherman, Simonds, Northcutt, Votaw, Weeks, West, Winans, Zorn, Colburn, Williams, *Faulkner*

Absent: Professors Adams, Child, Cornell, Cosand, DeKornfeld, Deskins, ~~Faulkner~~, Flynn, Kachaturoff, Proctor, Soucek, Stross

Guests: Professors Lawrence Brockway, Saul Hymans, William Neenan, Rosemary Sarri

CALL TO ORDER Professor Williams welcomed Assembly members back for the new school year and called the meeting to order at 3:17 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES The minutes of the Assembly meeting of June 21, 1976 were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS Professor Williams announced that the State of the University Address to be presented by President Fleming and the annual awards presentation would be held September 27, 1976 in Rackham Auditorium beginning at 8 p.m.

ANNUAL REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE FACULTY Professor Saul Hymans, the outgoing chairman of CESF, pointed out that the Overview section of the Committee's annual report contained substantially the same summary of the Committee's activities as he had presented orally to the Senate Assembly at its May 17, 1976 meeting. He noted, however, one major difference. The earlier report had discussed the University Professorship Program as a tentative plan for the use of some \$200,000 in earnings on gifts which the Administration had earmarked for special recognition of faculty merit. The published report, however, made no mention of the University Professorship Program and discussed instead the Faculty Development Fund as the plan finally approved for the use of these earmarked funds.

Professor Hymans stressed that the faculty had played a major role in persuading the Administration and CESF that the original University Professorship plan would have been ill-advised. Principally, the problem was the inevitable divisiveness which would have been generated within the faculty by a reward system which was limited to recognizing only one out of six professors as being somehow meritorious.

Professor Hymans praised the faculty for having seen this problem clearly and for having written a great many letters to that effect both to CESF and to the Administration. He explained that the original program had been proposed by the Administration largely in response to CESF pressure to launch some kind of program which would recognize faculty achievement, especially during a period when tight budgets were holding down the growth of faculty salaries. Professor Hymans admitted that the Committee, himself included, had simply been too close to the issue to evaluate properly all of the major ramifications of the Program.

Professor William B. Neenan, the new CESF Chairman, spoke next outlining the salary improvement requests for the upcoming year. The compensation requests, made formally at the September Regents meeting, was based upon an analysis of "market value." That term represents what a professor is "worth" if he or she were to be employed by one of Michigan's peer institutions. The compensation package is divided into a maintenance factor and an improvement factor. The maintenance factor, set in order to keep pace with salaries at our peer institutions, was determined to be 10.4%. This figure was arrived at in the following way: the Committee added the 2.2% shortfall in this year's compensation package with 8.2% which is the figure CESF expects our faculty will need to keep pace for the next year. The improvement factor was set at 1.1%. These components total to 11.5%, the request presented to the Board of Regents. This figure was presented to the Board of Regents not as a bargaining figure--a first offer--but rather as a realistic assessment of the legitimate salary requirements of this faculty if we are to remain competitive in our peer market. The administration is preparing to make their requests for the faculty salaries at the October Regents meeting.

Two additional items were mentioned by Professor Neenan. First, the prepaid health maintenance program is still under investigation. Former Dean Myron Wegman has been given the responsibility of examining the issues in some depth, and will report to the Executive Officers, through Vice-President Rhodes, by January 1977. The ad hoc committee chaired by Professor Ralph Loomis over the past year will serve as a resource group for Dean Wegman and others who have an interest in a prepaid health care delivery system. CESF welcomes comments on this issue. Second, Professor Neenan mentioned that the aggregate nature of CESF tables and figures had apparently been causing some difficulty. CESF is concerned that the figures not become misleading to those individuals who may review them. Professor Neenan expects to clarify these tables and figures in this year's Committee report.

Questions from the floor began with Professor Weeks asking for a clarification of the term "Opportunity Costs." That figure is simply the cost to the faculty member to refuse an offer from another peer institution.

Professor Gordon wondered about the wisdom of looking at just peer institutions as the "market." Why not consider a broader definition of the market available to The University of Michigan faculty members. Professor Elving carried the point further by saying that the Ann Arbor market as a whole should also be considered. Professor Neenan noted that CESF will attempt to look at these areas of concern.

Professor Brazer asked that some thought be given to the total salary allocated to instructional staff as compared to the amount budgeted to P & A personnel. He urged CESF to examine this matter thoroughly in the upcoming year. Professor Neenan assured the members that this matter will be considered. Professor Williams noted that SACUA will also examine the issue.

Professor Merte asked if there was any relationship between requests and the actual amount allocated to salary improvement. The answer was that CESF requests have not been fully funded in the past.

Professor Lands expressed concern over the faculty's lack of flexibility in the number of job titles available as compared to the many titles open to P & A personnel. He argued that the compression of the faculty brought about a lack of freedom and thus brought with it a detrimental effect on salary improvement. Professor Neenan acknowledged the contention and observed that CESF was concerned about the point.

Professor Lehmann asked what recommendations CESF would report if the salary request is cut in half again this year as it has been in years past. Specifically Lehmann asked if collective action would be called for. Professor Neenan said he expected a certain militancy if CESF requests are denied. Neenan pointed out that he would not be opposed to having the issue of collective action examined. He cautioned the Assembly, however, that the adversary relationships which have developed on some other campuses where unionization has taken place is not altogether agreeable. Neenan made it clear that he would not personally favor unionization for this campus. He said he hoped for a new, innovative method for the management of these problems during the next decade.

Professor Hymans noted the relative health and good standing of our faculty especially when compared with faculties on other campuses and with other job groups. He also noted that CESF has not interpreted its charge to fight other job families for salary money. He felt that other committees, i.e., Budget Priorities, would be more appropriately charged with assessing the relative financial health of various job families.

Professor Gordon continued the discussion asking that average salary increases for the faculty be reported in an understandable fashion. Professor Neenan pointed out that Deans and Directors have some responsibility in clarifying their salary program and that not all of the blame for misunderstanding of the various salary programs should be charged to CESF.

Professor Lands asked that CESF not misinterpret the concern over the allocation of monies to instructional staff and P & A personnel. He pointed out that the Assembly was not asking for "a fight" between the job families but rather a fair reporting of the data is what is desired. The Committee should investigate the salary programs of other job families and report back.

Professor Williams thanked Professor Neenan and Professor Hymans for their presentations, to conclude the discussion.

REPORT FROM
THE RESEARCH
POLICIES
COMMITTEE

Professor Williams asked Assembly members to take five (5) minutes to read the handout distributed at the meeting regarding the report and recommendations for the composition and functions of the Biological Research Review Committee (Committee C). After the members had taken time to read the Report, Professor Lawrence Brockway touched briefly upon the history of the recombinant DNA issue. He discussed the work of Committee B and the public forums which were held last Spring. Professor Brockway then mentioned the April 19, 1976 Senate Assembly resolution which read:

RESOLVED: That the Research Policies Committee, in consultation with Committees A and B, formulate the charge of Committee C, including procedures for the selection of personnel, and return the recommendations to the Assembly for its consideration.

It is this resolution which formed the basis for the discussion of the Biological Review Committee. And it is this resolution which prompted the writing of the report, under the name of Professor Rosemary Sarri, Chairwoman of the Research Policies Committee.

Professor Sarri mentioned that the critical information forming the basis of the recommendations came from NIH. She stated further that many sources led to the formulation of specific recommendations contained within the report. She presented the organizational pattern for the report as follows: On pages 2-5, the charge to Committee C is stipulated; pages 5-6 present the proposal for the composition of the Committee; pages 7-12 provide the background of the issue.

Professor Sarri urged some response from the Assembly on the report. She also noted the Committee's openness to receive comments and questions.

Professor Weeks asked what was meant by the statement "One member should not be a researcher in the biological sciences", especially as it relates to earlier recommendations from Committee B. Professor Sarri noted that the NIH guidelines were not known last spring and these guidelines give greater detail in specifying membership of the Committee.

Professor Bornstein also asked about the composition of the Committee in that nonbiological researchers seemed restricted by the recommendations. Professor Sarri said the size of the Committee and the other NIH guidelines did bring about many of the restrictions noted.

Professor Elving pointed out that one person may meet more than one of the qualifications. Professor Sarri agreed with the point. Professor Brockway asked that the Assembly look at this proposed structure as "a start." He continued by saying that a year's operation under these guidelines would be most helpful in assessing their workability.

Professor Cohen moved that the rules be suspended so that the report could be considered today. The motion was seconded by Professor Lands and was carried by a two-thirds vote.

Several further clarifying questions were raised in the debate which followed. Foremost was the question of the Committee's ability to act when a research project was outside specified boundaries. Professor Zander argued that the responsibilities of the principal investigator required monitoring of his or her own research activities. He also pointed out that another, yet undesignated, committee will be structured to survey DNA research activities.

Before the vote was taken Professor Gordon expressed concern that the issue was too important to be acted upon at the same meeting at which the report was circulated and discussed.

The vote was taken and carried by a 33 to 10 margin. The recommendations of the Research Policies Committee concerning the functions and composition of the Biological Research Review Committee (Committee C) were supported.

Immediately following passage of the motion Professor Weeks took the floor and urged that a sense of the Assembly motion be considered. He moved that it be the sense of this meeting that at least two (2) members of Committee C be from the nonbiological sciences. His motion was seconded by Professor Jones. After clarifying remarks concerning the recommending nature of the motion Professor Weeks had proposed, the vote was taken. The motion carried and will be transmitted as a recommendation to the Research Policies Committee and to Vice-President Charles Overberger.

There was no new business proposed.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

C. William Colburn
Secretary

bc