

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Assembly Meeting, September 22, 1975

ATTENDANCE

Present: Professors Bornstein, Browder, Brown, Christensen, Cohen, B., Cohen, C., Cornell, Corpron, Crawford, DeKornfeld, Dernberger, Easley, Harris, Hildebrandt, Hoffman, Horsley, Ilie, Jones, Kachaturoff, Kaplan, Kell, Kelsey, Kessler, Kish, G., Leary, Lehmann, Lindberg, Livermore, Lytle, Magrill, Millard, Mullen, Murphey, Nesbitt, Proctor, Aupperle, Seger, Seligson, Sherman, Soucek, Springer, Taren, Terwilliger, Votaw, Weeks, Williams, Hoch, Colburn, Johnson

Absent: Professors Adams, Baublis, Berki, Bishop, Child, Cosand, Deskins, Flynn, Gikas, Meiland, Gray, Guinn, Kish, L., Lands, Morton Lucchesi, Tubergen, Sibley, Stross, Van der Voo, West, Wilson

Guests: Professors Edward Bordin and Saul Hymans

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:20 p.m., Chairman Johnson welcoming the members of the Assembly on their return to the new academic year.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Assembly meeting of June 16, 1975 were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

So that the members of the Assembly would be fully apprised of the activities of SACUA during the summer months, Chairman Johnson presented an account of interim developments, noting the following:

a. A variety of reports (Review Committee of Rackham Graduate School, Reply by Executive Board of the Graduate School, Committee on Extension Service Relationship to UM-D and UM-F, Committee on Environmental Resources, Planning and Design) had been reviewed by SACUA and referred to the Academic Affairs Committee. Copies had been sent to the members of the Assembly in the hope that they would encourage discussion of the reports in their respective units, sharing with Professor Roe, chairman of the Academic Affairs Committee, such reactions as were forthcoming.

b. In keeping with the wish of the Assembly, an ad hoc committee has been created in cooperation with the Civil Liberties Board to study the issue of freedom of speech on campus, with a report expected in the fall.

c. Having been alerted to questions raised by certain areas of current research in genetics, SACUA had discussed the issues with President Fleming, Vice-President Overberger, and Associate Vice-President Zander. The committee was concerned not only with such practical details as the expense involved in the building or remodeling of laboratory facilities but also with the humanitarian aspects of such research.

Of three committees created by the Office of the Vice-President for Research, one will deal with scientific questions, another with safety features, and a third with the ethical and philosophical aspects of such research. Professor Cohen, a member of SACUA, has been appointed a member of the latter, as has Professor Livermore, a representative of the Assembly, who has agreed to serve.

d. The Faculty Handbook is in the final stages, with only one remaining matter delaying its publication, namely, clarification of the policy with respect to summer appointments, that is, whether the latter may be 3/9 or only 2/9. As Chairman Johnson pointed out, the restriction to 2/9 seemed to have been imposed unilaterally and has acted especially to the detriment of faculty whose research would support three months of summer appointment. It is hoped that the matter can be resolved shortly, making publication of the Handbook a reality. A matter for future consideration would be the possibility of a three-part Handbook, devoted respectively to the instructional staff, primary research staff, and librarians and curators.

e. Having reviewed the comprehensive report of the Committee to Assess the Periodic Health Appraisal Unit, SACUA has asked the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty to study the implications of the recommendations.

f. It is expected that the Bylaws Committee, with whose chairman SACUA has met for preliminary discussion, will shortly prepare recommendations on the manner in which the primary research scientists are to be represented in the Assembly.

g. On October 7, 1975, Chairman Johnson and Professor Williams will meet with the chairpersons of Assembly committees to identify and discuss matters of mutual interest, following which SACUA itself will plan on a follow-up meeting of similar nature.

h. The Statement of Fair Procedure, developed by the Senate Advisory Review Committee, is to be included in the Faculty Handbook as well as distributed to deans and departmental chairpersons.

i. At its annual retreat in June, SACUA saw three matters as having highest priority, namely, further discussion of the economic status of the faculty with the executive officers and Regents, the role of the graduate school, and appropriate participation by the faculty in the governance of the University.

j. SACUA had expressed to Vice-President Rhodes its concern over the manner in which the CRISP system of registration has functioned. The Office of the Vice-President for Academic Affairs has subsequently established a review committee to study the matter.

k. From panels of nominees submitted to them by SACUA, the Regents had made the following appointments to University committees:

Board in Control of Intercollegiate Athletics: Thomas Anton, Political Science, Murray Jackson, Education, and C. James Pilcher, Business Administration (3-year terms)

Advisory Committee on Recreation, Intramurals and Club Sports (ACRICS): Leslie A. Olsen, Humanities, and Otelio Randall, Internal Medicine (2-year terms)

Executive Committee of the University Press: Vern Carroll, Anthropology, Jens Zorn, Physics, and Frank Yates, Psychology (3-year terms)

l. The annual State of the University address by President Fleming will be given on October 6, 1975 and members of the Assembly and their colleagues were urged to attend. In this connection Professor Carl Cohen suggested that President Fleming be asked whether he would entertain questions following his address.

m. The Assembly was reminded that the fall meeting of the University Senate will take place on November 24, 1975.

n. An additional announcement, by Professor Kaplan, informed the Assembly that the AAUP chapter would be discussing the University Health Plan and possible developments with respect to it.

SACUA MEMBER  
REPLACEMENT

Since Professor Allen had indicated her regret at not being able to complete her term on SACUA in view of other University responsibilities, SACUA had proposed that Professor Magrill, who had been elected by the Assembly in December, 1974 as Professor Allen's temporary replacement, be asked to complete the term. The Assembly voted approval.

NOMINATIONS  
AND APPOINTMENTS

In connection with nominations by SACUA, the Assembly voted to approve the following appointments:

Michigan Union Board of Directors--Professor Marilyn Searson, to June 30, 1977 (replacing Professor Main)  
Senate Advisory Review Committee--Professor Gerald Rosberg, one-year term (replacing Professor Green)  
Senate Advisory Review Committee vice-chairmanship--Professor Wallace Berry, one-year term (replacing Professor Green)

ANNUAL REPORT  
OF COMMITTEE  
ON THE ECONOMIC  
STATUS OF THE  
FACULTY

In introducing Professor Hymans, chairman of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, Chairman Johnson took occasion to commend the work of the committee and the leadership Professor Hymans has provided. Professor Hymans, in turn, gave credit to the members of his committee and to the staff which supports the activities of CESF. He was pleased to report, too, that his committee and the administration seemed to be speaking the same language.

One is tempted to use the consumer price index or the condition of the general worker in society as reference points in assessing the economic status of the faculty, Professor Hymans noted. Neither, however, provides an appropriate basis for comparison; the University competes in a special market. We need therefore to be looking at what

is happening in some 15-20 peer institutions; it is how strong or weak the market is there that counts. These universities are essentially competing for the same faculty. It is in this market that we must remain at the top if Michigan is to continue as a preeminent educational institution.

In May of this year our situation looked unpromising, Professor Hymans reported, with only 3 to 4% in new money expected. Some had argued therefore that the faculty settle for a salary increase of 5.6% or for a minimum of 5.6%. CESF was not willing to take such a course, and, indeed, the administration agreed that the University must do better, both with respect to maintaining faculty morale as well as retaining the University's excellence. Accordingly, in his recent letter President Fleming stressed the need for a longer term view of the faculty's economic status.

As Professor Hymans reminded the Assembly, a 7% increase in compensation has come to pass. If the latter does not seem adequate, he would urge the faculty to make its feelings known to the administration, for CESF itself is but a committee to represent the faculty in expressing its economic needs and is without the resources needed for a careful study of budget priorities. As he pointed out, when his committee last year urged a compensation increase of 18% (later reduced to 13.23% by the Regents), it should not have been expected to indicate where the funds were to be found. That question cannot be answered by CESF, which does not have the necessary staff for such a study. There are, however, budget priority committees, he reminded the Assembly, and it is to them that the faculty is urged to relay its pleasure or displeasure about priority choices which are made.

In any case, for 1976-77 CESF is recommending a salary increase of 12.4%, consisting of three factors--maintenance, restoration, and improvement--the latter to be budgeted over a three-year period. In 1974-75 the faculty's economic position improved substantially in the academic market, Professor Hymans noted. CESF is now scheduled to meet shortly with President Fleming and Vice-Presidents Rhodes and Pierpont to discuss its 12.4% proposal and will present its case to the Regents on October 16, 1975. Meanwhile, he added, the committee's proposal for supplementing the annuities of faculty who retired prior to 1956 is to go into effect this year.

In the ensuing discussion Professor Jones raised points regarding the need for both clarification of the actual salary increase situation as well as for hard data. With respect to the latter, Professor Hymans noted that the report of the committee contained pertinent information. More generally, he observed, it should be remembered that in distributing funds received from the Office of Academic Affairs, schools and colleges make it a practice to retain a fraction thereof as a necessary fund for meeting competing offers, validating past commitments, and the like. Hence there may be misunderstanding as to the amount available to units for general salary increases. When one looks at our overall compensation situation a year from now, however, he assured the Assembly, it will have improved by a factor of 7%, as announced.

There are, to be sure, some disparities, Professor Hymans noted. At this time, for example, our assistant professors are relatively well paid in terms of the market in which the University competes; by contrast, our full professors are not as fortunate. Too, some units within the University as a whole may be in good economic health with respect to faculty salaries while others fare not nearly as well. In response to a question from Professor Carl Cohen in this connection, Professor Hymans indicated that at this point CESF has information on the University as a whole but not on individual units as such. The administration is, however, being urged to develop a plan whereby salary increases which differ by rank could be implemented sensibly if funds for this purpose became available.

With respect to a question from Professor Kaplan as to whether a trend is foreseen to make the faculty more "productive" via a reduction in positions, Professor Hymans replied in the negative, pointing out, however, that with reductions in appropriations from the legislature the University is forced to find the necessary funds or retrench. He reminded the Assembly that last year the Regents had felt they could readily justify a faculty compensation increase of 13.23% if the funds were available. Hence he suggested again that the faculty review the priorities, making its feelings known to the administration.

Professors Bennett Cohen, Bornstein, and Votaw, respectively, suggested aspects to which CESF might direct further attention--clarification of the actual fraction available for salary increases, the circumstances of part-time as compared with full-time faculty, and the salary situation of minority groups and women. In the latter connection Professor Hymans pointed out that committees exist for the purpose, while Chairman Johnson reminded the Assembly that special funds had been made available for such salary adjustments.

With respect to the manner in which CESF functions, Professors Taren, Springer, and Jones, respectively, had some queries and suggestions--whether an expansion of the committee's charge would help, what the faculty might have received in the absence of CESF, and how communication with the legislature might be improved. Professor Hymans felt no need for an expanded charge; he did feel confident that without the role played by CESF, faculty salary increases would have been less. Concerning relations with the legislature, he and Chairman Johnson noted that it has been suggested that President Fleming consider the advisability of dealing with the legislature as head of a delegation rather than on his own resources, and that perhaps Professor Hymans should participate with the Committee on State Relations as it deals with the legislature.

PROPOSED CON-  
STITUTIONAL  
CHANGE

In the interest of promoting continuity, the Senate Advisory Review Committee had proposed a change in its constitution, extending the terms of Unit Representatives from one to three years. SACUA had concurred in the proposal and recommended its approval by Senate Assembly. Professor Kaplan moved its adoption, and, having been seconded, the proposed change in the constitution of SARC was approved unanimously.

ANNUAL RE-  
PORT OF  
SENATE AD-  
VISORY RE-  
VIEW COM-  
MITTEE

Chairman Johnson was pleased to welcome Professor Bordin, chairman of the Senate Advisory Review Committee, who had been invited to present the annual report of his committee. In doing so, Professor Bordin commented in particular on four features of the activities of SARC.

a. The cases reviewed formally have, fortunately, not exceeded the committee's capacity to provide full hearings. There is, however, a limit to the number of cases that can be so heard. He hoped therefore that the resolution just passed by the Assembly would facilitate informal resolution of grievances at the unit level, especially since the committee has worked actively with Unit Representatives toward this end.

b. The Statement of Fair Procedure, developed by SARC and recently reviewed by SACUA for inclusion in the Faculty Handbook, seems to be welcomed by deans and chairpersons, suggesting that administrators are now actively aware of, and concerned about, due process.

c. Among the recommendations made in matters heard by SARC, it should be noted that one case is currently in litigation, in another the dean and executive committee disagreed with the recommendation of the committee, while in a third the administration offered to negotiate but the faculty member refused. Nevertheless, Professor Bordin noted an ever increasing tendency on the part of deans and chairpersons to consult with SARC, suggesting that the committee is having an impact.

d. There is, as Professor Bordin pointed out, an orphan group whose interests deserve attention, namely, lecturers and instructors. Whereas teaching assistants, clerical workers, and Senate members all have channels through which grievances may be processed, lecturers and instructors do not. SARC is therefore studying possible remedies.

In response to questions raised by Professor Hildebrandt, Professor Bordin remarked that all but one of the schools and colleges have Unit Representatives at this time and that, while the delay in publication of the Faculty Handbook will keep the Statement of Fair Procedure out of general circulation a bit longer, copies are meanwhile being made available to members of the Assembly as well as to deans and chairpersons. Apropos of the latter, Professor Bordin agreed with a suggestion offered by Professor Carl Cohen that in instances where deans and chairpersons do not seem predisposed to accept the recommendations of SARC, they be encouraged to consult with the committee before taking final action.

As Professor Corpron understood it, SARC does not presume to substitute its judgment for that of a faculty committee; it is concerned with the process by which conclusions are reached rather than with the substance of the matter under consideration. While Professor Bordin agreed, he noted the difficulty which often occurs in separating out substantive matters as procedural adequacy is examined. Asked by Professor Taren whether an increase in the number of cases is anticipated, he suggested that such might be expected, given the fact that

more adverse decisions would probably need to be made in the academic world in the years ahead.

On behalf of the Assembly, Chairman Johnson thanked Professor Bordin and his committee for their efforts in this important area of University affairs.

NEW  
BUSINESS

There being no new business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Erasmus L. Hoch  
Secretary