

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Regular Assembly Meeting, September 25, 1972

ATTENDANCE

Present: Allen, Anton, Asgar, Birch, Bowditch, Brockway, Buning, Caldwell, Cartwright, Cassidy, Cohen, Cooperrider, Crawford, Danielson, Darvas, Ehrenkreutz, Evaldson, Fader, Farrand, Floyd, Franken, Goodman, Graebel, Krachenberg, Higgins, Taylor, Hymans, Creeth, Jameson, Jensen, Kerr, Lands, Lloyd, Loomis, Magee, Marshall, Meyer, Nelson, Nystuen, Oberman, Ostrand, Overseth, Ice, Rowe, Ryder, Sana, Sawyer, Deskins, Sears, Simpson, Vander, Vaughn, Colburn, Goldstein, Wilkes, Williams, Zweifler, Mohler, Hinerman, Kincaid, Hildebrandt

Absent: Rutledge, Cornish, Scholl, Hertzler, Weber, Larkin, Preston, DeKornfeld

Guests: A. Geoffrey Norman,  
Chairmen, Academic Affairs Advisory Committee, Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, and Rights and Responsibilities of the Faculty Committee

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Hinerman called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m. There were no corrections to the minutes of the June 19 meeting.

INTRODUCTION OF PARLIAMENTARIAN

Chairman Hinerman introduced Professor Herbert Hildebrandt, former member of the Assembly, and chairman of the Bylaws Committee, who had agreed to serve as Parliamentarian.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Hinerman urged attendance at the State of the University Address and the following reception in the League Ballroom to be held that evening.

Chairman Hinerman said that the Secretary is preparing reports of SACUA meetings, which would be made available to members of the Assembly. Accordingly, it would no longer be necessary for SACUA activities to be reported specifically at Assembly meetings. Persons wishing copies could call Mrs. Janice Downs, 4-0303. In response to a question by Professor Cohen, Chairman Hinerman said that Assembly members would have the opportunity to ask questions about these reports during each Assembly meeting.

REPORT OF SACUA ACTIVITIES

Professor Anton delivered the SACUA report as follows:

Since the last Assembly meeting, SACUA met on June 22, July 10, 17, and 19, on August 14, and on September 11, 18, and 25. In addition, SACUA met with President Fleming on June 20 and September 18.

Issues stemming from the Rights and Responsibilities Report and the proposed expanded role for the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty were discussed at almost every meeting. Professor Goodman will treat this topic in greater detail later in the agenda. One meeting was devoted to the demand for information on individual faculty salaries made by the Michigan Daily. The proposed University Budget was discussed a number of times, and a statement was issued a few days ago. An inquiry from SGC on student participation in considering stock handling policies was received and discussed. In addition, there was the usual need for filling committee vacancies and for setting the Assembly agenda.

Topics discussed in the meetings with Mr. Fleming included the University Budget, the divestiture of Willow Run Laboratories, the Opportunity Program, the University Council, appointments to the Board in Control of Intercollegiate Athletics, and a suit being brought against the University concerning out-of-state tuition.

REMARKS BY  
A. GEOFFREY  
NORMAN,  
FORMER VICE-  
PRESIDENT  
FOR RESEARCH

The chairman now asked Dr. A. Geoffrey Norman, until recently the Vice-President for Research, and now the Director of the Institute for Environmental Quality, to come forward and address the Assembly.

Dr. Norman began by remarking that he was happy to be able to make his comments in an atmosphere free of tension. He was going to leave classified research aside and speak of the broad picture of research at the University.

Its breadth, diversity, and magnitude of research programs had brought the University to a high place relative to other institutions. In dollar volume, admittedly a fallible measure, we had consistently been in second or third place, competing with MIT and Harvard, with the next few places usually occupied by Stanford, UCLA, Wisconsin, and Illinois. Of this money 70% came from federal sources, which was lower than at many other institutions.

After the severe difficulties, and indeed anguish, of the last few years, Dr. Norman was able to strike an optimistic note, pointing to the increase of 4 million dollars ~~in~~ in 1971-72 over the previous year as a clear indication of a turn-around in the situation. This was the largest increase in several years, and was now being analyzed to see whether it stemmed from larger awards, more projects, or greater success with renewals.

Certain trends were becoming apparent. First, federal agencies were becoming more directive than in the past. Program officers were becoming program managers; and contracts with very specific work statements were taking the place of broadly-drawn grants. Old line agencies such as the National Institutes of Health, the Office of Education, and the Department of Labor were leading the trend.

Second, there was an increasing emphasis on the application of research to real or inferred present-day problems. This was healthy up to a point, but could easily be overdone and lead to a neglect of basic science.

Finally, there was a trend towards larger awards of a quasi-institutional type. The Sea Grant Programs was one of the larger examples. The desire of the NIH to concentrate research on certain diseases pointed in the same direction. Moreover the larger awards were associated with higher requirements for accountability.

Dr. Norman then turned to the internal scene. He pointed out that if there was a new upsurge in research, the situation would differ from the sixties, when the whole University was growing at the same time. In the future, the University as a whole was likely to remain about the same size. If the faculty was not enlarged, it would be necessary to work with those now on the scene; this would mean more dual appointments,

for example. This approach would create some problems for faculty members, who might like to feel that their salaries were ensured from general funds. But larger research units would carry increased funding stability, while at the same time increases in legislative appropriations were becoming harder to achieve. Departments would have to concern themselves with organized research activities to a greater extent than in the past. Much past planning had not been optimal; research was now becoming too important to be wholly laissez-faire. The high degree of meshing with graduate instruction and professional training called for more realistic policies related to the nature and extent of research.

Dr. Norman closed with a quotation from Francis Bacon --"Lastly, I would address one general admonition to all: That they consider what are the true ends of knowledge, and that they seek it not for pleasure of mind, or for contention, or for superiority to others, or for profit, or fame, or power, or any of these inferior things, but for the benefit and use of life, and that they perfect and govern it in charity".

Chairman Hinerman thanked Dr. Norman for addressing the Assembly and for his timely message.

Chairman Hinerman then turned to the alternative proposal for Section A of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities report, which was the next item on the agenda. He asked Professor Goodman to bring the Assembly up-to-date on this matter.

After reviewing the history of the proposal up to the last Assembly meeting (which is described in Assembly minutes for the June and earlier meetings), Professor Goodman said that SACUA had decided against sending out a mail ballot as suggested in the June Assembly meeting, since both the procedure and the authorization for it were dubious. The proposal on which the Assembly was being asked to take action had been turned over to the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, and he hoped for a reaction from that committee at this time.

Chairman Hinerman invited Professor Pilcher, chairman of CESF, to comment on the proposal.

Professor Pilcher said that the Committee was not able to take much action during the summer, since the proposal was forwarded to them in July just before people left for summer activities, and in any case it was hard to operate on the basis of a document that had not yet been formally approved. Moreover, six out of the ten members of the Committee had just been appointed. However, a subcommittee had looked at the proposal, and they hoped it would be approved. Professor Pilcher felt that the new document was clearer than the previous one. It gave the faculty a voice without creating a union and establishing full collective bargaining. He wished he could say more, but there had not been sufficient time for consideration.

Professor Wilkes asked whether the Committee could fulfill the charges given to it in the proposal. Professor Pilcher replied that with a full-time staff member added, the Committee should be able to accomplish more than in the past.

Professor Wilkes asked for more specific information about staffing. Vice-President Allan Smith, who was present, said that one professional

ALTERNATIVE  
PROPOSAL,  
PART A,  
RIGHTS AND  
RESPONSIBILITIES REPORT

position had been built into the budget. The sum allotted was \$14,000, but the qualifications for the position and the duties associated with it had not been fully spelled out.

Professor Cohen asked whether the motion was a substitute for Pages viii and ix in the Rights and Responsibilities report. Professor Goodman said that some parts of the proposal were taken from the Rights and Responsibilities report and some from the Academic Affairs Committee report. [The parliamentarian pointed out subsequently that the proposal represented a replacement for both the cited portion of the Rights and Responsibilities report and for the statement in the February 1971 "Senate Assembly Committee Organization and Procedures" describing the duties of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty.]

Chairman Hinerman invited comments from Professors Reed and Eggertsen, of the Rights and Responsibilities Committee, and from Mrs. Dunlap, chairman of the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee. All of them said that they were well-satisfied with the compromise that had been reached, and urged its prompt adoption by the Assembly.

Professor Nelson asked whether some of the phrasing of the proposal did not imply adversary relationships, which Mrs. Dunlap had indicated were being avoided, and also asked whether the call for prompt action was the result of an increased threat of union activity. Professor Pilcher said that adversary relationships were possible but not probable, depending upon the tone of the discussions. Professor Eggertsen acknowledged Professor Nelson's point about unions.

Professor Cohen said that he was unhappy at the excision of "consultative negotiations" from the proposal. He felt that unless the CESF acted like a negotiating team, the step taken would not be large enough to head off collective bargaining.

Professor Goodman replied that the removal of these words was a result of the conversation with Professor Edwards. There was a risk that a charge of company unionism might be brought, and SACUA learned that they had better not risk losing everything by using the wrong words.

Professor Darvas tried to pursue the question of what would happen if the Committee's salary recommendations were turned down. In the following discussion, it was brought out that the situation was a complex one, since the Administration, the Regents, the Governor, and the Legislature were all involved. Chairman Hinerman pointed out that under the new proposal, the Committee's report would be available at an earlier date than heretofore, that there would be time for meaningful faculty discussion before the budget was due in the Governor's office.

Professor Cassidy asked for more information from SACUA on the legal problems that had been referred to. Professor Franken replied, pointing out that a detailed answer could be found in his memorandum, which had been distributed. However, the principal point was that domination or assistance of a labor organization by an employer is barred under the relevant State statute. In a recent tenure case at MSU, the plaintiff charged that a departmental executive committee constituted a labor organization. In denying this claim, the Court made a distinction between long-established University bodies and novel constructs. Since CESF had been a duly-constituted faculty body for many years, the course taken seemed to be the safest one. The issue was important, since an adverse

ruling would not merely put matters back where they were, but might severely restrain the Assembly's future activities.

A question was asked whether all campuses of the University were included in the scope of the proposal being discussed. Vice-President Smith gave it as his opinion that only the Ann Arbor campus should be included at present.

Professor Caldwell asked if there would be an objection if the Flint campus wanted to be included, saying that he thought that would be their desire. Professor Cohen said that since the Flint and Dearborn campuses were represented here, they should be included if they wanted to be, and asked the chairman to rule on the question. Chairman Hinerman complied, ruling that the proposal was to be considered as embracing all campuses of the University.

APPROVAL OF  
THE PROPOSAL

There being no further discussion, Chairman Hinerman called for a vote. The proposal was passed by 45 votes in favor to 6 opposed. (The complete text of the proposal is attached.)

NOMINATIONS  
AND APPOINT-  
MENTS

Saying that he hoped to achieve adjournment by 5:00 p.m. in view of the President's address and reception scheduled for the evening, Chairman Hinerman proposed to change the order of business and take up nominations and appointments immediately. There were no objections.

Professor Colburn, seconded by Professor Kerr, moved to consider the entire slate of nominations at once. Professors Cohen and Franken objected to this procedure, however, and the motion was defeated.

For each of the seven posts to be filled there were no additional nominations, and acceptance of SACUA's nominees was moved, supported, and passed in turn.

PART C,  
FACULTY  
RIGHTS AND  
RESPONSIBIL-  
ITIES REPORT

Chairman Hinerman then turned to Part C of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities report. He pointed out that this portion of the report, as written, did not specify definite actions to be taken. Accordingly, SACUA had concluded that it should revise the language in concert with the Rights and Responsibilities committee, and present the result to the next Assembly meeting. At present, SACUA felt that an informal discussion of Part C would be worthwhile, and would serve as a partial guide to the drafting operation. Accordingly, Chairman Hinerman asked for the Assembly's reactions.

In response to a question by Professor Colburn, Chairman Hinerman said that Part C, like the rest of the report, was prepared by the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee; Part B, by vote of the Assembly, had been tabled until next March, allowing for gaining experience in the operation of the new planning and budgeting committees.

In reference to Paragraph 1, Part C, Professor Wilkes said that he saw nothing wrong with the present method of selecting Assembly representatives in the Engineering College. Junior faculty members acquired five or six years experience before they could be effective Assembly members, by which time they were likely to have acquired tenure.

Professor Fader said that he was dubious about the marshal system suggested in Paragraph 4 for handling crisis situations. He had seen it tried elsewhere with disastrous results in one instance. Chairman Hinerman

replied that at present the University Council was charged with dealing with such problems, and said that he didn't know whether the Assembly wanted to stay with this arrangement.

Professor Jensen asked whether the study suggested in Paragraph 2b was not part of the function of CESF.

Chairman Hinerman said that in connection with Paragraph 3, Professor Dallas Young, from Case Western Reserve University, was here on a sabbatical doing research on faculty collective bargaining. He had promised to furnish a copy of his report when it was completed.

Professor ~~Hinerman~~<sup>Hyman</sup> said that while he approved the principle of Paragraph 3, he urged the removal of the words "and Collective Bargaining" from the title of the proposed research center.

Professor Zweifler asked what the methods of selecting Assembly members were in the separate schools. Chairman Hinerman replied that, as far as he knew, all the schools held elections for Assembly members, and he did not know of any quota systems to insure the election of non-tenured members. Professor Jensen asked whether there were any non-tenured members in the Assembly. Professor Taylor replied that he was elected in that status, but was now tenured. Professor Asgar said that it would be very awkward for small colleges to impose any kind of quota.

Professor Reed, speaking for the committee, said that portion of the report was prepared rather hurriedly. The committee agreed that the present situation left something to be desired with regard to participation of non-tenured faculty. Their idea was to ask the Assembly to take a serious look at the current procedures; no specific alternatives were being proposed. Professor Crawford agreed with Professor Reed's remarks.

Professor Cohen said he would like more study of what should be done in crisis situations. He pointed out that there were faculty present who had had experiences with such situations at other universities.

Since the time was growing late, Chairman Hinerman asked that further discussion should be delayed until the next meeting, and asked that further suggestions should be communicated to SACUA in writing.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS

Under the heading of new business, Professor Ehrenkreutz reminded the group that he had spoken earlier about plans to celebrate the 500th anniversary of Copernicus' birth. He announced that money had been provided by the National Science Foundation to set up a symposium that would be held here next April.

Professor Crawford said that he was glad to notice the good turnout of members at this meeting, and thought that this boded well for the future.

Vice-President Smith said that he wanted to express his appreciation for the work that the Assembly had done in passing the proposal before it. He felt that a very useful structure had been created, and he wanted to express his thanks.

Professor Oberman expressed concern about the morale problem created by the late distribution of appointments.

ADJOURNMENT

The Assembly adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Wilfred M. Kincaid