

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Regular Assembly Meeting, October 15, 1973

ATTENDANCE Present: Allen, Anton, Berki, Brockway, Brown, Buning, Caldwell, Cassidy, Cohen, Colburn, Cooperrider, Danielson, Darvas, Dernberger, Evaldson, Farrand, Floyd, Gikas, Heller, Higgins, Hoffman, Hymans, Ilie, Jameson, Johnson, Kell, Kelsey, Kerr, Kish, Lagler, Larkin, Lehmann, Lloyd, Loomis, Slavens, Kline, Mohler, Ostrand, Sana, Sawyer, Sibley, Springer, Taren, Taylor, Terwilliger, Vaughn, Williams, Wilson, Goodman, Kincaid

Absent: Bishop, Cartwright, Ehrenkreutz, Adams, Lucchesi, Berkove, Creeth, Kaplan, Holbrook, Krachenberg, Lands, Nystuen, Oberman, Paul, Rowe, Schmickel, Seligson, Vander, Zweifler, Hildebrandt

Guests: Dean Donald Stokes and Professor Harold Johnson

CALL TO ORDER Chairman Goodman called the meeting to order at 3:22 p.m. in the Rackham Amphitheater.

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES The minutes of the September 17 meeting were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS Chairman Goodman had a number of announcements, as follows:

He reminded the Assembly that this meeting, like earlier ones, was being taped by WUOM for later public broadcast.

Applications for in-state residency for tuition purposes had numbered somewhat over 1600 for the current fall term. About 60 such applications were received during the summer term, about 30 of which had been approved.

In response to the questions raised at the September meeting concerning a change of wording in the charge to the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee, Chairman Goodman said that the matter was still being reviewed by the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee. The Assembly would be informed of their position on the matter as soon as it was available.

Each of the three substantive committees associated with the Office of Budgets and Planning was preparing a report describing its activities and current status, to be sent to President Fleming in his capacity as Chairman of the Steering Committee. Copies of these reports, and letters of transmittal summarizing what may be considered the next appropriate steps to be taken in each area, would be distributed to the Assembly. Chairman Goodman assumed that consideration of the reports and the proposed next steps would be the main order of business at the November meeting.

Chairman Goodman urged members of the Assembly to display more initiative in presenting items for Assembly consideration. SACUA had considered moving new business to an earlier point in the agenda to facilitate this, but had desisted, at least for the present meeting, since it would not be fair to the invited speakers. However, there would be such an item presented at this meeting, in the form of a resolution to be offered by Professor Hoffman.

The final announcement, presented with great regret, concerned the recent death of Dr. Leonard Greenbaum. At Chairman Goodman's suggestion, the Assembly rose to observe a moment of silence in memory of Dr. Greenbaum. The Chairman then announced that Professor Brymer Williams had agreed to succeed Dr. Greenbaum as chairman of the Proper Role Committee.

REPORT ON
CESF

Chairman Goodman next invited Professor Harold Johnson, the Chairman of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, to address the Assembly as called for in the agenda. While introducing Professor Johnson, Chairman Goodman remarked on the great importance of his task, which was reflected in the vast amount of time that he had been giving to it.

In opening his remarks, Professor Johnson agreed that the position was time-consuming, adding that this applied to the entire Committee. There had been numerous meetings among themselves and with the Executive Officers, and the coming Thursday they would be meeting with the Board of Regents.

Professor Johnson listed three major current projects of the Committee; developing a compensation proposal for the 1974-75 academic year, developing a proposal on early retirement, and building up a data base to permit meaningful comparisons both within the University and between this university and others.

Copies of the Committee's annual report had been distributed to the Assembly. Anyone having specific questions about it was invited to call John Forsyth, the staff assistant. The report had been timed, in accordance with instructions from the Assembly, to correspond with the beginning of the new compensation year.

The current budget included a 6% increase in average faculty compensation, 5.5% of which was in the form of salary increases and the balance in fringe benefits; 1.2% of this was achieved by cannibalization. (The 0.5% increase in fringe benefits assisted faculty members only to the extent of increased University contributions to Social Security.) No unit-by-unit analysis of these figures was possible at this time. Many factors could cause a given unit's average to be above or below the general figure. In particular (as a partial answer to Professor Darvas' question raised at the previous Assembly meeting), additional funds were being held for use by Architecture and Design to add new faculty positions, and there had been a reduction in working hours for several A & D faculty members.

Returning to the main projects listed at the start of his talk, Professor Johnson reviewed the Committee's compensation proposals. A preliminary proposal of 13.6% on June 28 had been replaced by a revised one of 16.8%. They were currently requesting ~~2%~~ for real

2.7%.

growth, 6% for restoring the University's position relative to peer institutions, 1% for merit increases, and an escalator clause to permit flexible adjustments to inflation. The preliminary figure was 7.2% for this purpose, but the proposal called for reexamining this amount next June in the light of changes in the cost of living up to that time. Professor Johnson said that the Committee's numerous meetings with the Executive Officers had been instructive and cordial. Their differences had related principally to the question of tailoring proposals to considerations of political feasibility.

With regard to early retirement, the Committee's primary motive was to expand the options open to faculty members. The Administration, on the other hand, was interested in reducing the current retirement age. CESF was about to submit a counterproposal to one in a report received by Vice President Smith from Dean Wilbur Cohen. The issues chiefly concerned alternative ways to spend money; whether to reduce the age of retirement, to liberalize the provisions for retirement furloughs, or to improve side benefits such as payments to dependents. Another issue concerned the effect upon disposable income at age 65 or retirement before that date.

In answer to a question from Professor Danielson about what was going to happen next, Professor Johnson said that the Regents would have to make a decision on the size of the request to send to Lansing. Meetings would then take place between representatives of the University and the Michigan Department of Management and Budget. Then the Governor would make his recommendations to the Legislature in December. President Fleming had said that representatives of CESF were welcome to go to Lansing with him and other Executive Officers to talk with persons from the Governor's Office and the Legislature.

Professor Hymans asked whether the Committee had chosen a specific escalator formula. Professor Johnson replied that they would do so if the principle was adopted. The June estimate of a 7.2% increase in the cost of living for the current year appeared far too conservative at this time. Therefore, regular evaluations would be necessary until the 1974-75 appropriation is finalized.

Professor Cohen said that it was important that the brunt of the change from June to September as the first month of new salary rates should be tied to one particular year. Professor Johnson replied that last year's annualization must be regarded as being paid for this year.

In answer to a question from Professor Cassidy about which fringe benefits the Committee was stressing, Professor Johnson said that they were being guided to a large extent by the results of the questionnaire they had distributed to faculty members. The most strongly favored suggestion had been fully-paid health insurance.

Professor Darvas said that he is very happy to see the escalator clause being put forward. He hoped the Legislature and Governor would see this as a real issue. Professor Johnson noted that faculty members would have been better off in the past if cost of living and merit increases had been kept separate.

Professors Dernberger and Hymans pointed out that there was some overlap between restoring the University's position relative to peer institutions and compensating for inflation, and Professor Johnson agreed. Professor Loomis said that compensating for inflation was intended to keep us where we are, while restoration of position was meant to get us back to where we were. Professor Hymans said that this line of argument assumed that our peer institutions were keeping pace with inflation.

In reply to a question from Professor Colburn, Professor Johnson said that he believed that the Committee's differences with the Administration were not over the justification of improved compensation levels, but rather over what account should be taken of political feasibility in making requests.

The discussion then moved to early retirement. Questions were asked by Professors Colburn and Caldwell, and Professor Johnson invited Dean Cohen, who was present, to make comments. Dean Cohen pointed out that the new Social Security law changed the picture considerably. Retirement was now possible at 65 or later with very little drop in disposable income. All agreed that finances should not be the only factor considered, and that possibilities for part-time teaching after retirement should be held open. Professor Johnson said that it was the position of the Committee that any change in compulsory retirement age should apply only to faculty members appointed in the future.

To a question from Professor Sana about male versus female retirement benefits, Professor Johnson replied that this sort of consideration was included in the Committee's efforts to expand the range of options available. To a question from Professor Larkin about the terminal (retirement furlough) year, he said that CESF felt that it should be retained but made more flexible.

Chairman Goodman, in closing the discussion, asked Assembly members to try to get discussions going in their own schools and colleges on these topics.

REMARKS BY
DEAN STOKES

Chairman Goodman next introduced Donald E. Stokes, Dean of the Graduate School and Chairman of the President's Committee on Fee Structure. Dean Stokes opened his remarks by saying that he had come mainly to listen, since his committee had not yet met as a group, and that any statements he might make would be rather speculative. However, he mentioned a few points that he thought were important for the Committee to consider.

First, he thought that the Committee had to assemble some basic information, both on this campus and from peer institutions.

Second, he thought it was essential to have input from various parts of the University, including the Assembly. There had to be as good an assessment of both the costs and the benefits of an education at the University as possible.

Third, it was not possible to deal properly with fees without considering at the same time fee privileges and financial aid. Likewise, other sources of University income had to be considered.

Dean Stokes closed by quoting from the Presidential charge to his Committee, which read as follows:

"I would ask this committee to review both the present University fee structure and the philosophy upon which it may be based. This may involve studies of the relationship between various sources of revenue for the University, prospects for the future, or other matters."

Professor Brockway remarked that the effect on out-of-state graduate student assistants in his department had been disastrous, with take-home pay reduced by \$1,000 in some instances. Dean Stokes replied that this judgment was premature, since differences of this sort were being made up through scholarships for the current academic year. Also, the stipend for teaching fellows would be increased by 5.5% for the winter term, and the same percentage as for faculty members next year. On the other hand, what would happen next year with regard to fee privileges was considerably more cloudy. He felt that there should be an explicit rather than implicit appropriation of funds for this purpose to individual departments. Professor Gans asked whether the allotment of funds to a given department for this purpose would depend on the proportion of teaching fellows that were from out of the state. Dean Stokes said that it was important for the faculty to make their case to the Administration in these matters. However, there were tax reasons for moving away from automatic abatement of tuition fees.

Professor Ilie pointed out that what was happening was having the effect of reducing the proportion of out-of-state graduate students. This effect was marked in Romance Languages, and by making the University less of a national institution, was threatening a decline in quality.

Dean Stokes replied that there was clearly a connection between the level of aid for teaching fellows and the quality of the teaching that was done. He added that the major cost benefit to the University of having teaching fellows doing a lot of the elementary teaching had been neglected. It was a very important by-product of having a good set of graduate students at the University.

Professor Ilie added that the quality of graduate students affected the attractiveness of the University to potential faculty members.

Professor Cohen raised the philosophical question of whether awards of scholarships to undergraduates should be purely on the basis of need, as seemed now to be the case.

Professor Colburn asked whether tuition rates should be kept steady over several years, rather than being raised each individual academic year. Responding to a question from Professor Danielson, Dean Stokes said that automatic tuition waivers for graduate assistants had not been ruled out, but were a very open question. Professor Danielson said that he would encourage the serious consideration of this possibility.

NOMINATIONS
AND
APPOINT-
MENTS

The next item on the agenda was the filling of vacancies on three committees. SACUA had submitted nominations as follows:

- (a) Board for Student Publications - 3-year term, Peter R. Klaver, Ass't. Prof. of Humanities, (succeeding Dr. Greenbaum)
- (b) SARC - 1-year term, R. Faye McCain, Professor of Nursing (replacing Prof. Ryder)
- (c) CESF - 3-year term, Dr. John H. Wiley, Professor of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, and Speech (replacing Dr. Bloom)

All the nominees were confirmed unanimously.

OLD
BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW
BUSINESS

Under the heading of New Business, the following resolution was introduced by Professor Lois Hoffman (and seconded):

RESOLUTION
PRESENTED

RESOLVED: That the Senate Assembly expresses disappointment with the University's implementation of its Affirmative Action Program for women. Data accumulated by the Affirmative Action Director indicate that there are still sizable inequalities in the salaries of men and women on the teaching faculty, under-representation of women at the higher academic ranks, and inadequate recruitment of new women faculty members. This body requests that the University administration instruct all department heads and executive committees as follows:

- (a) In the forthcoming deliberations regarding salary, promotions, and tenure, every effort should be made to rectify existing inequities between men and women.
- (b) Where additions to new faculty are needed, every effort should be made to recruit women.

Professor Hoffman said that several reports were available on this subject, the most impressive being the bulky one just released from Dr. Varner's office. All of these showed enormous differences in salary between men and women at the same academic level, and showed also that women were seriously under-represented at the higher academic levels. The data, presented department by department, could not be explained by differences in seniority between men and women. Many women who were associate professors had qualifications comparable to full professors but salaries comparable to assistant professors.

Chairman Goodman said there was time for a discussion of the proposal, but that voting on it should be left for a later meeting.

ertain In reply to a question from Professor Taren, Professor Hoffman said that ~~some~~ other universities had ~~done much better~~ than we had in the area under discussion. *shows more change*

In a response to a question from Professor Lagler, Professor Hoffman said that the report on Affirmative Action had gone to deans' offices and would go to the Regents.

Professor Cohen said that he had read the document. First, it was clear that there were inequities, and he would urge their correction. Second, inequities should not be inferred from each malproportion of numbers. Third, he was not comfortable with the notion that all other things being equal, we should prefer women to men as appointees.

Professor Hoffman replied that with regard to Professor Cohen's third point, many graduate students wanted to work with women as advisors; consequently, at least in her department, women faculty members were often seriously overworked. As for his second point, she agreed in principle, but pointed out that the report had tried to explain all mitigating circumstances in each department. In fact, she felt that the report had gone so far in this direction that it included some explanations that were rather forced.

Professor Larkin pointed out that Vice President Smith had made some money available two years previously to rectify inequalities, and that this had not been taken proper advantage of. He and others asked whether more copies of the report could be made available. Chairman Goodman said that some were available in the SACUA Office.

Chairman Goodman said that he was inviting Professor Hoffman to go to the next SACUA meeting and discuss her ideas further.

Professor Kish, with a second from Professor Sawyer, moved to postpone further consideration of the resolution until the next meeting. The motion passed on a voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

The Assembly adjourned at 5:14 p.m.

Wilfred M. Kincaid
Secretary