

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Regular Assembly Meeting, October 16, 1972

ATTENDANCE

Present: Allen, Anton, Asgar, Birch, Bowditch, Buning, Caldwell, Cartwright, Cassidy, Cohen, Cooperrider, Crawford, Danielson, Ehrenkreutz, Evaldson, Farrand, Goodman, Graebel, Higgins, Taylor, Hymans, Creeth, Jameson, Jensen, Kerr, Weber, Oxender, Larkin, Lloyd, Loomis, Magee, Griffin, Meyer, Nelson, Ostrand, Overseth, Ice, Sana, Sawyer, Sears, Vaughn, Colburn, Goldstein, Zweifler, Mohler, Hinerman, Kincaid, Hildebrandt

Absent: Rutledge, Brockway, Cornish, Darvas, DeKornfeld, Fader, Floyd, Franken, Krachenberg, Scholl, Hertzler, Nystuen, Oberman, Preston, Rowe, Ryder, Deskins, Simpson, Vander, Wilkes, Williams

Guests: John Romani, Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs
Thomas Gies, Chairman, Communications Review Committee
Chairmen: University Relations Committee,
Academic Affairs Advisory Committee
Members, Rights and Responsibilities Committee

CALL TO
ORDER

Chairman Hinerman called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m.

CONSIDER-
ATION OF
MINUTES

The minutes of the September 25 meeting were accepted with the following corrections. On page 2, paragraph 5, line 3: change "a million dollars a year" to "\$4 million dollars". In paragraph 7, same page, "Sea Grant Institute" should read "Sea Grant Program". On page 6, third full paragraph, change "Professor Hinerman" to "Professor Hymans".

ANNOUNCE-
MENTS

Chairman Hinerman had a number of announcements.

1. When Willow Run Laboratories severed its connection with the University in August, the Classified Research Committee had no further function to perform. Accordingly, SACUA had disbanded the Committee, and sent a letter of appreciation to each of its members. (This announcement was inadvertently omitted at the September meeting.)
2. As a result of the approaching retirement of Dr. Clyde Vroman, the Director of Admissions, a search committee had been formed to fill the vacancy. Names of possible candidates were welcome.
3. The University Relations Committee had produced a film "Michigan to Michigan", depicting the benefits brought to the State by the University. The Chairman had seen it, and strongly recommended it for showing to appropriate groups.
4. At the last meeting, it had been announced that SACUA minutes would be available to anyone who wanted them; however, only four requests had been received to date. Professor Higgins asked whether it would not be more convenient to send them out with the Assembly notices. The chairman asked for a show of hands, and almost all present indicated that they would like this arrangement. Chairman Hinerman agreed to follow this mandate.
5. The current Chemistry Department problem had been discussed at three SACUA meetings during the preceding week. They had tried to keep

informed of developments, but had avoided making statements that would interfere with due process. Chairman Hinerman invited anyone who wanted to discuss the matter to bring it up under new business, at the close of the meeting.

REMARKS BY
MR. ROMANI

Chairman Hinerman then introduced Mr. John Romani, Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs, who had been invited to address the Assembly.

Mr. Romani began by describing some of the assignments he had undertaken since assuming his present post. One of these was on a special ad hoc task force on health services administration and the educational program to deal with this within the institution. Another dealt with the educational activities of the School of Nursing, and included a search, not yet successful, for a successor to Dean Rhoda Russell.

After Dean Spurr left in July 1971, a cluster of activities that had been under his jurisdiction were returned to the Office of Academic Affairs. These included the Office of Admissions, the Office of Financial Aids, Registration and Records, Evaluation and Examination, Orientation, Scheduling, the Opportunity Program, and the Tuskegee Exchange Program. Last July Mr. Romani had assumed responsibility for these programs. Some of these were under the immediate supervision of Mr. Zimmermann; Mr. Romani was most directly involved with Financial Aids and the Opportunity Program.

Mr. Romani was also involved in international programs, primarily with those supported by institutional grants (essentially from the Ford Foundation); other sources of support would soon be needed as these grants expired. Finally, he was a member of the General Committee of the Division of Health Sciences.

Next he tried to look ahead toward some challenges that would face the Opportunity Program. First, it was necessary to ensure that the data on which needs were projected was as accurate as possible. Second, it appeared that the present (1972-73) \$6.7 million of general funds spent for financial aid (about 50% for the Opportunity Program) would have to be increased by \$3.5 to \$3.8 million if commitments were to be met, while the Legislature had furnished for 1972-73 only \$152,000 additional specifically for student financial aid.

Even more of a problem than the need for direct financial aid was the furnishing of supportive services that would enable students from different kinds of social backgrounds to compete and function effectively as members of the University Community. One of his problems was that he was not really sure how much we were spending for this, not only in the Opportunity Program but in terms of counselling, housing, etc. throughout the institution. There was a feeling, however, that we were not doing enough. A central role in making the necessary decisions was being played by the Office of Special Academic Projects, which was created some years ago, and has had the management responsibility for the Opportunity Program. The structure of that office and its interaction with others was currently being studied.

One of Mr. Romani's first acts had been to ask for some faculty assistance. He was happy to report that Mrs. Dunlap had recruited three

faculty members - Professor Weeks, Professor Maddox, and Professor Tropman - to sit with him as an advisory group. The Student Government Council had promised to send three students on the same basis.

Mr. Romani closed by saying that he had no dramatic solutions to announce, but that he hoped that by a year from now we would have a better handle on the issues and problems presented by the academic services at the University.

At the conclusion of his talk, Mr. Romani remained to answer questions.

Professor Anton asked whether departments whose student enrollment had increased would get additional financial help next year. Mr. Romani said that the answer was yes, but he didn't know how much. Units needing major increments posed a difficulty.

Professor Colburn said that his department had had its term III-A budget cut, although he had had good spring enrollments in the past. Mr. Romani expressed concern, and said that the issue should be drawn to the attention of the Advisory Committee for Academic Affairs.

Professor Mohler asked about some difficulties that had arisen in connection with student aid in the Music School. Mr. Romani replied that conflicts had arisen because there were three separate programs that supported students. For a student to receive money under any of them, a need analysis was required. Any student employment, such as a teaching fellowship, was considered to be financial aid. The problem was troublesome, and raised some serious issues.

Chairman Hinerman next introduced Professor Thomas Gies, the chairman of the Communications Review Committee.

REMARKS BY
PROFESSOR
GIES

Professor Gies began by saying that he had been on the Broadcasting Committee for some time. Because concerns were expressed that recent advances in audio-visual techniques seemed to pass the University by, President Fleming asked for a general survey of the state of communications. President Fleming set up a nine member Communications Review Committee to do this, which was now meeting once a week.

One task of the Committee was to review the hardware and software that was currently available for audio-visual presentations. A number of firms had developed equipment that was now coming on the market. Some units of the University had facilities that were not generally known. Another purpose of the Committee was to stimulate the thinking of faculty members in this direction. Finally, the Committee was concerned with administrative structures that would be called for in making effective use of the new techniques. He recognized that this ran counter to the tradition of decentralized administration on the campus.

Professor Gies closed by introducing Mr. Robert Sauve, and saying that he was the person to get in touch with if faculty members had any ideas in this area.

UNIVERSITY
RELATIONS
COMMITTEE
RESOLUTION

The next order of business was a resolution of the University Relations Committee, proposing that its membership should be increased by one faculty member. Chairman Hinerman announced that Professor Reiff, the chairman of the Committee, was present to speak on the issue.

Professor Reiff said that the Committee had been handicapped by rather sporadic meetings. Also, there was only one woman on the Committee, and considering the nature of the Committee's business, it was important to have a good representation of women. Accordingly, they were asking for an additional committee position, which would be filled by a woman. In answer to a question by Professor Zweifler, Professor Reiff indicated that the sexual composition of the Committee should not be specified in the legislation.

The resolution was passed with one dissenting vote.

ACADEMIC
AFFAIRS
COMMITTEE
RESOLUTION

The next item on the agenda was a resolution from the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee, proposing that its student membership should be reduced from five to two, one graduate student and one undergraduate.

Chairman Hinerman invited Mrs. Connie Dunlap, the chairman of the Committee, to comment upon the resolution.

Mrs. Dunlap said that while the resolution came from her committee, she was not necessarily completely in favor of it herself. She said that several faculty members of the Committee felt that they could not express themselves freely before the student members, fearing that anything that was said might appear in the Michigan Daily. Also there would be a space problem in the meeting room if all the student members showed up. In fact, student members were often absent and committee time was wasted bringing them up-to-date. When present, the students tended to impede the business of the Committee by talking among themselves, passing notes, and in general not attending to business. It was felt that two student members who took the committee business seriously would be more effective than five that did not. In answer to a question, she said that there were presently ten faculty members in addition to the five student members.

There was considerable discussion on the motion; besides Mrs. Dunlap, Professors Magee, Anton, Oxender, Hymans, Jensen, Nelson, Loomis, and Cohen spoke. Most of the remarks were opposed to the motion, with only Professor Cohen and Mrs. Dunlap speaking in favor. In answer to a question about opinions within the Committee, Mrs. Dunlap said that two faculty members wanted to retain the present student membership, while the others wanted it reduced. She said, however, that the discussion had taken place a year ago, and that the question had not been brought before the current membership of the Committee. With regard to the question of disclosure, she said that many discussions were of a very preliminary nature, and that reporting proposals that never got beyond the talking stage could be seriously upsetting to many students. Others held that merely reducing the number of students would not solve this problem, that students had served satisfactorily on other committees, and that there should be a clear understanding about confidentiality of discussions. Professor Cohen, on the other hand, expressed some doubt about the adequacy of student representation under the current system, remarking that SGC seemed to appoint only students having a certain point of view.

The motion was brought to a vote, and defeated by a clear majority.

R & R REPORT
PART C

The next order of business was Part C of the report of the ad hoc Committee on the Rights and Responsibilities of the Faculty. A rewritten version of Part C, more suitable for parliamentary action, had been prepared by SACUA and distributed to the Assembly with the call to the meeting.

Chairman Hinerman suggested, without objection, that the five paragraphs of the revised version should be taken up separately. After a brief discussion, the Parliamentarian said that each paragraph could be considered as an amendment to Part C of the original report.

Opening the discussion of Paragraph 1, Professor Cooperrider said that it contained a dubious factual assertion, and failed to separate the question of representation on the Assembly itself from that of membership on committees. Accordingly, with a second by Professor Cohen, he moved to substitute the following statement:

"SACUA should consider whether current patterns of Assembly membership are adequately representative of the membership of the Senate, and in the light of its conclusions in that regard, whether the adoption of general standards governing the procedures by which the various schools and colleges select their Assembly representatives should be proposed.

"SACUA should keep its procedures for nomination of members to Assembly committees under continuing study to assure that those committees are adequately representative of the Senate membership."

After a brief discussion, the amendment was passed by a voice vote.

In discussing Paragraph 2, Professor Zweifler asked whether it added anything to the duties of CESF already defined. Professor Crawford pointed out that research was not mentioned in Part A.

Paragraph 2 passed by a voice vote.

In introducing Paragraph 3, Chairman Hinerman said that studies of the sort mentioned were already going on. In a brief discussion, engaged in by Professors Colburn, Anton, Reed, Crawford, and Cassidy, it was brought out that only foundation-funded research was envisaged. Professor Reed defended the words "collective bargaining" in the title, saying that this was the most prominent issue in University governance today. The paragraph passed on a voice vote.

Paragraph 4 was next taken up. There was considerable discussion about the desirability of the marshal system and about the appropriateness of the term itself. Professor Crawford recalled past instances in which the presence of faculty members had served to cool down tense situations. Professor Cooperrider, with a second by Professor Nelson, moved to amend the last sentence to read "furthermore, the University Council is hereby asked to consider whether a marshal system should be established to respond to any major campus disturbances that may arise". Professor Crawford, with a second from Professor Loomis, moved an amendment to the amendment to replace the word "marshal" with the words "faculty monitor".

The amendment to the amendment was passed, and then the amendment was passed.

Professor Hymans then said that the meaning of the first part of Paragraph 4 was not clear. He moved to insert after the word "participation"

the words "in the handling of such situations"; his motion was seconded by Professor Anton. In the subsequent discussion, it was brought out that the faculty participation was in no way to be limited to physical confrontation; there would ordinarily be a wide range of decisions made before this point was reached.

The amendment was passed with one dissenting vote; Paragraph 4 was then passed.

Paragraph 5 engendered no discussion, and was carried unanimously. The text of Part C, as amended, follows:

C. SENATE ASSEMBLY PROCEDURES

1. Patterns of Representation

(a) SACUA should consider whether current patterns of Assembly membership are adequately representative of the membership of the Senate, and in the light of its conclusions in that regard, whether the adoption of general standards governing the procedures by which the various schools and colleges select their Assembly representatives should be proposed.

(b) SACUA should keep its procedures for nomination of members to Assembly committees under continuing study to assure that those committees are adequately representative of the Senate membership.

2. Continuing Study

The administration of the University is hereby asked to support the research function of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty by funding a continuing program of study by designated faculty and supportive personnel to ascertain the attitudes of the University community on issues affecting academic work.

3. Research Center on Faculty Governance and Collective Bargaining

Senate Assembly supports the establishment of a foundation-funded Research Center on Faculty Governance and Collective Bargaining, either at the University of Michigan or elsewhere.

4. Handling Crisis Situations

SACUA is instructed to review the procedures currently being followed in the handling of crisis situations within the University, and to ascertain that appropriate and effective faculty participation in the handling of such situations is stipulated. If changes must be made to meet this assurance, SACUA should prepare the appropriate recommendations for Assembly action.

(continuing with No. 4, Handling Crisis Situations)

Furthermore, the University Council is hereby asked to consider whether a faculty monitor system should be established to respond to any major campus disturbances that may arise.

5. Information and Communication

SACUA should establish a regular procedure, not only through the University Record but by other means as well, to assure (a) greater knowledge of its committees' work among the faculty, (b) a greater ease of access to them by faculty, (c) a more effective discussion within the University community of issues raised in their reports, (d) a more thorough monitoring and following through of programs proposed or instituted by Senate Assembly, and (e) the establishment of several resource stations within the University library system where faculty and others can expect to find up-to-date documentation on issues being considered by Senate Assembly and its committees.

R & R REPORT
PART D

Part D of the Rights and Responsibilities Report was taken up next. Chairman Hinerman said that the Senate Advisory Review Committee was still working in this area, that he would like to ask them to combine their recommendations with Part D, and that the Assembly should vote on both sets of recommendations. Although Professors Kerr and Crawford felt that consideration of Part D should be postponed until SARC was heard from, Professor Loomis moved to approve Section D as it stood, with the thought that the SARC report could be received later. His motion was seconded and passed by the Assembly.

The text of Part D follows:

D. GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

Several inadequacies still inhere in the grievance procedures, requiring at least the following steps toward remedy:

1. Overcoming Reluctance to Use the Present Process

First, potential exposure to ill will and subtle sanctions at the early stages will discourage faculty from entering the grievance process. This situation should be carefully and sensitively studied by the Senate Advisory Review Committee and a report made to Senate Assembly at the earliest opportunity.

2. Opportunities for Confidential Counsel

Opportunities to find out one's relative status, to explore a range of possible actions, or to get informal settlement in a strictly confidential setting are still lacking. In the spring of 1971 the Commission on Women and the Faculty Reform Coalition's Task Force on Women in the University both recommended confidential advocacy procedures for that group; with legal services available to offer advice and consultation to the Commission, and

(continuing with No. 2, Opportunities for Confidential Counsel)

with grievance procedures revised to assure due process for all faculty. Some such further provision for all faculty, combining the virtues of the union steward, the legal advocate, and the ombudsman, should be considered by the Senate Advisory Review Committee and recommendations made for action by Senate Assembly within the academic year 1971-72.

3. Dealing with Inequities between Units, Schools, and Colleges

Finally, the limited jurisdictional scope thus far allowed indicates the need for ways to deal with inequities between the various units, schools, and colleges and to handle problems that arise for staff not members of the Faculty Senate. Senate Assembly should charge an appropriate committee with the task of considering this need and of reporting suitable remedies.

Professor Cohen remarked that the report received from SARC implied that only procedural matters would be considered, whereas the resolution just passed implied that they should also consider substantive issues. Chairman Hinerman asked whether a letter to SARC pointing this out would be acceptable, and Professor Cohen agreed.

NOMINATIONS
AND
PROCEDURES

Two sets of nominations were to be considered. The first of these was the nomination of Professor Dorothea E. Wyatt, to the newly-created seat on the University Relations Committee. The nomination was approved unanimously.

The second set of nominations was to the faculty panel for the University Court of Appeals. These nominations were submitted by the Interviewing Board for the University Court of Appeals, and were as follows:

Robert M. Caddell, Professor, Mechanical Engineering
Halvor N. Christensen, Professor, Biological Chemistry
Gunter Dufey, Assistant Professor, Business Administration
Harvey W. Graves, Jr. Lecturer, Nuclear Engineering
Marie D. Hartwig, Professor, Physical Education
Frank M. Koen, Associate Professor, Psychology

Professor Abrams, a member of the Interviewing Board, was present and described their procedure. They began by generating a panel of 50 volunteers. Of these, 30 were selected at random and interviewed. From these, the final panel of six was selected. In answer to a question, he said that the student panel had not yet been selected, but would come before them when it was.

The nominees were approved unanimously.

OLD
BUSINESS

There was no old business, except for one of the corrections to the minutes mentioned above.

NEW
BUSINESS

Under new business, Professor Anton made some remarks about SACUA's role in the Chemistry Department case during the preceding week. There had been two main issues. The first of these concerned academic freedom,

that is, the merits of the case itself. Since the case was in the hands of another group, SACUA could play no immediate role in this regard.

The second issue was that of due process. A similar case involving a tenured faculty member would not have been treated in the same way, and would have had to be brought before SACUA. This dichotomy was created by the Regental Bylaws, and Professor Anton could see no sound basis for it. He had worked out a proposal to remedy the situation, copies of which he passed out at this point (one is attached to these minutes). He realized that it was not a perfect proposal, but he urged everyone to think about the issue with the hope of finding a solution.

Professor Hymans asked whether abrupt removal from teaching was precluded for a tenured faculty member by the Regents' bylaws. Professor Anton replied that this could be done only by the President of the University under emergency conditions. Professor Caldwell expressed concern that Professor Anton's proposal would make it more difficult to give terminal appointments to non-tenured faculty, saying that there was already an increasing tendency to make the continuance of appointments automatic. Professor Anton said that he had no intention of changing the system in this regard, and that this was one reason why his proposal would require some reworking. He added that it would be useful if a non-tenured faculty member could be involved in the discussion of the issue.

Professor Cohen said that he agreed with Professor Anton's objective, but that it was necessary to make the distinction between dismissal and demotion on the one hand, and terminal appointment on the other. Professor Anton agreed, and invited everyone's help, pointing out that there might well be a better solution than his, and that a long process of consideration lay ahead if the Assembly passed a proposal.

Professor Larkin said that he liked Professor Anton's idea. He said that the Administration had pushed the various units of the University to develop their own systems for handling such problems, and that most had done a poor job. He thought that due process should start within each department.

ADJOURNMENT

The Assembly adjourned at 5:43 p.m.

Wilfred M. Kincaid
Secretary