

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

· SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting of 16 October 1989

ATTENDANCE

Present: Blane, Bord, Bornstein, Brooks, Burdi, Cameron, Chesler, Gidley, Chudacoff, Croxton, Davis, Diana, Didier, Dobbins, Drabenstott, Duell, Eggertsen, Foss, Floyd, Goepfinger, Greenwood, Grosse, Gull, Hollingsworth, Jensen, Jones, Ketefian, Kimeldorf, Lenaghan, Levy, M. Lomax, R. Lomax, Marcelo, McDonald, McLaughlin, Mignolo, Mosher, Penchansky, Radine, Rosenthal, Ross, Russell, P. Smith, L. Tentler, T. Tentler, Turner, Veroff, Warner, Whitehouse, Winn, Woods, Wroblewski, Wulff.

Absent: Baird, Birdsall, Borders, Connelly, Davies, Dirks, Dressman, Friedman, Gilgenbach, Harrison, Hinton, Jenkins, Kelsey, McLeod, Meyerhoff, Miller, Morely, Morris, Owens, Mosberg, Papalambros, Potter, Seligman, Senkevitch, G. Smith.

MINUTES

The minutes of 18 September were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. At the invitation of Professor Ness, Professor Kaplan called attention to the announcement of the showing of the documentary videotape "Keeping in Mind" concerning the McCarthy era at the University, scheduled for 7 and 9 p.m. on 23 October. It is co-sponsored by the Department of English and the U-M Chapter of AAUP.

2. The questionnaires on grievance policies that were distributed with the minutes should be filled out and handed in at the meeting.

PROPOSED ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY RELATIONS

Inserting a new item into the agenda, Professor Ness presented for approval SACUA's proposal to create an Advisory Committee on University Relations. Its role would be to advise and consult with the Executive Director of

University Relations.

Winn moved (seconded) that the proposal be approved. The motion carried.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

The following list of nominees for the Advisory Committee on University Relations was presented for approval:

Peggie Hollingsworth (SACUA liaison)
Edward Gramlich (Board for Student Publications liaison)
Charles Eisendrath, Communication, LS&A for a 3-year term
James C. Snyder, Architecture and Urban Planning, for a 3-year term
Daniel Moerman, Anthropology, UM-Dearborn, for a 3-year term
Fatma Muge Gocek, Sociology, LS&A, for a 2-year term
Melvin Manis, Psychology, LS&A, for a 2-year term
Daniel Chiego, Dentistry, for a 1-year term
Bobbi Low, School of Natural Resources, for a 1-year term

Penchansky moved (seconded) that the list be approved. The motion carried.

The following list of nominees for the Committee for a Multicultural University was presented for approval:

Kate Warner (SACUA liaison)
Beth Reed, Social Work, for a 3-year term
Eddie Boyd, Pharmacy, for a 3-year term
Ann Larimore, Residential College, for a 3-year term
William Alexander, English, LS&A, for a 2-year term
Harriet Wall, Psychology, UM-Flint, for a 2-year term
Barbara Anderson, Sociology, LS&A, for a 1-year term
Karl L. Hutterer, Anthropology, LS&A, for a 1-year term

The UM-Flint nomination had arrived after the distributed list was printed; there was no nominee from UM-Dearborn as yet.

Burdi: Is there not an imbalance toward LS&A?

Ness: The problem has been getting consent to serve. A strong attempt was made to include all professional schools.

Winn: What were the reasons for rejection? Many may feel the President's office makes policy in this area, and a faculty committee may not have a meaningful role.

Ness: Another reason may be that this is perceived as a "hot" area.

Laina Savory: One reason was that women and minorities were sought, and they tend to be already too much in demand.

Ness: An attempt will be made to find additional members.

Burdi moved (seconded) that the list be approved. The motion carried.

COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE FACULTY (CESF)

In the temporary absence of Professor Root, 1988/89 Chair of CESF, the report on the 1989/90 agenda preceded the Annual Report.

1. CESF Agenda for 1989-90, Roy Penchansky, Chair, CESF

CESF has recently been much concerned with 3 models for flexible benefits presented by the University for comment. In a flexible benefit plan, each employee gets a "pool" on the basis of certain criteria, e.g., marital status. Normally, there are core benefits that all must take, while others are optional. Many people were interested when the concept was first discussed, because it was thought it included such things as tuition waivers for dependents. Such waivers are not permitted by the IRS as tax-exempt benefits, however. In flexible benefits, a price is attached to each benefit. You might have, for instance, a pool of \$2000. Any amount by which your benefits fell short of this could be cashed out.

CESF judged the proposed models by a series of criteria, of which the most important were: (a) benefit adequacy and security, (b) cost to the employee, and (c) equity among employees. The University already has a relatively good benefit program without high benefit costs and with a range of alternatives. We have as much flexibility as many other universities. Vacation/sick leave conversion, one possible flexible benefit, is not applicable to faculty. Two sets of philosophical issues were discussed: the best safety net for all versus individual choice, and equal benefits versus benefits related to need. Most CESF members feel we are a community and must make sure that everyone has at least a guaranteed minimum. The central economic issues are: (1) Will the charges influence total benefit costs or simply shift costs? (2) Will the proposal shift costs from the University to the employee? (3) Will the shift in costs outweigh any gains from flexibility or equity, so that after a year or two everyone loses?

Burdi: How does the University decide on the original pool?

Penchansky: I would not favor such a plan without a guarantee of an adequate base for every employee. The committee is therefore skeptical. Most examples see the pool rising 10% and costs 18%. One effect of flexible benefits is that low users drop out and the average cost of the benefit involved (e.g., Dental) goes up. Of the 3 proposals presented, Proposal A is not worth the cost. It would not significantly affect flexibility or family coverage. Proposal B would provide some gain in flexibility and Proposal C much gain, but with a correspondingly great decline in family coverage. Each plan would involve increased administrative costs ranging from \$213,750 to \$1.1 million (the upper estimate for Proposal C). Proposals A, B, and C would involve respectively a progressive decrease in University costs and increases in employee costs. In the most extreme example for Proposal C, there is a tenfold increase (\$2.8 million to \$28 million) for employees and a parallel decrease for the University. CESF has not opposed changes if there is some gain. It sees this as a major shift. (A detailed summary of the presentation was distributed and is available in the SACUA office.)

Burdi: Can the faculty decide?

Penchansky: We were asked for our opinion. CESF is not in favor of the proposals presented. They would serve to make the University less competitive.

Ness: There is a strong sense that the Assembly is not in favor of the proposals.

Winn: I would like some reassurance of the power relationships involved.

Penchansky: It is within the purview of the Regents to impose this, but that does not appear likely. There is concern with health costs. I don't think the prospect is for ramming it down. But it can easily be perceived that this is a valuable thing. Actually, the proposals were sold by consultants who are used to dealing with companies that have less concern with their employees; the selling point is reducing costs to the employer.

Ness: We can help to bury this by making our position clear.

Ketefian: To what extent should I discuss this with colleagues? It is very technical.

Penchansky: CESF would be glad to send someone to explain it.

Question: Senate Assembly is consultative. It is important to have a resolution.

Ness: SACUA will present a resolution. It will be sent out on the message system this week.

2. CESF Annual Report, Lawrence Root, 1988-89 CESF Chair

CESF was concerned in 1988-89 with compensation review, flexible benefits, catastrophic care (now a moot issue), financial counseling for faculty members, and legal defense (with aaac). There is no stated policy on legal defense. There might be a possible conflict between an individual faculty member's interest and the University's interest.

Question: Is there enough in common law so that any policy on legal defense that contradicts it would be illegal?

Root: We don't have actual precedents of the University not defending the faculty. There are some questions.

Wulff: Changes in the relationship between the faculty and the University can lead to conflicts of interest.

Ness: The report is now in the General Counsel's office.

MOVING THE MICHIGAN MANDATE: FACULTY RETENTION AND OBSTACLES TO RETENTION

Ness: A message was received on E-mail at 5 O'clock this morning about minority enrollments. There is a substantial increase, although Black first year students are somewhat down. Faculty recruitment is also moving along. Retention is also important. There has been a substantial jump in the last two years, but otherwise a quite flat curve for female and minority faculty.

Professor Ness then introduced the panel: Cheryl Easley, formerly of the School of Nursing, now at the University of Illinois; Zaida Giraldo, Affirmative Action Director, who came to the UM from the University of Massachusetts this year; and Mark Chesler, Professor of Sociology.

Cheryl Easley

The project "Women, Men, and the Climate for Research Productivity of Women at the University of Michigan" grew out of the Academic Women's Caucus. M.A. and doctoral students have worked along with faculty. There was a questionnaire and an interview of 2-3 hours each with 6 men and 6 women roughly paired by discipline. The process of productivity, structure and processes, outside help, professional organizations, other roles that hindered or helped were discussed. Originally only gender was involved, but it was soon realized that race had to be included. Another series of interviews and a mailed questionnaire are planned. Questions to be asked include: nature of work done, how central to the unit, how valued; interdisciplinary and split appointments; start-up package, information on resources, released time, conditions of appointment; process of productivity, degree of social support; teaching assignments, advisement (women and minorities often have disproportionate advisement responsibilities); learning how to get something published; mentoring, collegueship. These things often work informally. By the time a female or minority faculty member learns how to get help it might be too late.

Zaida Giraldo

A study was done in Affirmative Action on the model for predicting faculty success in achieving tenure: Ph.D. before arriving, publications, teaching experience, and 2 other variables. This is very reliable for predicting tenure for white male faculty, but not for women and minorities. What causes the differences? There is anecdotal information. Speaking from experience prior to coming to the U-M, if 5-10 minority faculty have left, I may hear from only 2. Roughly 10% involved cases of overt discrimination. The other 90% were communication problems, difficulties in style, inability to deal with (especially) the department head. We need to learn how to make the faculty member feel welcome. What comes naturally for white males has to be formalized for minorities and women. Often a department head would say he believed he had provided the necessary information, while the faculty member repeatedly said it was not provided. Perhaps it was given too hastily. The one person who has come to me here so far is a classic example. He felt unjustly treated, but I could imagine the explanation the head would give. The issues were lab space, lab support, getting a grant then finding it had disappeared. This individual was not interested in taking action, having found a better position. A survey of departing faculty could be used for statistics and discerning patterns. Exit interviews are not effective.

People leave angry, "drop a bombshell" but won't come as witnesses, etc. Although privacy is promised, reports on such interviews do not really protect anonymity despite intent to do so.

Mark Chesler

I urge all of you to test with your colleagues of color what you have heard. The culture of our institution is unfriendly to faculty of color. They often do not receive intellectual respect from colleagues. We often duck discussion of issues of race with them because it seems intrusive. There are backroom conversations about affirmative action resulting in incompetence. Definitions of faculty excellence don't include dealing head-on with issues of racism, which faculty of color can't avoid. There is a lack of intercultural community. Non-attention to racism in the surrounding community adds to the problem. Minority faculty have to deal alone with these problems. Collegiality is needed, explaining the explicit and implicit rules of the game. We lack understanding of their special burdens, the demands from minority students, lack of respect from white students. They lack our pro-active help when administrators fail to reward anti-racist activities. The current issue of the AAUP journal Academe has useful articles on mentoring minority faculty.

Professor Ness thanked the panel for its valuable presentation.

Professor Moerman reminded Assembly members to hand in their questionnaires on grievance policies.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary C. Crichton
Senate Secretary pro tem