

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Assembly Meeting, October 18, 1976

ATTENDANCE Present: Professors Adams, Angus, Aupperle, Bornstein, Browder, Cartwright, Christensen, Cohen, Corpron, Crawford, Crichton, Diamond, Downen, Edwards, A., Eisley, Faulkner, Goldman, Gordon, Gray, Harris, J., Harris, R., Johnson, Jones, Kachaturoff, Caldwell, Kish, Lands, Leary, Lehmann, Lindberg, Livermore, Lytle, Heers, Nesbitt, Olson, Rabkin, Seger, Sherman, Northcutt, Votaw, Weeks, West, Winans, Zorn, Colburn, Williams

Absent: Professors Baublis, Brazer, Child, Coon, Cornell, Cosand, DeKornfeld, Deskins, Edwards, O., Elving, Fekety, Flynn, Browne, Hildebrandt, Horsley, Merte, Millard, Murphey, Portman, Proctor, Scott, Simonds, Soucek, Stross

Guest: Associate Vice-President Richard A. English

CALL TO ORDER Professor Williams welcomed Assembly members and called the meeting to order at 3:18 p.m.

ELECTION OF NOMINATING COMMITTEE Professor Williams described the new election procedures for electing the Nominating Committee. Assembly members whose terms expire in April of 1977 are eligible to serve on the SACUA Nominating Committee. From a first ballot with the names of Assembly members whose terms end in April 1977, eight individuals will be selected. From the eight names selected, four will be selected in a second round of balloting to join two outgoing members of SACUA to form the six-member committee.

Elected in the two rounds of voting to serve from the Assembly were the following four individuals:

Jo A Horsley - Nursing
Shaw Livermore - History
Rhoads Murphey - Geography
Robert Weeks - Engineering (Humanities)

These Assembly members will join Professors Harold Johnson and William E. M. Lands of SACUA to form the six-member Nominating Committee.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES The minutes of the Assembly meeting of September 20, 1976 were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS 1. Professor Williams announced that Committee C has been appointed. The Committee is made up of the following members: John B. Atwater, Wash-tenaw County Public Health Officer and adjunct associate professor of public health administration; Joseph Baublis, professor of pediatrics and communicable disease and of pathology; William Brockman, assistant professor of microbiology; Harry Douthit, associate professor of botany; Rolf Freter, professor of microbiology; Francis E. Payne, professor of epidemiology; Jan Bancuk, senior lab technician, biological chemistry; Lawrence O. Brockway, professor of chemistry and member, research policies committee, and Russell Fuller, pastor, Memorial Christian Church.

2. Professor Lehmann announced that there is some mild optimism over recent exchanges of information between the bargainers representing GEO and the University. Lehmann also encouraged all Assembly members to read a letter from President Fleming mailed to the faculty on October 18. The letter is designed to clarify the existing situation concerning the negotiations.

In a questioning period following the Lehmann announcement, Professor Sherman asked for a clarification of the role of the Assembly representatives on the Advisory Committee. Lehmann noted that the question is a good one and has been given much thought. Lehmann said that the position taken by the representatives was one of "serving as the conscience of the faculty."

Professor Harold Johnson pointed out that two years ago the Assembly had urged a position of neutrality in the GEO-University bargaining situation. Johnson mentioned that the interest of the faculty must be represented in the various negotiation sessions.

NOMINATIONS AND APPOINT- MENTS

The name of Shirley H. Cooper was brought to the Assembly membership as SACUA's nomination to replace Lorraine Perry on the Office of Student Services Policy Board. There were no additional nominations from the floor and Professor Cooper was elected.

UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT PATTERNS AND FINANCIAL AID

Professor Williams introduced Richard A. English, Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs to discuss the matters of undergraduate enrollment patterns and financial aid with members of the Assembly.

Associate Vice-President English gave his presentation, a copy of which is attached.

Following his presentation, Professor English invited questions from the floor. Professor Rabkin observed that since LSA has been designated as an area of special concern by President Fleming and various other reports, that some information must be included to update the situation. The College has just recently established a merit scholarship program. Also, Professor Rabkin pointed out that some new procedures for handling student applications for financial aid have been employed which have determined that need is a factor in most cases involved. Professor English responded that it was his office that brought surpluses in the College's scholarship funds to the attention of the Dean and Executive Committee. It is this money that has aided in the development of new funds and helped to bring about a new emphasis on procedures to assist students in receiving financial aid.

Professor English added a point that he felt all should understand, namely, in 1958 the Regents did establish the policy that no out-of-state students should receive general fund money. The policy is one that should be followed. He went on to observe however, that scholarship policies do sometimes become unclear and that even the Regents Alumni Scholarship program should be reviewed in terms of the policy upon which it rests.

Professor Lands followed up Professor English's observation and asked who set the \$50 amount for the Regents-Alumni Scholarship and who has the

authority to revise policies governing this particular Scholarship. Dr. English noted that there is a Student-Faculty Advisory Committee which can make recommendations. The amount was set by a Committee chaired by Vice-President Stephen Spurr a number of years ago.

Professor Crawford moved to another area of concern and stressed that the School of Music must rely on the strength of the faculty to recruit outstanding students. Where students are lost however it is because the School has been "out-bid" by another school of music. Professor Crawford noted that it is the bidding process which causes the loss of outstanding students. Professor English said that he understood the difficulty but stressed the limited amount of scholarship dollars available.

Professor Bennett Cohen asked if the various colleges could identify the numbers of out-of-state students lost because of a lack of aid offered to them. Professor English suggested that questions of this sort are best addressed to the colleges. Professor Cohen asked how much we are short in competing to get students we really would like to attract to Michigan. Professor English said that we are about a \$1000 a year "short" in competing with some of our peer institutions.

Professor Lands asked if we could determine the number of meritorious in-state-students who go elsewhere. Professor English did suggest that the numerical information is available but one can only speculate as to why a student goes to another school. There are many factors, other than aid, which affect enrollment patterns in the State of Michigan.

Professor Jones asked for a breakdown of the various scholarship funds and the amount of money available in each fund. Professor English gave some general figures but suggested that his report to the Regents be consulted for detailed information.

Professor Johnson said that he found the term "no-need" an unattractive term. He said that need and merit were not mutually exclusive. There was general agreement with this observation.

Professor Jesse Gordon said that the term "quality" was a bothersome term used by many when talking about enrollment patterns. Professor Gordon went on to suggest that a follow up of students and their career selections should be made routinely to determine success or failure of our support program.

Professor Bornstein pointed out that the current merit scholarship program in LSA is of recent development. He then asked if Dr. English could give the need/merit ratio, in dollar terms, in scholarship funds across campus. Professor Bornstein said that it was his impression that the allocation to merit scholarships was "miniscule." Professor English said he was not sure what that ratio was but that he would guess that the merit scholarship money was significantly less than need dollars. He continued to emphasize however that federal and state guidelines for numerous University programs required our attention to the need factor in our support programs.

Professor Eisley was concerned that there was a Board of Regents policy which dictated the use of non-general fund sources of scholarship aid. Professor English said that to his knowledge no such policy exists and that non-general fund dollars can be spent in a way determined by the donor or by the college allocating the money.

Professor Angus next raised a point that had to do with the criteria for allocating financial aid. He said that it was his opinion that some recognition of the difference between standards of need and merit was in order. He went on to argue that if dollars were to be allocated on a merit first, need second basis you would have a much different support program than if the process used a need first, merit second basis of allocation. He said he felt a clear analysis of the need/merit issue was in order.

Professor Livermore continued by asking for an interpretation of the SAT scores of resident and non-resident students. Specifically he asked for an interpretation of the various trends which seem to be emerging. Professor English observed that this analysis is available and is in his report to the Regents.

Professor Lands asked if we had a University policy for establishing measures of need and for establishing measures of merit. Professor English said that these decisions are made at the various school and college levels. The faculties of the schools and colleges govern the standards of admission. Lands continued his question by asking just where the decision was made in the schools or colleges; specifically, Professor Lands asked if the Executive Committees made the decisions. Dr. English said he would imagine that the decision making process varies from school to school.

Professor Kish asked that policies now used at the graduate level be examined to see if they could be applied to undergraduate recruitment. Specifically he wanted to know if a program of employment might be developed at the undergraduate level. Professor English said that this idea had been given careful thought but that only one or two employment programs had been tried. He concluded that the idea deserves more investigation.

Professor Caldwell said he was unclear about the administration of financial aid. Professor English noted the role of the Office of Financial Aid in appropriating funds through the schools and colleges.

Professor Gordon asked whether the aid provided to offset rising tuition fees meant that there was a zero gain in the tuition-income account. English said "no" that the tuition income was greater than the scholarship program.

Professor Williams asked if there was a "self screening" process by the prospective students themselves. That is, if the students felt that they could not qualify under the need requirements then they simply would not apply for aid. Professor English agreed that this was a problem. He stressed that there did seem to be a "myth that there is simply no support for students from middle income families."

Professor Lands asked whether we might not consider awarding aid to "the most meritorious of the needy." He followed by asking "what percentage of the student body is needy?" Professor English said he did not know the answer but he did know that over half the student body is now supported.

Professor Christensen followed by observing that the motivation of the student to apply for aid appears to be a major factor in determining aid patterns.

Professor Williams asked if the report Professor English prepared for the Regents might be made available to Senate Assembly members. Professor English said he would be pleased to give the report to any Assembly member who requested a copy.

There was no old or new business.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

William C. Colburn
Secretary

bc