

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting of 18 October 1982

ATTENDANCE

Present: Aberbach, Bailey, Barald, Barnard, Barritt, Beck, Bishop, Blass, Brooks, Browne, Bulkley, Burdi, Caffesse, Carter, Cooper, Dahl, Easley, Adler, Weiss, Fellin, Green, Grosse, Hagen, Hilbert, Hildebrandt, Hollinger, Hopwood, Hultquist, Janecke, Kaplan, Kelsey, Knudsvig, Loup, Martin, Meyer, Moerman, Mosher, Froseth, Nagy, O'Meara, Pollock, Powell, Rae, Regezi, Ringler, Robinson, Root, Rucknagel, Stevenson, Radine, Wieland

Absent: Briggs, Cares, Cassidy, Crowfoot, Courant, Crane, Danielson, Evans, Haddock, Kahn, Keren, Lawrence, Lockwood, Ludema, Maassab, Morash, Rinne, Senior, Simon, Smith, Solomon, Weiner, Whitehouse, Young

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Professor Bishop, chair, at 3:20 p.m. The minutes of the meeting of 20 September, 1982, were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The SACUA-AAUP forum on "How Should Higher Education Respond to the Funding Crisis" will take place this evening at 8:00 in the Hale Auditorium of the Business School.

2. A forum on priorities for reallocation of funds, sponsored by SACUA, MSA, and the Academic Affairs Office, will take place at 7:30 p.m. on 1 November, in the Rackham Amphitheatre.

SEARCH FOR BIG TEN FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE

Professor Paul Gikas, chair of the Big Ten Faculty Representative Search Subcommittee of the Board in Control of Intercollegiate Athletics, announced to the Assembly that Professor Thomas Anton had resigned as Big Ten Faculty Representative, effective 30 June, 1982, and that a search for a successor was in progress. Advertisements in the University Record in July and September had produced about ten candidates, and Professor Gikas invited Assembly members to submit additional nominations to him, after verifying the nominee's interest in

the position. He explained that the faculty representatives have ultimate control of Big Ten policy, above the athletic directors and even the presidents. Michigan's faculty representative also chairs the Committee on Academic Performance which reviews the academic progress of athletes.

Professor Burdi mentioned that this year was to have been Michigan's turn to chair the Big Ten conference. Professor Gikas said that, because of the vacancy created by Professor Anton's resignation, Michigan's turn will be postponed for two years. Professor Burdi asked why Professor Cruzat was not chairing the conference. Professor Gikas replied that the alternate representatives are not included in the chairmanship rotation. Recalling the Assembly's decision that the alternate representative is to serve as the representative in the latter's absence, Professor Pollock felt that Professor Cruzat should now be the faculty representative and the search should be for a new alternate representative. Professor Gikas said that Professor Cruzat had declined to be considered for the faculty representative position.

In reply to a question from Professor Burdi about criteria for the selection of a faculty representative, Professor Gikas said that the committee would prefer someone with experience on the Board in Control and that it seemed unwise to give such a time-consuming job to a faculty member still on a promotion track. Professor Hollinger noted that the requirement of experience on the Board in Control substantially cuts the pool of possible candidates. Professor Gikas said that, while he felt that such experience was helpful but not essential, some members of his subcommittee attached greater importance to it. He added that there were some good candidates without such experience.

In reply to a question from Professor Hollinger, Professor Gikas said that he expects his subcommittee to present two or possibly three names to the full Board in Control. The Board will appoint the representative, subject to approval by the Assembly.

#### MATTERS ARISING

Professor Barritt requested information about two items in the SACUA minutes of 30 August, the tenure task force and the role of the Budget Priorities Committee (BPC) in the review of the Center for Continuing Education of Women (CEW). To the first question, Professor Bishop replied that Vice President Frye, SACUA, and the Tenure Committee are setting up a group to discuss the advisability of codifying tenure policy more precisely, as opposed to leaving it to experience and case law. He said there is no specific connection with the review process. To the second question, Professor Bishop replied that some members of the BPC believed that CEW had been targeted for a budget review, to be conducted after its regular review, and that this targeting had been nullified by Vice President Frye without consulting the BPC. It appears, however, that CEW had not actually been targeted.

Professor Bailey said that this report is accurate from the BPC's point of view. He then asked for information about SACUA's plans to discontinue membership in the Association of Michigan Collegiate Faculties (AMCF). Professor Bishop said that, after long discussion, SACUA doubts that the benefits of AMCF membership are worth the \$750 annual dues. Professor Kaplan provided the following information about AMCF. Its dues are proportional to faculty size and have not increased in over ten years. Two delegates from each of the fifteen member institutions attend meetings four times per year and meet with various state officials (including, once, the governor). In addition, the League of Women Voters prepares a newsletter for AMCF and informs AMCF when matters of importance to faculty are on the legislative agenda. AMCF has sponsored some meetings with representatives of the business community and is an important means of communication between schools. It has the endorsement of the State Relations Committee of this Assembly.

Professor Bailey requested that the issue of membership in AMFC be put on the Assembly's November agenda for full discussion and decision.

#### NOMINATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

SACUA's list of nominees to fill vacancies on the Budget Priorities Committee, the Research Policies Committee, the Financial Affairs Committee, the Student Relations Committee, and the University Cellar Board of Directors had been distributed with the agenda. There were no nominations from the floor, and the slate of nominees was approved.

#### CREATIVE RESEARCH AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN - VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH CHARLES OVERBERGER

Vice President Overberger's prepared remarks were as follows:

Creative Research is a somewhat redundant phrase. Thus we'd like to assume that all research is creative--at least at The University of Michigan. As the word suggests, to do research is to seek out, to search again. One can't get very far in a search without the creative intelligence, the gift that permits human beings to imagine and thus to establish hypotheses, to make connections, and to grasp a totality from reflecting on some of its parts.

Creativity is ultimately a mystery. We think we recognize it when it is present, but it resists our efforts to isolate it or even define it adequately. Like most of the best things in life, it dwells somewhere within; it cannot be dissembled--or bought, or sold, or even given away; it is a human potential that is earned and that has ultimate value in and of itself.

I come to my views on research and the research process through some forty years as a chemical researcher and as a guide for several hundred graduate student researchers. These views have been tempered by a lifelong habit of reading about research, not only in my own field but in a wide spectrum of disciplines. As many of you know, to be a survivor--even for a week--in the Administration Building, one must be an extremely fast reader. That ability, which I developed early, has stood me in good stead not only as a survival tool for an administrator but also as a means over the years of broadening and deepening my acquaintance with and appreciation for the magnificent tapestry that research represents.

I want today to touch on a few threads in that tapestry as it exists at The University of Michigan.

The current financial troubles of the University, which look like they may well extend beyond the Biblical seven lean years, have made acute many of the problems that in times of plenty are minor and easily resolved. Several years ago, when funds from sponsors were readily available and when the central administration had a comfortable amount of flexible monies to help start new research programs and tide over old ones in periods of stress, the research opportunities were almost unlimited. Anyone with a worthwhile idea could find support either outside or inside the University, and programs throughout the range of disciplines on this campus multiplied in great abundance and variety. Research Administration under those circumstances was mainly a job of facilitating, catalyzing, and, in general, helping smooth the way for vigorous expansion.

Today, the problems are vastly different, and the central research administration is obliged more and more to be an arbiter, a priority-setter, and, many times, a nay-sayer. Sponsored funds have declined in many areas, and the little flexible money still available to us won't even begin to cover the emergencies, let alone help stimulate all the new initiatives that we think would be valuable. The downward spiral has created many displacements and some anguish in our research community as we struggle to hold on to essential programs now insufficiently funded and to keep pace with rapidly emerging new fields that will dominate the future.

These circumstances have put a new urgency on the setting of priorities, an unpopular but necessary function of central administration, especially in times of limited resources. As many of you know, we have placed some emphasis in the past

year on robotics and its related technologies and on molecular genetics, both of which are subjects that Governor Milliken's High-Technology Task Force has designated as high priorities for the state of Michigan. These represent rapidly developing fields that the University must pursue if it is to remain a great research institution. For each of these fields, the ramifications and the interlockings with other fields are so pervasive that they simply cannot be ignored.

Within the College of Engineering, the new program designated CRIM (Center for Research on Integrated Manufacturing) is widely interdisciplinary and already has established a valuable network of interactions both with industries that produce robots and other machines that are increasingly contributing to the automated factory of the future and with the industries that use these machines.

In another large step related to robots and industrial automation, the University is playing a central role in the Industrial Technology Institute, the organization created in Ann Arbor by the state. The automating of many industrial processes is crucial for the future industrial health of the state of Michigan, and we should be thankful to play a major part in the development of this technology.

With respect to molecular genetics, a new center is in the late stages of University review and approval, one to be designated University Center for Molecular Genetics. This center will encompass and draw upon important work in many of the Medical School departments, in Biological Sciences, in several LSA departments, and elsewhere. Again, the state of Michigan has created a separate institute (this one in Lansing) with which we will collaborate. The importance of molecular genetics in industrial as well as in academic development in the coming decades cannot be overestimated.

The two fields of robotics or integrated manufacturing and of molecular genetics are rather clear and exceptional cases. Many other decisions in which the central administration is involved, along with deans and department heads, are less clear and more controversial. The fact that these decisions are difficult, however, doesn't mean that they shouldn't be made. With inadequate resources, at our disposal, we must face up to hard choices almost daily. Obviously, not everyone will share the same point of view, and, in fact, there is more tension in our research community than perhaps we would like.

One element in that tension has arisen from the perception among many faculty members that our increased efforts recently to attract industrial support, to update our high-technology capabilities, and to encourage entrepreneurial enterprise in Engineering and the sciences have tended to unbalance the academic scales. Is too much attention being given to new areas of research at the expense of such traditional areas as the humanities and arts?

It is a legitimate question and a legitimate concern--one that is very intensively considered and discussed in the Administration Building, just as it is in the LSA Building, Angell Hall, the Modern Languages Building, here in the Rackham Building, and other outposts of what some regard today as a beleaguered minority. Because of the importance of this subject, I'd like to emphasize it particularly in these remarks today.

It would be singularly unfortunate if the recent discussions about high technology were permitted to obscure the continuing commitment of the University to research and creative activity in the humanities and the arts. I should like to state for the record that this commitment has in no way been compromised by our internal review of programs and schools or by our efforts to assist in the economic rehabilitation of the state of Michigan (research agenda - special fund for graduate student recruitment), in 1982-83 (i.e., this fiscal year), Vice President Fyre provided \$160,000 to the arts and humanities for graduate student recruitment. Over the next two years, this will build to \$250,000. (This year the funds went to Music and LSA.) No other unit of the University received such funding for recruitment of graduate students.

That the style and setting of research in the humanities and the arts are very different from those in the sciences and engineering is widely appreciated. And while those who engage in cross-disciplinary projects and programs deserve applause--one thinks of the long-standing consortium on science, technology, and human values or the Medieval and Renaissance Collegium--we all recognize that most research in the humanities and arts is the product of individual initiative and inspiration. No one expects the humanities and the arts to become "growth industries" or to contribute, through collaboration with external entrepreneurs, to the short term economic resuscitation of the state. When we recognize our responsibility and opportunity to help the state--and in the process help ourselves--by developing our high-technology resources, we are not forgetting the basic disciplines, including the humanities and arts, that have always played a central role in the University and always will. Increasing our monetary capital is important, of course, but our essential and underlying purpose as an institution of higher learning is to increase

our intellectual capital. Our creative researchers and scholars, in the sciences, the engineering disciplines, the professions, and not least in the humanities and arts constitute our real source of wealth and our central concern.

I should like to exorcise another demon--the suspicion that the University is putting all its available internal resources into high technology, computer sciences, physics, etc. If anything, the humanities and arts have received in recent years an increasing percentage of the total internal support contributed by my office, the Graduate School, and the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts. This reflects not only a continuing commitment, but also a recognition that outside sources of support for humanities and arts projects and programs are few in number and modest in comparison with those available to the sciences and social sciences. Conferences, publications, individual and large-scale research projects--from the acclaimed Middle English Dictionary to the proposed index of Indian inscriptions--have all received internal support and indeed could not have been undertaken without it. The program to supplement the stipends of major fellowships (Guggenheim, ACLS, NEH, etc.) and the grants made to colleagues under the International Partnerships program are only the most recent internal efforts to facilitate research and creative activities in the humanities and the arts.

Finally, let me say a word about outside support commonly but often misleadingly categorized under the heading "sponsored research." While we shall always encourage faculty to compete for outside fellowships and grants, we have never measured the success of the humanities and arts departments or faculty members in terms of the external dollars they produce.

In spite of the recession, and the widely known reductions in federal support for research, opportunities for outside support of individual research and creative activities in the humanities and the arts remain. The private foundations and the national endowments continue to offer fellowships and grants, and there is reason to believe that additional support may be made available in the near future. At the risk of seeming overly optimistic, I think it is fair to say that external support for research and creative activities in the humanities and the arts will hold its own in this generally fallow period and will probably increase significantly in the relatively near future.

I am happy to have had this opportunity today to express my strong views on a subject that I know has concerned many faculty members.

I now turn to report briefly on the research volume for fiscal 1981-82.

After these remarks, Vice President Overberger showed, on slides, data concerning sponsored research at the University. The data included the total research volume for each year from 1972 to 1982, both in inflated dollars and in real dollars, as well as the distribution of these dollars among University units and among funding sources. Vice President Overberger explained that the apparent drop in total research volume for the last fiscal year is entirely due to a decrease in the indirect cost rate allowed by the Department of Health and Human Services; he viewed this reduction as an attempt to pass on federal research costs to the universities, and he commented that this would be all right if the state legislature helped, but ours doesn't. He also noted that social scientists have done an excellent job this year in convincing Congress against drastic funding cuts in their field. He expressed concern that press reports of decreasing research funds discourage faculty and staff from preparing research proposals; he pointed out that this faculty has a better chance than most of obtaining research grants and that proposal preparation can be a beneficial intellectual experience. He commented that the cost of the Division of Research Development and Administration was only 0.9% of the total research volume; it had been 1.4% a decade ago. Finally, he drew attention to a recent New York Times article, "Corporate Links Worry Scholars." He remarked that, in the widely publicized university-industry collaborations, industry makes most of the money; a university's first concern should be to maximize intellectual input.

#### CESF REPORT

Professors Ronald Teigen and Beth Reed presented the report of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty. Professor Teigen summarized the written report that had been distributed with the agenda. It contains the results of two surveys, one on the economic status of annuitants and survivors and one on faculty attitudes toward the salary program and unionization. The former survey showed that 88% of the respondents found their income, from all sources, at least adequate. For the second survey, a full report (109 pages of text plus over 100 pages of respondents' comments) is available in various libraries; copying costs prevent wider circulation.

In addition to the surveys, CESF's activities last year included a study of staff benefits and the possibility of flexible benefits, a preliminary report on early retirement, and the collection of data on salaries at the University and elsewhere.

Professor Loup asked why librarians were no longer included in CESF's survey of faculty salaries. Professor John Tropman, chair of CESF, replied that he had been unable to find a reason and that librarians will be included in the future.

Professor Reed listed projects planned by CESF for the current year. In addition to the continuing job of watching faculty salaries and lobbying with the administration for their improvement, these projects included further study of fringe benefits leading to possible development of alternative benefit packages, review of administration proposals to revise the periodic health appraisal program and to eliminate the retirement furlough for faculty hired in the future, collection and

distribution of information about collective bargaining, a follow-up on the survey of annuitants and survivors, and preparation of a newsletter to be distributed to the Assembly three or four times per year.

#### DISCUSSION

Professor Barritt remarked that tuition reductions for faculty families, once dismissed as politically unfeasible, had been instituted at Michigan State University. He asked whether CESF had considered this possibility. Professor Tropman replied that the matter had been discussed with Vice President Frye, and he urged faculty with strong interest in it to inform CESF. He added that Wayne State University has instituted such a program also.

Professor Kaplan said that the AAUP has heard of cases where early retirement was used to encourage people to leave early. He asked whether CESF is monitoring the situation, and he suggested that people be alerted to report instances of undue pressure. Professor Reed suggested including such an alert in the newsletter. She added that it had proved difficult to get information about this matter and that CESF did not plan to form a new subcommittee on early retirement. Professor Carter urged that this decision be reconsidered. He expressed concern that we are entering an era of pressured or forced early retirement, and he particularly favors the proposal for an early retirement advocate to help faculty deal with able bureaucrats and high-priced lawyers. Professor Reed said that recommendations concerning an advocate or guidelines for early retirement should come from the Assembly or SACUA, unless they choose to refer the question to CESF. Professor Tropman added that, although last year's subcommittee on early retirement heard rumors of inappropriate bonuses for early retirement, it was unable to find hard evidence to verify these rumors. Professor Browne said that real pressure on an individual to retire early would be a matter for the Tenure Committee or the Civil Liberties Board to investigate. In reply to a question from Professor Green, Professor Tropman said that information on early retirements had been sought mainly from the faculty involved; Professor Reed added that the subcommittee had also talked with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the dean of LSA. Professor Rucknagel asked about the role of unit representatives and SARC in monitoring early retirement practices. Professor Bishop replied that the SARC system is not presently functioning. Professor Kaplan said that the AAUP may be able to help in this regard.

Professor Bailey noted that tuition reductions would disproportionately benefit some of the faculty, a problem that Professor Reed had also mentioned in connection with the present system of inflexible benefits. Professor Bailey asked whether CESF has a position on this issue. Professor Reed replied that it does not yet. One possibility is to make a certain number of dollars available for each faculty member to allocate to benefits of his or her choice. This would lead to difficulty in bookkeeping and may be costly because of adverse (from the University's point of view) selection. It may therefore be better to offer discrete packages of benefits.

Professor Pollock asked about the status of the proposed health maintenance

organization. Professors Reed and Bishop replied that the plan was scrapped because University employees do not constitute a sufficiently wide base for such an organization. Professor Pollock asked whether CESF oversees such things as Blue Cross-Blue Shield benefits; who decided BC-BS is a good deal? Professor Reed said that the decision was probably made by the staff benefits office. Professor Pollock remarked that, as a good bureaucracy, it avoids change.

Professor Rucknagel urged CESF to keep an eye on tax aspects of benefits. Professor Reed noted that it is difficult to determine the tax status of, for example, tuition reduction.

Professor Bishop said that, in the past, the budget always came down to faculty salaries versus tuition but that Professor Teigen's comments last spring had succeeded in reducing the linkage between the two.

Professor Barritt suggested holding public forums on unionization.

#### NEW BUSINESS

Professor Kaplan said that many faculty are concerned about our sense of community, an issue also raised by President Shapiro. Is the community disintegrating because of the review process? The AAUP Executive Committee suggests that SACUA survey faculty opinion on the process of redirection and its effect on the University. Professor Bishop said that SACUA will take the suggestion under advisement. Noting that President Shapiro had invited suggestions to improve the process, Professor Barritt asked that it be put on the Assembly's agenda so that ideas like reviewing schools and colleges in groups can be discussed. Professor Bishop promised to look into the request but expressed doubt that the Assembly could fruitfully discuss such a diffuse topic. Professor Hollinger asked for clarification of the proposed agenda item; was it to be brainstorming on how to do downsizing? Professor Barritt said that this described what he had in mind.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Andreas Blass  
Senate Secretary