

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Assembly Meeting, October 21, 1974

- ATTENDANCE Present: Allen, Anton, Baublis, Brockway, Browder, Brown, Caldwell, Cornell, Baker, Clough, Danielson, DeKornfeld, Dernberger, Deskins, Eisley, Evaldson, Flynn, Gikas, Goldman, Horsley Hymans, Jameson, Johnson, Kachaturoff, Kaplan, Kell, Kelsey, Larkin, Lehmann, Livermore, Loomis, Lytle, Magrill, Mohler, Nesbitt, Oberman, Hayward, Seligson, Matejka, Springer, Sudarkasa, Taren, Terwilliger, Vander, Williams, Wilson, Leonard, Hoch, Hildebrandt, Cohen
- Absent: Adams, Berki, Bishop, Cartwright, Cassidy, Creeth, Beaver, Floyd, Harrison, Hoffman, Kish, Krachenberg, Lands, Murphey, Ostrand, Schmickel, Scott, Springer, Van Der Voo, Vaughn, Weeks, Ilie, Sibley
- CALL TO ORDER Chairman Cohen called the meeting to order at 3:22 p.m.
- APPROVAL OF MINUTES The minutes of the Assembly meeting of September 16, 1974 were approved.
- ANNOUNCEMENTS The Chairman made the following series of announcements:
- a) The report of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty by representatives of the committee at the recent meeting of the Regents was presented with great effectiveness.
 - b) As requested by the Assembly at its last meeting, The Special Report on Tenure had been submitted to the Commission for Women and various schools for review and comment. Several responses commending the report had been received in turn.
 - c) The Assembly was reminded of the forthcoming meeting of the University Senate on November 25, 1974 in Rackham Amphitheatre.
 - d) The attention of the members of the Assembly was called to several handouts available for information purposes, among them one describing the status of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act slated to go into effect on November 21, 1974, a report to the Assembly on GEO negotiations by Professor Kaplan, and excerpts from the GEO proposals extracted by SACUA for the information of the Assembly.
- RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE PROPER ROLE COMMITTEE In the course of regental approval of Mr. Rhodes as Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Mr. Kennedy as Vice-President for State Relations, some administrative responsibilities were reassigned in the process, the planning function, for example, coming under the Office of Academic Affairs. Hence the Committee on the Proper Role of the University had taken corresponding note of its title and charge and proposed some modifications, presented to the Assembly in the form of a resolution. Professor Williams moved adoption of the resolution, a proposal that was seconded, and the Assembly voted approval of the proposed change in committee title (to State Relations Committee) and in its charge.

Under the chairmanship of Professor Whitehouse, the committee hopes this year to concentrate on the quality issue as it relates to the University program and its faculty, with special reference to State appropriations.

SENATE
ASSEMBLY
REAPPOR-
TIONMENT

Having met for the triennial reapportionment of representation to the Assembly, the Bylaws Committee, with the help of Janice Downs, had drawn up and recommended a schedule of representatives from Schools and Colleges based on their current Senate membership. The figures proposed by the committee were recommended for adoption by Professor Child, seconded by Professor DeKornfeld, and subsequently approved by the Assembly as the basis for apportionment of representatives to the Assembly during the period from 1975-78.

RECEIPT AND
DISCUSSION OF
COMMITTEE
REPORTS

Introducing both incoming and outgoing chairpersons of committees, where present, Chairman Cohen provided opportunity for each to comment on the work of his or her committee during the year, prior to action by the Assembly on the respective committee reports. Considered in the process were the following:

a) Committee on Academic Affairs--

Now advisory to Vice-President Rhodes, the committee is concerned not only with such matters as budgetary issues but also with the general prospect of having the University adopt other than a fire-fighting role. In the course of these general remarks the present chairman, Professor Tropman, indicated also the hope that the Faculty Handbook would be available to the Assembly for consideration at its January or February meeting. With relation to the latter, Professor Arthos, past chairman of the committee, observed that a negligible number of suggestions had been received in connection with the draft of the faculty manual.

Adoption of the report having been moved and seconded, it was approved.

b) Committee on Financial Affairs--

Commenting on the concerns of his committee, Professor Peterson, its chairman, expressed the intention to move from the more far flung, wide-ranging agenda of the past to a more structured approach. Thus, the committee's November meeting is scheduled to deal with the long-range picture of the operating budget, while its December meeting will take a long-range view of the capital budget. At any rate, in the course of its discussions the committee hopes to deal with such matters as salary packages existing across campus and trends in this connection, the impact of inflation, trends in State support, and related issues.

Adoption of the report having been moved and seconded, it was approved.

c) Committee on University Relations--

In commenting on the plans of his committee, Professor Colburn indicated that, though the committee has not yet met, he has meanwhile consulted with Vice-President Radock concerning state and federal relations, and that the committee itself is scheduled to meet with Vice-President Kennedy in November for discussion of a variety of internal and external problems.

Adoption of the report having subsequently been moved and seconded, it was approved.

d) Committee on Research Policies--

In the absence of its chairman, Professor Bennett Cohen, Professor Macnee moved adoption of the report, and the motion, having been moved and seconded, was approved.

e) Committee on Student Relations--

Comments by its outgoing and incoming chairpersons, Professors Churchill and Downen respectively, expressed regret at the slowness with which Student Government Council has in the past appointed student members to the committee, a situation in which improvement is expected. In passing, Chairman Cohen took occasion to point out also that there is reason to believe that the Guidelines for the Use of University Facilities, previously considered by SACUA and the Assembly and subsequently reviewed by the Committee on Student Relations, will have a salutary influence in at least one area that has in the past caused confusion and misunderstanding.

Adoption of the report having been moved and seconded, it was approved.

f) Bylaws Committee--

As noted above, the reapportionment of representation to the Assembly, as proposed by the committee, was approved, as was the report of the committee for the preceding year, its adoption having been moved and seconded.

g) Civil Liberties Board--

Though the Board was not presenting a formal report for Assembly Action, Professors Jensen and Rothman, its outgoing and incoming chairmen respectively, expressed the hope that the administration would hereafter brief the University staff effectively on matters of civil liberties. Chairman Cohen reminded the Assembly that SACUA had referred issues (e.g., the use of the Senate mailing list) to the Civil Liberties Board, where appropriate, and that the counsel of the Board would continue to be sought, in such matters, for example, as access to student records, among others.

h) Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty--

Professor Johnson, past chairman of the committee, expressed thanks to the current chairman, Professor Hymans, for the latter's assistance in drafting the 1975-76 compensation proposal even prior to his assumption of office and directed the attention of the Assembly to a number of features in the report deserving of special notice. Thanks were expressed as well, by Chairman Cohen, to Ms. Birdsall and Ms. Radcliffe for the staff support which has been provided the committee.

Comments and questions having been raised by Professors Kaplan, Nesbitt, Loomis, and Terwilliger concerning such matters as the financial problems of annuitants, the distribution of the CESF report, and the availability of data for 1974-75, Professor Hymans was invited by Chairman Cohen to elaborate on the work and plans of the committee. In the course of his remarks,

Professor Hymans was pleased to indicate that the report he had made at the recent meeting of the Regents, with the assistance of Professors Kornblum, Wright, and Brazer, seemed to have been well received. The CESF argument concerning an 18% compensation package, with restoration, maintenance, and improvement components, was not challenged per se by the Regents, who asked pertinent questions following the presentation. There was some concern on their part as to how such a proposal would be received by the legislature at a time when the economy is slow, substantial unemployment exists, and the financial situation is shaky at best. CESF, for its part, took the position that one should not second-guess Lansing but rather present the economic needs of the faculty forthrightly.

In response to a question from Professor Brockway concerning newspaper reports that Vice-President Rhodes favored a 12%, rather than 18%, figure, Professor Hymans indicated that Mr. Rhodes was in agreement with the analysis presented by CESF, had some questions about the restoration figure in the compensation package, and was simply using the lower ends of ranges suggested for restoration, maintenance, and improvement, arriving at a resultant 12% figure. The Vice-President had assured the Regents that, in any case, the administration would be proposing a compensation package of at least 12%.

A question from Professor Taren as to whether Assembly action is required before CESF is authorized to act drew negative replies from Chairman Cohen and Past-Chairman Goodman. Both saw CESF as an agent of the Assembly and underlined the need for the committee to stay as closely in touch with faculty sentiment as possible, something CESF has always sought to do. At the same time, they pointed out, to require CESF to check with the Assembly at every step would significantly hinder the active operation of the committee which, for that matter, strives to keep the Assembly regularly posted on its activities at every stage. As Professor Hayward noted, it had in fact been hoped originally that CESF would in a sense serve as "bargaining agent" for the faculty. To Professor Seligson's inquiry toward the close of discussion as to whether one could report to one's Department on the activities of CESF, Chairman Cohen therefore replied that one not only could but, indeed, should.

A motion for the adoption of the report having been made and seconded, the CESF report was approved with special thanks.

i) Senate Advisory Review Committee--

Having been introduced as the outgoing chairman of the committee, Professor Vaughan indicated that Professor Bordin, the present chairman, would comment briefly on its current activities. The orientation of SARC was described by Professor Bordin as two-pronged--serving as a board of review for faculty members presenting a grievance, while at the same time attempting to seek broad consensus in the University at large concerning issues of fair procedure. As he reminded the Assembly, the latter had recently acted to make the committee more accessible. In any case, as indicated in its report, SARC has been confronted with a number of cases,

and while the workload does not present a problem at the moment, the committee has proposed to SACUA that the nature of its mission is such as to warrant a three-year, rather than two-year, term for its members.

Adoption of the report having been moved and seconded, it was approved.

j) Tenure Committee--

Introduced as outgoing chairman of the committee was Professor Cooper-rider, together with Professor Super as current chairman. To a question from Professor Brockway concerning possible overlap between the Tenure Committee and the Senate Advisory Review Committee, Professor Cooperrider replied in the negative. The former, he noted, deals with review of recommendations for demotion or dismissal of tenured faculty; SARC, on the other hand, is concerned with grievances in general.

Adoption of the report of the committee having been moved and seconded, it was approved.

In thanking the chairpersons who had reported on the activities of their respective committees, Chairman Cohen pointed out that the interplay among committees and between committees and the administration is, in the last analysis, the network through which the faculty functions.

GEO NEGO-
TIATIONS

In continuing its discussion of GEO matters, the Assembly heard from several of its representatives--Professors Lehmann, Kaplan, and Seligson--the former serving as a member of the University Advisory Committee, the latter two acting as faculty observers at the open meetings of the negotiating teams. In one respect Professors Kaplan and Lehmann presented somewhat different perspectives, Professor Kaplan expressing some concern at what he viewed as the slowness of the process, while Professor Lehmann saw the negotiations as proceeding at a reasonable pace. In any case, Professors Kaplan and Seligson have been attending the negotiation sessions regularly and receiving pertinent materials routinely.

Though, according to Professor Lehmann, the Advisory Committee is the typical group the administration would consult on most matters, the viewpoints of the faculty representatives--Professors Lehmann, McKeachie, and Olken--are clearly considered. Thus, it has been possible to remind the committee members, for example, that what is of primary concern is the matter of education and training rather than of employment opportunities. The faculty representatives are accordingly attempting to make their influence felt at the biweekly meetings.

Having attended the negotiating sessions, Professors Kaplan and Seligson urged members of the Assembly to do likewise. The experience is informative and, according to Professor Seligson, can prove somewhat unnerving as well, as one senses the adversary character of the proceedings, a mood to which the seating arrangement itself contributes. Yet, as Professor Lehmann remarked, the proposals contained in the handout which the Assembly had before it were not representative of those being seriously considered. By way of getting at the latter, Professor Demberger inquired

about the University counter-proposals while Professor Loomis wondered whether an invitation to Professor Jones might produce the necessary bargaining points for the information of the Assembly. The latter, Professor Lehmann suggested, will now become known more quickly and widely through the medium of the recently instituted University newsletter. Meanwhile he and Professors McKeachie and Olken find themselves in the somewhat anomalous position of being privy to discussion of proposals under serious consideration while at the same time needing to keep the latter in confidence for the nonce. Thus, he suggested, another invitation to Vice-President Rhodes might be in order at this point.

Questions from Professors Livermore, Loomis, and Cohen prompted Professors Lehmann, Kaplan, and Seligson to elaborate on several matters. Illustrative of his previous distinction between training and employment, Professor Lehmann observed, is such an issue as the length of contract. Any union group, he noted, wishes to extend its contract as long as possible; the GEO, being no exception, talks in terms of five-year periods. Yet, the administration, cognizant of the importance of the training function, feels training opportunities are to be rotated, hence wishes to negotiate a year at a time. In response to Professor Livermore's further inquiry concerning the matter of grading in courses, Professor Lehmann noted a typical complication, namely, the substantial differences existing among, and even within, schools and colleges, with one wing, for example, allowing Teaching Assistants autonomy in the issuance of grades while another permits grading only under faculty supervision.

Another complicating factor had been raised earlier with Chairman Cohen by a member of the Natural Science faculty, namely, the size of the graduate student body. According to this respondent, too many graduate students have been admitted in the recent past; hence it would be an error for the University to negotiate on the basis of the present size of its graduate student body. This, Professor Lehmann pointed out, is indeed an issue which the Advisory Committee, responsive as it is to enrollment trends and the needs of Departments, sees as deserving of serious deliberation. Bearing on this matter, too, as Professors Kaplan and Seligson observed, is the concern on the part of GEO lest its bargaining unit be eroded. Though GEO now numbers approximately 600 of a possible group of some 2,200 members, it appears that only 200 of the 600 have to date opted for a dues checkoff, a fraction that might, of course, increase over time.

As chairman Cohen repeated, the particular subset of proposals excerpted by SACUA from the full list of GEO proposals in the handout distributed at the present meeting had simply been abstracted for the information of the Assembly. In response to Professor Hayward's question as to whether not all GEO proposals are to be taken seriously, Professor Kaplan responded, however, that indeed they must, for, though the ultimate agreement will doubtless be more moderate in character, every proposal submitted exerts more or less influence on the negotiating process. On this basis, Professors Kaplan and Seligson again urged the attendance of members of the Assembly at the open negotiating sessions, while Professor Lehmann invited comments and suggestions for the guidance of the faculty representatives to the Advisory Committee.

NOMINATIONS
AND APPOINT-
MENTS

The Assembly acted on nominations by SACUA, appointing the following to the boards and committees noted:

Professor Emery--Financial Affairs Committee and Budget Priorities Committee (replacing Professor Schaefer in both cases)

Professor Vasse--Long-Range Planning Committee (replacing Professor Heywood)

Professor Baker--OSS Policy Board (replacing Professor Stapp)

Professor Strachan--Student Relations Committee (replacing Professor Gamson)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no old or new business, a motion to adjourn brought the meeting of the Assembly to a close at 5:20 p.m.

Erasmus L. Hoch
Secretary