

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs

4008 Fleming Building

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48109

764-0303

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting of 28 October 1985

ATTENDANCE

Present: Bailey, Bassett, Beutler, Bissell,  
Brewer, Briggs, Checkoway,  
Chudacoff, Comminou, Cornell,  
Durrance, Easley, Eaton, English,  
Green, Vinh, Han, Kalisch,  
Kusnerz, Larson, Lavoie, Lehmann,  
Leonard, Lewis, Lockwood, Lougee,  
Loup, Lusk, Ard, Margolis,  
McCarus, McClamroch, Meyer,  
Miller, Moerman, Moran, Mosher,  
Nadelman, Oleinick, Olsen, Pierce,  
Reed, Rizki, Marc Ross, Rutledge,  
Sanders, Olson, Schteingart,  
Sears, Stebbins, Taylor,  
Warschausky, Wiseman, Zweifler,  
Yocum

Absent: Ascione, Boyd, Burdi, Carnahan,  
Thomson, Eschman, Farley, Glover,  
Hanks, Herbert, Howe, Hudson,  
Jacobs, Kahn, Lorey, Malvin,  
Manis, Mermier, Payne, Radine,  
Muriel Ross, Schauer, Snyder,  
Arnett, Stapp, Todor, White,  
Zelenock

Professor Robert Green convened the meeting at 3:16 p.m.

MINUTES

The minutes of 23 September 1985 were approved as written.

MATTERS ARISING

Professor Sanders suggested that Vice President Frye be commended for his contributions to the University. SACUA will consider how this might best be done.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Don Canham will present his annual report at the January Assembly meeting.

FACULTY PERSPECTIVE ON THE SEARCH FOR A NEW VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Professor Green recounted developments from the September 20 announcement of Vice President Frye's forthcoming resignation to the appointment of an advisory committee announced in the Record today.

At its September 23 meeting SACUA began to discuss how its members felt about an impending search and subsequently agreed that it would be pleased to serve as the search committee or as the core of an expanded search committee as it had done for three previous Vice President for Academic Affairs searches. It then met with President Shapiro on September 30 to learn what options he was considering. His plans included involving SACUA in some capacity, employing an executive search firm, and appointing an advisory committee which he would chair. The committee would consist largely of faculty members selected from a pool larger than SACUA and would include one or two administrators and students. All appointments would be made on the condition of confidentiality. SACUA indicated that it wanted to participate as strongly and fully as possible in the search.

President Shapiro met again with SACUA on October 14 and presented a list of 50-60 faculty members who had been suggested by their colleagues as possible members of the advisory committee. A lengthy, candid discussion ensued. During it SACUA also put forth some of its own members for appointment. Since then the committee has been appointed and will have its first meeting on Wednesday. Professor Green from SACUA is a member.

In response to Professor McCarus' questions, Professor Green stated that he was not certain where the option of retaining an executive search firm stood. As he understood it, the role of such a firm is similar to that of the faculty in identifying potential candidates but with a greater possibility of preserving confidentiality. Some candidates regard this as especially important. A search firm would not preempt committee judgment. Professor Briggs added that according to the President a search firm could identify more candidates and thus enlarge the pool from which to choose. This does not preclude faculty members from recommending candidates and he urged them to do so.

OPPORTUNITIES AND OBLIGATIONS: RESPONSES TO A CHANGING WORLD

Professor Stebbins stated that SACUA hoped to promote more activity in the Assembly this year. One way is to focus on the role of faculty governance in University decision-making. Four ad hoc committees have now been appointed. Professor Stebbins announced the members and introduced committee chairs: Professor Al Burdi (University Program); Professor Lorraine Nadelman (University Faculty); Professor Seong Soo Han (Research and Scholarship); and Professor Joan Durrance (University's Influence). Professor Nadelman noted that the thrust of committee work would be for the long range and to

articulate a faculty role in opportunities and obligations. Professor Han hoped that his committee would take a visionary approach when it deals with the basic nature of scholarship, research and knowledge. He welcomed advice to help devise a framework which would be inclusive initially and then be scaled to manageable proportions. Professor Durrance echoed her colleagues' statements and said she would be available after the meeting to hear suggestions.

Professor Stebbins said that each committee has been asked to prepare a written report and to present an oral report to the Assembly later in the year. SACUA hopes that both will prompt extensive discussion. Assembly members still wishing to join a committee should see Professor Stebbins. Professor Green concluded by noting that the four committees represent a new departure for the Assembly.

#### REPORT ON PRESERVATION OF LIBRARY MATERIALS

Professor Green introduced Margaret Byrnes, Head of the Preservation Unit, University Library. Ms. Byrnes began her report by stating that the deterioration of library materials is a nationwide phenomenon. Major causes are acidic paper used in books since 1850, high humidity, poor handling and binding practices and air pollution. It is estimated that \$400M would be needed to preserve the contents of affected material. The problem at the U of M is less severe than at some other institutions because the collection here is younger, has been exposed to less air pollution and been housed in air conditioned buildings. Nonetheless, 25-30% of the U of M collection or 1 1/2 - 2 million volumes are affected.

To deal with the problem, the University Library established the Preservation Office in August 1981 with support from University Administration. Major activities have included construction and staffing of a conservation lab, renovation of the Buhr building for proper humidity and temperature control, revision of the commercial binding contract, installation of a microfilming lab and equipment, and initiation of a program to educate staff and users about preservation. Recent efforts have included a program for cleaning the collection, work with a University committee on proper physical environment needed for the collection and continued work on identifying funding sources.

To date the Library has received three grants from the Department of Education. It has also begun a cooperative project with several peer libraries to film nineteenth century imprints and then to make films available at cost. Master negatives are deposited in a vault in Pennsylvania and are expected to last 500 years. For other fragile materials the Library buys commercial replacements. The next priorities are to reduce binding costs, develop plans and train staff for handling disasters, expand publicity, and improve productivity.

Developments nationally are encouraging. NEH has made preservation one of its primary program emphases. There is a new national standard encouraging publishers to use non-acid paper for publications of durable content. The

Association of Research Libraries encourages its members to devote 10% of their materials budgets to preservation and the Research Libraries Group (which includes the U of M) has long had preservation as one of its major programs. Among its many activities, the Library of Congress is studying the use of optical disk technology. If successful, the optical disk will become the premier preservation tool for materials which have already deteriorated. Library Council is also involved in de-acidification. When finished in 1986 or 1987 its new facility will be able to de-acidify 500,000 volumes each year. It is hoped that the U of M will have a similar facility on campus and would need state help to establish it. Much can be learned from the experiment in Illinois where a state-wide de-acidification facility is being planned.

Ms. Byrnes concluded by expressing hope that the problem can be brought under control. The Library seeks to expand awareness of the need to preserve the collection and needs faculty to spread the work to their departments, professional associations, and federal and state authorities. She also expressed appreciation to Vice President Frye for his support in establishing the U of M program and for his work as Chair, Committee on Preservation and Access, Council on Library Resources.

Professor Bailey asked if the College of Engineering could be involved in the technical aspects of de-acidification and development of a facility. Ms. Byrnes replied that that was possible but with respect to the former perhaps unnecessary as good de-acidification processes have already been developed. As for a facility, the U of M still has much work ahead of it in convincing the Legislature of the need. Professor Bailey noted the need to expand awareness of preservation especially to libraries outside the University Library system. Ms. Byrnes reported that her office is in contact with the Law Library.

In reply to Professor McClamroch's questions Ms. Byrnes stated that to date preservation priorities have been driven by grants and use. Some items in the collection have deteriorated and copy cannot be filmed. In such cases another library is asked to film its copy. The Library needs to establish priorities of what should be preserved, is awaiting the report of the Frye committee before establishing these and, in addition, will need broad guidelines from the faculty.

Professor Green asked about the use of non-acidic paper. Ms. Byrnes explained that university presses use alkaline paper but that trade publishers have not been as cooperative. Book paper constitutes only 1% of the paper market. Paper manufacturers are learning, however, that alkaline paper is easier on their machinery so there is an inherent economic incentive for them to favor it. Use of alkaline paper is expected to increase over time.

In reply to Professor Bassett's questions, Ms. Byrnes explained that technically several copies of a book can be microfilmed and there is no policy which stipulates that only one copy will be made. Should the U of M establish

a de-acidification facility, it would treat its own materials and keep them here. A continuing challenge is to determine how to finance the preservation program and how to incorporate that money into the acquisitions budget.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE FACULTY

Professor Beth Reed reported for Ms. Sheila Creth, Chair, CESF, who is out of town. CESF 1) monitors salary and fringe benefits, 2) serves as liaison and faculty advocate with Administration, 3) responds to issues and plans and 4) identifies and explores areas of interest to the faculty.

Referring to Table 1 previously distributed Professor Reed noted that salary improvement reclaimed some of the buying power lost earlier. Seven peer institutions, however, have achieved greater recovery. During the past year CESF also studied retirement options additional to TIAA-CREF, met with Vice President Frye to discuss issues raised with the Regents, and began examining how the merit salary program is being operated. Subcommittees studied HMO's, the economic status of University annuitants, tuition supplements for dependents and facilities available to emeritus faculty. CESF succeeded in establishing formal contact with the Staff Benefits Committee. The two groups now meet twice annually and exchange minutes of their regular meetings.

CESF's work requires that its members develop technical knowledge especially in the area of staff benefits. To help the present committee, Professor Reed agreed to serve this year while CESF determines a role for the past chair. Agenda items for the year include SRA's, health benefits options, extension of dental benefits at cost to faculty on leave, and perhaps periodic health appraisals. A major activity will be follow-up on the presentation to the Regents, especially with respect to the merit program. A subcommittee has developed a faculty survey which will be mailed next week. Assembly members were asked to urge their colleagues to fill out and return the surveys. CESF believes that a high return rate will strengthen the survey's credibility.

Referring to the tables distributed, Professor Bailey noted that the salary situation of black male professors appears to have worsened over the previous year. He also noted that the salary gap between non-minority men and non-minority women increased in two ranks. For faculty entering the University now, gender appears less of a factor than for faculty already holding appointments. He also asked how these data compare to those being collected by the Affirmative Action Office. Virginia Nordby, Director, Affirmative Action Programs, reported that the study is proceeding and is staffed by a research scientist. Current plans are to develop an in-depth evaluation of one school's faculty as a pilot. Results may be available by late December and reviewed by the faculty advisory committee in January. Professor Reed stated that a CESF member also serves on the advisory committee so there is a communication channel. Some question remains, however, if CESF has a charge to investigate the differences among faculty salaries. Until

recently, CESF's role had been to address the sagging fortunes of all faculty and not to pursue the question of inequities among faculty. This has changed over the last few years and CESF needs feedback on how much attention Senate Assembly wants CESF to pay to differences among faculty.

Professor Beutler suggested that a question of equity applies to fringe benefits inasmuch as these come out of the same pool. A "cafeteria" approach was mentioned both last year and this; he asked Professor Reed to elaborate. She said that three years ago a subcommittee examined flexible benefits and decided not to recommend such a program. Institutions which offer them have had to cap health care benefits whereas the U of M has not. In short, the subcommittee concluded, U of M faculty enjoyed better coverage under the present program. It seems to her, however, that flexible benefits are likely at the U of M and that CESF might do well to re-examine the matter. Professor Kalisch suggested that, in light of the recent decrease in health care costs for university staff, CESF should reconsider flexible benefits.

Professor Reed also said that as of 1984 the U of M is the only state-supported university in the state not offering tuition assistance to dependents. Professor Easley and Dr. Savory noted that the new health care benefits are being studied as are HMO and prescription pricing. Professor Kalisch noted that Financial Affairs examined Supplemental Retirement Annuities (SRA's), whose \$2/month charge for new participants may be a disincentive to use. Professor Reed stated that CESF had opposed the fee.

#### OLD BUSINESS

Professor Sanders asked for a report on the ad hoc committee to review the guidelines for classified research. Professor Green stated that the review was requested by the Regents, Research Policies Committee did not consider the proposal and neither did SACUA. SACUA supplied names of potential committee members and has assurances that the faculty governance system will see and be able to comment on the committee's final report.

Professor Rutledge expressed concern over potential operating costs of the new campus phone system. He requested that the phone people be invited to meet with the Assembly again. Matter referred to Financial Affairs.

#### NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

  
Patricia B. Yocum  
Senate Secretary