

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Assembly Meeting, November 15, 1976

ATTENDANCE

Present: Professors Angus, Aupperle, Bornstein, Browder, Cartwright, Cohen, Corpron, Cosand, Crichton, Whitmore, Edwards, O., Easley, Elving, Goldman, Gordon, Gray, Browne, Hildebrandt, Johnson, Jones, Kachaturoff, Caldwell, Kish, Lands, Leary, Lehmann, Lindberg, Livermore, Lytle, Merte, Millard, Nesbitt, Olson, Portman, Rabkin, Scott, Seger, Sherman, Simonds, Votaw, Weeks, Zorn, Colburn, Williams

Absent: Professors Adams, Baublis, Brazer, Child, Christensen, Coon, Cornell, Crawford, DeKornfeld, Deskins, Diamond, Edwards, A., Faulkner, Fekety, Flynn, Harris, J., Harris, R., Horsley, Heers, Murphey, Proctor, Soucek, Stross, Northcutt, West, Winans

Guests: Professors Carl Cohen, Lawrence McMahon, and Adon Gordus

CALL TO ORDER

Professor Williams welcomed Assembly members and called the meeting to order at 3:21 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the October 18, 1976 meeting were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Professor Williams announced that all Assembly meetings are recorded for possible use on WUOM.

2. Professor Williams announced that the Senate meeting scheduled for Monday, November 22, 1976, 4:00 p.m. will feature President Fleming responding to questions and concerns raised by his State of the University address.

UNDERGRADUATE FINANCIAL AID

The discussion opened at the October Senate Assembly meeting on the subject of undergraduate financial aid was continued at the November Assembly meeting. Three guests were invited to discuss the issue from their point of view. The three speakers were: Professor Carl Cohen, former Chairman of the Faculty Senate; Professor Lawrence E. McMahon, Co-Chairman of the Academic Affairs Committee; and Professor Adon Gordus, Chairman of the Admissions Committee for the College of LS&A.

The first speaker of the afternoon was Professor Cohen. His remarks were made from a manuscript, a copy of which is attached.

The second speaker was Professor Lawrence McMahon speaking from his experience working with the Academic Affairs Committee. His first observation was that there had been very little faculty input into the whole financial aid operation. Second, Professor McMahon noted that there is a great deal of statistical information available but that certain items of information have not been developed, such as: how many aid recipients graduate, how many graduate in four years, and what is the average G.P.A. of aid recipients. The third observation was that this is not a "need versus merit" issue, but rather whether merit should be considered along with need. The only merit screening that is done at the present time is through the admissions process. The Academic Affairs Committee is proposing that need and

merit be considered more or less equally. One possible way of doing that would be to rank students in order of merit and give aid to the most meritorious proportionally to their need, and so on until there was no more money left.

Professor Adon Gordus was the third spokesman of the day. He talked from the perspective of his role as Chairman of the Steering Committee on Admissions in the College of Literature, Science and the Arts. Professor Gordus noted that recent shifts in the enrollment patterns have had an impact upon the curriculum. The shift has been from the Humanities to the Sciences. Professor Gordus also noted that enrollment numbers have been of recent concern because we are now at a peak in the number of eighteen-year-old citizens in our society. The applicant pool will diminish in the future. For these reasons, then, the College had asked the Steering Committee to analyze enrollment patterns from the present date to 1990. The analysis has been completed and some interesting findings are available. First, we are "holding our own" in competing for students. Second, the ranking of our students on various admissions tests and high school class standing has decreased. Third, costs now seem to be a factor in the admission of students. The cost of attending Michigan now approaches the total costs of some outstanding private schools. Fourth, the University has done little to recruit National Merit Scholarship winners, outside of sending them a congratulatory note. To meet this problem a new program has been initiated for this year. Professor Gordus distributed a booklet entitled "Traditions in the Making" printed under the directions of the College of LS&A. Fifth, the College has started to work more closely with the alumni in assisting the recruitment of outstanding students.

In summary, Professor Gordus noted that the two major problems facing us at this time seem to be the decreasing quality of incoming students and the major shifts in the election of courses (from the Humanities to the Sciences) by the students who enroll at Michigan.

In the question and answer period which followed, Professor Edwards asked Professor Cohen "what reason is there for giving money to students"? Professor Edwards said he was also concerned about the relationship between social-economic status and grade point averages. On a third level Professor Edwards asked if merit is not accounted for in the "simple act of admitting students." Professor Cohen answered the first question by saying that scholarship money should be used to advance the goals of the University. On questions two and three, Professor Cohen noted that statistical questions are open in both areas. Finally, on question three, Professor Cohen observed that the act of admission is only one determinate of scholarship aid. Both gentlemen then summarized their positions on the purposes of scholarship aid--Professor Cohen stressing the point that the quality of student body is decreasing and financial aid must be used to recruit the outstanding student.

Professor Lands picked up on the football-hockey-basketball support analogy used by Professor Cohen to demonstrate the success of using aid to recruit outstanding athletes. Professor Lands noted that with proper deliberation, funds for young scholars and programs to "recruit excellence" can be established. The problem, he argued, is how a faculty sets the standards to be used in recruitment. Further, Professor Lands argued that funds must be channeled to such a program once it is established. Professor McMahon did suggest that ranking of the applicant pool is possible and once such a ranking has been set the highest ranking students receive scholarship aid.

Professor Votaw asked about the support programs available for meritorious students. Professor McMahon said the information is not easily retrieved from the central administration. He further stressed that more information from the central administration would be helpful to all those who wish to discuss the issue.

Professor Elving asked, following up Professor Edwards' concern, why do we wish to reward merit as opposed to need? He noted that this question deserves much more analysis. Professor Elving observed that one reason which might explain a recent drop in better students is that Michigan is no longer the "exciting place it once was." We may be losing students but it may just be a symptom.

Professor Olson observed that the aid question must not be mixed up with the shifts of concern among young people in our potential applicant pool. He noted that in his work with high school teachers he has seen the shifting nature of concerns of our young citizens. This matter must be separated from the issue of scholarship aid. Professor Gordus followed by saying that studies have been conducted to assess the image of the University. The problem is that people see us as a great place to prepare for medical school. Our Humanities and Social Science areas have slipped in recent years.

Professor Goldman said that we run the risk of misdirecting our attention when we look at the complexities of financial aid. He argued that we must first establish what are our goals in providing financial aid. Professor Goldman agreed with Professor Edwards who in his earlier remarks had first raised the notion that goals of scholarship aid must be set down.

Professor Johnson spoke of his concern that the Cohen presentation oversimplified the need/merit issue. Johnson pointed out that the issue is how we improve the quality of our student body and that question is much deeper than just need/merit scholarship aid. Professor Johnson said that the extensive use of teaching fellows in our programs may be a major reason why meritorious students do not enroll at Michigan. He went on to say that he was hopeful that our Academic Affairs Committee would examine this matter with special care.

Professor Cohen responded by saying the issue of setting goals is not a difficult matter. It takes discussion and agreement on the part of the faculty.

Professor Jones asked that the matter discussed today be referred to the Academic Affairs Committee. He formally moved:

MOTION

That the Academic Affairs Committee study the question of financial aid programs in light of the two Assembly meetings, and that recommendations growing from the study be brought back to Assembly by at least its March meeting. Professor Bennett Cohen seconded. In the discussion that followed Professor Rabkin asked that in the study the matter of faculty governance be reviewed especially as it relates to the release of financial aid money to the various schools and colleges. Professor Cosand asked that the study group also focus upon "who we are going to admit." Professor Elving added that the Committee should look at how our faculty and programs stand up as factors in recruiting outstanding students. Professor Angus agreed with Professor Elving, and said that we must

determine why it is that people do enroll at Michigan. The motion was refined by Professor Bornstein, who wanted to include in the motion that the quality of the student body must be recognized as a major concern of the faculty. Professors Jones and Cohen each accepted the idea as a friendly amendment.

Professor Livermore cautioned the Assembly not to "cop out" on the issue by simply passing the problem on to a committee. Livermore argued that there are responsibilities inherent in the University realm which, some will claim, call upon us to teach those who seek an education and to support students in a manner which meets their particular needs; the point being that there are many complex issues which must be decided and which cannot be simply passed on without careful and thoughtful deliberation.

The motion passed unanimously. Williams expressed his hope that the Committee would proceed judiciously.

RESOLUTION TO
STUDY COLLEC-
TIVE BARGAIN-
ING

The following motion was moved by Gordon and seconded by Professor Browne.

RESOLVED: That Senate Assembly establish an ad hoc committee to study faculty collective bargaining, and report its findings to Senate Assembly no later than October, 1977. The committee's charge shall be to:

1. Analyze the experience with faculty collective bargaining at other universities with respect to faculty salaries, governance, and faculty-administration relations;
2. Identify the major forms and variations in faculty collective bargaining as they are represented at other universities, and summarize their advantages and disadvantages; and
3. Identify the several faculty collective bargaining organizations used in other universities and report on their effectiveness with respect to faculty economic status, governance, and faculty-administration relations.

Seven members of the ad hoc committee shall be appointed by SACUA so as to include the range of faculty attitudes regarding collective bargaining. In addition to the seven members, the Chairman of CESF and the Chairman of Senate Assembly shall be ex officio members of the committee.

Professor Gordon opened the discussion by noting that the motion was not meant to criticize CESF for their efforts in past years. Rather, Professor Gordon argued that the motion is designed to prepare us for a possible alternate should the future economic situation dictate that the way we are now proceeding is inappropriate.

Professor Bennett Cohen asked if the motion as written over-lapped with the charge of CESF. Chairman Williams noted that the governance matter did fall outside the responsibility of CESF but that the financial matter was clearly within the charge to CESF.

Professor Cartwright asked about the knowledge available on the issue. Gordon answered that it was his understanding that information on the subject of collective bargaining was available on the Michigan campus. He also stressed that there were several knowledgeable individuals on campus who could speak on the matter.

Professor Eisley asked about the appropriateness of setting aside the matter until December. Professor Hildebrandt indicated a willingness to support such a motion if one were formally moved, both speakers noting a desire to place the issue before their respective faculties.

Professor Elving said that a study does seem appropriate. He noted that the trend of the times encourage such a study be made on our campus.

Professor Lehmann then joined the discussion by first reading a letter from CESF to SACUA:

"The Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty has considered briefly the Senate Assembly agenda item proposed by Professors Gordon et al with respect to collective bargaining.

"A serious objection to the proposal, as it now stands, arises immediately. The motion which is offered outlines a piece of serious economic research demanding professional competence not only in data analysis but, much more importantly, in the theory of wage determination. The effects of collective bargaining is a topic which is peculiarly inappropriate to be dealt with by a committee without the necessary training or resources. Indeed, two years ago, CESF undertook preliminary steps toward undertaking such a study and experienced itself the difficulties which surround such research. CESF must, therefore, oppose the motion as it is written."

Following the reading of the letter, Professor Lehmann said that SACUA is concerned about this matter on a number of fronts. He argued that the governance matter is just one matter of concern. Professor Lehmann then moved the following substitute motion:

That Senate Assembly requests the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty to resume and complete its study of the economic effects of faculty collective bargaining at other universities, and to report its findings at the February 1977 meeting of Senate Assembly.

The motion was seconded by Professor Weeks, after several clarifying questions which centered on matters of CESF staff, scope of the study, time of reporting, etc. The matter of governance was of major concern to members of the Assembly as expressed most forcefully by Professor Bornstein. Professor Lehmann responded by saying that SACUA would, of course, continue its study of the governance issue. Professor Cosand asked that the "Merrill Flood report" be incorporated into the final recommendations presented to the Assembly. Professor Rabkin asked that models that describe "uncollective" bargaining be included in the study. Professor Crichton endorsed the observation made by Professor Rabkin.

The substitute motion was carried unamously by the Assembly. Following passage of the motion the meeting was adjourned without further comment on the presentation of old or new business.

Meeting adjourned:5:35 p.m.

C. William Colburn
Secretary

bc