

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Regular Assembly Meeting, November 19, 1973

ATTENDANCE Present: Allen, Berki, Brockway, Brown, Caldwell, Cartwright, Cassidy, Cohen, Colburn, Cooperrider, Danielson, Dernberger, Ehrenkreutz, Farrand, Floyd, Adams, Gikas, Harrison, Hoffman, Ilie, Jameson, Kaplan, Kelsey, Kish, Holbrook, Larkin, Lehmann, Lloyd, Loomis, Magrill, Mohler, Nystuen, Oberman, Ostrand, Rowe, Schmickel, Seligson, Sibley, Falls, Taylor, Terwilliger, Vander, Vaughn, Williams, Zweifler, Kincaid, Hildebrandt, Goodman

Absent: Anton, Bishop, Buning, Darvas, Evaldson, Heller, Berkove, Higgins, Hymans, Creeth, Johnson, Kell, Kerr, Krachenberg, Lagler, Lands, Kline, Paul, Sana, Sawyer, Springer, Wilson

Guests: Members: Budget Priorities Committee
Long-Range Planning Committee
Program Evaluation Committee

CALL TO ORDER Chairman Goodman called the meeting to order at 3:25 p.m. in the Rackham Amphitheater.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES The minutes of the October 15 meeting were approved with the following corrections:

On page 2, last line, the figure 2% should be replaced by 2.7%.

On page 6, the next to the last paragraph should be re-written "In reply to a question from Professor Taren, Professor Hoffman said that certain other universities had shown more change than we had in the area under discussion."

ANNOUNCEMENTS Chairman Goodman had the following announcements:

Assembly members were asked to help in achieving better understanding of the Senate Advisory Review Committee among faculty members by trying to have SARC representatives appear at meetings of their respective schools and colleges. A convenient time to do this might be when they were giving their own reports on Assembly activities. Arrangements could be made through Mrs. Downs.

Assembly members were reminded of the invitation, issued at the last meeting, to bring items before the Assembly in the form of new business.

Some correspondence had been received from the Henry Russel Award Committee, conveyed by the chairman, Professor Theodore Buttrey. A serious problem had arisen; not enough nominations for the award were being received (only 9 last year). The underlying difficulty was that not enough faculty members who satisfied the requirements for the award had been on campus long enough to be worthy of serious consideration for it. To improve the situation, the Committee was proposing the following rule changes:

1. The upper age limit for the Henry Russel Award should be lifted to 50.
2. The six year in rank limitation should be dropped.
3. If the rank limitation is not dropped, the words "at the University of Michigan" should be added to it.
4. The Award should be divided in two, and applications segregated into the three major categories of Humanities, Social Sciences and Natural Sciences, one Award being made annually in each of two of the three divisions.

Chairman Goodman said that he had heard no objections to the proposed changes thus far and asked whether any Assembly members wanted to raise any. Professor George Kish pointed out that the award had originally been intended to reward young faculty members. If the age limit was raised to 50, there was a danger that the award could become a second-class Russel Lectureship. Chairman Goodman thanked Professor Kish for his comments, and said that he would distribute copies of the letter to the Assembly and put the question on the agenda for a later Assembly meeting so that it could be discussed more fully.

Chairman Goodman drew attention to the Senate meeting scheduled for the following week. He expressed the hope that the important questions to be discussed--Long-Range Planning and Early Retirement--would increase attendance over the dismally low levels attained at recent meetings.

RESOLUTION ON The next item on the agenda was the resolution regarding the Affirmative
AFFIRMATIVE Action Program. Chairman Goodman reminded the Assembly that this had been
ACTION postponed since the previous meeting. In the interim, SACUA and the original
 mover, Professor Hoffman, had agreed on a substitute motion directed toward
 the same end but with somewhat changed wording. The changes were made
 clear in the material distributed to the Assembly. Chairman Goodman asked
 whether there were any objections to considering the re-worded motion;
 there were none.

Professor Hoffman added a few words about the changes, saying that one sentence had been deleted as carrying too negative a connotation, while the other change had been made to clarify the meaning.

Professor Caldwell noted that Tables I and II accompanying the resolution covered the entire University, and pointed out that the figures could be misleading since the proportion of women varied sharply from one unit to another. Professor Hoffman replied that Professor Caldwell's point was valid, but that the data had been presented department by department in the original report, and that Table III had been added in an effort to allow for this source of bias.

Professor Ehrenkreutz suggested that the merits of the motion were more important than the statistics.

Professor Kaplan remarked that it had been recently drawn to his attention that one handicap suffered by women emerges upon graduation from high school, when parents who have several children and cannot afford to send all of them to college tend to favor the boys.

Professor Holbrook asked what the proposed resolution added to the existing Affirmative Action Program. Professor Hoffman replied that the program is at the University level, while this resolution is directed to individual department chairmen. They might form judgments based on overall information, while the aggregate data don't really tell the whole story. She pointed out that the report that had been prepared served two different purposes, namely, to show HEW that the University was working to overcome discrimination, and to point out problem areas. Pursuing the first of these objectives interfered to some extent with achieving the second. In consequence, some real inequities were not apparent in the report.

Professor Larkin said that he hoped that the report would be corrected before it was sent on to HEW. He knew personally of some inaccuracies in the report, and he was concerned that passing the resolution would seem to put the Assembly's stamp of approval on the report.

AMENDMENT
MOVED

Dr. Falls pointed out that the first sentence of the resolution was an assertion of fact, and proposed it should be expressed as a whereas clause rather than as a part of the resolution proper. He moved, with a second by Professor Larkin, to amend the resolution accordingly, that is, by preceding the first sentence with "whereas" and placing the word "resolved" before the second sentence.

Professor Cohen said that he supported the amendment for another reason, namely, that he was not convinced that the data clearly demonstrated the assertions being made.

AMENDMENT
PASSED

The amendment was put to a vote and passed.

AMENDMENT
MOVED

Professor Cohen then moved to strike the "whereas" clause. After his amendment was seconded he explained that though he had no objection to the objectives towards which the resolution was directed, he did not want to certify the accuracy of this factual statement, particularly with reference to recruiting.

Professor Hoffman pursued this point, saying that the Affirmative Action Director had asked each department chairman to identify reservoirs of potential appointees. These reservoirs were examined to see what proportions of them were women or minorities. The results were interesting, since they showed that some departments that seemingly had a good representation of women had low representation relative to the proportion in the general pool.

Professor Cooperrider said that the figures necessarily related to the status quo, which reflected many years of admitted discrimination. The figures he had seen on new hirings suggested a good effort. It was not clear to him that our recruiting was currently inadequate. Professor Williams argued along the same lines, remarking that the report reflected last year's data, and that current data should be obtained before the factual assertions were made.

AMENDMENT
PASSED

The amendment was passed by a vote of 22 for to 19 against.

AMENDMENT
MOVED

Professor Holbrook asked whether the Assembly was already on record as opposing discrimination on race, creed, color or national origin. When Chairman Goodman replied in the negative, Professor Holbrook moved to amend a resolution by adding appropriate words to Parts (a) & (b) so that these other forms of discrimination would be included.

Professors Colburn and Cohen opposed this amendment, saying that Professor Hoffman had done a great deal of work identifying women's problems as such, and that broadening the resolution in this way would do her an injustice and take away its punch.

Professor Hoffman said that she had not done comparable homework on the other forms of discrimination referred to, but that she had the strong impression that the pictures were not completely parallel. She felt that all groups would be better off if separate resolutions were passed, backed by appropriate research, rather than one general one.

AMENDMENT
DEFEATED

The amendment was defeated on a voice vote.

AMENDMENT
MOVED AND
PASSED

Professor Brockway argued that the words "the forthcoming" appearing in paragraph (a) no longer served a purpose, and moved to delete them. His amendment was passed unanimously.

RESOLUTION
PASSED

The resolution was then put to a vote and passed unanimously. As amended, it read as follows:

RESOLVED: That this body requests that the University administration instruct all department heads and executive committees as follows:

- (a) In deliberations regarding salary, promotions, and tenure, every effort should be made to rectify existing inequities between men and women.
- (b) Where additions to the faculty are needed, every effort should be made to include women in the list of candidates considered for the position.

NOMINATION
APPROVED

Chairman Goodman proposed that the order of the agenda should be changed by taking up the nomination of Professor Garvin to serve as a temporary replacement for Professor Tropman on the Academic Affairs Committee, before proceeding to other business. There were no objections, and the nomination was approved unanimously.

REPORTS FROM
BUDGETS AND
PLANNING
COMMITTEES

The next item on the agenda was the consideration of reports from the Committees of the Office of Budgets and Planning. Chairman Goodman announced that the discussion would start with Program Evaluation, followed by Long-Range Planning and Budget Priorities. In addition, part of the Senate meeting was to be devoted to Long-Range Planning. He then invited Professor Bulkley, Chairman of the Program Evaluation Committee, to come forward and speak.

PROGRAM
EVALUATION
REPORT:
PROFESSOR
BULKLEY

Since the Committee report had already been distributed to the Assembly, Professor Bulkley limited himself to a brief review of the high points.

The following four tasks had been specified originally for the Committee: (1) To design review prototypes which it will recommend to operate in units for application in conducting reviews. (2) To recommend to the respective Vice-Presidents the need for review of specific programs within their jurisdictions. (3) On request, to work with operating units to see that the proposed review will generate the kinds of information which will make evaluation both possible and productive. (4) To recommend a plan of systematic, periodic review of all units.

Professor Bulkley said that up to the present the committee had confined itself to the first and last of these tasks, principally the first. To this end three task groups had been created. The first of these, chaired by Dean Stokes, worked on determining the nature and extent of program evaluation practice already going on within the University. The second, chaired by Professor Spivey, was charged with looking into examples of comparable activity at other universities. The third, or "clean-slate" group, chaired by Professor J. A. Dorr worked on determining what elements should be included in program evaluation starting from scratch, without regard for prior experience here or elsewhere. All three groups had met at Inglis House in February, 1973. The time since then had been occupied in preparing the current report.

In conclusion, Professor Bulkley brought out certain key points. First, the environment in which the University is now operating, with pressure from many directions, strongly suggests the carrying out of evaluations. Second, the concept of a zero-growth rate for the University, now accepted, has implications that must be carefully examined. Third, any evaluative process must be clearly related to the kind of decisions that are required. Moreover, programs should not be confused with budgetary units. For example, the Water Resources Program, with which Professor Bulkley was relatively familiar, embraced many budgetary units. An evaluation of the program would have to reflect this fact.

Chairman Goodman invited questions at this point, reminding the Assembly that the reports were directed to the President, and not to the Assembly. Thus no action was called for, but comments were very much in order.

Professor Danielson asked what the ultimate criteria for evaluations were. Professor Bulkley replied that the criteria for any evaluation depended on the purpose of that evaluation, and were not the same for all. For example, if the occasion for evaluating a program, say Water Resources, was the need to limit enrollment in the program, everyone involved in the evaluation should realize that this was the purpose and the evaluation should be designed with this purpose in mind. In response to a further question, he added that the evaluative process could take place either within a given unit or across two or more units.

Chairman Goodman said that he wanted to make it clear that the committee was not recommending a central office for evaluative activities. Professor Bulkley agreed, saying that in any evaluation the bulk of the work should

be carried out by the units involved. Committee members might serve as observers and resource persons, but would not do the evaluating themselves. In some cases, outsiders would be required to take part in an evaluative process, such as one in which a decision was to be made on terminating a unit.

Professor Berki pointed out that certain decisions about the relative importance of various objectives had to be external decisions. Professor Bulkley replied that this was the key role of deans and executive officers. The committee might be able to point out the implications of certain such choices, but they should not be making the choices themselves.

Professor Ehrenkreutz asked whether there was a link between the activity of the committee and the departmental evaluations going on in the Literary College. Professor Bulkley said that to the best of his knowledge, these activities were independent. He assumed that part of the reason for the LS&A activity was a need for looking ahead to what might be coming.

Professor Dernberger said that all sorts of decisions were being made at the higher levels of the University. If each decision-maker wanted an evaluation, a unit was apt to be asked the same questions over and over again. Moreover, many of the questions asked concerned information that units did not have, and going through repeated evaluations put an unreasonable burden on the units. Professor Bulkley replied that the point was very well taken. Program evaluation was a time-consuming exercise that should not be undertaken without a really good reason.

Professor Larkin suggested that the information assembled for PBES might be mentioned as a source of data for evaluations. Professor Kaplan said that the Long-Range Planning Committee had tried this out, but had found that conferences with deans and others gave much more information. Professor Bulkley remarked that CRAS was cited in Appendix 3 as a useful source of information.

Professor Seligson said that she was impressed with the report. She added that there was an atmosphere of fear in certain departments that could be alleviated by the committee's thinking.

Professor Cohen asked what mode was envisaged for the selection of test cases for program evaluation, as envisaged by the report. Professor Bulkley replied that everyone could suggest who else would be a good candidate for evaluation. More seriously, he said that two or three activities should be selected that could be used as test cases, and that his audience, i.e., faculty members, could provide the basis for selection.

Chairman Goodman indicated that it was time to move to consideration of the Long-Range Planning Report. Professor Bulkley thanked the Assembly very much, saying that he welcomed the observations that had been made.

LONG-RANGE
PLANNING
REPORT

Chairman Goodman said that the Long-Range Planning report was in two parts; the first part was a general statement looking towards the development of long-range planning in the future, while the second part included some immediate recommendations. He invited Professor Bernstein, chairman of the Long-Range Planning Committee, to make any comments he

wished to. Professor Bernstein said that he had nothing to say at the moment, but would be interested in the discussion; he suggested that Professor Kaplan should be asked to comment.

Professor Kaplan said that in pursuing one part of its task the committee had surveyed the whole University, visiting deans, department chairmen, and so forth in an effort to get a clear picture. In May and June they had held a session in which they had tried to answer some specific questions. On the other hand, the committee had tried to consider some of the philosophical questions that they could see arising, five, ten, fifteen, or twenty years from now. Professor Eggertsen added that the intention of the committee was to develop the capacity to learn about the future, especially with regard to factors which influenced the University.

Chairman Goodman asked what the next step was. In reply, Professor Kaplan said that the committee had chosen six specific areas in which they would try to assess future trends. In the meantime, they would continue to monitor what was going on, making periodic reports.

Professor Larkin said that the committee had done a fascinating piece of work. He asked what could be done to prevent the University from making mistakes analogous to introducing the Edsel. Professor Bernstein said that they felt that only by knowing what members of the University community thought and wanted could they influence the future.

Professor Danielson asked whether the committee saw this as an educational role. Professor Kaplan replied that the role should be more than educational. The committee hoped to make recommendations on policy. In general, the University had done little in the way of projections. President Fleming was sympathetic to this approach, but others in positions of influence seemed more concerned about the annual budget.

Professor Loomis asked about the relationship of long-range planning and capital planning. Professor Kaplan said that capital planning was a major part of long-range planning but not the whole story.

BUDGET
PRIORITIES

Chairman Goodman said that it was now time to take up the Budget Priorities Committee report. He summarized it by saying it offered three options with respect to the future of the committee; remaining in its present advisory capacity, beefing up its capabilities with added staff support, and folding up, with some of the committee's work to be taken over by the Long-Range Planning and Program Evaluation Committees. Some responsibilities would fall to CESF, with some SACUA input.

Professor Lehmann said that he had presumed that the committee could have responded to immediate issues, such as the distribution of tuition funds. He asked whether the three alternatives proposed were the only ones. Could the committee shrink and be linked more tightly to SACUA?

Professor Dunn pointed out that the committee was not a faculty committee, and its role was not one of advocacy. The report had put all modes of operation on the table, in order to give the Assembly a full opportunity to reconsider the situation. With regard to the surplus funds, Professor Dunn reminded the Assembly that they represented a prognosis, not actual money.

Professor Kaplan said that he saw hope in tying the committees more closely together, and using staff support to reduce the load on faculty members. Professor Dunn replied that the more responsibility that is given to staff, the less role is played by students and faculty. He felt that the committee had been slipping its wheels, but was now gaining more insight.

Professor Loomis said that we should think about both clarity of organization and potential for improved advice. With the added committees, the organization is more complex than before. Should there be fewer committees or fewer members on committees, or is it more important to get a greater variety of advice?

In concluding the discussion, Chairman Goodman again urged Assembly members to come to the Senate meeting the following week to pursue some of these issues further.

ADJOURNMENT

There was no old or new business, and the Assembly adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Wilfred M. Kincaid
Secretary