

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting of 19 November 1984

ATTENDANCE

Present: Ascione, Bailey, Bassett, Beutler, Briggs, Boyd, Bulkley, Burdi, Chudacoff, La Ferla, Easley, King, English, Green, Gulari, Hanks, Herbert, Hopwood, Kaplan, Kelsey, Knudsvig, Kusnerz, Larson, Lehmann, Leonard, Lorey, Lougee, Loup, Ludema, McClamroch, Mermier, Meyer, Moerman, Mosher, Nadelman, Payne, Powell, Rae, Reed, Sanders, Scheele, Sears, Solomon, Lewis, Stapp, Stebbins, Warschausky, Whitehouse, Yocum

Absent: Aberbach, Barald, Burt, Catford, Cohen, Courant, Dahlke, Danielson, Eschman, Farley, Fellin, Glover, Grosse, Hilbert, Howe, Jacobs, Janecke, Kahn, Kalisch, Lawrence, Lockwood, Lusk, Luther, Margolis, Radine, Robinson, Rucknagel, Rutledge, Schauer, Schteingart, Simon, Synder, Taylor, Zweifler

CALL TO ORDER

Professor Robert A. Green, SACUA Vice-Chair, presided and called the meeting to order at 3:19 p.m.

MINUTES

The minutes of 15 October were amended as follows:

Remarks by Chair. To the present sentence add: "and to communicate their faculties' views to the Senate Assembly especially before votes are taken." The minutes were then accepted.

REMARKS BY CHAIR

1. SACUA met with the Regents November 15 and discussed:

- Ethics in scholarship in the University Community

- Training and evaluation of faculty as managers
- Competition between pre-professional and professional training, and the liberal arts
- Objectives of graduate education
- Impact of demographics on life-long learning
- Role of the faculty and University in the State

SACUA was very satisfied with the meeting, will follow-up on several aspects and will keep Senate Assembly informed.

2. A proposed supplemental agenda was distributed and approved. The Assembly then considered nominations to the following committees:

Richard J. Price (Psych), 3-year term on Board for Student Publications
Ann Hartman (Soc Wk), 2-year term on the University Council
Irving Fox (Internal Med), 1-year replacement for Carol Kauffman on Budget
Priorities Committee
Charles F. Lehmann (Education), 3-year term on Association of Michigan
Collegiate Faculties (AMCF) term to begin 1 January 1985

Professor Kaplan moved, Professor Burdi seconded, endorsement of the nominations. Motion passed.

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON INTEGRITY OF SCHOLARSHIP

Professor Steneck began by noting that this was the 7th or 8th opportunity the Task Force had to discuss the report with various bodies. All discussions had been fruitful and each had identified a few perspectives which had not been previously considered. The Task Force was appointed jointly in the summer of 1983 by Vice Presidents Frye and Sussman and held its first meeting in October, 1983. Following discussions the chair synthesized points into a statement which the group then reconsidered. Throughout deliberations the task force requested general faculty input, received a modest amount and discovered no blatant, major cases of unethical research currently at the University.

The emphasis of task force work was on establishing the principles of ethical conduct. The group's report, "Maintaining the Integrity of Scholarship," has five core sections which examine the matter in these ways:

1. Establishing the basis of what is and what is not integrity.

2. Pressures which compromise integrity.
3. How these pressures can be alleviated.
4. Principles and procedures for handling alleged violations.
5. Specific recommendations.

The task force recommends that the report be endorsed as written or with necessary amendments. In this case, endorsement means agreeing that certain principles would be followed. The task force also recommends that implementation of those principles be handled at the school and college level, that is, as close as possible to the research setting. The Medical School has already endorsed the report and Professor Steneck hoped that the Senate Assembly would also.

Professor Beutler suggested that a statement be added addressing the practice of simultaneous submission of a manuscript to two or more publications so that the author(s) can then select the most favorable response. Such practice strains the system of refereeing manuscripts. Professor Steneck noted that while most fields regard this practice as unethical, not all do and it is therefore difficult to develop a universal statement. Point #15, p. 7 may cover this situation.

Professor Chudacoff noted that there was no mention of creative art, including performance, which is presumed analogous to scholarship among some faculties. Could such a sentence be added? Professor Steneck replied that the task force had not ventured into defining what is fraudulent in the creative arts but some reference to it could be made in a footnote and will be considered.

With respect to p. 17, Item F, Professor Chudacoff asked for amplification of what steps might be taken to gain compensation for false allegations. In the past, Professor Steneck noted, the "whistle-blower" had often suffered. Because the task force believed that the University has an obligation to pursue allegations of fraud, it felt a need to protect potential reporters. At the same time, it was concerned about frivolous charges and consequent damage to the reputations of innocent people. He stated that false accusers could be punished or even sued by the damaged party and that this, like other procedural matters, remains to be worked out.

Professor Larson asked about the rationale for item #5, p. 19 as the first measure to be taken. She suggested that the sequence for promoting awareness of ethics might better begin in the research setting and then move to the classroom. Professor Steneck replied that no priority in sequencing was

intended and the task force was concerned that ethics be woven into the fabric of the whole University. Approaches might vary but the goal was shared.

Professor Moerman asked if the question of confidentiality had been raised by other groups with whom the task force had met. Professor Steneck replied that task force members themselves differed on the timing of public disclosure and ultimately agreed to provide flexibility for necessary individual judgment. For example, if a case involved a drug whose misuse could result in death, the need for confidentiality could not override the need for disclosure.

Professor Lehmann asked if the task force intended the University to designate someone to act as an agent for an external accuser asserting misconduct against an internal professor. Professor Steneck reported that this question had been raised and that the task force felt the University has an obligation in the matter. It is assumed that such a case would be reported to the Vice President for Research and a University official would act as the agent for the external party.

Because a substantial portion of the report deals with pressures put on faculty members, Professor Burdi asked for elaboration of the reasoning for the statement urging wide discussion of ethical conduct. Professor Steneck noted that administrative decisions can bear on the conduct of scholarship and therefore administrators should be encouraged to consider this link. Professor Burdi asked if proposed program reduction would call for debate. Acknowledging that program reduction puts pressures on scholarship, Professor Steneck noted that other administrative decisions, such as that to undertake certain types of research or switch from twelve-month to nine-month appointments, also have an effect and should be discussed.

In reply to Professor Stebbins, Professor Steneck stated that if adopted at various levels (especially by the Executive Officers), the report would be ready to serve as a framework to guide the schools and colleges in their development of procedures. The University would subscribe to recommendations 6-9 listed on p. 19. Endorsement of the report by the Senate Assembly would move this process along.

Observing that the report was very practical, Professor Sanders noted that it was nonetheless silent on the powerful role example plays in promulgating ethical principles. Professor Steneck noted that all teaching methods have strengths and weaknesses. Because most breaches of ethical conduct occur among senior researchers, it may be unwise to rely exclusively on them for role models. Courses in ethics can be fruitful means to change behavior. The University of Illinois, for example, uses modules to teach ethics.

Professor Burdi commended Professor Steneck and his colleagues for their work and moved that the Assembly endorse in principle the task force report. Professor Moerman seconded the motion. All members were in favor, none opposed.

REPORT BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE FACULTY (CESF)

a) CESF Annual Report

Professor Howrey, past chair, noted the following corrections:

1. p. 22, paragraph 3, line 8. Change "8%" to "92%."
2. p. 38, p. 8, column "1983/84", lines 1 & 2.
Change "0" to "1", and "blank" to "43,500"
Change "13" to "6" and "33,500" to "69,000"
3. p. 42, column "1983/84", lines 1 & 2
Delete "1" and "43,500"
Change "6" to "13" and "69,000" to "33,500"

He then reported that CESF's major activities last year were:

1. Two presentations to the Regents.
2. Subcommittee work on the benefits/disadvantages of faculty unionization.
3. Investigation of the adequacy of retirement income.
4. Preparation of the tables presented at the end of the annual report.

In meetings with the Regents, CESF emphasized the following:

1. Although salary increases over the last three years exceeded the rate of inflation, those over the last seven years fell short of the inflation rate. The net result has been a loss in faculty earning power.

2. Compared to the average salaries at peer institutions, U of M salaries lag increasingly. If the salary schedule continues to slip relative to peer institutions, the University's power to attract faculty will erode over the long run.

3. A three year University commitment to salary improvement is warranted.

b) CESF Agenda for 1984/85

Professor Beth Reed reported that CESF met with the Regents this Fall, summarized last year's report, proposals and plans, and will solicit Regents'

input during the Spring. Working through subcommittees, CESF plans to examine the status of current annuitants and retirement plans; study HMO's; and monitor the benefits package. With respect to the last, CESF questions to what degree it should consider variance. This may become especially important as the University moves increasingly to a merit system for salary increases. Two issues of the CESF Newsletter are planned for the year; faculty are encouraged to contribute suggestions for them. Professor Stebbins suggested that the Newsletter might provide analysis/advice on HMO's and Professor Reed concurred.

Professor Kaplan noted that some units are currently underfunded but must still meet teaching responsibilities. He asked if CESF considered such increases in workload and if the Regents were aware of it. Professor Reed was not aware that the topic had arisen in committee. Professor Green stated that SACUA plans to address the question to Vice President Frye.

On the matter of salary increases, Professor Bulkley suggested that CESF might take a retrospective view to see if gaps between units have increased more rapidly than before emphasis was placed on merit increases.

In reply to Professor Scheele's question, Professor Howrey stated that the choice of peer institutions for salary comparison was an historical coincidence; they were the institutions the Administration has traditionally chosen for comparisons. Professor Scheele asked if comparisons are based on status as a public institution. Professor Reed offered the impression that the Regents take pride in comparing U of M to private institutions at the top of reputational surveys. Professor Penchansky (a member of CESF) suggested that the University of Texas should probably now be included among schools competitive with Michigan.

Noting reports that CESF's data gathering process may shortly be changed and improved, Professor Moerman asked what other groups might do to foster this. Professor Reed replied that, first, CESF must identify what data are needed and that ready and direct access to data would be helpful. If CESF is unsuccessful in obtaining data they will ask for help. Professor Howrey stated that CESF has more access to internal data than to data from other institutions because, commonly, unit data compiled in detail at the U of M can't be compared to its equivalent at other institutions.

Speaking to CESF's Annual Report, table 11, p. 43, Professor Larson noted substantial salary differentials between male and female faculty at all professorial ranks and asked if CESF plans to address this. Stating that there is also a difference between average salaries for black and white faculty, Professor Reed said that the table has been forwarded to the Affirmative Action Office which is conducting an equity review. A CESF member is acting as an advisor to Affirmative Action for this study.

Professor Nadelman asked if there was to be a revised benefits package offered in Winter 1985 and if so, are these decisions made at the committee level. She expressed general concern that there was not sufficient input from the faculty who were faced often with a "fait accompli." Professor Reed clarified that the Administration, not CESF, is revising the benefits package and CESF is trying to master the intricacies as fast as possible. Further discussion was deferred to the next agenda item.

Professor Whitehouse spoke to the major impending nationwide review of TIAA-CREF and asked if CESF planned to consult the faculty regarding it. Professor Reed stated that CESF is already studying the matter, collecting materials and plans to meet with President Shapiro in the future.

c) Health Benefits Options

Professor McClamroch reported that as of March 1, 1985, the University plans to offer health care coverage through one of several Health Maintenance Organizations (HMO's) as an option to Blue Cross. These options already apply to the Dearborn and Flint campuses and would now be extended to the Ann Arbor campus. Likely choices of HMO's include:

1. Health Care Network (Blue Cross).
2. McCauley Health Plan (St. Jos. Mercy Hospital)
3. Health Plus (a "for profit" Genesee Co. HMO).

These are independent provider (IPA) HMO's. Another option may include a preferred provider option (PPO).

4. M-Care (U of M Hospital).

Each faculty member would have the option of selecting health care coverage through one of these organizations. Selections of an HMO will require careful consideration of the particular benefits, which differ to some extent. There will be substantial efforts, including brochures and meetings, to publicize these options. February 1985 will be the likely enrollment period. Because there are a number of details yet to be worked out, planning continues in the Office of Staff Benefits with input from the CESF subcommittee. HMO's are an Administration initiative to which CESF only recently gained information and CESF is responding as quickly as possible.

Professor Kaplan asked if the subcommittee was aware of previous study and controversy surrounding it. Professor McClamroch noted that the previous proposal differed by offering a closed panel of physicians. The present HMO's are assembled by other units.

In reply to Professor Chudacoff's question, Professor McClamroch stated that, yes, costs and benefits will vary but the details are not yet available. Some HMO's do not yet operate in the Ann Arbor area. When a faculty member elects an HMO, the University plans to pay its premium from the current costs of Blue Cross. Is major-medical coverage then being relinquished, Professor Chudacoff asked? Professor McClamroch said that this is an important question. At Dearborn and Flint one has the option of maintaining major-medical coverage. If you select an HMO, maintaining major medical would not appear to be desirable because it does not add much additional coverage for the cost.

A series of questions from a number of Assembly members received these answers:

1. All HMO's provide services outside their base areas.
2. It is believed that HMO's will also be offered to annuitants. There will be a Medicare "wrap-around" and all deductibles folded into the coverage.
3. The HMO option will be offered to all staff.
4. CESF wants to play a major informational role in the matter.
5. Staff Benefits is presently considering preparation of a brochure comparing benefits offered by the different HMO's.
6. Costs of HMO's are comparable to Blue Cross major medical costs as they now exist.
7. HMO's offer open enrollment each year; thus, enrollees can switch from one to another.
8. Electing an HMO is not mandatory but is an option. Instead of selecting an HMO, staff may continue with present medical coverage.

Professor Penchansky reported that Federal law requires the University to offer HMO's up to the cost of major medical insurance premiums. HMO's also provide office visits and are assumed to provide comprehensive coverage and drug costs for the same cost as Blue Cross coverage. He also stated that a state committee regulates HMO premium rates but has not yet taken an active role.

Professor Leonard asked if there were any reports on the success of plans such as the Kaiser plan. Professor McClamroch observed that other parts of the country have had substantial experience with HMO's and CESF could collect information on this experience.

On other CESF matters, Professor Powell asked for a brief report on potential additional benefits such as tuition refunds for dependents. Professor Reed reported that CESF is examining the issue and that the question of equity in benefit payments frequently arises. CESF needs to make a decision this year whether or not to recommend this as a new benefit.

Professor Beutler asked about progress in the faculty choosing various benefits options. Professor Reed replied that the University may be exploring a flexible benefits plan but CESF has no details. Two years ago, when CESF examined the topic, two issues arose: dual career families where both are employed at the U of M, and the cost of benefits for a family compared to those for single people. Through a benefits seminar, CESF members learned that employers are moving towards flexible benefits in a effort to contain costs of health benefits. CESF currently is not pressing for flexible benefits.

OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

NEW BUSINESS

Referring to Professor Nadelman's earlier comments, Professor Kaplan reported faculty interest in discussing issues which their representatives would in turn bring to Senate Assembly meetings. He suggested that to promote such discussion, SACUA consider sending a note to all deans or to Assembly representatives announcing discussion topics. Professor Green put the suggestion on the SACUA agenda. Professor Chudacoff asked if SACUA had considered putting an item on two consecutive agendas, first for discussion, then for action. Professor Green replied that this has been done and SACUA will continue the practice.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:01 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Patricia B. Yocum
Acting Senate Secretary