

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Regular Assembly Meeting, November 20, 1972

ATTENDANCE

Present: Rutledge, Allen, Anton, Asgar, Birch, Bowditch, Brockway, Caldwell, Cartwright, Cassidy, Cohen, Cooperrider, Crawford, Danielson, Darvas, DeKornfeld, Ehrenkreutz, Evaldson, Farrand, Floyd, Franken, Goodman, Graebel, Krachenberg, Scholl, Taylor, Creeth, Jameson, Jensen, Kerr, Weber, Lands, Larkin, Lloyd, Loomis, Magee, Marshall, Meyer, Nelson, Oberman, Ostrand, Overseth, Ice, Preston, Rowe, Ryder, Sana, Sawyer, Sears, Vander, Vaughn, Goldstein, Wilkes, Mohler, Hildebrandt, Kincaid, Hinerman

Absent: Buning, Cornish, Fader, Hertzler, Higgins, Hymans, Nystuen, Deskins, Simpson, Colburn, Williams, Zweifler

Guests: Professors Thomas Dunn, William A. Ericson, and James Pilcher

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Hinerman called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m. at the Rackham Amphitheater.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Hinerman announced that the Senate Meeting on Monday, November 27 was also scheduled for the Amphitheater.

He asked permission to move the December Assembly meeting ahead a week, to December 11; there were no objections.

He then asked permission to add to the list of nominations the name of Professor Hadley Schaefer to fill a vacancy on the Budget Priorities Committee. There were no objections.

MINUTES APPROVED

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as distributed.

ADDRESS BY PROFESSOR PILCHER

Chairman Hinerman invited Professor James Pilcher, the chairman of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, to address the Assembly. He said that Vice-President Smith might not appear as scheduled, since he was addressing some student demonstrators at the Administration Building.

Professor Pilcher opened by saying that the Committee had been trying to find a staff assistant. There were 15 applicants originally, final interviews were being conducted, and they hoped to have someone appointed by December 1.

CESF was maintaining links with SACUA, with the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee, and with the Budget Priorities Committee. This was being done through common members and exchanges of minutes with these groups.

At its meeting of October 26, CESF set up a number of subcommittees to work on special problems. One of these was set up to consider faculty salary guidelines to use when the matter of faculty compensation was under discussion with persons or agencies outside the University. Another was set up to deal with internal salary guidelines. This latter subcommittee had useful discussions with members of the AAUP, in particular with Professor Hymans and his group, who had recommended a framework for setting salaries within the University.

The CESF recommended to Vice-President Smith that he should get information on minimum as well as average salaries in various units, in order to study the issue of whether there should be a general policy in this regard. Both subcommittees had focused on the 1974-75 budget year.

Several committees were concerned directly with fringe benefits. One of these was concerned with the apportionment of compensation between fringe benefits and salaries. Another was investigating the possibility of allowing options to individuals from a group of fringe benefits. Further subcommittees were concerned with early retirement, retirees' income, alternative health care systems, fractional appointments, and dental care.

Ten days earlier the Committee had been told that it wasn't too late to make recommendations for total salary adjustments in the 1973-74 budget. As a result, the Committee had changed its emphasis from the 1974-75 fiscal year to 1973-74. They were trying to come up with recommendations by mid-January.

Professor Pilcher closed by saying that the Committee was meeting once a week, and hoped to become more productive. He then opened the floor for questions.

Professor Anton, expressing curiosity about the new information the Committee had received, asked who they would send their recommendations for 1973-74 to. Professor Pilcher replied that the Committee would talk to SACUA and the Assembly, and would convey its recommendations to Vice-President Smith. Professor Anton asked how the Regents were likely to react, and Professor Pilcher said that he was not sure how to answer that question.

Professor Cohen said that he thought direct links with the Regents would be desirable, and that he would be pleased if the Committee could meet with them. Professor Pilcher said that they would do so if directed by the Assembly. Chairman Hinerman said that SACUA had been assured that the Committee could have time with the Regents if it were needed.

Professor Nelson speculated that the Committee might be able to strengthen the Administration's hand in some cases; Professor Pilcher agreed.

Professor Cohen remarked that there was severe time pressure this year, but expressed the hope that in subsequent years a wider range of questions could be considered. Professor Pilcher replied that there had already been instances of this, and cited a case in which there was some dispute about arrangements for a staff member's leave. He stressed, however, that the Committee should concern itself with general principles rather than becoming a grievance board.

Chairman Hinerman said that he hoped the Assembly members had copies of the timetable that had been prepared by Vice-President Smith. The recommendations from CESF would be reviewed by SACUA and the Assembly, and would then be carried to the Budget Priorities Committee.

ADDRESS BY  
PROFESSOR  
JNN

At this point he introduced Professor Dunn, the chairman of the Budget Priorities Committee, who had been invited to speak on the work of that committee.

Professor Dunn addressed the Assembly as followed:

"It must be recalled that the Budget Priorities Committee originates in the President's Office of Budget and Planning and has three constituencies. The first of these is the Administration, second is the Faculty, whose members are nominated by the Assembly upon the advice of SACUA and the third is the students whose members are nominated by SGC.

"It would be nice to be able to report a solid series of substantive achievements at this time but this has not turned out to be possible as yet. I will divide my comments into three categories, Problems, Questions and Achievements.

"In the matter of Problems we have here a committee containing two Vice-Presidents, two Deans, Administrative personnel, Faculty and students and it is impossible for this committee to meet as a whole at any time during the week. Even evening sessions are subject to problems because of commitments of members elsewhere.

"The Budget Priorities Committee is also operating, to some extent, in a vacuum in that there are as yet no reports from the long range or program evaluation committees which enable any framework of the priorities of the University to be set up. What priorities have so far been used by the Budget Priorities Committee are those which were originally suggested in the report of the Commission on Resource Allocation but more specific priorities will have to be defined before this committee can function with full efficiency.

"The questions which have arisen during our discussions are four in number. The first of these is whether the committee should operate on incremental or total budget dollars. Clearly, from an initial operating point of view, it is far easier to operate on incremental dollars but the total purview of the committee should probably consider total budget control. The problems of the latter type have already been accentuated by such operations as that experienced by the University of Minnesota and so far it is not felt that the directions are sufficiently well-defined to enable a total budget control to be carried out. The committee will continue to look at both aspects, however.

"Secondly, should the Budget Priorities Committee be a line committee or not? In other words, should the Budget Priorities Committee allow itself to become emmeshed in the timetabling of budgetary presentation by the Administration? The amount of detail and the time constraints of such a process are great and some members of the committee do not feel that this is a proper role for it to adopt.

"Thirdly, should we be operating on a philosophical basis and in a non-line capacity? Such an operation depends upon the

development of a set of philosophies and in this regard some work is proceeding which will, hopefully, at least show us where our money is going and in what way our commitments have changed during the past five years. This may form the basis of some philosophy on budget priorities.

"Fourthly, should we be operating on a contingency basis i.e., should we be preparing contingency plans as to how we should approach anything from a 2% contraction to a 5% expansion? The working paper on this is being prepared by Professor Harold Shapiro for discussion at the next meeting when the ramification and significance of this mode of operation will be explored.

"In terms of achievements, the committee has made itself knowledgeable in many areas of the budget ranging from its general structure, through the operation of the program budget evaluation system of the State of Michigan and including specific presentations on varied topics from financial aid to a discussion of the compensation policy of the University.

"The committee has also considered in moderate detail the format and presentation of the program revision requests for 1973-74 as well as the institutional program plan for the same year. In a consideration of program revision requests the general basis for critical discussion were the rules laid down by the Commission on Resource Allocation.

"The committee made the final recommendation to the Executive Officers on the contracted 1972-73 budget because of the loss of revenue and the resultant competition between salary increases and other possible directions in which this money could be spent such as financial aid. The committee strongly supported the retention of our commitments to financial aid, particularly those in the region of the Opportunities program and minorities programs generally. Also, they concurred with the implementation of the salary increase at 5.2% for a 10 month basis rather than 4.3% on a 12 month basis with operations set at a 98.8% level for 1972-73. All of these recommendations were subsequently followed by the Executive Office.

"The committee agreed to an exchange of minutes with the committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty since they regard the plans being made by this committee as an important factor in the total budgetary assessments.

"Finally, the committee has realized the importance of building plans in future expenditures of the University and has resolved that all future plant extension decisions be referred to it together with a copy of the substantive part of the minutes of that committee.

"The committee is as yet only a little over six months old and despite problems concerned with the operation of such a broadly based committee, it is felt that a positive contribution to the budgetary process of the University can be made once the procedural and modalities of operation have been established."

In response to a question by Professor Anton about the Program Budget Evaluation System, Professor Dunn said that the Governor's Office was deeply involved in it, but the Legislature was not. Its effects on the campus could be far-reaching, since it was concerned with programs rather than units and could thus have direct effects even at the departmental level.

In an interchange with Professor Cohen, Professor Dunn agreed that budget planning is made more difficult by the fact that funds that are set aside to meet contingencies are apt to be taken away.

Professor Loomis asked what happened to money that was freed by the unexpected departure of faculty members. Professor Dunn replied that it was returned to the appropriate dean's office. This was questioned by Professor Mohler, who said that this was not in harmony with the information he had been given in his own college.

In response to a question from Professor Lands about the goals of the institution, Professor Dunn said that the committee had nothing to go on except for the mottos of the colleges, and statements made after the fact. He hoped that some useful ideas would emerge from the Long-Range Planning Committee. Professor Larkin expressed some concern that goals were being shifted through successive budget parings without conscious setting of directions.

Professor Anton asked whether the Committee had begun measuring productivity. Professor Dunn replied that it had not gone very far in this direction, but that some attention was being paid to whether money was being spent in the directions for which it had been requested.

Dr. Hinerman said that Vice-President Smith had apparently been unable to get to the meeting. He had given assurance, however, that he welcomed the new procedures that had been described, thinking that they represented a move in the right direction.

NOMINATIONS  
AND  
APPOINTMENTS

In accordance with the agenda, Chairman Hinerman presented a number of nominations to the Assembly for consideration.

The first of these was the nomination of Professor Allan G. Feldt to a 3-year term on the Board of Directors of the Student Bookstore, replacing Professor Jonathan Bulkley. There were no further nominations, and Professor Feldt was elected unanimously.

The Interviewing Board for the University Court of Appeals submitted the following student panel of six names:

Cheri Bank	Law	2-year term	Geri Sprung	LSA	1-year term
Ken Kohnstam	Law	2-year term	Mark Wingerson	LSA	1-year term
Mark Goldsmith	LSA	1-year term	Robert Rosen	Med.	2-year term

Professor William Ericson was present to describe the procedures of the Interviewing Board. Professor Ericson said that three members of the board had interviewed 20 students who volunteered for the panel. The interviewers were in agreement on their rankings, and were very impressed by the quality of the students.

Professor Rutledge asked what criteria were used by the Interviewing Board. Professor Ericson mentioned experience and the need to achieve a

certain balance of representation. In response to a question from Professor Cohen, he said that it was accidental that the three panel members with one-year terms were all from LS&A.

The panel was approved unanimously by the Assembly.

Professors Richard W. Bailey and Eugene Feingold were presented as a panel of two names to fill a vacancy on the Committee on Communications, replacing Professor Marvin Felheim. The panel was approved unanimously. (One member of the panel will be selected by SGC.)

In accordance with the understanding reached at the beginning of the meeting, the nomination of Professor Hadley Schaefer to the Budget Priorities Committee (replacing Professor Robert Vinter) was considered. Professor Schaefer was elected unanimously.

There was no old or new business.

ADJOURNMENT

The Assembly adjourned at 4:46 p.m.

Wilfred M. Kincaid  
Secretary