

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Regular Assembly Meeting, December 11, 1972

ATTENDANCE

Present: Rutledge, Allen, Anton, Hayward, Birch, Bowditch, Brockway, Caldwell, Cartwright, Cassidy, Cohen, Cooperrider, Crawford, Danielson, Darvas, DeKornfeld, Evaldson, Fader, Farrand, Franken, Goodman, Graebel, Krachenberg, Scholl, Taylor, Hymans, Jameson, Jensen, Kerr, Weber, Lands, Larkin, Lloyd, Loomis, Marshall, Nelson, Nystuen, Oberman, Ostrand, Overseeth, Preston, Rowe, Sawyer, Sears, Simpson, Colburn, Goldstein, Williams, Mohler, Kincaid, Hinerman

Absent: Buning, Cornish, Ehrenkreutz, Floyd, Hertzler, Higgins, Creeth, Magee, Meyer, Ice, Ryder, Sana, Deskins, Vander, Vaughn, Wilkes, Zweifler, Hildebrandt

Guests: Professors Bernstein, Eggertsen, Kaplan and Pilcher; Dr. Heebink; John Forsyth

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Hinerman called the meeting to order at 3:23 p.m. in the Rackham Amphitheater.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Hinerman asked whether there were any questions arising from the notes on the SACUA meetings; there were none. He said that there would be a similar opportunity to ask questions at the beginning of each Assembly meeting in the future.

Chairman Hinerman asked permission to add to the list of nominations and appointments the name of Professor Alvin Zander as a permanent alternate on the Review Panel for Classified Research proposals. The handling of such proposals had been impeded because there was always one member of the Review Panel missing. There were no objections.

Chairman Hinerman drew attention to the memorandum from Dr. Donald Lelong that had been distributed at the start of the meeting. He said that the document was an important one and he urged everyone to read it.

The chairman announced that his name had been added to the mailing list for correspondence addressed to deans and department chairmen by the executive officers.

A question had been asked at the last meeting about what became of money that was unspent because a faculty member left the University unexpectedly. The answer was that the funds reverted to the dean of the respective school or college, not to the central administration. Chairman Hinerman reported on a visit with Mr. Deane Baker, the newly-elected Regent. There had been a pleasant exchange of ideas, and it was clear that Mr. Baker intended to become well-informed about University affairs.

The next item on the agenda was a report to the Assembly by Professor James Pilcher, the chairman of the Committee on Economic Status of the Faculty.

REPORT BY
PROFESSOR
PILCHER,
CHAIRMAN,
CESF

Professor Pilcher came forward and gave a brief report. The Committee had hired a staff assistant, Mr. John Forsyth. Although he had not yet fully completed his previous duties, he was attending committee meetings and would soon be working full time.

The Committee had been debating whether its duties included locating sources of funds for any increases in faculty compensation that it proposed. The members of the Committee had been unable to resolve this issue among themselves, and would appreciate guidance from the Assembly. The question, as paraphrased by Professor Loomis, was whether CESF should simply be an advocate for the faculty or whether it should have the responsibility of seeing where money should come from.

A vigorous discussion ensued, with most speakers taking the position that the Committee should confine itself to the former role. The point was made that the other duties properly belong to the Budget Priorities Committee. Eventually Professor Loomis moved formally that the Assembly should direct the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty to devote itself primarily to improvements in compensation, with the understanding that it is not the Committee's duty to recommend or decide where the money is coming from. The motion was seconded by Professor Larkin.

Discussion proceeded on the motion. Some speakers said that they agreed with the spirit of the motion, but were dissatisfied with the wording; however, no amendments were formally proposed. Some questioned whether the faculty was abdicating its responsibility, but it was pointed out that a majority of the Budget Priorities Committee, including its chairman, were faculty members who were chosen by the Assembly.

When a vote was taken, the motion was passed by 30 votes in favor to 10 opposed.

Professor Oberman said that he would like to resurrect the question of educational benefits for children of faculty members, which were available at a number of universities. Professor Pilcher said that the Committee would be glad to study the issue. Professor Hayward suggested that the Committee might refer to notes made on this subject by its predecessors.

REPORT BY
PROFESSOR
BERNSTEIN,
CHAIRMAN,
LONG-RANGE
PLANNING
COMMITTEE

Chairman Hinerman now passed to the next item of business, and introduced Professor Isadore Bernstein, the chairman of the Long-Range Planning Committee. Professor Bernstein addressed the Assembly as follows:

"The Long-Range Planning Committee of the President's Office of Budget and Planning is charged with:

1. Proposing goals for the University in the 80's and 90's and
2. Suggesting the sequence of steps which will be necessary in order to attain those goals.

"In pursuing these objectives the Committee is directed to:

- a) Adequately inform itself on the status, operation and goals of the University at the present time, to
- b) Reinterpret the University's traditional role in preserving, expanding and transmitting knowledge to include new opportunities and demands imposed by economic, demographic, technological, educational and societal changes, and to

c) Project one or more models of the University based upon these findings.

"The Committee was told to consult widely both within and without the University in preparing recommendations about educational needs and how the University should participate in meeting these needs. Its findings will be, and in fact are being, reported to the Steering Committee on a continuing basis.

"The membership of the Committee includes:

Professors

Theodore Buttrey, Classics
Alfred Conard, Law
Claude Eggertsen, Education
Edward Hucke, Engineering
Wilfred Kaplan, Mathematics
Ann Larimore, Geography
Richard Mann, Psychology
Marc Ross, Physics

Students

Bob Cares
Jay Rising
and two more students who have been nominated by SGC but whose names have not yet been forwarded to the Committee.

Deans

Floyd Bond, Business Administration
Phillip Fellin, Social Work

Vice-Presidents

Wilbur Pierpont, Finance
Charles Overberger, Research

"Staff support for the Committee is provided by Dr. David Heebink, Assistant Vice-President of State Relations and Planning as executive secretary and Janice Burke and William Lasher from the Office of Institutional Research as resource people. Mr. James Lesch, Assistant to Vice-President Allan Smith, represents Academic Affairs. Dr. Donald Lelong, Director of the Office of Institutional Research, is working in close support of our activities.

"After a series of informal exploratory meetings held in small groups during the summer, the Committee convened its first full scale meeting September 21, 1971 at Inglis House. During an all-day and evening session, the Committee a) reviewed the history of its own development including the work of the Assembly's Proper Role Committee, and the Planning Conference at Inglis House on February 24-25, 1971 which the Proper Role Committee organized, b) the Assembly's Study Commission proposals made prior to 1972 and c) the Administration's moves towards greater faculty involvement in matters of budget and planning. Salient points of planning studies, carried out at other institutions, were reviewed.

"President Fleming gave the Committee his views of its prospective role in University affairs. He strongly indicated his belief that the Committee's findings and recommendations would be welcome and would receive serious consideration by the Administration since the need for effective dynamic long-range planning was evident to the Administration.

"The Committee spent some time discussing general principles of long-range planning and agreed that the planning process

- a) must involve input from all relevant sources of information,
- b) must involve those people who will implement the plans,
- c) should be capable of continually responding to future changes in the University's environment resulting from changes in societal desires and needs, from fiscal pressures, from technological developments, etc., and
- d) should allow the University to exert some control over its environment as well as reacting to it.

"The Committee decided to begin its work by:

- a) ascertaining what the schools and colleges are currently doing in the realm of long-range planning, with particular emphasis on techniques of planning, the degree to which basic information is available, correlating between the University's units, etc., and by
- b) attempting to identify and assess major trends and developments for the 80's and 90's which are likely to change the environment in which the University functions.

"To implement the first objective, a Subcommittee on Liaison with Schools and Colleges, chaired by Professor Kaplan, was charged with

- a) learning about the plans now being developed by the schools, colleges and other units such as the library and research centers,
- b) using this information to prepare a summary of plans for the University as envisaged by the units,
- c) assisting the parent committee in the development of new ideas on plans for the University based upon information derived from the separate units, and
- d) maintaining contact with the units to insure their participation in developing new ideas and the harmonization of such new ideas with their extant plans.

"Similarly, to accomplish the second objective, a Subcommittee on the Future Environment of the University, chaired by Professor Eggertsen, was charged with identifying and evaluating possible future changes in the University's total environment to which the University will be required to adjust, and with formulating goals which should guide the University's future activities.

"Both the subcommittees have been exceedingly busy meeting twice weekly on the average since October.

"Professor Kaplan's Subcommittee on Liaison with the Schools and Colleges is in the process of visiting with the dean and executive committee (or similar representative group) of each unit. Preceding each visit, the subcommittee transmits to all concerned a list of questions for discussion.

This agenda is formulated after the subcommittee peruses available information including reports of school activities, future plans, future needs, course lists, etc. as made available by the unit to be visited or the central administration. Each visit last 1-2 hours and visits are being made about once a week. Nursing, Natural Resources, Architecture and Design, Pharmacy, Dentistry and Law have been visited as of this date. The responses of the various school officials have been universally friendly, open and extremely useful.

"The visits have revealed a considerable variation in the extent of planning within units, as well as a considerable number of problems which appear to be general in the University, e.g. the difficulty in maintaining the clearly-desired strong link between the North and Central campuses.

"Professor Eggertsen's Subcommittee on the Future Environment has conducted a number of interviews with members of the University faculty who the Committee believes have expertise in predicting and evaluating forces which might alter the University's future environment. The Subcommittee is also formulating a written request for advice which will be distributed to all members of the University faculty. Similar requests will be made to students, staff, alumni and other groups. While the Subcommittee in an attempt to produce credible predictions about the environment of the future, will consider the study techniques and conclusions of institutions and individuals who have been concerned professionally with the issue, and while the Committee will certainly analyze trend data, it will not overlook the potentially positive contribution to the attainment of its objectives represented in the views of interested and informed members of the University community and of the public.

"The Subcommittee is specially interested in developing an operating procedure whereby members of the Assembly can make known **their** perceptions of the future environment of the University. Assembly members will be contacted by letter requesting cooperation in this regard and in setting up times at which discussions about the purpose and procedures of the project may be conducted with members of the Committee.

"It is also planned to seek counsel from such organizations as the American Association of University Women, the UAW-CIO, the Michigan Bar Association, the Michigan Education Association, and the American Automobile Manufacturers Association, among others. While the response of these, and a score or more of similar groups, may be presented in Committee hearings, it is hoped that members of the Assembly may be recruited to procure responses from other organizations which members believe could provide helpful reactions to the Subcommittee's questions.

"Relevant agencies at all levels of government will, of course, also be contacted for their informed opinions of trends which may imprint on the University in the future.

"The Committee on Long-Range Planning hopes to produce early in 1973 the first draft reports on certain phases of its activities. I would judge, however, from the amount of work to be done, that anything like final reports will not appear before the end of the summer. The Committee will need a period of time, e.g., Term IIIA, when it can meet in a concentrated, uninterrupted effort to evaluate its information input and to formulate alternative plans which, in its opinion, would allow the University to respond to various

perceptions of future environmental pressures while achieving the goals which have been set for it. These alternative plans, with their supporting data, will be funneled to the various involved units and individuals for critical review and return to the Committee for indicated revision. Such a cycle would likely have to be repeated a number of times before a series of viable alternative plans would emerge thus extending the needed time.

"A number of areas of its operations have as yet not been adequately defined by the Committee and will shortly begin receiving attention. For example, we need to work out techniques for continually updating our alternative projected responses as new information about the environment becomes available. We need to evolve a procedure for focusing on the specific problems identified as a result of our information-gathering. Probably most importantly, we need to develop our lines of communication with the University's units, as well as with individual members of the University community, so each will feel a responsibility for and involvement in long-range planning for the University."

Chairman Hinerman pointed out that besides Professor Bernstein, three other members of the Committee, Professors Eggertsen and Kaplan and Dr. Heebink, were present to take part in the discussion.

Professor Eggertsen, commenting that he wanted to inject a historical note, said that during the first year of the Assembly's existence, a resolution was passed favoring the kind of study that the Committee was undertaking.

Professor Hayward, identifying himself as a member of the Budget Priorities Committee, said that both that committee and Professor Bernstein's would only be effective if the Assembly remained aware that they existed and channel their desires through them.

Professor Lands asked whether the Committee was studying models of how the University was set up, and whether they had any valid way of formulating the goals of the University.

Professor Kaplan said that the subcommittee of which he was chairman had asked various units pointedly about their goals. When they were done, they would have a long list, some in conflict with each other. There was a job of harmonizing these goals, which had not been undertaken before. Another subcommittee was looking at what the goals should be some years ahead. Professor Nelson asked whether the Committee was talking to students. Professor Bernstein replied that they would be. Professor Eggertsen added that the Committee was securing data from a sample of graduate students in their final year. Also they were working with the Survey Research Center to develop techniques that would enable them to discern long-term plans. Professor Bernstein said that the hope was that the models could be projected and later evaluated by other committees.

Professor Cohen said that the nature and role of the branch campuses was important. They should not be thought of as identical with the main campus. They should play an important part in the growth of the University. He was aware of a morale problem at the Dearborn campus because some of the faculty there felt uncertain about their future with the University; this should be clarified. Professor Bernstein replied that both campuses were going to be represented on the Committee, which should be an indication that they were part of the family.

Professor Anton asked whether it was too early to assess the quantity and quality of planning now going on. Professor Kaplan replied that it varied greatly from one unit to another.

Professor Lloyd suggested that the Committee should be commended for the job they were doing. Chairman Hinerman heartily endorsed this sentiment, and added that the Assembly would like to hear from them again.

NOMINATIONS
AND
APPOINTMENTS

The following nominations were placed before the Assembly by SACUA:

Academic Affairs Committee - 1/1/73 to 9/1/73,
John Arthos, Professor of English Lang. & Lit.
(temporary replacement for Joseph Vining)

University Relations Committee - present to
May 1974, Mildred B. Loeffler, Director, Bus.
Ad. Library (replacing John D. Nystuen)

Board of Directors, University Cellar -
2-year term, Stephen R. Kimbleton, Ass't. Prof.
of Indust. & Operations Engineering (replacing
Charles H. Davis)

Review Panel for Classified Research -
Permanent alternate - Alvin F. Zander,
Professor of Psych & Ed., and Chairman of the
Research Policies Committee

The Assembly considered each of these nominations in turn, and all of them were accepted unanimously.

There was no old business

NEW
BUSINESS

Under the heading of new business, Professor Cohen brought up the question of intramural athletics. He pointed out that the University's Financial Report listed 13 buildings as being planned, with no mention of intramural facilities. He urged Chairman Hinerman to do what he could to advance the cause.

Chairman Hinerman said that an announcement would be made shortly to put matters in a more hopeful light. Professor Franken said that he had spoken with Mr. Canham, and that there was complete agreement about the need for better facilities. Professor Anton seconded these sentiments strongly, mentioning the long lines he had encountered in trying to reserve time for playing handball.

Chairman Hinerman asked that further discussion be postponed until the January meeting, at which time he hoped to have a report from Mr. Canham.

Also referring to the Financial Report, Professor Lands asked about two items. On Page 37 there was an entry of \$10.5 million for Other Research Units, while on Page 43 almost \$2.5 million was attributed to Other Publications and Printing. He asked what these items meant. Chairman Hinerman directed the question to Professor Crawford, who promised to look up the information.

ADJOURNMENT

The Assembly adjourned at 5:09 p.m.

Wilfred M. Kincaid
Secretary