

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Assembly Meeting, December 14, 1970

ATTENDANCE

Present: Alston, Asgar, Barnes, Bassett, Bertolaet, Bett, Birch, Bishop, Bole, Bowditch, Bowman, Castor, Coon, Cooperrider, Cornish, Crawford, DeKornfeld, Dowson, Eggertsen, Frye, Galler, Gilbert, Graebel, Handler, Hauenstein, Hinerman, Huntington, Iglehart, Jensen, Kish, Lind, Magee, Marsden, Meyer, Michelsen, Mills, Morgan, Nelson, Norman, Overseth, Porter, Price, Richards, Rigan, Rucknagel, Ryder, Scherer, Schulze, Schuman, Sears, Shappirio, Sonntag, Votaw, Wilkes, Yagle, Yablonky, Weinberg

Absent: Abrams, Brown, Carter, Goodman, Hooper, Hazlett, Kahn, Krachenberg, Lloyd, Rhodes, Sandalow, Youngdahl

C L TO ORDER

Chairman Weinberg called the December meeting to order at 3:20 p.m. in the Rackham Amphitheatre.

ANNOUNCE-  
MENTS

Chairman Weinberg announced that the proposal for a permanent judiciary was scheduled to be discussed at the Regents' meeting on Friday, December 18, that the matter will come before the Assembly for discussion at its January, 1971 meeting and will go back to the Regents at the January meeting for possible action.

REPORT OF  
SACUA ACTIVI-  
TIES

Professor Coon, reporting on SACUA activities since the last Assembly meeting, said three meetings had been held. At one of the meetings, SACUA met with chairmen of three Assembly committees -- Campus Planning, Research Policy and University Relations for informal reports on their work. An evening meeting was devoted to an informal discussion of the role of collective bargaining of faculty government. Another meeting involved Vice President for Student Services, Robert Knauss, in a discussion of a mechanism for appointing faculty members to the OSS Policy Board units. Other activities included a discussion with Dr. Owen Haig of the Medical School on a proposal for a clinic for street people, a discussion with Professor Theodore St. Antoine of the Law School and Chairman of the University Council on crisis handling by the Council and SACUA and also a discussion

regarding extension of the president calendar for the academic year 1972-1973 instead of for two years. (Chairman Weinberg interjected the comment that the one-year extension was agreeable to the central administration). SACUA also discussed the proposed Sports Service Building.

Also, at a meeting held today with President Fleming, Professor Coon reported that items discussed included a time schedule for handling the proposal on the permanent judiciary, HEW guidelines and the appointment of a Commission on Women.

REMARKS BY  
VICE PRESIDENT  
FAURI

Vice President for State Relations and Planning F. F. Fauri at the outset read the Regental Bylaw that created the office he assumed some months ago. He noted that the office has an important but limited role in the area of planning, that all planning functions were not vested in his office.

For the past few months, he said, he and the staff have been concentrating on ways and means of presenting the University's budget request for 1971-72. This afternoon he said he wanted to discuss the requested compensation increase of ten per cent, totaling approximately \$10 million.

The Vice President pointed out that for those who think this 10 per cent is an unrealistic figure, in view of the economic climate, he noted that it would require a 14 per cent increase to bring the University compensation decline since 1966-67 back in line with the average national AAUP increases, the Michigan Civil Service salary range adjustments and the Detroit area price increases. He said there had been a significant drop in the University's national AAUP compensation ranking in recent years. The University was ranked 17th in 1967-68, 24th in 1968-69 and 31st in 1969-70. He said preliminary data indicate that there has been a further drop in 1970-71.

Vice President Fauri said the Michigan Civil Service salary range adjustments alone, excluding merit step and fringe benefit increases, have been substantially greater than the University compensation increases. Between 1966-67 and the current fiscal year, a "percentage point gap" of 7.3 per cent has accumulated relative to Michigan Civil Service salaries.

He said the University's relative position to salaries paid in the Big Ten has declined. For many years, he said, the University's average salary has been the highest for all the public universities in the Big Ten. Only Northwestern outranked Michigan. In 1969-70, Michigan dropped to third in the average salary paid to full professors with

Illinois ranking second. Moreover, the spread between the highest average salary for full professors in the Big Ten and the average at Michigan has increased from \$600 in 1965-66 to \$2,100 in 1969-70. At the same time the spread between the University's average salary and the average at the lowest paid institution has narrowed. Moreover, in the last five years the University granted the lowest percentage salary increases among the Big Ten institutions for all professorial ranks.

Vice President Fauri said the situation is similar when the University's salaries are compared to four-year institutions in the State of Michigan. Some of the Michigan universities have been able to provide higher salary increases than have been provided at the University in the last few years. For the current year, he said, two universities in the state provided compensation increases of twelve and eleven per cent, respectively.

Vice President Fauri cited a comparison in salaries, by rank, being paid at Eastern Michigan University and at the University's Ann Arbor campus for the current year. These are as follows:

	<u>U-M</u>	<u>Eastern</u>
Professor	\$20,607	\$20,089
Associate Professor	15,000	14,547
Assistant Professor	12,283	11,839

In citing these figures, Vice President Fauri explained that the University figures exclude the Flint campus and the School of Medicine and are on a nine-month basis. He also noted that at the University salaries for faculty as a whole are higher on average. At Eastern, a higher proportion are at the lower rank including instructors.

In conclusion, Vice President Fauri said it was his belief that the current salary scales at the University are resulting in the loss of prestige for the University in the academic world, bringing about a vulnerability to raiding of faculty by higher-paying institutions, and posing difficulty in recruiting new faculty members with outstanding qualifications. He said it was his hope, despite the bad economic climate in the State, that through the joint efforts of the University administration and faculty that we can reverse the trend of recent years and bring about needed salary improvements.

Professor Scherer asked whether the academic performance audit was tied to the requirement for a certain number of contact hours which each faculty member is supposed to have.

Vice President Fauri said there was no separate act. He said if we're successful in getting rid of the ten contact-hours provision, the performance audit will still remain.

Professor Eggertsen asked whether there are other ways the faculty can co-operate with Vice President Fauri's office.

Vice President Fauri said there are lots of ways. He said Professor Wilfred Kaplan, chairman of the Proper Role Committee, is trying to put together a document on the role of the University from the faculty point of view.

PROPOSED  
SPORTS SER-  
VICE BUILDING

Chairman Weinberg explained that an agenda item had been added dealing with the proposed construction of a Sports Service Building. He explained that SACUA and faculty members of the Board in Control of Intercollegiate Athletics felt it was appropriate to have the matter discussed by the Assembly. He said materials relating to the proposed building had been distributed and faculty members of the Board in Control of Intercollegiate Athletics and Athletic Director Donald Canham were present to answer any questions. He said Professor McKeachie of the Board in Control had been invited by SACUA to explain the action of the Board.

Before Professor McKeachie spoke, Professor Galler asked whether the chairman was ruling out possible action by the Assembly. Another questioner asked why the matter was coming before the Assembly and whether such matters normally come before the Assembly.

Chairman Weinberg said he was not ruling out possible action by the Assembly but he suggested that we handle the discussion somewhat informally since some people present at today's meeting are not members of the Assembly and wish to participate in the discussion. He also said that the matter was being brought before the Assembly to inform members on the action taken by the Board in Control of Intercollegiate Athletics. He said that action on such building projects is the province of the Regents after such proposals are considered by Vice President Pierpont and the

central administration. But, he said, faculty members of the Athletic Board and SACUA felt the matter should be brought before the Assembly.

Professor McKeachie's remarks follow:

When a faculty member hears within the space of a month first the news that all academic units are to cut their budgets three per cent and a little later that the Board in Control of Intercollegiate Athletics is proposing to build a \$375,000 Sports Service Building, he has a legitimate reason to wonder what form of institutional schizophrenia has afflicted us. It seems preposterous that we could contemplate such an expenditure when we are so impoverished.

The majority of the members of the Board in Control are faculty members. We take as our goal not that of enhancing the Athletic Program for its own sake but rather that of the general good of the University. If this is our goal, you might ask why we don't simply turn the \$375,000 over to the University general funds. It is because we feel that this is a reasonable question that we asked that our recommendations to build the Sports Service Building be presented to this Assembly before going to the Regents.

The logical beginning would be to describe the need for the building. We do want to indicate why we think the University needs this building, but we don't wish to contend that this is the most vital thing the University would do with \$375,000. What I would like to do is explore with you the relative costs and benefits of spending this particular \$375,000 on this building versus other worthy uses. To do that, let's step back a moment to gain some perspective.

I am not at all sure what place a big-time football team and a 101,001-seat stadium have in a university. I know some of the arguments such as providing a common interest for a diverse body of students, alumni and the general public. I think they have some validity, but I don't find them very compelling and if I were founding a university, I doubt that I would build it around a giant stadium.

But this is the University of Michigan. We have a stadium; we have a football team which has been financially profitable through a large part of the University's history;

we have an organizational structure in which physical educational, intramural sports and intercollegiate athletics are under one director and football is expected to finance a good deal of the activities which would otherwise be financed by general funds. Whether or not this is ideal, it exists.

With this mode of financing we get into trouble when profits drop and costs rise as they have in recent years. One of the reasons we ran into trouble was the cost of the Crisler Arena. I don't know how responsible the Board in Control was for this expenditure, but all the stories seem to agree that Mr. Crisler was against the building and the decision to go ahead was by the Administration and the Regents. As a result of that decision, student fees which have been used to support intramural and other athletic activities were withdrawn from the operation budget and pledged to cover the debt on the building. Thus as intramural facilities deteriorated, the University eventually had to make an allocation from general funds to improve them. That three-year allocation terminates this year.

If we are going to have \$375,000 for a building, why shouldn't we at least pay the expenses for heat, light and so forth on the Arena, rather than build a building? The Board in Control recognizes that the general funds allocation will receive close scrutiny each year that intercollegiate athletics generates funds, but the situation between the Commission on Allocation of Resources and Intercollegiate Athletics is very much like that between the Legislature and the University. The Legislature is threatening to reduce our appropriation by an amount proportional to the amounts we receive in gifts and research grants. We argue that if they do so, they remove all incentives to go out and ask for funds from other sources.

I believe that that argument also holds in the present case. Don Canham and his staff have generated additional revenue by effective ticket promotion, by attracting contributions from sports fans and by negotiations of a very favorable contract from the Detroit Lions. To now say that whatever is generated will be taken away, without regard for the needs of intercollegiate athletics, intramural sports and physical education would be an obvious blow to the spirit and energy that has generated the funds. One of the great strengths of the University is our decentralization and willingness to move ahead where we can, rather than holding every unit to the progress of those having the most difficulty.

What I have been saying is that the needs of the units which generate funds should have some weight in determining

how the funds are expended. I am not saying that these funds should provide luxuries while units are in poverty. We have to demonstrate that there is a need for a building and I now like to turn to that.

Essentially the new building will help meet four needs which we have felt for some time: 1) the need for medical and training facilities in the area of Ferry Field, Yost and the Sports Building; 2) the need for equipment storage for intramurals; 3) the need for expanded locker rooms for varsity, clubs and intramural athletics, men and women; 4) the need for physical education classrooms.

Doctor Hinerman will discuss the medical needs. Let me review the other three needs. I'll be brief since they are described in the materials you received before the meeting.

At present there is a small shed at the corner of Ferry Field used for intramural equipment storage. It is not adequate. The tartan turf on Ferry Field is used day and night; yet there are no training-room facilities or meeting rooms.

Similarly, locker facilities for club sports, women's teams or intramural teams using Ferry Field are very limited. In fact, last year when the Women's National Field Hockey Tournament was held here, the teams had to dress in their hotel rooms.

Physical education classrooms are no less needed. Four will be included in the new building and these can be used for team meetings which now must be held in the locker room where they block access to the training room. It is not entirely coincidental that the locker rooms and training facilities in the new building will meet the need of the football team, but the Board was impressed that the needs were strongly stated by heads of women's and men's physical education and intramural and club sports.

These needs are not new. The Board voted almost two years ago to construct this building as soon as we could. We didn't just find the money and look around for something to spend it on. But the Lions game contract gives us the funds we need. The slackness in building makes contractors eager to bid. Your representatives believe that we should now go ahead.

Professor Hinerman said that over the past ten years three committees have looked into the medical needs for

athletics at the University. He quoted from one report which spoke of major deficiencies. He also noted the school's responsibilities in litigation involving athletes. Professor Hinerman said to fail to provide the needed medical facilities as provided for in the proposed Sports Service Building would be a crime. He said it's long overdue to build such a facility for medical care alone.

Professor Shappirio asked what portion of the proposed building would be devoted to medical care.

Professor Hinerman, in reply, said it would come to a large fraction. Professor McKeachie said about one quarter of the space is blocked off in the plan.

Professor Scherer asked whether the new facility would clear space for other classrooms elsewhere.

Professor McKeachie said he thought it would.

Director of Athletics Canham said physical education classes are meeting in several buildings on the campus. He said we're meeting in hallways and in the basement of the Athletic Office.

Professor Scherer commented that it would be important to know what capacity is being freed up by the proposed building.

Professor Galler referred to the \$600,000 reserves in the Athletic budget and quoted from a letter which he said was written by an LS&A Department Chairman to the Dean of the College, decrying the increase in class loads of the staff and appealing for additional funds. He said as a member of the LS&A executive committee, he was trying to find four per cent in the budget to help increase salaries. We're in the process of turning down requests for replacements of the faculty, he said. He added he doesn't know when the Athletic Board will discover Michigan has a financial crisis. The Sport Building, he said, will begin to cost the University maintenance costs. When I came, he said, the Athletic program was self-supporting. In the last three or four years, they've lost money and there's been a 17 per cent increase in salaries and we might ask why. He said the Athletic program reserve ought to go into the general fund and we ought to cut out the University contribution to the Athletic program.

Professor Galler moved the following motion: it reads: "The Senate Assembly recognizing the serious financial situation in the entire University, strongly recommends that the proposed Sports Services Building not be constructed at this time." The motion was seconded by Professor Abrams.

Professor Galler also commented on the remodeling for the Office of Student Services now underway in the Michigan Union. He asked, how do we respond to these issues?

Chairman Weinberg said in the particular instance of the remodeling of the Union for the OSS, the Regents found out only after most of the relevant decisions had already been made. He said SACUA has tried to anticipate issues.

Professor McKeachie said the letter to which Professor Galler referred was one he had written. He said he disagrees with the notion that the University has no responsibility to the intramural and physical education programs and that football should foot the entire bill. The maintenance of the Crisler Events Building is not entirely the responsibility of the Athletic program. He said the Lions contract is not an ordinary one; it constitutes a donation for this building which Mr. Canham convinced the Lions to make. Part of the money comes from donors to the Victors Club.

Professor Bowditch asked why will the transfer of funds interfere with giving?

Professor McKeachie replied that the donors give money for athletic scholarships and nothing else.

Professor Bowditch said there is a larger issue than the need for this building. I like to take advantage of sports, he said. If there's \$500,000-\$600,000 sitting in the bank, who has the right to that money and who controls it? He said if there was a deficit in Athletics, wouldn't they dip into general funds? Who makes that decision, he asked?

Professor McKeachie said the Board in Control, if Intercollegiate Athletics is incorporated independently. The majority on the Board are faculty, he said, and we try to reflect the faculty view. The reserves have been dropping in recent years and at present it amounts to two football games; it's not very large if we got snowed out or bombed out.

Professor Dunn, who said he would become an Assembly member in January, 1971, said separate funds--athletic funds and general funds--are historical accidents. The real problem arises in trying to look at expenditures of the University as a whole. He said we can't view athletic expenditures separately from other expenditures. If the University is going to examine its attitudes and resources, it can't do so by examining things piecemeal. There is a need for such a building, he said, but the question is one of timing. One has to look at real balance sheets and now is a bad time to go into this building.

Professor Crawford said the OSS remodeling came as a surprise to the Regents. There is a faculty advisory committee to Vice President Pierpont to ask and receive information on such matters and also a Plant Extension Committee chaired by President Fleming and including most of the Vice Presidents. He said that he and Professor Cleveland were on the latter committee. He said we sat in the meeting when the item of the Sports Service Building came up. He said the point he was making is that the faculty has representation all along the line.

A comment was made that this building doesn't approach the need for an intramural building at all, that the money could be better spent in providing indoor facilities for intramural activities.

Professor Porter said he did not understand how physical education is entirely paid for by intercollegiate athletics. Most universities, he said, do not run physical education in this fashion.

Professor McKeachie responded by saying that basically physical education is out of general funds.

In response to a question as to how the building will be paid for, Athletic Director Canham said it would be financed in the same way the tartan turf in the stadium was handled over a five-year period. He said the exhibition football games will pay off the yearly indebtedness.

Professor Porter said he had little confidence that intercollegiate athletics can pay for itself here in the future. He said we're going to have to be looking at direct subsidization of athletics.

Professor Bowditch suggested that we have a discussion at the next meeting. More important, he said, is how the University allocates its resources.

Chairman Weinberg said that given the fact that this matter is on the Regents' agenda at their meeting this week, the Assembly ought to be able to express itself if it chooses.

In response to a question as to what should be done, Professor Galler responded by saying that the Athletic Board should prepare a budget with no money from the general fund.

Professor Hinerman said he wanted to clear up some misconceptions. He said if the money is not used for the proposed building, it will not be there. He said the intercollegiate program has never spent one red cent from the general funds. He said the money you're talking about is used to pay overhead for the intramural program.

Director Canham said the intercollegiate athletic program had never used any general fund money. The Department does get general fund money, he explained. The sum of \$360,000, he said, is pledged by state law to the indebtedness for the Crisler Arena. Other money from the general fund, \$147,000, is for maintenance on the Crisler and intramural buildings.

Professor Galler said he can't allow that kind of statement to be made that general funds are not used. This statement, he said, takes a good deal of scrutiny.

In the vote on the Galler motion, on a show of hands, the motion was defeated 30 to 20.

Professor Scherer moved that "the Assembly expresses concern that the expenditure of funds on a new Sports Service Building might be a misallocation of resources at this time. It urges the Regents to defer consideration of this proposal for two months until a further study is completed." The motion was seconded.

In a vote on the Scherer motion, by a show of hands, the motion was carried 34 to 23.

Chairman Weinberg referred to two documents submitted with the call to the meeting relating to a proposal endorsing a Free Clinic for Street People. He called on Professor Coon, of SACUA, who proposed the following resolution:

"With full realization of the needs of this segment of our community and the needs of our students and staff to satisfy the demands of their conscience, and with the further realization that this endeavor is potentially of great value

FREE  
CLINIC  
FOR STREET  
PEOPLE

to the education, services and research activities which are the responsibilities of the University, the Senate Assembly urges that the University and its several schools provide the necessary sanctions for the operation of a 'Free Clinic for Street People'".

The resolution was supported by Professor DeKornfeld.

Professor Paul Gikas, speaking in favor of the resolution, said there is a need for medical care for a segment of the population who are not getting it. These, he said, are young people, many of them non-students. He said there is a physical facility which is available at 302 East Liberty, which is now being shared by Ozone House and Drug Help. These two groups which are currently functioning have many people coming in with needed medical help, many of them with infectious diseases and suffering from malnutrition. He said they won't go to existing "straight" facilities unless it's a last resort. He said such a service could be of benefit to the community, that the University has a legitimate concern, that many of our students would receive training and experience not available in the Outpatient Clinic. He said the clinic would serve a teaching function and the University would be involved in service.

Professor Gikas said that there is a need for approval to involve University residents and interns because of licensure problems. Many do not have permanent licenses or malpractice insurance. He said the clinic would be supported without any great financial involvement from the University. All help would be on a voluntary basis. There would be no salaries and the only expenditures would be for medications. He said the clinic has equipment donated or pledges of donations. He said we think we can get enough money from the community to meet our needs. He said there were some 60 clinics like this one in the United States. Many are without such endorsements. One in Detroit failed because it was poorly organized.

Dr. Owen Haig of the Medical School faculty, said the first such clinic was started at Haight-Asbury in San Francisco and is serving 60 to 70 patients a day. He said we've spent six months organizing this one carefully.

Professor Gikas said that what we're asking for from this body is to approve the philosophy. He said the appropriate unit in the Medical School will take action.

Professor Bowman, from the School of Public Health, read the following letter from Professor Brown, another member of the Assembly, addressed to Chairman Weinberg:

"Unfortunately I will be out of town on Monday, December 14, and therefore unable to attend the next meeting of the Senate Assembly. I am writing you at this time because of an item on the agenda for that meeting. I am extremely disturbed about the proposed resolution supporting a 'free clinic for street people'. On the basis of the information provided to us, it would seem to me indeed unfortunate if the Senate Assembly of the University of Michigan were to go on record as being in favor of this project. There are no reasons given why these individuals do not seek health care from existing facilities. Those who are students should certainly attend the University-operated Student Health Service. Those who are not students should not be any consideration of ours. By condoning the whole project we would, in fact, be condoning many actions which many of us disapprove of violently. In light of the tremendous importance of public relations and the image of the University in these present difficult times, I cannot help but feel that it would be a grave mistake for us to go on record as providing any kind of help for these individuals who choose to live outside of the bounds of accepted society."

Professor Bowman said he shared some of Professor Brown's feelings. He said he doesn't object to the establishment of the clinic and to the idea of students volunteering their services. But he said he had reservations about the University sanctioning such a service.

In elaborating on his position, Professor Bowman raised a number of questions.

He asked first, how does the University explain to taxpayers its sponsorship of a clinic to serve a small group of students and transients when a sizeable group of Michigan families, many in the Southeast Michigan area, have many unmet health needs and little hope of equally easy access to treatment facilities.

He asked why should such a clinic be given University sanction. Professor Bowman said University students associated with the street people already have access to the University Health Service facilities provided by tax monies and student fees. And he said it is recognized that many of the non-students associated with the street people are from

families who are well able to provide for their medical needs.

He asked, why won't the University students involved use the University Health Service? The only answer given, he said, is that they do not want their records to show treatment for overuse of drugs or for VD. Does this imply the operation of the proposed clinic free of records, he asked? If so, is this a desirable learning environment for students from the professional schools to be involved? And he asked, are students to be associated with any venture aimed at circumventing state laws?

Professor Bowman noted that the principal reason given for University sanction of the clinic is to provide provisions for University faculty and staff under the University Malpractice Insurance Policy. He asked whether anyone knows how this will affect the costs of this insurance for the University. He asked whether the University should be expected to take this risk or whether the clinic should be expected to carry its own malpractice insurance.

He noted that the City Board of Health has endorsed the idea of such a clinic but he said it is of interest to show that this was done over the objection of two MDs, Dr. Engelke, Health Officer, and Dr. Harry Towsley, a member of the Board. He said, basically, Dr. Engelke objects to the establishment of small clinics to meet the needs of special groups and believes that the services listed for the proposed clinic already are available in the community.

Professor Bowman said justifying the proposed clinic on the basis that street people will not use established medical facilities makes no sense in view of the stack of bills received by the local Health Department each month for reimbursement to local physicians for VD treatment provided for street people and others in their offices or local clinics.

He said justifying the proposed clinic on the basis of protecting the community from these people also makes no sense to Dr. Engelke since he feels that the Health Department already has adequate power and means to protect the community against the spread of diseases.

Professor Bowman also said that the Health Department has given no approval for the use of the building at 302 East Liberty for clinic purposes, contrary to the statement of November 23.

Professor Haig, responding to Professor Bowman's questions, said residents do work outside without licensure, that the majority of people voted approval at the Health Department, that we have to get involved in service functions and that there are problems of minors and you can treat them. He said it all comes down to the point of free clinics. In four years, since free clinics have been created, no suit has been filed. He asked, why should we bother with the whole younger generation? Why are they alienated? Because, he said, of the attitude expressed here. If we don't bother with them, he said, we're going to lose a whole generation.

Professor Galler said he doesn't feel competent to vote on this, that he doesn't think the Assembly is competent to handle this.

Professor Hinerman said one of the reasons for bringing this resolution to the Assembly is that there are many schools involved, Medical, Dentistry, Pharmacy, even LS&A students. He said we shouldn't sit in judgment on the moral fiber; we can't say its worse than many modes of behavior. He said we ought to help these people.

Chairman Weinberg, in responding to Professor Galler's comment, said it was the feeling of SACUA that what would come before the Assembly would be a general policy statement. The discussion, he said, also involved people who could provide answers to specific problems.

Professor Gikas said we're not running a clandestine agency. He noted that he was on the County Board of Health. He said we can get antibiotics free on reporting venereal diseases. He said there was a precedent for this in the University. He said we issue contraceptives without parental consent.

Professor Bishop said the clinic is a University-wide operation. He said if the clinic is not allowed to operate, some people will be deprived of the services.

Professor Norman said we're being asked to give expression of the University community to a social problem. He said it's appropriate. He said he was in favor of the resolution. He said we haven't been asked to address ourselves to specific issues.

In a vote on the resolution, by a show of hands, the resolution was adopted.

UNIVERS-  
1 CLUB

Chairman Weinberg recalled that an earlier resolution had been distributed with respect to the formation of a University Club. He asked that a substitution resolution which had been distributed with the agenda be considered. Professor Hinerman offered the substitute resolution, which reads:

"The Senate Assembly supports the formation of a University Club for faculty and staff members having space which includes the dining area of the Michigan Union and a top-rated restaurant with bar facilities including liquor by the glass in a private club arrangement for members and guests. We further support a limited and voluntary pledge from each member to cover the cost of the operation."

The resolution was seconded.

Chairman Weinberg noted that Professors Franken and Payne had been working on the project and were present to answer any questions.

Professor Franken said he sensed some fiscal tensions. He said his ad hoc group was working on financial matters and that the idea is to make the proposed club self-supporting.

Professor Kish asked how the Club can be made successful when the Michigan Union has been a failure.

Professor Franken said with alcoholic beverages.

Chairman Weinberg said it was important to have an expression from the Assembly so that the matter can be placed before the Regents.

Professor Marsden asked whether the new Club would be restricted to men as the University Club was in the past. She also inquired whether there were women representatives on the committee.

Professor Franken replied that membership would be open to all faculty members. The ad hoc committee, he said, is a self-appointed group and would be glad to add other people.

In a vote on the resolution on the University Club, the resolution was approved.

NOMINA-  
NS AND  
APPOINT-  
MENTS

The following nomination by SACUA was approved by  
the Assembly:

Professor Vern Terpstra, of Business Administration,  
to the Book Store Board, three year term, replacement for  
Professor Crawford.

ADJOURN-  
MENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Ben Yablonky  
Secretary