

SENATE ASSEMBLY MINUTES OF 15 DECEMBER 1986

ATTENDANCE: Present: Ascione, Barlow, Bassett, Bissell, Borcherts, Briggs, Burdi, Checkoway, Chudacoff, Cohen, Comninou, Dandekar, Debler, DeCamp, Durrance, Gage, Haefner, Larson, Lehmann, Lenaghan, Leonard, Lockwood, Lorey, Lusk, Margolis, Manis, McCarus, McClamroch, Meyer, Miller, Moerman, Moore, Mosher, Nadelman, Ness, Olson, Reed, Rosenthal, Hudson, Rutledge, Sanders, Daub, Schteingart, Seidler, Shannon, Thomson, Borer, Wiseman, Berent

Absent: Arnett, Brewer, Vorus, Craig, Dobbins, Eggertsen, Ard, Glover, Goldberg, Gray, Yang, Han, Hanks, Hollingsworth, Hook, Lavoie, Lewis, Lougee, Moran, Oleinick, Olsen, Pierce, Muirhead, Schauer, Silverman, Nystuen, Stapp, Weiler, White

Professor William C. Stebbins convened the meeting at 3:24 p.m.

MINUTES

Professor Moore offered the following change to the minutes of 17 November 1986.

p.6., first full paragraph

"Professor Moore moved to amend Professor Oleinick's amendment as follows: Retain paragraph one through the phrase 'after the award of the grant or contract;' delete all that follows beginning with 'the following procedure shall be followed,' and the project shall be treated as a new application for research sponsorship." {changes underlined}

The change was accepted and the minutes approved.

MATTERS ARISING

Professor Stebbins asked members to forward information on the new telephone system to the SACUA Office before the January Senate Assembly meeting.

ELECTION OF SACUA NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Ballots were distributed to Assembly members present with instructions to vote for two outgoing members of SACUA and four outgoing members of the Assembly. The committee subsequently elected members Stebbins, Loup, Bassett, Chudacoff, Cohen and Stapp.

"UNIVERSITY RELATIONS WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT." VICE PRESIDENT FOR GOVERNMENT RELATIONS AND SECRETARY OF THE UNIVERSITY , RICHARD L. KENNEDY

Vice President Kennedy welcomed the opportunity to address the Assembly at this time because the area of university relations with the Federal Government is undergoing changes which may result in an improved capacity for the University to interact with the national government.

The University's federal and state relations have many of the same objectives. The principal ones are to maximize resources and minimize the negative impact of regulatory measures. For the most part, though, similarities end here because of the way each is organized and executed. State relations efforts are largely centralized, highly concentrated in a single office and carried out by a relatively small number of staff members. Federal relations, on the other hand, are diffused throughout the University, involve large numbers of people including many members of the faculty, and are a responsibility shared among at least three University officers.

Federal research dollars to the U of M now exceed \$100 million annually. They result largely from the efforts of hundreds of faculty members, each pursuing individual research proposals that compete for funding from a broad array of federal agencies. Most of this falls under the purview of the Vice President for Research who is responsible for maintaining a climate which encourages individual faculty members to pursue their research interests and for administering the machinery that monitors the what, when and how of research dollars in the federal agencies and assist faculty in accessing that funding. Vice

President Wilson is also responsible for fostering a federal policy framework that will continue to make federal dollars available for research through the Congressional authorization and appropriation process.

In the health sciences, the Vice Provost for Medical Affairs exercises similar responsibility. Here, however, the focus is on the regulatory mechanisms of the Federal Government in the health care industry and the related funding arrangements of Medicare and federal participation in state-operated Medicaid programs. The fiscal significance to the U of M exceeds \$50 million annually.

In the area of federal financial aid for students, funding for international programs, legislation concerning taxes, employee benefit programs and other regulatory matters, similar responsibilities are exercised by Vice President Kennedy's office.

At present the University is beginning to put in place a framework which will structure this diverse set of responsibilities so that the U of M can receive maximum benefit from the staff and other resources committed to this effort. Elements of this more structured effort in federal relations include the following:

1. Setting an annual federal agenda and effecting better internal coordination.

Because of the diffuse nature of federal operations and the U of M's shared responsibility pattern of organization, there has been a tendency to pursue objectives in a somewhat opportunistic if not haphazard way. The University would thus benefit from a thorough annual review of those issues most susceptible to attention, a clear assignment of responsibility within staff resources and a common understanding of the strategy to be pursued in addressing each issue. This will take a high level of coordination, the mechanism for which is already in place.

2. Clarifying and strengthening on-campus relationships.

The U of M needs to develop closer working relationships between the offices working in federal relations and individual units, particularly schools and colleges. The pattern of research funding at some federal agencies is giving rise to the need to develop multi-million

dollar proposals that cross disciplines in a center-type approach to research investigation. Along with this trend is the need for a political strategy to accompany the traditional proposal review process. Thankfully, the peer review process is alive and well and continues to be used as the major determinant for proposal success.

3. Strengthening our Washington connections.

The U of M needs to make a systematic effort to identify and utilize University-related individuals who have formal and informal ties to federal agencies. Included are members of our faculty and staff who serve on various national boards, review panels and advisory groups. We also need to encourage appropriate participation by others at the University who are not presently involved. Similarly, alumni in Washington, D.C., with a variety of governmental connections can be helpful in pursuing University interests. We need, however, a much clearer notion of who they are and how they can be involved.

4. Coordinating and improving our relations with the Michigan Congressional delegation.

The University is making a concerted effort to take better advantage of resources represented by each member of the Michigan delegation. Congress currently is going through the usual post-election ritual of making committee assignments, which is especially interesting this year because the Senate has changed hands. Michigan is blessed with a rather stable, well placed delegation in terms of committee assignments and we must work harder to understand how best to involve each member in representing a specific area of University interest. We need to be sure that the whole delegation knows what objectives the U of M is pursuing, how our own staff is organized and who has the lead responsibility for a given area of interest. That will require a higher level of coordination than we have experienced before but is crucial to the continued success of our operations in Washington.

Finally, there are two areas which bear special emphasis. The first might be described as the preservation of individual faculty relationships with federal funding agencies. Those relationships will continue to be the most important single element in our federal relations effort and none of the changes mentioned above is intended to affect that activity. The other issue is commonly referred to as

"pork barrelling." It is becoming increasingly common for higher education institutions to bypass the peer review process in seeking federal grants, particularly for facilities. Both authorization and appropriation legislation appear with specific language that earmarks funds for projects at individual campuses without reference to any review of those projects on their merits. The U of M has deliberately chosen not to pursue such a course and indeed has joined others in attempts to eliminate such practices. It does so in the hope that higher education will ultimately benefit more by strict adherence to a merit-based, competitive grant system rather than one which is politically based and which, left unchecked, will dissipate scarce resources and destroy the credibility of institutions.

Professor Ness asked the Vice President to comment further on the structure to improve coordination of efforts. Mr. Kennedy explained that coordination has accelerated in the last three or four months. Vice President Wilson, Vice Provost Zuidema and he now meet regularly to review issues and prepare discussions for the other Executive Officers. To even out the work assignment of the small Washington staff, Vice President Kennedy may make his staff available to schools and colleges for certain work. Currently the hospital uses a Washington consultant firm on Medicaid; this practice may expand to other topics in which the University is interested.

Professor Sanders noted the strong public statement Cornell issued opposing "pork barrelling" and asked if the U of M planned a similar approach. Vice President Kennedy replied that most of the University's work has been done under the aegis of organizations such as the American Association of Universities (AAU) which has taken a strong stand on the issue. This is a difficult course because some AAU member institutions are also those benefitting from "pork barrelling." He foresees no change in the University's position or decline in "pork barrelling" activities in the years ahead.

In response to Professor Moerman's question, the Vice President said that the University's responsibility is to use its influence to persuade the Michigan delegation to address proposals in a certain way. Experience shows that no federal agency resents a delegation stating its views or asking questions on issues. As long as the University is

not interfering with the peer review process, he sees no reason not to pursue such an avenue.

Professor Schteingart asked at what point in the peer review process the political effect occurs. Mr. Kennedy replied that it occurs after the site visit and peer consideration, that is, at the selection of which proposals to fund. Expression of political interest is a very tricky business and an awkward or premature expression can negatively affect the whole process.

Professor Lehmann asked for further comment on the interaction between federal funding efforts and success at the state level. Vice President Kennedy replied that increasingly there is a relationship between the two. For example, Research Excellence Funds have helped garner additional federal and private support.

Professor Stebbins inquired if there is more coordination with other universities in approaching the Federal Government. Mr. Kennedy replied that he detects no increased efforts in these areas although associations continue efforts to get generic legislation passed.

In reply to Professor McClamroch's question, the Vice President noted that prospects for federal student support over the next few years are moderate. He expects the current status to hold but sees no new initiatives in this area although there may be some hope for increased aid for graduate students.

Professor Cohen noted that today's discussion has focused on direct relations with the Federal Government but pointed out the large topic of public climate supporting the University. He asked if the Vice President's office attempts to influence this climate. Mr. Kennedy replied that his office gets involved in this more at the state than at the federal level. There is a general notion that the citizens of Michigan think well of the U of M but a more serious attempt is needed to know what shapes that attitude and what initiatives might be adopted.

Professor Schteingart asked if the federal model could be applied to private foundations. Mr. Kennedy replied that the answer to this is uncertain.

In response to Professor Wiseman's question, Mr. Kennedy said that the University is involved in attempts to

amend the new Federal tax laws. For example, it is trying to undo some of the negative impacts on scholarships, fellowships and private giving but prospects for such changes in the near future are dim.

Professor Strang, Chair, Government Relations Committee, noted that committee interests have ranged through the issues Vice President Kennedy discussed today. The group is also looking at the impact of changes on the local scene, including students and housing.

"HIRING OF WOMEN AND MINORITY FACULTY," VIRGINIA NORDBY,
DIRECTOR, AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS

Mrs. Nordby opened her remarks by complementing the Assembly for the amount of attention it is devoting this Fall to affirmative action issues. The Assembly has heard from Dr. Sudarkasa and Dr. Jones about minority students programs on both the undergraduate and graduate level. To a great extent, the success of these programs depends on the strength and number of minority faculty and, even more importantly, upon the commitment and concern of the faculty as a whole. Today she would like to discuss the University's faculty affirmative action programs, focusing primarily on hiring.

She then referred to data sheets distributed to each Assembly member. The data, taken on October 1, include only faculty on the payroll, not emeriti faculty or those on unpaid leave. They include the School of Nursing but exclude some faculty who are primarily administrators or directors of research centers or institutes. Affirmative Action data are taken for all women and minority groups. Over the last two years the number of regular faculty has remained reasonably stable. The number of instructors is down and the number of lecturers up, mainly because of changes in Medical School appointment protocols. Changes in the number of women and minorities are slight and reflect promotions and returns from leaves at the level of professor and associate professor. The assistant professor level, however, shows a drop in blacks and a steady state for women, creating real problems because this level is the "pipeline" to those above it.

Data for new hires show clear growth in new assistant professor hires last year from the previous year and those hiring opportunities were used to bring in more women. At the time there was a drop from five to four of new black

hires at the assistant professor level whereas three new hires were made at tenured levels.

Preliminary results of a ten year study show the number of total faculty as well as the number of white male faculty members to be in decline while the number of women faculty is slowly increasing as is the number of minorities. The number of blacks is basically steady. At the assistant professor level the total number of positions is increasing as is the number of white males in this group, a trend which has been in effect since 1981. During this same period the number and percent of females has been decreasing. Although the number of women assistant professors this year is up slightly over last year, the percent they constitute is the same. Compared to ten years ago, that percent is down dramatically. The number and percent of all minorities are up since 1977, but decidedly down from an all time high in 1981. As with females, both the number and percent of black assistant professors have been declining since 1981. Moreover, both the number and the percent are decidedly down from 1977.

The numbers, she suggested, speak for themselves: we have a serious problem which does not seem to be responding to current strategies. This is a problem for faculty and administration and has to be solved cooperatively.

There are several misunderstandings or mistaken attitudes abroad at the University which interfere with creative problem-solving. The first of these is that affirmative action is illegal, possibly unconstitutional and should be abandoned. The University's policies are, and always have been, completely legal, since they do not involve quotas or any kind of preferential treatment or reverse discrimination. The Supreme Court recently upheld even quotas and some forms of preferential treatment and no change in federal regulations is imminent. Failure to take affirmative action can thus get the University into as much, if not more, legal hot water than taking such action.

The second misunderstanding is that affirmative action for women is unnecessary. This is not supported by data which show the numbers and percent of faculty appointments of women declining even as the number of women receiving doctorates is rising. At 23:1, the student/faculty ratio for women at the U of M is worse than any minority group, leaving women students with fewer role models and opportunities for same group faculty counseling.

The third misunderstanding is that affirmative action for minorities, especially blacks, is hopeless. Certainly it is hard, but for many fields there is a significant number of qualified candidates and for almost every field there are at least some. We need to boast about the University's distinguished black faculty and to augment their numbers by attracting them at the early stages of their careers by offering post-docs and other arrangements.

Finally, there is the notion that the University doesn't really care about affirmative action. The reverse is true. From the annual report to the Regents through the President's addresses, such as his State of the University Address, to the selection of deans and the annual budget conferences with schools and colleges, the University continually demonstrates its commitment to affirmative action.

Now is a perfect time for the faculty to express heightened interest as this year's faculty job searches are in full swing. As they recruit new colleagues, faculty members should keep in mind the data they have seen today and look for opportunities to strengthen the University's performance in this area. As President Shapiro has noted, enlightened self-interest of the University requires more action in affirmative action.

Professor Comninou noted departments sometimes identify a desired candidate, then prepare a recruitment advertisement which is so detailed that it applies to only one candidate. She asked how this circumvention of affirmative action might be prevented. Mrs. Nordby replied that affirmative action commits the University to conduct open searches including a two month national search. A detailed job description may honestly reflect a department's specialized need and so could be perfectly legal. On the other hand, if the search is a closed shop used to circumvent affirmative action by excluding women and minorities then there is a problem which must be addressed.

Professor Rutledge asked how the U of M compares to other universities in the area of student/faculty ratios. Mrs. Nordby responded that in the Big 10 the University's female ratio gives it a low rank, about seventh or eighth. For blacks it is about third best.

Professor Borer asked about salary comparisons for women and minorities and whether or not any units show different hiring patterns. Mrs. Nordby replied that her office is just completing a salary equity study and will pursue those areas which seem troubled. These are pockets rather than whole schools or colleges. Her office has also completed a three year study of hiring patterns and she will shortly be speaking with deans in problem areas. In this matter one must look at different criteria. Some units have had no openings and have none now, making it difficult to effect a change. In other cases, units have had openings, produce minority and women Ph.D.'s but have hired few minorities or women. She defines a problem as an area where change is possible and desirable but none is happening.

Professor Checkoway asked if new faculty hires face any particular problems on this campus as opposed to others. Mrs. Nordby stated that her office is trying to determine the success or lack thereof of these people. A group of faculty women is also studying the problem. There have been many studies of all universities in general but she is not sure to what extent the findings apply to the U of M. It is known that if assistant professors enter with fewer credentials, they have less chance to get tenure than their cohorts. It is also known that women don't bargain as hard as men for laboratory space, equipment, computer time and salary.

Professor Lusk noted some difficulty in the area of spouse placement. Mrs. Nordby stated that Associate Vice President Swain looks at individual cases of spouse placement. Mrs. Nordby is also concerned with the matter. The University can't accommodate faculty recruits who have mobility problems because of legal concerns over discrimination. Further, the University does not have the money to fill two positions each time it advertises for one. Often, the spouse is not an academic but is a professional who would be searching in the Detroit market. The University is trying to develop more contacts in that market to identify opportunities but is not in a position to enter negotiations. Because this is a very complex issue it must be handled on an individual and legal basis.

Professor Thomson asked if industry, faced with similar difficulties, contacts the University to aid in spouse placement for its recruits. Mrs. Nordby acknowledged that industry does call but to date the University's principal response has been to forward copies of the Record listing

job openings. It might be advisable to expand the University's efforts in this area.

Professor Stebbins asked if the Provost would consider making funds available annually for targets of opportunity. Professor Burdi noted that the University will shortly have targeted funds for visiting minority faculty. Mrs. Nordby concurred and added that the University has asked the State Legislature for an increase in these funds for next year for minority post-docs in the hope that some of these might later receive regular faculty appointments.

Professor Berent asked about University placement efforts for minorities. Mrs. Nordby noted there are many resources assisting them and said it is essential that schools like the U of M vigorously produce Ph.D.'s for the national supply.

REPORTS FROM SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

Professor Burdi reported that to increase faculty participation, the Medical School has changed faculty meetings from monthly to bi-monthly. Vice Provost Zuidema also convened a strategic planning retreat to assure that the Medical School can meet the demands placed on the Medical Center in the future.

OLD BUSINESS

Professor Ross inquired about the status of the request to add a socially responsible option to the pension plan. Professor Stebbins replied that CESF is discussing the matter. Professor Lusk added that a sub-committee is looking at Columbia's retirement program and will shortly meet with representatives from two pension plans to see if either can offer the desired option to be available beginning in January 1988. There is general agreement that this option would apply only to new contributions and not to make it retroactive.

NEW BUSINESS

Professor Stebbins announced that the Assembly will offer nominations for two appointments to University Council which is working on developing a student code of nonacademic conduct. Interested Assembly members should see him after the meeting.

Senate Assembly Minutes of 12/15/86
Page 12

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Patricia B. Yocum".

Patricia B. Yocum
Senate Secretary