

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Assembly Meeting, December 16, 1974

ATTENDANCE

Present: Professors Allen, Baublis, Bishop, Brockway, Browder, Brown, Cartwright, Cassidy, Cosand, Crawford, Danielson, DeKornfeld, Evaldson, Beaver, Floyd, Flynn, Gikas, Ilie, Starring, Kachaturoff, Kaplan, Kelsey, Lands, Larkin, Lehmann, Loomis, Lytle, Magrill, Clough, Oberman, Rowe, Seligson, Springer, Sudarkasa, Taren, Terwilliger, Van Der Voo, Williams, Leonard, Hoch, Hildebrandt, Cohen

Absent: Professors Adams, Anton, Berki, Caldwell, Cornell, Creeth, Dernberger, Deskins, Eisley, Goldman, Goodman, Harrison, Hoffman, Horsley, Hymans, Johnson, Kell, Kish, Lyjak, Livermore, Murphey, Nesbitt, Ostrand, Schmickel, Scott, Sibley, Matejka, Vander, Vaughn, Weeks, Wilson

Guests: Vice-President Pierpont, Professors Harold Shapiro and Marvin Peterson

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Cohen called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Assembly meeting of November 18, 1974 were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

In the course of several preliminary announcements to the members of the Assembly, Chairman Cohen noted, among other things, that:

a) SACUA has named members of the faculty to serve on two new committees--the Task Force on Student Counseling and the ad hoc Committee to Appraise the Periodic Health Examination Unit.

b) The report of the Commission on the Study of Student Governance, which contains many items of concern to the faculty, will be a subject for discussion at the January meeting of the Assembly.

FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN CLERICAL UNION NEGOTIATIONS

Having been invited to arrange for formal faculty representation on the Advisory Committee to the University Bargaining Team in the negotiations with CCFA/UAW, SACUA had referred the matter to the Financial Affairs Committee for guidance. The committee offered its suggestions in a memorandum of December 11, 1974, and Professor Peterson, its chairman, had accordingly been invited to discuss the recommendations with the Assembly.

While the Financial Affairs Committee saw faculty representation on the Negotiating Team itself as inappropriate for reasons of conflict of interest, it strongly recommended faculty representation on the Advisory Committee to the University's Negotiating Team, suggesting however that, while such representatives should advise on issues pertaining to working conditions and responsibilities, they should not advise on salary issues.

The latter exclusion provoked discussion, Professor Lehmann pointing out, for example, that, to be consistent, one would then have to declare that faculty representatives in the GEO negotiations should similarly refrain from commenting on salary matters. The salary issue, he suggested, is a primary one; he hoped, therefore, that the faculty representatives would not hesitate to participate in its discussion. Commenting on another point, Professor Sudarkasa's inquiry concerning Professor Fوسفeld's suggestion that there be faculty representation on both sides, Professor Lehmann reminded the Assembly of the caveat issued by Professor Edwards in the GEO negotiations, namely, that such dual representation would constitute a legal violation.

Professor Larkin felt, that in refraining from full participation one is nevertheless talking out of both sides of one's mouth, for while sometimes eschewing direct affiliation with management, the faculty is inching in that direction, and is in some respects obliged to do so. Asked by Professor Taren to comment further on the question of conflict of interest, Professor Peterson indicated that it is simply a fact of life that with a finite amount available for compensation purposes, when one group receives more, proportionately less remains for others. A motion to amend the resolution of the Financial Affairs Committee, to remove the provision excluding the faculty representatives from discussion of the salary issue, carried by a vote of 26 to 3. The size of the faculty panel on the advisory committee, a matter on which Professor Lands suggested the Assembly might wish to comment, was not further discussed, the Financial Affairs Committee having suggested a minimum of four or five. The spirit of the resolution, Chairman Cohen noted, was essentially that the diverse interests of the faculty should be represented.

Subsequently, by a vote of 28 to 3, the Assembly passed the amended resolution of the Financial Affairs Committee, reading as follows:

That SACUA appoint a panel of faculty representatives to the Advisory Committee to the University's Negotiating Team.

Professor Peterson and his committee were thanked for their guidance in the matter.

PROCEDURES
AND CRITERIA
FOR BUDGETARY
CUTS

Having been invited to discuss the pending budgetary cuts, Professor Shapiro, Chairman of the Budget Priorities Committee, presented an overview of the process by which the University expected to accomplish the reductions envisioned. The administration has opted for differential, as against across-the-board cuts, or perhaps a combination of the two, he noted, and since selective reductions require more information than do blanket ones, the procedure becomes the more complex, especially in view of the time constraints involved. The Budget Priorities Committee is therefore particularly desirous of serving as a vehicle for faculty opinion.

According to a memorandum of December 4, 1974 from Vice-President Rhodes to Deans and Directors, in a series of budgetary hearings between January 8-22, the heads of units will have opportunity to present their respective

cases in relation to the proposed differential cuts. In these deliberations the Budget Priorities Committee is to be closely involved. Subsequently the Committee on Budget Administration will make its recommendations available to the Budget Priorities Committee for review and comment. Having taken such feedback into account, the Committee on Budget Administration will then formulate final recommendations for consideration by the executive officers and ultimate action by the Regents. Thus having outlined the procedure, Professor Shapiro invited such comments as the members of the Assembly wished to offer.

The reactions were many and varied. Expressing the hope that the Budget Priorities Committee will have given timely thought to the priorities by which the respective units' needs and effectiveness are to be gauged, Professor Lands sought further clarification of the committee's approach. Two aspects of the review process were cited by Professor Shapiro: (a) in matters judged to be "central of the University" some degree of leeway will be reserved to the administration; (b) in the area of cost effectiveness, units will be compared not with other units within the University but rather with their counterparts in peer institutions.

In the course of further discussion Professor Shapiro responded to a variety of comments and questions. Suggestions by Professors Cassidy and Springer that savings be sought not at the expense of the faculty but by reducing administrative costs were met with assurance that there was no thought of terminating tenured staff and that administrative costs were, indeed, as subject to reduction as was any other area. Assurance was similarly given Professor Taren that, while preservation of the research function has high priority, there is no intention of foregoing the important service role.

In simplest terms, Professor Larkin declared, what is really at issue is the familiar business of student headcount and the basic questions of whether one is to preserve faculty or support staff in the present circumstances, the latter now fortified through unionization. On this score, Professor Shapiro felt, one must remember that the Budget Priorities Committee is not a faculty committee per se but one with responsibility for the best interests of the University as a whole. Nonetheless the implications for formula funding still concerned Professor Cosand, among others, and on this point Chairman Cohen reminded the Assembly that President Fleming has continued to resist such a policy as stoutly as is possible. On this and financial matters in general, he suggested, Vice-President Pierpont might wish to comment, having been invited to attend this meeting of the Assembly.

Prefacing his remarks with a reference to the report recently issued by the State Auditor General, Mr. Pierpont recommended that members of the Assembly take note of the University Record of this date which carried the University's response to the charge that it had accumulated \$44 million of unexpended funds that were available for current operations at the discretion of the Board of Regents. To have spent these funds, he insisted

would have constituted a breach of faith with the donors, whose contributions to the fund-raising program they represented; instead, it had been considered wise to invest these monies, spending the interest accumulated without touching the capital.

Turning to the more immediate problems under discussion, Mr. Pierpont admitted that the concern of some that the equipment budget had been cut drastically over the last 3-4 years was well founded. The current accounts budgets of units have likewise declined. On the other hand, funds allotted to the personnel category have held steady, representing approximately 77% of the budget, while the amount devoted to student financial aid has meanwhile increased from 3% in 1968-69 to 7% during the current fiscal year. Responding to an inquiry from Professor Oberman concerning the proportion of the personnel budget category allotted to faculty, Vice-President Pierpont pointed out that approximately half of this amount represents academic salaries. Despite the fact that other categories of personnel have recently been unionized, he added, they have not disproportionately drawn off merit increase money, all groups having received an average 8% salary increase. With respect to Professor Danielson's query as to whether central administration has grown more than has faculty, Mr. Pierpont pointed out that in 1968-69 general administrative costs had consumed 1.1% of the budget while this year they amounted to 1.3%, not an appreciable increase, as he saw it, since the rise was attributable primarily to affirmative action staff. The amount allotted to business operations has meanwhile declined from 5% in 1968-69 to 4.7% during the current year.

Inasmuch as during the month of January the Budget Priorities Committee will have witnessed the actual process by which budgetary reductions are determined, the Assembly welcomed a return visit by Professor Shapiro at its February meeting. Chairman Cohen and Professor Loomis suggested in passing that it should not be forgotten that the faculty has had many opportunities for making input up to this point via various committees and SACUA, in meetings of its officers with the executive officers, and through dialogue with Vice-President Rhodes in the Assembly. Thanking Vice-President Pierpont and Professor Shapiro for their participation, Chairman Cohen voiced assurance that the thoughts of the members of the Assembly had been heard and would be duly taken into account, later noting that in Vice-President Pierpont the faculty has a staunch and sophisticated ally.

Following the departure of the visitors, various members of the Assembly aired some residual feelings concerning some of the aspects of the preceding discussion, wondering, among other things, whether some form of more vigorous action was in order. On the other hand, Professor Larkin saw the problem not as one of passing resolutions but as one of changing the mood and attitude of the Assembly from that of a mild-mannered, understanding body seeking to avoid confrontation of any kind. Be that as it may, Chairman Cohen suggested, the posture and demeanor of the Assembly are in the last analysis a function of the prevailing sentiment of the constituencies it represents.

SENATE
ADVISORY RE-
VIEW COMMIT-
TEE

SACUA had previously concurred in a suggestion by SARC that, in the interest of continuity and effectiveness, the terms of members of the committee be increased. The Assembly now had before it a resolution to this effect and, on a motion made by Professor Brockway and seconded, the

following resolution was adopted unanimously:

That the term of appointment to the Senate Advisory Review Committee (SARC) be increased from two to three years, with the terms staggered so that approximately one-third of the membership will retire each year.

SACUA
VACANCY

By way of electing a temporary replacement to SACUA during the leave to be taken by Professor Allen from January 1, 1975 to September 1, 1975, the nominating committee previously elected by the Assembly proposed a slate consisting of Professors Magrill and Seligson. By vote of the Assembly, Professor Magrill was elected to serve.

Inasmuch as the nominating committee is scheduled to propose nominees for the regular SACUA vacancies at the April meeting of the Assembly, its chairman, Professor Brockway, sought further guidance as to procedure. It was agreed that the committee would present the Assembly with a list of eligible candidates at its March meeting, with the actual election to take place in April.

NOMINATIONS
AND APPOINT-
MENTS

On nomination by SACUA, the Assembly approved unanimously the following appointments:

--Professor Harry Edwards to serve as a replacement for Professor Stebbins on the Senate Advisory Review Committee from January 1, 1975 to September 1, 1975;

--Professor Lee Danielson to serve a three-year term replacing Professor Miller on the Board of Directors of the University Cellar.

ADJOURNMENT

With best wishes for a happy holiday season from Chairman Cohen, the Assembly adjourned at 5:09 p.m.

Erasmus L. Hoch
Secretary