

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting, December 17, 1979

ATTENDANCE Present: Barnett, Bishop, D.B.Brown, M.Brown, Browne, Cohen, Corpron, Dabich, Dingle, Dixon, Holbrook, Fowler, Friedman, Frost, Gay, George, Gordon, Hilbert, Hildebrandt, Hinerman, Hungerman, Koran, Lindberg, Lynch, Simms, McClendon, Millard, Naylor, Parkinson, Porter, Portman, W. Powers, Bacon, Romani, Rowe, Rush, Scarse, Schulze, Tilly, Wynne.

Absent: Abdel-Massih, Ackley, Baumgarten, Berg, D.R.Brown, Burdi, Carpenter, Cooper, DeKornfeld, Eckert, Fearn, Meisler, Gray, Groves, Gull, Holland, Juvinal, Kirkpatrick, Morley, Nagy, Nisbett, L.Powers, Senior, Sinsheimer, Outcalt, Trojan, Verhey, Vinter, J. White, N.White.

Guests: Harvey Brazer, Charles Kelsey, Paul Rasmussen, Lester Rutledge, Tony Tripodi.

MINUTES The minutes of the Senate Assembly meeting of November 19, 1979 were approved.

ANNOUNCE- Chairman Corpron reported on the progress of the  
MENTS Search Committee for a new Vice President for Academic Affairs. He said that the field of candidates had been reduced by half. The Search Committee is optimistic that it will meet its target date of February 1 for the submission of a panel of candidates to the President and the Regents.

TRIBUTE TO Chairman Corpron then called on Professor Naylor, Vice  
EARL J. Chairman of SACUA, for some remarks:

SCHULZE  
SENATE  
SECRETARY

Professor Earl Schulze completes his tenure as Secretary of the Senate this month. As we all know this is an important Senate office that requires dedicated service. As members of the Assembly are aware he has served it well. And, even more so, members of SACUA will attest to Professor Schulze's dedicated service. In the name of the Assembly and SACUA I would like to thank Professor Schulze for a job well done. Finally, on a personal note, I'm sure I speak for all of us when I say that Earl it has been a joy to work with you.

NOMINATI-  
ONS AND  
APPOINT-  
MENTS

The Assembly approved the nomination of:

BUDGET PRIORITIES COMMITTEE

James J. Duderstadt 1-year term replacing Hansford W. Farris.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNIVERSITY CELLAR

Edna J. Laughery 3-year term to succeed herself.

FORUM

Professor Paul G. Rasmussen, Associate Dean (LSA), on the Relation between Research, Scholarly Activity, and Instruction: Incentives and Disincentives; Professors Lester T. Rutledge and Tony Tripodi of the Committee on Research Policies.

Professor Rutledge spoke first, announcing that the Committee on Research Policies had been charged with establishing forums on Research Incentives and that today's program was an experiment in format. He said he would be glad to receive the Assembly's advice on the form and focus of upcoming programs.

Professor Tripodi then introduced the Forum for today and its principal speaker.

Professor Rasmussen began by noting that discussion of research incentives and disincentives seems always to gravitate to the issue of indirect costs. His remarks would try to avoid that topic in order to view the theme of research incentives in the broad context of the University's concern for excellence.

The theme and the idea of forums, he said, had come out of the Report of the Committee on Academic Affairs (Duderstadt Report) and SACUA's response to the Report. One statement early in the Report disturbed him both because it is a serious allegation and he is not sure it is accurate. The statement asserts that there has been a decline in research at the University. The allegation, he said, has not been documented and he inclines to disbelieve it. In the case of sponsored research, the figures show an increase in the past year over and above that of inflation.

He then divided his examination of research incentives and disincentives into three headings: the faculty; the relation of research and teaching; and the external role

of the faculty. Most people, he said, have assumptions about these matters, but they are worth reexamining.

He defined the faculty as the vital ingredient of any research institution. Good research institutions have a faculty with a strong tradition and expectation of research. He cited some facts. Only twenty percent of those trained to do research ever actually publish contributions to their fields. A very small percentage of those who do publish make a disproportionately large contribution. Hence it is important to recruit individuals who find intrinsic rewards in doing research. He referred to a study by Professor Wilbert McKeachie that reinforces the idea that obtaining intrinsic rewards from their work is most important to scholars. Without denying the need for sufficient money, faculty members listed their most important need as: 1) academic freedom, 2) intellectual interchange, 3) student development, 4) classroom teaching, and 5) professional recognition. Administrative policies are a source of dissatisfaction rather than satisfaction. Apparently, when programs are well-administrated, the satisfaction with administration goes unnoticed. Research incentives are largely generated by faculty members themselves.

Hence, our promotion policy in the University has strongly emphasized research. Professor Rasmussen said that in his view the standard for promotion - especially for tenure - ought to be set at above the average of the existing faculty. We ought to give tenure only to those of better-than-average quality. To do otherwise is to commit the University to a less than excellent faculty. This policy has created hardships for some, but on the bright side, the majority of our recently-tenured staff is doing very well. Referring again to McKeachie's study, he noted that when extrinsic rewards are used in place of intrinsic rewards, (e.g. promotion), they must be continued. Apparently, intrinsic satisfaction declines when extrinsic satisfaction is obtained and is very difficult to resurrect if extrinsic rewards are withdrawn.

He then turned to the relation of teaching to research, and declared that the opinion that great teachers are being passed over for promotion through our emphasis on research is a myth. He asserted that research is what keeps our teaching fresh and illustrated the point from his own experience. He said there was evidence that the motivation of faculty members changed as they aged. Perhaps a single

broad-scale program of research incentives was inadequate, that changing goals ought to be better reflected in our programs.

Maybe the toughest problem faculty members face is that of choosing priorities given the condition of a finite amount of time - how much time to give to teaching, how much to research? He cited a memorandum on the distribution of faculty time written by Professor Thomas Dunn several years ago. Professor Dunn estimated that 27-30 hours per week were being required of faculty members in activities not directly related to either research or teaching -- 27-30 hours more, that is, than had been required of faculty members in the 1950's.

This raises, he said, the issue of how administration can help the faculty to do its primary work. Such is the goal of administration. Clearly, administrators could relieve more of the burden, but we enter here, he said, the delicate border between administrative authority and faculty government.

Professor Rasmussen said that in his opinion we could significantly raise productivity. More variety in class sizes and new modes of instruction have barely been tried. The basic instructional model has not changed at the University in more than fifty years, and there are some great advantages to be reaped from change. At the least we can eliminate duplication of courses.

He then turned to the external role of the faculty. We should take the high-road, he said, in the justification of the University as a research institution to the public and the legislature. Research for its own sake is worth doing. Moreover, the economic future of the state does not lie in energy-intensive industry but in expertise-intensive industry. The University has a great role to play in this future. He suggested that we must perhaps develop a new view of "outside-consulting", and of the relation of the University to proprietary research and to the promotion of patents. In any event the ivory tower must be abandoned.

Professor Freidman opened Assembly participation in the forum by asking, what happen when intrinsic drives to do research decline? He noted especially that category of scholars who have succeeded in effecting changes in their fields and were now satisfied that things were as they should be (a situation not uncommonly found in their departments

by assistant professors). Should we try to translate intrinsic into extrinsic rewards for senior faculty members, constituting, for example, several grades of full professor? Nobody thought there was much possibility in the suggestion of promotional steps for full professors.

Professor Hildebrandt said that he hoped the McKeachie study and the Dunn memorandum might be made available to Assembly members. He then said he felt there was a strong need to publicize the programmatic research done at the University, the sort, for example, that would be of direct help to legislators. The current publication of Michigan Today was cited. Professor Rasmussen reiterated his belief that we ought to take the high-road in promoting research. There is too much emphasis on what we return to the State in dollars.

Professor Gordon noted that the faculty did research before the great era of federal funding. He thought the need to obtain support, and design research for that purpose, worked against creativity - the simple "mucking around in the laboratory". Professor Rasmussen said he thought "mucking around in the lab" was, given the current state of science, less likely to produce fruitful results than in the past. On the other hand, federal funding tended to produce, in the words of a colleague, either a "call-girl" or "hired gun" psychology among researchers.

Professor Naylor said that institutionally we now have research rather than do it. What is the malaise with the climate of research here? People feel they should be helped, not hindered by the institution. Is this part of the difficulty?

Professor Dixon said that he did not feel there is a malaise. He asked if LSA reserved some appointments for research? Professor Rasmussen said there are some leaves granted for purposes of designing a research program, but they are great luxuries. Professor Rutledge noted that Vice President for Research, Charles Overberger, has a fund for such purposes, but only three projects were funded last year. There had been only five applications. Members of the Assembly averred that the fund had been unknown to them - that they were happy to know of the opportunity.

Professor Rasmussen noted that there was continuing program in supplying seed money for research projects. The project has already borne fruit.

Professor D. Brown prophesied that the desire to increase research productivity and the desire to increase the teaching load would soon come into open conflict. There must be an effort, he said, to find a reasonable compromise. Professor Rasmussen said that work-load models designed to balance these responsibilities were both in use and being developed. Professor D. Brown was sceptical of the "point-system" models he had seen. Professor M. Brown suggested that a perfect work-load model would imply equality of salaries. Professor Rasmussen replied that salary differences would remain as reflections of differences in the quality of the work done. The merit pay system would be unaffected.

Professor Tripodi called the forum to a halt. He and Professor Rutledge asked for the Assembly's advice on the future of such forums. Most members felt that the forums should be continued, both at meetings of the Assembly and at faculty meetings in the schools and colleges. Other suggestions were that the Research Policies Committee prepare a list of ways of promoting research, prepare figures on the quantity of research done at the University, and design forums around controversial issues, the assumption for example, that we will require higher and higher standards in the near future.

ANNUAL  
REPORT  
OF  
COMMITTEE  
ON THE  
ECONOMIC  
STATUS OF  
THE  
FACULTY  
1978-79--  
PROFESSOR  
HARVEY  
BRAZER

Professor Brazer began by saying that several years ago (1972) CESF had been charged by the Assembly with carrying out consultative negotiations with the Executive Officers and Regents of the University. There has through the years been good will on both sides, but it is his feeling that the faculty is not currently well served.

One of the main reasons has been a shift forward in the timing of budget requests. He then rehearsed the experience of this fall. Within two weeks of its normal first meeting in September, CESF was asked by the administration to submit its salary proposal. This meant that the Committee had practically no time to do its major work of the year, and clearly no time to reflect on the nature of the report it should make. The Report in fact was ready by October 5 (two weeks later than requested) but we discovered that even had it been ready earlier, it was already too late. Before we could submit our work to SACUA (let alone the Assembly) we had to present it to the Academic Affairs Advisory Council (AAAC). We found when we arrived that all the Deans had been given copies of the budget request prepared by the Executive Officers. There were, therefore, two discrete budget requests in existence: ours prepared in haste at

administrative urging, and the Executive Officers', prepared without faculty consultation. Later in the month CESF had to perform for the Regents, who were expected at that very meeting to decide on a single budget request. The Regents heard our report and arguments with great politeness, and then chose to submit the request prepared by the Executive Officers to Lansing. Our request for a 16% raise was shelved in favor of the Executive Officers' more modest request for 11%.

Now, Professor Brazer continued, there are probably at least two uses to which the CESF Report may be put. It may be used, as it was this year, to make the Executive Officers appear realistic. And it may be used to "drive up" the official salary request, which, without faculty pressure, might be lower than we would tolerate. Neither use, however, is the one originally conceived - consultative negotiations - with the goal of arriving at a single, mutually satisfying request. Our arguments this year, although virtually ignored, were quite strong. The State of Michigan's support of higher education is losing ground, falling well behind the national average. We are 10th in per capita income and used to be 9th in support of higher education. We are now 35th among the states in such support. Within the University there is also cause for concern. Faculty salaries do not seem to be a high priority. Our real incomes (non-inflationary dollars) are below what they were ten years ago - assistant professors 19% behind, associate professors 17% behind, full professors 14% behind. In contrast average real income in the economy as a whole has risen 13% over the same period. We have fallen behind, in other words, 26-32%. We need to prevent further deterioration.

Professor Brazer said that we need to look at more than salary-by-rank averages as compiled by AAUP. We need to develop narrower break-downs that reflect the relative professional ranking of Departments. The tremendous variance in salaries should be adjusted according to peer-group rankings.

He then cited several examples. These data, he suggested, are not sufficient to provide an accounting to the administration, but they do indicate that an intelligent analysis of salaries in relation to department peer-group ranking should be made.

Professor Brazer then noted briefly the other major concerns of CESF this year. CESF will be represented on the

task force headed by Vice President Brinkerhoff on the Retirement Program. Feasible alternatives to our current package will be sought. CESF has consulted with the Committee to study the establishing of an HMO, has given its advice, and has concluded that it has no more to offer at this point. Finally, CESF is working on methods by which the University might offer flexible benefits to the faculty - a goal of long-standing interest.

He concluded by saying that what matters most is the issue of the role of CESF in setting budget requests. Increasingly, the University position seems to be that the faculty represents but 1/5th of the University's employees and that the tail ought not to be allowed to wag the puppy.

Questions and comments were called for:

Professor Corpron began by asking Mrs. Birdsall to relate the story of how the faculty received its new dental benefit program.

Mrs. Birdsall responded. The story showed clearly that the faculty in this instance was the all-but-unwilling beneficiary of the University - AFSCME labor contract, and that, had it been asked, the faculty would not have given the program a high priority.

Professor Gordon asked how the faculty might be more determinative in salary requests. Professor Brazer said that CESF must begin its work much earlier, probably in the spring. A problem is that members of CESF are not ordinarily available through the summer.

Professor Naylor asked, what should our aims be? Mr. Brazer said we must have the opportunity for significant participation in the decision on a salary request. The Executive Officers have listened to CESF in the past, but increasingly effective in-put is coming from their budget staff. The faculty should play a more influential role. Professor Naylor then asked if other "job-families" had fared better? Nobody seemed to know.

Professor Dixon asked if it possible for CESF to do its work in Term II. Professor Romani added that it is really necessary to have it done by March. His experience was that the outline of the budget was set by September. Professor Brazer said he was perfectly willing to accept

that advice.

Professor Friedman asked Professor Brazer to respond to President Smith's suggestion that we achieve higher salaries by increasing class size and cutting faculty positions. Is the suggestion realistic in the long range? Professor Brazer replied that non-tenured positions are already disappearing, that the suggestion seemed short-sighted. Excellence, he went on, implies that the funding efforts of the State Legislature will never be adequate.

Professor Gordon asked if the current deterioration of consultative negotiations between CESF and the Executive Officers indicated a change of policy in the administration. Professor Brazer said he thought that both the time-cycle and the increased dependence upon professional staff were responsible.

Professor Dabich asked what use would be made of the data opened up by salary disclosure. Professor Brazer said that nothing had yet been determined. He noted that general salary data (non-name-linked) had always been available. He was open to advice on how to create strong argument for higher salaries.

Professor Hungerman asked if flexible benefits were likelier because of the new dental program. Professor Brazer said that his guess was that the more fixed benefits one absorbs, the more difficult flexible benefits become.

Chairman Corpron thanked Professor Brazer for his Report.

OTHER  
BUSINESS

There was neither old nor new business.

ADJOURN-  
MENT

The Assembly adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Earl J. Schulze  
Senate Secretary