

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Regular Assembly Meeting, December 20, 1971

ATTENDANCE

Present: Allen, Stolz, Anton, Asgar, Buning, Birch, Bishop, Bowditch, Bowman, Castor, Cohen, Ledger, Cooperrider, Cornish, Hildebrandt, DeKornfeld, Dowson, Ehrenkreutz, Reade, Franken, Graebel, Mohler, Heller, Higgins, Hinerman, Colburn, Kahn, Kerr, Kish, Berkove, Lind, Lloyd, Longone, Magee, Meyer, Hafter, Overseth, Preston, Rigan, Rucknagel, Ryder, Sana, Sawyer, Scherer, Schulze, Schuman, Votaw, Youngdahl, Kincaid, Norman

Absent: Abrams, Bertolaet, Bett, Darvas, Goodman, Hood, Huntington, Iglehart, Michelsen, Nystuen, Paul, Pollack, Sandalow, Moore, Simpson, Hertzler, Verheyen, Yagle, Zweifler

Guests: Assembly advisory committee chairmen; chairman, Economic Status of the Faculty Committee; members of Classified Research Committee; members of Committee on Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty; members of Resource Allocation Commission; members of Subcommittee on Planning Mechanisms (Proper Role)

CALL TO
ORDER

Chairman Norman called the meeting to order at 3:21 p.m. in the Rackham Amphitheater.

APPROVAL
OF MINUTES

The minutes of the November 15 meeting were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCE-
MENTS

Chairman Norman announced that the Research Policies Committee had prepared a pre-final draft of their report on proprietary research and had discussed it with SACUA. The report was expected to be ready for distribution in advance of the January 24 meeting of the Assembly.

He then announced that the chairman of the Classified Research Committee had notified SACUA that Vice-President Norman had forwarded two classified proposals to potential sponsors although they had not been approved by majority vote of the Classified Research Committee. The proposals, designated 72-16 and 72-21, had received 6-2-1 and 5-2-1 votes in committee, respectively. The minutes of the Committee meetings had been transmitted to SACUA and were available for inspection. He had had a discussion of the matter with Vice-President Norman, but they had been unable to arrive at a meeting of minds.

In answer to a question from Professor Leslie Kish about the timing of the Research Policies Committee report, Chairman Norman pointed out that in view of the fact that the Regents would be meeting earlier than usual, while the Assembly would be meeting later than usual, in January, there was no way of securing Regental action on the issue until their February meeting, at which time it was hoped they would take up the question. By that time it was also to be hoped that more would be known about the future status of Willow Run.

Professor Scherer asked whether Professor George Kish (chairman of the Classified Research Committee) cared to comment on the proposals which had

been forwarded by Vice-President Norman. Professor Kish said that of the two projects, 72-16 concerned an optimized sensor. It was discussed in three sessions of the Committee, one of which was called at the request of the Willow Run Laboratories, and finally received a vote of 6-2-1. (One additional member indicated his approval of the proposal afterwards.) He read a paragraph from the minutes of the Committee; it appeared that the objections to the proposal were concerned with its relationship to missile guidance. Somewhat similar remarks applied to the other proposal, 72-21, which came from the Infrared and Optics Laboratory.

Professor Scherer asked why a majority of the Committee favored the proposals, and why there was a shift in the voting from one week to the next.

Professor Kish said that he would answer the second question first. The change in the vote meant simply that more information was available on the later occasion. This was a common occurrence on the Committee, because pre-proposal summaries were rarely adequate for forming judgments. Usually the Committee asked for work statements and for the proposal itself if it was available. There was frequently a time-lag before the additional documents arrived. As for the other question, the votes reflected a series of individual judgments. Sometimes a weapon would be regarded as essentially defensive, and sometimes the ultimate benefit of the research was deemed to outweigh some apparent deleterious results.

Professor Cohen expressed himself as being concerned about the procedures followed. He drew attention to the fact that the recently-passed resolution on classified research said that it was the sense of the Assembly that proposals should not go forward without formal approval by the Committee. Chairman Norman said that there was a difference of opinion over the proper interpretation of the existing legislation in cases where fewer than seven votes were cast either for or against a proposal. Vice-President Norman felt that such a situation did not constitute disapproval of a proposal, but others disagreed.

REPORT OF
SACUA
ACTIVITIES

Chairman Norman then called on Dr. DeKornfeld to present the report on SACUA activities for the preceding month. His report follows:

SACUA had a busy month, meeting on November 18, 19, 22, and 29, and on December 1, 2, 3, 6, 13, 15, and 20 (the last just before this Assembly meeting). These included meetings with President Fleming on November 19, December 3, and December 15, and a meeting with the Regents on November 18. Members of the Economic Status Committee, Proper Role Committee, and Research Policies Committee were present at one or more meetings.

As usual, filling committee vacancies was prominent on the order of business. Much time was spent, including the meeting with the Regents, discussing classified and proprietary research. Other prominent topics included suggested mechanisms for University planning and budgeting, the implications of the Rights and Responsibilities Report, the Overberger Committee Report (on the Vice-Presidency for Research), the appointment of student members to committees, and the report on the Health Service.

PRESENTATIONS
BY PRESIDENT
FLEMING AND
VICE-PRESI-
DENT SMITH

Chairman Norman then prepared to introduce President Fleming and Vice-President Smith to give their scheduled presentations. He said that the chief executive officers had been concerned with the problems of planning and budgeting for some time, and drew attention to the memorandum from President Fleming that had been distributed with the call to the meeting. He added that while

this document bore a recent date, it had been in preparation well before the Reed Committee report had appeared, and was in no sense to be regarded as a reply to the latter. He said that members of the relevant Senate Assembly committees had been invited to be present and to take part in the discussion. He concluded by remarking that SACUA had arrived at no clear consensus with regard to the next step to be taken, and he hoped that some guidance on this question would emerge from the Assembly discussion.

ADDRESS
BY PRESI-
DENT FLEMING

He then invited President Fleming to come forward to make his presentation. President Fleming's remarks may be summarized as follows:

I have said most of what I have to say, either in the document you have before you or in the short piece I wrote for the Daily, but perhaps I can fill in some of the background. I do want to make one thing clear, and that is that the great bulk of my thinking about this, and my discussions with the various faculty groups, took place long before the Reed report found publication. Therefore, the two presentations ought to be completely disassociated, and it is unfortunate from my standpoint that the public discussion of the two comes up at the same time and makes them appear to be related, which was not intended.

I suppose particularly in this past year or so when we've all felt financial pressures upon us, we've been more and more conscious of some of the deficiencies of our own internal procedures for dealing with some of these difficult questions. I've always said that I thought the single most difficult question that a university administrator has to face is the allocation of resources, because it involves comparing apples and oranges, and it has some judgmental aspects--and different backgrounds lead to different judgments about what is most important. Almost every university administration that I know of today is spending a good deal of time thinking about how to deal with difficult questions such as long-range planning, the allocation of resources among the colleges, or the evaluation of programs with the possibility of limiting or phasing out some of them. Therefore, I think the important question is not whether we should do something about trying to improve our structures, but how--and it's the "how" that's the very difficult question. You've seen what I've suggested as a possible way of doing this. I don't claim it's the only way to do it. In my mind it's the best that I've been able to think of as I've talked to a good many people about it.

The difficulties that I see in trying to prepare a structure for dealing with these questions are these. On the one hand we have built here a university which we all think is a distinguished university, by giving a great deal of autonomy to our sub-units, and we've not tried to administer from the top a system which tells all of the sub-units how to behave with respect to expenditures of money, the appointment of staff, etc., except in the most overall kinds of ways. Now, as we all know, we're being forced more in that direction by our affirmative action program, the fact that we've got an unemployment compensation statute taking effect January 1, and so forth. But still, we have always relied on a very considerable autonomy here, and a great deal of authority in the deans. Therefore, the feeling of the deans about this is important. Your faculty committees have been very conscious of that and have talked with the deans about it. We've had at least one session with Allan Smith's Academic Affairs Advisory Council, which has all the deans, and Wilfred Kaplan and some of his people, in an attempt to reconcile for everybody's satis-

faction the line administrative role of the deans, with some central mechanisms which we might construct that would in some ways transcend colleges.

That's where the problem begins to bind. At the college level, there is on the whole effective faculty input in making decisions. But some of the most difficult questions really arise above the college level. For instance, if we are only going to get X amount of new money, the question is where that money can best go. Each college can make out a good case for its own needs. Comparing, for example, Medical School with Literary College claims is not easy, and one can't expect persons within the respective schools to make the comparison. Thus any mechanism for choice has to transcend the colleges.

It seems to me that one of the things we have to do is to preserve the line authority of the deans and directors to operate with the kind of input they have had and also to have a more global view of where the University is going available to them and assessed for them.

Another problem I see is that in any university this big there will be at least two sub-problems in the construction of an overall mechanism. One is that no committee of the kind I have suggested small enough to be workable will be regarded as properly representative. Even a committee with only one member from each of the 16 colleges would probably be too large. A second problem is that the members of such a committee would have to spend so much time on it that they would probably need some released time. There is some wry humor in this, for the present administrators are really faculty members on released time, and faculty members (or students) who were given the required released time would in a sense become administrators. Moreover, their decisions would probably differ little from those of the present administrators in many cases, since the range of options is usually narrow. However, whether or not the decision-making is improved is not the right question. The question is, do people think that they have a greater participation and a greater acceptance of the decisions. If they do, that's enough.

The third problem I see is that one who is in an administrative position has to accept the public responsibility for what happens, whether he wants to or not. If an administrator can't do this well, he should be replaced; but I don't think you can get rid of the problem by spreading the responsibility.

With that kind of background, those of us who have the responsibility of administering decisions will be happy to get advice and assistance that will improve the chances of acceptance.

Coming to the scheme in my memorandum, I thought the way to proceed was not to erect a formal structure overnight, but to create in my office something I labeled the Office of Planning and Budgeting. The reason for putting it in my office was that nowhere else was there a global jurisdiction. I suggested then that control should rest in a Steering Committee of which, initially at least, I would be the chairman, and there would be an appointed vice-chairman. Then I picked three sub-areas that seemed to me the most urgent.

The first is long-range planning. The group dealing with this has to be a combination of people who are dealing with day-to-day problems and who will be implementing any report, and of people who have more time to think about where we should be going in the next ten years.

The second is program evaluation. I believe that within colleges and departments we do a fairly good job of this now; over a period of ten years one will see quite significant changes within a college. But we have no comparable evaluation mechanism above or outside the colleges (institutes, for example). I am suggesting that a committee responsible for this area could pick out a program that was in need of review and ask the unit within which the program was located to make a review and report back to the committee.

Finally, budget allocation is the most difficult problem there is. It's a combination of subjective judgments, evaluations, political realities, and funding realities, which may not square with each other. For example, if funds become available for a project that is not of high priority, do we accept them? The committee in this area could help us, with allocating (1) funds coming from increased State appropriations, and (2) funds coming from programs that have been eliminated.

I put my thoughts about this together because I wanted people to look at it. Then, once we've discussed it, if we find that this or something like it is a good step to take, let's try it. I would not formalize it for perhaps a year. If at that time it was working well, we could formalize it. If not, we could alter it in the light of our experience.

But my plea to you is to find something we can try that impresses you as going in the direction of meeting these problems and then let's try it.

ADDRESS BY
VICE-PRESI-
DENT SMITH

Since Vice-President Smith had to be elsewhere shortly afterwards, Chairman Norman suggested that he should come forward, with questions delayed until after he had finished.

A summary of Vice-President Smith's address follows:

I'm not sure that I have a great deal to add to the basic discussion that President Fleming has laid before you. I would encourage you, first, to see if something along the lines suggested can be developed and put into operation in the near future. Whether or not decisions will be very different, it is always important in an era of fund shortages that there be total understanding and total credibility of the decisions, and that they be generally understood to have the respect and responsibility of as broad a group as possible.

Let me talk mostly about budget processes, priorities, and mechanisms, because as chairman of the committee on budget administration, I spend a great deal of my time in that way.

I think it only candid to say that the important priority decisions rest in new dollars, not in saved dollars. For example, if we got \$8 million in new funds, that would be equivalent to the result of an 8% internal

reallocation of funds--and you will recall the pain and anguish with which a 1-1/4% modification in operating budget was achieved.

I've indicated before this group earlier that there are different kinds of priorities. There are legislatively determined priorities, that we have generally gone along with.

It is hard to establish a priority between a faculty compensation program and one position in a particular school. We can and must make generalized priority decisions, and it is here that the kind of structure suggested by Mr. Fleming would be most helpful. We can set generalized priorities between a compensation program, which for a faculty of this size costs roughly \$1 million for 1% improvement, and staff additions, which if we put as much as \$500,000 into in a given year would accomplish a significant improvement in many instructional programs. By the same token, the broad priorities of non-salary needs, such as our library acquisition program, have to be built into those decisions. And a committee, or a structure, that would let there be advanced consideration, would be extremely helpful in making the later detailed decisions.

For example, I have worked this fall with my own Senate advisory committee on questions of compensation policy other than the amount of money, and it will be extremely helpful in the future if this Assembly can receive that kind of report, and approve, modify, or disapprove the proposed policies, because they can then be utilized in developing a compensation program in any given year.

We have worked with the Committee on Economic Status. It would be extremely helpful if any of the three suggested groups would come to some articulated decision as to the basis upon which our request for compensation should be generated. We have worked on a basis that there are peer institutions with which we should achieve competitive capacity. We have tried to develop a system of requests in which we would say that if we are at the top of the third quartile in salaries of that peer group we will be competitive, because the difference between the top quartile and the top of the third does not mean that we cannot be competitive in every real sense. Maybe that's too low; in any case, it would be very helpful in formulating the compensation request if that kind of methodology could be articulated by a committee and submitted to this group and some agreement reached. That is always, by the way, the first step in the formulation of the compensation program, which annually presents the largest and first priority expenditure item of new money and old.

The second step comes after we receive an indication from the Governor as to the recommendation he will make in his budget bill. A ten-year study indicates that the final appropriation for this University is pretty well controlled by this recommendation. For that reason, some two years ago we extended our liaison efforts in Lansing to spend much more time with the Governor's budget office than in earlier years. We are very hopeful that as a result we will at least go into the legislative process with a decent recommendation.

We need, however, after that indication of compensation arises, to have a place to which we can repair, and again the kind of structure that has been suggested would be extremely useful in this regard if it were acceptable to, understood by, and had credibility with the faculty, to see whether or not the Governor's response comes anywhere near adequacy, and if not, what steps might be taken to modify that recommendation in the Legislature or, ultimately, to prepare for alternative sources that would provide an adequate compensation program.

The third step comes after the Senate has acted, because by that time we have two out of three indications of where the final result will lie. At that point we can get fairly specific about budget allocation potentials, and to see whether or not additional resources must be developed in order to meet minimum requirements.

I think the three sub-groups Mr. Fleming has suggested represent the three most significant arenas; I plead with you not to add more now. By judicious use of existing Senate advisory committees it should be possible to get the kind of faculty input that is sought on almost any subject that you choose. I think the Steering Committee might be asked, along with SACUA, to allocate responsibility for such studies as are needed by the three sub-groups. Frankly, one of the problems that presently exists is a multiplicity of committees that slows down, I think without corresponding gain, the processes of getting faculty, administrative, and student input into a particular problem. The suggested structure might help to alleviate this problem.

As an example of possible inputs from existing committees, the Economic Status Committee is currently undertaking studies on what our staff benefit program should be, and the relation which allocations to staff benefits should bear to direct salary improvements. We don't have total freedom here; in the budget year 1972-73 we will invest about \$322,000 in Social Security growth. This was not our decision, but it cost dollars in our compensation. However, there remain additional decisions to be taken by us. Some of those have been articulated by the Academic Affairs Committee.

In conclusion, I would simply lend my encouragement to what Mr. Fleming has suggested. Although all the t's cannot be crossed and the i's dotted, there is a real need, I believe, for the development of a structure which will attack a problem that exists for this University concerning the allocation of resources.

I should add that we have been working for a year with the Commission on Resource Allocation, who are to produce a report by next spring on what ought to be done in that direction. That Commission has a few ideas that have been distributed to you concerning how the mechanism can work; I urge that those be considered.

We can, with the support of this group and others, get a mechanism operative that will bring to the University a stability and credibility for some very difficult decisions that are going to be made that will be very useful in keeping the University where we all want it to be.

Chairman Norman said that the floor was open for questions and discussion by Assembly members and guests.

COMMENTS
AND
QUESTIONS

Professor Kaplan, chairman of the Proper Role Committee, came forward and drew attention to the memorandum from the Sub-committee on Planning Mechanisms that had been distributed to the Assembly. He said that the long-range planning group was the center of the Proper Role Committee's concern. Following a meeting at Inglis House in the spring, the Proper Role Committee had been called on to look at possible planning mechanisms. The group had worked hard at this assignment, meeting with SACUA, the President, and various deans.

One of the tough questions was whether such a group should be part of the administration or should be advisory. A purely advisory group might have no effect on the course of events, while a group that was part of the administration might upset existing structures. President Fleming's suggestion seemed to offer hope of avoiding this difficulty, with the planning group attached to the administrative structure, but not in a central position. The spring half-term, when many faculty members would be in Ann Arbor but not engaged in teaching, might be a good time for faculty members to take active roles in the proposed committee.

Professor Kaplan went on to say that the University was experiencing great pressures from outside at the present time. The question was how we could adjust to these. He expressed himself as strongly in favor of going ahead with the President's proposals.

Professor Colburn drew attention to the need for the committee to have access to information, including some confidential data such as salaries. He made it clear that he was strongly in favor of the ideas that had been presented.

Professor Rosemary Sarri, chairman of the Resource Allocation Commission, referred briefly to some of the points raised in the commentary on the proposals distributed to the Assembly by the Commission.

Professor Cohen said that he shared Vice-President Smith's concern with possible overgrowth and redundancy of committees. Also he wanted to ask where a reconstituted Economic Status Committee along the lines of the Rights and Responsibilities report might fit into the structure.

President Fleming said that many points had been left open, for example, the make-up of the proposed committees. How other committees fit into the picture remained to be resolved. He felt that the first step should be to get the Steering Committee working.

Chairman Norman said that some had wondered how consultative negotiation, with faculty members in a role of advocacy, could fit in with participation on an advisory basis. He added that SACUA had received a report from the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee, raising a number of questions about the proposed structures, and that he was trying to schedule a meeting with them.

In response to a further expression of concern by Professor Rucknagel about the proliferation of committees, Chairman Norman remarked that the

committee structure had grown like Topsy, and might need re-thinking. A severe problem was one of communication between different groups concerned with the same problems; the recent discussion on budget allocation was an example. He pointed out that some suggestions did not require legislation by the Assembly. Perhaps a cabinet or shadow-cabinet of committee chairmen could be set up to meet with SACUA, for example.

APPOINT-
MENTS TO
VACANCIES

Referring to the agenda item concerned with appointments to committee vacancies, Chairman Norman said that he would like to have the Assembly's permission to waive the rules in order to present two nominations that had not been previously announced. First, however, he asked whether there were additional nominations for the vacancy in the Research Policies Committee. There were none, and a motion to have the Secretary cast a unanimous ballot for Professor Cooperrider, (replacing Professor Jackson) was passed.

With the permission of the Assembly, he then presented nominations for two vacancies on the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee. SACUA was nominating Professors Steve Paraskevopoulos, of the School of Architecture, and Terrence Tice, of the School of Education, to fill the places of Professors Eugene Litwak and Finn Michelsen. These nominations were also accepted unanimously.

OLD
BUSINESS:
DISCUSSION
OF PLANNING
AND BUDGET-
ING PRO-
POSALS

Under the heading of old business, Professor Scherer asked, "Where do we go from here on all these proposals?" Chairman Norman said that SACUA had agonized over the situation. Ideas seemed to be coming in from all directions at once.

Professor Leslie Kish said that he welcomed the new structures if the committees would be in touch with both the Assembly and the administration. He asked what would be the composition of the committees.

Chairman Norman said that some serious questions were raised by the Resource Allocation Commission. He suggested the formation of nominating committees to help SACUA recommend people.

Professor Franken said that he was gratified that the administration was willing to search out sources of advice. With regard to the problem of representation, he said that he was not especially worried about it, since most faculty members on committees try to get away from their own individual biases. He added that he wouldn't mind if President Fleming made the initial choice of committee members, or asked SACUA to provide names.

Professor Schulze suggested that the faculty had to decide what its role was to be in solving these problems. Advocacy and collaboration were alternatives suggested by the Reed report and Mr. Fleming's proposals, respectively.

Professor Scherer said that while some had seen these roles as competitive, it was possible that they might be complementary. But if one proposal was taken up first, there was the possibility of foreclosing consideration of the other.

Professor Kerr said he was in favor of taking an advisory role. He agreed with President Fleming that responsibility had to be pinpointed on administrators. He said that stagnation was a hazard inherent in the zero-growth situation that we were now faced with, and pointed out that the strength of the University depended upon faculty, not committees.

Professor Rucknagel said that he didn't see that an advisory role necessarily precluded an advocacy one. It all depended on how the administration reacted to advice; his own opinion was that the administration would listen. Professor Cohen said that he would like to urge that when the advisory program went forward we should cooperate but should also explore the idea of consultative negotiations. Professor Kish remarked that the mere fact that we have professors on committees is not sufficient. It was important that the committees should report not only to the President, but also to the Assembly. Chairman Norman said that the University had operated with an interface system for some time. His guess was that annual or semi-annual reports would be enough. He noted that one omission from the proposals was a broader input to day-to-day budget decisions.

NEW
BUSINESS

Under the heading of new business, Professor Colburn said that he hated to end the meeting on a too-serious note. He moved the following resolution: "The Senate Assembly extends to Bo Schembechler, his coaching staff, and the University of Michigan football team our congratulations for their outstanding season, and our best wishes for a successful New Year's Day in Pasadena." The motion was passed unanimously.

Professor Ehrenkreutz suggested that Copernicus' 500th anniversary should not be forgotten.

ADJOURN-
MENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

Wilfred M. Kincaid
Secretary