

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting 21 December 1981

ATTENDANCE

Present: Bailey, Barnard, Barritt, Bishop, Blass, D.Brown, M.Brown, Cares, Cooper, Crane, DeKornfeld, Friedman, Green, Hilbert, Hultquist, Kirkpatrick, Loup, Meyer, Millard, Mosher, Nagy, Pollock, Senior, Smith, Vinter, Weiner, White, Wieland, Young

Absent: Ackley, Beck, Brooks, Martin, Browne, Burdi, Caffesse, Carpenter, Carter, Cassidy, Dahl, Dixon, Dobel, Stephenson, Easley, Esteban, Evans, Abdel-Massih, Frost, Gray, Groves, Haddock, Hildebrandt, Kesling, Hollinger, Kahn, Keren, Liepman, Lockwood, Lynch, Maassab, Morash, O'Meara, Regezi, Ringler, Rinne, Romani, Root, Sisman, Tek, Tentler, Hagen, Wynne

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:16 p.m. by Professor M. Brown, Chairman and the minutes of the meeting of 16 November 1981 were approved.

ANNOUNCE-
MENTS

1. GEO negotiations. A summary of the Senate Assembly's discussions of the Graduate Employees Organization in 1974-75 was distributed with the agenda for this meeting. Professor M. Brown announced that SACUA is tentatively following the decisions made then. It has appointed three faculty members, Richmond Browne, Peter Hinman, and Warren Norman, to serve on the advisory committee, which also includes all deans and directors. It has also asked for a voice in choosing the faculty members of the negotiating team. Professor M. Brown asked whether Assembly members wished to change any of the decisions made in 1974-75 concerning participation in negotiations with the GEO.

Professor Barritt asked how our advising the administration would affect us if the faculty were to unionize. Professor M. Brown replied that, according to Professor Koppmeyer of Wayne State University (in a recent talk to the AAUP), unionization does not necessarily prevent the faculty from advising the administration. He also said that since the faculty effectively hires the teaching assistants, it functions in some respects as an employer; but this does not require it to be anti-employee.

Advising the administration does not put us on one side of the issue. Professor Barritt asked what would happen if the GEO asked for faculty advisors. Professor M. Brown replied that such a request would be brought to the Assembly for a decision.

Professor Hilbert asked whether the Assembly would take the same attitude toward negotiations with a faculty union. Professor M. Brown said that the three faculty members appointed to the advisory committee were chosen for their experience with teaching assistants, not as representatives of the whole faculty or the Assembly. Professor Hilbert requested that it be made clear that they do not represent the Assembly. Professor Friedman said that their role is not to be adversaries of the union but to inform the administration about what goes on in the classroom.

Professor White asked whether our participation in the negotiations implied approval of them and of the GEO. He said that he does not consider the existence of a teaching assistants' union to be a good idea and would not want to imply that it is. Professor M. Brown replied that the circumstances that Professor White objects to are beyond our control and we are not implying any opinion about them.

Professor Barnard asked what charge was given to the three members of the advisory committee. Professor M. Brown said that there was no explicit charge; SACUA merely responded to the administration's request in accordance with the 1974-75 precedent. Professor Bishop said that there was no implied charge but to facilitate the best interest of the academic community.

2. CESF questionnaire. In response to requests from members of the Departments of Physics and of History of Art, CESF will collect data on faculty interest in unionization and assemble information on the advantages and disadvantages of unionization. Professor Barritt, citing CESF's heavy workload and the long time needed for an earlier survey, asked why SACUA had not brought the matter directly to the Assembly so that other faculty might participate in the discussion. Professor D. Brown said that CESF had prepared the survey with great dispatch and was prepared to mail out the questionnaires immediately after the Christmas recess. Professor M. Brown said that the matter was referred to CESF because one of the petitions was addressed to CESF and CESF was mentioned in the other. He added that, since unionization might have an impact (positive or negative) on

faculty governance, it seemed best to keep SACUA at a distance from it. Professor Friedman said that CESF is knowledgeable about handling such information and that SACUA has been criticized in the past for bringing topics to the Assembly without background data. Professor M. Brown said that he expects unionization to be on the Assembly's agenda after CESF collects the information.

3. Central grievance procedure. A committee, consisting of Virginia Nordby, Charles Allmand, William Lemmer, and two faculty members, has been charged by Vice President Frye to (1) review the appeals procedures of the various units and formulate minimal standards for these procedures while respecting diversity and (2) formulate a proposal for a central appeals procedure, reporting directly to Frye, to be used, for example, to provide appellate review outside units too small for an internal two-tiered review system. This charge was drawn up after discussions between Vice President Frye and SACUA. Progress will be reported to the Assembly.

BOARD IN
CONTROL
OF INTER-
COLLE-
GIATE
ATHLETICS

Professor Paul Gikas presented, for the Assembly's approval, the appointment of Professor Gwendolyn Cruzat as alternate faculty representative to the Big Ten Conference for a term of one-year. He described the administrative structure of the conference, and explained that its expansion into the area of women's athletics had increased the workload of the ten faculty representatives to the point where it was decided to appoint an alternate representative from each school. It is implied, though not explicitly stated, that the alternate representatives are to be responsible primarily for women's athletics. Professor Gikas chaired the committee that nominated Professor Cruzat for this position, a nomination that has been approved by the Board in Control of Intercollegiate Athletics. Since the position does not yet have a job description, the Board is asking the Assembly to approve the appointment for one year; thereafter, an appointment for a three-year term will be made. After four years, the system of alternate representatives will be reviewed by the Big Ten Conference.

Professor Pollock asked whether there is a job description for the regular faculty representative and whether this position is paid. Professor Gikas said that the conference rules specify the duties of the faculty representative and that our representative, Professor Tom Anton, gets no remuneration or released time for this work. Professor Pollock suggested using the

same description of responsibilities for the alternate representative as for the regular representative and letting the two decide how to divide the work. He introduced a motion to nominate Professor Cruzat as co-representative with the same duties as the representative. At Professor Gikas's suggestion he changed the "co-representative" to "alternate representative" to conform to the Big Ten's nomenclature, and in this form the motion was seconded. Professor D. Brown said that he preferred "co-representative" since "alternate" seemed to slight women's athletics. Professor Barritt expressed dismay at the trend toward a business view of athletics and asked whether women's athletics are now being pushed in the same direction. Professor M. Brown suggested inviting Professor Cruzat to address the Assembly on women's athletics. Professor Weiner asked what would happen if the Assembly remained neutral, neither endorsing nor rejecting the appointment. Professor M. Brown replied that this was unclear as the rules don't yet exist; but he assumed that the nominee could not serve without the Assembly's approval. Professor Barritt asked whether Professor Cruzat was chosen as someone who approves of the direction that Big Ten athletics has recently moved or as someone who supports women's athletics; Professor Gikas said "the latter." There followed a brief discussion of the financing of athletics. Then Professor Barritt asked about faculty representative to the AIAW. Professor Gikas replied that the Associate Athletic Director Phyllis Ocker represents the University in the AIAW; there is no faculty representative, but Professor Cruzat would be active here as well. Professor Hilbert suggested that the Assembly approve the nomination and encourage the Big Ten to reorganize so that both representatives would have votes. Professor M. Brown pointed out that, since the Big Ten rules require complete faculty control of athletics, any written Big Ten rules about alternate representatives would presumably come before the Assembly. Professor Friedman asked why Professor Cruzat wasn't present at this meeting; Professors M. Brown and Gikas replied that the suggestion hadn't come up. Professor Weiner suggested endorsing the nomination but asking that "alternate representative" be changed to "co-representative". Professor Pollock said that in many organizations several delegates share a single vote. Professor M. Brown said that the proposed changes were appropriate; he will transmit the recommendations to the Board in Control. In reply to a question from Professor Bishop, Professor Gikas said that Michigan State is the only school whose regular Big Ten representative is a woman. Professor Pollock's motion was put to a vote and carried.

BUDGET
PRIORI-
TIES
COMMIT-
TEE

Professor Mary Ann Swain, chair of the Budget Priorities Committee, reported on this committee's activities. She began by describing the budget situation. General funds and research support have not kept up with inflation. In addition, the cost of building maintenance has increased with the addition of two million square feet of space, utility costs are rising by \$4 million per year, and the health science schools have lost capitation money from the federal government. State support has decreased and tuition increased. The situation at the federal level is unclear especially in regard to student aid and certain sectors of research. Declining graduate enrollment seriously affects tuition revenue since graduate tuition is higher than undergraduate tuition. Professor Swain recalled Vice President Frye's list of five underfunded areas (in his address to the Assembly in September): faculty salaries, graduate aid, the research environment, equipment, and new intellectual thrusts. She said that we can expect no real growth in revenue and possibly a real loss coupled with increasing costs. This will force significant evolution if not revolution; we have already seen cuts in LSA (Geography) and an increasing collaboration between business and the Engineering College.

Two members of the Budget Priorities Committee have been named to work with the staff of the Vice President for Academic Affairs in developing reallocation proposals. Subcommittees then evaluate suggested reductions. Committee members also attend the budget conferences in which deans present to the administration their plans for the next year. The committee has made recommendations, on the basis of these conferences, for the return to units of some internally generated funds (about \$1 million, out of a total of \$12 million).

Last year's 6% cuts were made in a crisis situation. Many look as though they can't be continued for five years. But real cuts are needed. The faculty can probably protect most of what is closest to their hearts. One advantage of our decentralized system is that we know what is important to us. A disadvantage is the lack of a total view and the slowness of the system. The executive officers are attempting an orderly transition to a smaller operation.

Professor Meyer suggested that the University dispose of some of its buildings, especially in view of high maintenance costs. Professor Swain said the subject has come up in her committee and she understands the

executive officers are looking at it. Professor Meyer urged the committee to monitor this effort. Professor Friedman mentioned that in the case of the Rackham building in Detroit, there are legal impediments to selling the building. Professor Pollock asked to whom the Budget Priorities Committee reports and how much power it has. Would a unanimous recommendation of the committee be carried out? Professor Swain replied that the Budget Priorities Committee advises the Committee on Budget Administration, which consists of five executive officers and is chaired by Vice President Frye. Its power is only advisory, but it is taken seriously. If a unanimous recommendation were not implemented, a strong explanation would be given.

NEW
BUSINESS

Professor Green inquired about the information items listed, in the SACUA minutes of 30 October 1981 as being on the Assembly's agenda for 16 November 1981. Professor M. Brown replied that the proposed changes in supplemental instructional staff definitions are in the hands of the Tenure Committee and the deans and directors; they will presumably come before the Assembly at a later date. The Tenure Committee's report on associate professorships without tenure has been sent to Vice President Frye and SACUA is watching the situation. Also, a committee, consisting of members of the Tenure Committee and administrators, has been formed to propose a model policy for how one gets tenure.

ADJOURN-
MENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Andreas Blass
Senate Secretary