

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting of 16 February 1987

ATTENDANCE

Present: Arnett, Bassett, Bissell,  
Borcherts, Blane, Briggs,  
Checkoway, Chudacoff, Cohen,  
Comninou, Craig,  
DeCamp, Dobbins, Durrance,  
Eggertsen, Gage, Glover,  
Gray, Hollingsworth, Hook,  
Larson, Lavoie, Lehmann,  
Lenaghan, Lougee, Loup, Lusk,  
Manis, McCarus, McClamroch,  
Meyer, Moore, Nadelman,  
Ness, Oleinick, Olsen, Olson,  
Pierce, Reed, Ross, Hudson,  
Rutledge, Schteingart,  
Seidler, Stapp, Stebbins,  
Borer, Wiseman, Yocum

Absent: Ascione, Barlow, Burdi, Vorus,  
Pastalan, Debler, Ard,  
Goldberg, Yang, Haefner, Han,  
Hanks, Leonard, Lewis,  
Lockwood, Lorey, Malvin,  
Margolis, Miller, Moerman,  
Moran, Mosher, Muirhead,  
Rosenthal, Sanders, Sargous,  
Schauer, Shannon, Silverman,  
Nystuen, Thomson, Weiler,  
White, Berent

Professor William Stebbins convened the meeting at 3:20  
p.m.

MINUTES

The minutes of 19 January 1987 were approved as  
written.

MATTERS ARISING

Professor Lehmann moved, Professor Nadelman seconded  
that James Cruse be appointed for a 2-year term to the  
University Council. Motion passed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Congressman William Ford will address the annual Senate meeting March 16, 4:00 p.m. Members were asked to inform their colleagues of the meeting.

REPORT OF THE SACUA NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Professor Stebbins reported that the following Assembly members nominations have been made: Thomas Lenaghan, Sally Lusk, Edward Chudacoff, Peggie Hollingsworth, Roy Pierce, William Dobbins, Charles Olson, Wendy Lougee. There were no nominations from the floor. Professor Lehmann then moved, Professor Nadelman seconded that the nominations be closed. Motion passed.

Professor Stebbins noted that three members will be elected for three year terms and one will be elected for a one year term to replace Professor Nadelman. The Rules constrain the number of members of a school or college who may be elected because of existing representation on SACUA. Thus, while two members of the Medical School faculty are nominated, only one can be elected in the March election.

"PROSPECTS AND PROGRESS" - LINDA S. WILSON, VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH

Vice President Wilson wished to report on the progress that has been made for improving the research environment and position of The University of Michigan in the areas of policy, research environment, strategy and organization, and management.

In the area of policy, the principal focus has been on the classified research policy, the policy on integrity in research and scholarship with the procedures for handling allegations of academic misconduct, and the policy on conflict of interest.

There has been a major effort to address the Regents' request for reconsideration of the classified research policy. A committee devoted eight months' effort to this, holding open hearings, probing the implications of various approaches, and wrestling with the dilemma of conflicting principles before issuing majority and minority reports. Those reports were then discussed in faculty, student and community forums with comments forwarded to the Executive Officers and the Regents. Prior to their March meeting the Regents will discuss the matter informally with members of SACUA and the Michigan Student Assembly. At each of the Regents' meetings this year there have been presentations on this matter during the public comments sessions. The extensive opportunity for examination of the classified

research policy was, in her view, appropriate and time well spent.

The policy and procedures on integrity in research and scholarship have been issued as an interim policy to permit refinements without leaving the institution and its members vulnerable in the meantime. The University's objective is to adopt a final policy which is clear and workable, and a set of procedures which encourage integrity and protect high standards while being attentive to the rights of individuals. The interim policy has been widely distributed and suggestions for refinement requested. The final policy will be taken through the formal review process in the Fall term unless no changes are recommended.

The conflict of interest policy has been reviewed by the Research Policies Committee, by the Deans and Directors, and is awaiting comment from SACUA. She hopes to complete work on it this term. Other policy matters which have received attention are the implementation of revised procedures for assuring the welfare and judicious use of animals in research and the university practice for the handling of proprietary information received from sponsors of work under contract.

During this past year considerable effort has been directed toward the research environment. Foremost have been the efforts to stimulate and nurture interdisciplinary research. The Academic Policy Group has signalled that such activities are valued and that the difficulties inherent in them are recognized. This group prepared a proposal to the Kellogg Foundation which resulted in the five million dollar Presidential Interdisciplinary Initiative, for which the first round of applications were just received. The response has been exciting. Nearly 150 proposals were submitted and more than 300 faculty have agreed to serve as peer reviewers.

She has focused some discretionary funds in her office for interdisciplinary activities and has given attention to the nature of interdisciplinary work, the conditions for its flourishing, its leadership, organization, and support and, on the basis of this study, is proposing a set of criteria to assist in determining the locus of interdisciplinary research units. Her office has also been assisting the development of some interdisciplinary activities, serving as brokers and indentifiers of opportunity where there is existing but widely dispersed strength, providing staff for the development of proposals, and stimulating discussion. About twenty such initiatives are in various stages of development.

The procedures for allocation of OVPR discretionary funds have been revised and published in a guide. OVPR, in

her view, has made explicit its role as complementary to other sources of funds available within the schools and colleges now that the management incentives program has been implemented. The OVPR has also prepared a document which describes the cost sharing requirements of external sponsors so that it can target University subsidies where they will have the most impact. Her office has also combined the process for allocating cost sharing to leverage external support with the process for allocating funds for support of internal choices so that the University makes conscious choices, understanding the tradeoffs and recognizing the real value of each such award. Finally, the office has joined with the Graduate School to initiate a new collaborative program, the Research Partnership Program, which focuses attention on the quality of the mentoring relationship between faculty member and graduate student.

In partnership with the Research Policies Committee OVPR has prepared a set of recommendations to improve the mechanisms for assuring quality in the ranks of primary research staff. The proposal addresses the recruiting process, the promotions process, and affirmative action processes as well as title, awards and job security. The proposal has been approved in principle by the Research Policies Committee and will be taken before the Deans shortly.

While the vast majority of transactions and problems that the OVPR handles concerns externally supported research, she is no less concerned with the quality of the research environment for those who work in fields not of interest to external sponsors. While much of the University's support of these fields is built into the regular budget, there remains a need for small-scale financial support as well as for explicit recognition of the scope, quality and significance of the non-sponsored research carried on here. Particularly pleasing to learn is the extent to which U of M faculty count collegial relationships and the quality of their intellectual companions as a major asset. She will continue to take special care not to disturb, but to help nurture, that environment.

Two other areas in the environment have required attention. One is the non-research sponsored activities, such as training, service, development, and demonstration carried out by some schools and colleges, especially but not limited to the professional schools. This area is a new one for attention and to date only the basic counting function has been accomplished. The other area is technology transfer. Given the growing importance of University research to economic development, both in the state and in the region, she has been studying technology transfer mechanisms and approaches including intellectual property

policy, practices and organization. She expects to bring specific proposals to the Research Policies Committee shortly.

As she noted last year, the Washington environment has undergone significant changes so that reassessing the strategy the U of M follows in representing its needs to Congress was in order. Heightened attention to new developments in the Executive Branch also seemed necessary. The resulting revised strategy encompasses the four Executive Officers of the University who have responsibilities requiring this representation and makes more explicit how they are organized for these tasks. Improvement has also been made in the coordination and focus of staff activities as well as in consultation with faculty and deans.

A third area of attention is research services. Along with the other Vice Presidents, she has been undertaking a review of administrative and research services, searching for ways to streamline these, to remove bureaucratic accretion, and to assure that the procedures and requirements in place serve a necessary function and are efficient.

The Vice President for Research is responsible for oversight of twelve units. Several of these, such as DRDA, ISR, and IST, have undergone major reviews this year. These organization and oversight matters have been a major focus of her effort.

In reviewing prospects she cited many external forces which must be accommodated, and believes two emerge as dominant: 1) the nation's response to global economic forces and 2) the substantial shifts in the nature of our population. Effective responses to both take a long lead time. For that reason, we need to think carefully about what are our principal objectives in our service of society and how these can best be achieved.

There are some factors worth considering for us in The University of Michigan. After a long history of widely acknowledged leadership in higher education and research, we find it increasingly demanding to sustain that leadership position. Competition is stiff and the "Rules" under which we have been successful are changing. Our leadership is not just a matter of pride; it is part of our contribution to our state and the nation. Leadership is not just an obligation. Those who have the capacity have the responsibility to lead. And the capacity is not just derived from the financial base.

This nation was built in part with selfish motives but also out of commitment, unselfish effort and even sacrifice.

The challenges ahead demand the same kind of commitment, sense of mission and desire to make a difference. There is a wide array of ways to contribute within our functions of teaching, research and service. We need to use the tools and skills we can collect to make those contributions effective.

The prospects she sees, then, include substantial and accelerating change, much of it beyond our control. At the U of M we must observe and contemplate the changes even as we participate and in some cases lead them.

Not all forward motion that our science and technology spurs is good, though it is probably impossible to foresee and distinguish good and evil outcomes in all but the very near term. Much of the nature of the outcomes depends more on our social systems than our choices of research. In the words of William Carey,

"So long as the advancement of science is understood to be something other than a sheer drive for power and something more than a mere fueling agent for the engines of military or economic nationalism, we will probably achieve a decent balance in the ends and uses of a search for knowledge."

The primary exception in her personal view is nuclear weapons. These introduce a qualitatively different factor into the historical process. We cannot, in her view, use past experience in the same way when addressing the future which includes nuclear weapons. We cannot put the genie back into the bottle. This is the dilemma of our time and all our decisions will be somewhat different because of it.

These remarks have been a mixture of progress on the micro scale and some more philosophical musings on the macro scale. She has left broad areas untouched or barely scratched but hopes that Assembly members have gained a glimpse of what she is trying to do and what kinds of horizons she searches. What is absolutely essential to her is a strong connection to the faculty. For that reason she has searched to find for the senior staff in OVPR three members of the faculty who will remain rooted in their research activities and roles as faculty members even as they contribute to the work of the institution at the Executive Officer level. In addition, she needs to hear from faculty and welcomes future opportunities to meet with them.

Note: The full text of Vice President Wilson's address is available in the SACUA Office.

"DISCRIMINATION, DEVALUATION, AND EXPLOITATION; THE LIBRARY AND CAMPUS DILEMMA." RICHARD M. DOUGHERTY, DIRECTOR, UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Dr. Dougherty stated that his purpose was to brief the Senate Assembly on a serious problem affecting the Library and which soon will begin to impact those faculty who rely on scholarly publications to communicate with colleagues and who depend on publications as a source of information, inspiration and ideas. His presentation, he said, would focus on how the world of scholarly publishing is changing and how these changes are affecting the Library's acquisition program.

The rapid escalation of publication prices is not exclusively a library or university problem but rather an issue that confronts all of higher education. The system of scholarly communication extant for the last two generations is now under threat. One notable trend is the takeover of American publishing firms by European companies while another is the growing concentration of publishing among a relatively small group of very large publishers. The problems that currently beset us cannot be attributed entirely to this concentration of publishing activity but certainly it is a contributant to the current situation.

Among a sampling of journals, all of which are viewed as prestigious and central to the disciplines they support, prices have increased from 55% to 177% in a four year period. The pattern of price increases is particularly dramatic for titles published in West Germany and Holland. If the Library's projections for 1987 prove accurate, we will have experienced almost a doubling of prices in just two years. In the aggregate these increases are significantly higher than inflationary increases for a variety of consumer products as reported recently in the New York Times.

"Discrimination" refers to the practice of some British publishers who charge their North American customers a differential subscription rate for publications. In large part due to the complaints registered by U.S. librarians, the trend toward differential pricing is beginning to abate. Examples of differential pricing help illustrate the problem. The price North American libraries pay for Philosophy, published by the Cambridge University Press, is far in excess of the price in pounds sterling. In 1984 the differential reached almost 87 percent. Angewandte Chemie, published by VCH, represents the typical pricing pattern of many scientific and technical journals published in West Germany. Here the growing weakness of the U.S. dollar is readily apparent but so too is the pricing differential. One factor at play, he believes, is the inelasticity of

demand and supply. So far campuses have not exhibited much resistance to price increases. He suspects that if the market for foreign publishers remains stable after hefty price increases, we can expect some American publishers to adopt similar pricing policies themselves.

He then examined how these trends are affecting the libraries at The University of Michigan. At the beginning of the current fiscal year, the Library's appropriation for books and serials was 4.22 million dollars. The Library expects to begin 1987/88 with an appropriation of 4.39 million dollars, an amount which takes into account the one percent budget reduction that all units on campus will be assessed and which assumes a five percent increase in the Library's acquisition fund. In order to narrow the anticipated budgetary deficit of \$630,000, the Library proposes to reduce the level of its acquisitions program by ten percent. Because this will not close the budgetary gap completely, additional reductions may be required later.

The Library's response will consist of two distinct strategies. First, it is implementing a plan that requires each fund manager to reduce the level of acquisitions in 1987/88 by ten percent by initiating journal cancellations and/or deferring the purchase of monographs. He then illustrated how the proposed retrenchment will affect a typical Literary College fund.

The second part of the Library's strategy will be to scrutinize the behavior of a select group of publishers believed to be responsible for our current predicament. These publishers were selected for three reasons: 1) some are known to have engaged in broad scale differential pricing, 2) others are known to be pursuing aggressive pricing policies, 3) the Library wants to examine a group of large publishers who enjoy particularly strong positions in their respective markets, and for whom we currently have little information about their pricing policies. The Library intends to give special attention to these publishers, and whenever appropriate make every effort to cancel as many of their titles as possible. In addition to notifying the publishers of our actions, the Library also plans to notify the editors and editorial advisors of the reasons for this special attention.

Special problems confront the Library as it struggles to retrench in a way that minimizes damage to the quality of the Library. First, how does one deal with collections that are interdisciplinary in nature? For example, though the Geography Department was disbanded a few years ago, the Library continued to purchase materials related to it. Examples include materials on anthropology, environmental studies and landscape architecture. In an academic environment in which "every tub is expected to stand on its

own bottom," it should be clear what can happen if there is no capacity to coordinate the way in which a complex library system such as ours retrenches its acquisitions program. The failure to coordinate collection development and retrenchment can have multiple and unexpected effects if actions are not carefully monitored and orchestrated. In his view, the libraries of this campus are not the exclusive resources of single academic units, or even clusters of units, they are a campus wide resource and should be viewed as such. Those in the Library responsible for executing the current program of retrenchment will be charged to keep this inter-relatedness of collections uppermost in their minds as they proceed to cancel subscriptions.

A second, particularly vexing concern is the matter of duplicate subscriptions. Should we cancel duplicated subscriptions, or subscriptions to titles which are unique to the campus? The Library staff endeavors to keep duplication to a minimum. However duplicates are frequently important to researchers working in interdisciplinary programs, but they are also expensive. He is not suggesting that duplicates are not important, but the dilemma facing the Library's staff can be succinctly summarized as follows: "Should we cancel unique titles and as a result accelerate the process of transforming the library into a sort of super academic lending library, and in the process lessen its ability to assemble a collection of unique, specialized publications necessary to support research in the years ahead?" This dilemma is much more difficult to resolve and there are no ready answers. In the final analysis our librarians can only strive to strike a balance when dealing with this issue.

It should be clearly understood by this body that this year's cancellation program will not be our last, unless next year's materials budget is substantially increased beyond five percent.

What the library world is currently experiencing is its version of "energy shock." As one faculty member noted, "Paying the higher subscriptions is simply the cost this university must bear in order to maintain academic excellence." He pointed out that when the University was confronted by accelerating energy, it did not shut down buildings or curtail programs. It should also be pointed out that the University's administration didn't remain passive either. It took steps to conserve resources and communicated the University's plight to governmental officials. It is the University community now that will have to decide how the campus should respond to this latest challenge.

There is already a growing body of data that suggests the Library's current peers may not include those

universities against which this campus compares itself. He suspects that the time is approaching when the University community may wish to reconsider what it expects of its libraries. Does the University need to compete with the libraries of Berkeley, Stanford, UCLA, Illinois and Texas in order to compete with those universities in the pursuit of academic excellence? If present disturbing trends persist the Library may not be viewed by the early 1990's as the valuable campus asset that has been traditionally the case. A library base takes a long time to build.

Dr. Dougherty plans further communication on the issue of peer relationships later this spring. In the meantime the Library will make every effort to impress on the world of publishing that the current trends are unacceptable and in the long run policies that result in inflated prices may not be in the best interests of either the producers or consumers of scholarly information. His presentation was meant to introduce the subject and to prepare the faculty for the retrenchment programs which are now being activated by the Library's staff.

In reply to Professor Cohen's questions, Dr. Dougherty replied that publishers explain the large price increases in several ways. One is that the number of pages published has increased. When the Library begins a subscription, however, it effectively contracts for a set number of pages only to become locked in when that number rises. The difference in cost per page also varies greatly among titles, with variations up to 300%. Some publishers claim that price increases result from the opening of U.S. offices to provide American customers better service. Librarians, however, were satisfied with previous service arrangements. With respect to alternate media, he suggested that publishers are probably opening the door to less traditional publication, especially in digitized form but this is not likely to save libraries money as both paper and digitized form will probably be demanded.

Professor Meyer asked to what extent professional society publications have increased their prices. Dr. Dougherty replied that there is no hard data on this as yet. Anecdotal data indicates that some have increased prices far beyond the increases in their costs. In many cases associations have become dependent on publishing revenues to sustain their operating budgets.

Professor Shy (in the audience) asked for a projection of the problem relative to the short- and mid-term. Dr. Dougherty replied that if scholars in their own associations begin to speak up about the issue, price increases will likely begin to level off. Speaking out can have a positive effect.

Professor Ness asked for an elaboration on the financial magnitude of the problem. Dr. Dougherty noted that one half the Library's budget is spent on journals and serials. Anticipating a problem, the Library prepared a one-time cushion but that will be exhausted this fiscal year. The practices he described will cause a deficit in the next fiscal year if no intervention is taken in the interim.

Professor Gray asked about criteria used for selecting journals. Dr. Dougherty replied that the practice up to now has been to give the individual librarian as much latitude as possible to determine selections in consultation with the faculty and to allow for differences between disciplines.

RECOMMENDATION WITH REGARD TO SENATE ASSEMBLY REPRESENTATION

Professor Lehmann moved acceptance of SACUA's recommendation that the reapportionment scheme, approved by the Assembly and the Regents' for the period 1984-87, be continued for the next three year period. Professor Cohen seconded the motion. The motion passed without opposition.

REPORTS FROM SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

Professor Leslie Olsen reported on selected activities in the College of Engineering. These included the Commission on Undergraduate Education, EXPRES (Experimental Research on Electronic Submission) and selected curricular developments including a joint Ph.D. program in applied physics with LSA Physics, and strengthening the bioengineering program in conjunction with the Medical School and the biotechnology program in conjunction with LSA Chemistry and the Medical School. The College is also involved in development of the Michigan Information Technology Network, a joint proposal of the U of M, MSU, WSU and Michigan Technological University. The network's objectives are to focus human and technological resources of the four research institutions in support of economic development of the State and to permit inexpensive access to those resources in every region of the State. The total cost is estimated at 13.27 million dollars over five years with initial installation and development targeted for 1987-88.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Patricia B. Yocum  
Senate Secretary