

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Regular Assembly Meeting, March 20, 1972

ATTENDANCE

Present: Rutledge, Allen, Anton, Buning, Bertolaet, Birch, Bishop, Bowditch, Bowman, Castor, Coon, Cooperrider, Cornish, Crawford, Darvas, Dowson, Ehrenkreutz, Franken, Goodman, Graebel, Mohler, Heller, Higgins, Hood, Huntington, Kahn, Kerr, Kish, Lloyd, Longone, Magee, Meyer, Loomis, Hafter, Nystuen, Overseth, Paul, Pollack, Preston, Ryder, Sana, Sandalow, Sawyer, Scherer, Schulze, Schuman, Moore, Verheyen, Wilkes, Youngdahl, Zweifler, Kincaid, Norman

Absent: Asgar, Caldwell, Cohen, Boles, Reade, Hinerman, Iglehart, Colburn, Berkove, Rigan, Rucknagel, Simpson, Hertzler, Votaw

Guests: Members of Classified Research Committee and Rights and Responsibilities Committee; Bob Nelson and Marty Scott, SGC; and Robert Kuhbach, Graduate Federation

CALL TO ORDER

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the February 21 meeting were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Norman announced that the consultative committee on classified research which was authorized in the motion passed at the last Assembly meeting had been duly constituted and had met with administration and student representatives. The group had developed and sent to the Regents a compromise proposal, which had been distributed to the Assembly with the call to the meeting. The Regents had responded by approving a resolution that was distributed with the proposal just referred to. The Regents' resolution had the effect of making the proposal from the consultative committee the official policy of the University, subject only to approval by the Senate Assembly.

CLASSIFIED RESEARCH

Professor Sandalow asked about the status of proprietary research. Chairman Norman reviewed the recent history; after receiving the first Assembly resolution, which referred only to classified research, the Regents had asked for a policy embracing proprietary research also, but had then reversed themselves. As things stood now, the Regents had not asked for any statement on proprietary research, and the Research Policies Committee had not looked at the question further since issuing their last report. Professor Kish asked whether proprietary research was subject to the provisions of the new policy. Chairman Norman pointed out that the statement on page 1 of the new policy specifically restricted its application to classified research.

Professor Schuman said that as a member of the Consultative Committee, he felt that the final product was the best that could have been achieved under the circumstances. At the same time, he felt that major compromises had been made. But it remained to be seen whether the compromises would be useful ones. The largest compromise was on Willow Run, which included the bulk of the classified research being carried on. The crucial question here was whether Willow Run would, in fact, be separated from the University within a year. The procedure with respect to classified research on campus

apart from Willow Run had also been changed, and a role given to the Research Policies Committee which it had not had previously. Finally, the Vice-President for Research was left free to send on proposals, with nothing said about reporting disagreements.

Professor Loomis moved that further discussion should be deferred until Item 6 in the agenda was reached. Without taking a formal vote, Chairman Norman asked if there were any objections to that procedure; there were none.

SACUA
REPORT

Professor Merle Crawford reported on SACUA activities as follows:

Since the last Assembly meeting, SACUA has met on February 28, March 13, and just before the present meeting. The principal part of the meeting in March was with President Fleming. In addition, there was a dinner at the Inglis House on March 16 attended by SACUA, the Regents, and the chief executive officers.

As usual, some time was devoted to setting the Assembly agenda and selecting nominees to vacancies on committees. The classified research issue was a major topic of discussion, as it has been for several months. Other topics included the Health Service, student committee appointments, the vice-presidential searches, and setting up the planning and budgeting committees. In addition, wider distribution of the Rights and Responsibilities Report was discussed and agreed to.

SGC
RESOLU-
TION

The next item of business was the Student Government Council resolution, dealing with the appointment of students to committees. Chairman Norman reviewed the recent history of this question. Assembly by-laws called for the nomination of undergraduate students by the Student Government Council, and of graduate students by the Graduate Assembly. Since the Graduate Assembly was now defunct, some change in procedures was obviously necessary. Last year SGC had followed a tactic of non-cooperation and had refused to nominate students for committees. This policy was changed after last fall's elections, and Chairman Norman had had a number of meetings with SGC representatives since, in which he asked for concrete proposals concerning student representation. On February 24, SGC had passed a resolution along these lines, which had been distributed with the call to the meeting. A representative of SGC was present, and would address the Assembly. A document from Graduate Federation had also been received and distributed, and a representative of this group would also speak.

Chairman Norman introduced Mr. Marty Scott, who was to speak for SGC. After reviewing the situation very briefly, Mr. Scott said that SGC felt that they represented graduate as well as undergraduate students. During the last few weeks they had appointed a number of graduate students to committees, and graduates were well represented on SGC itself.

Professor Bowman asked how many students voted in SGC elections, and what proportion of graduate students voted. Mr. Scott replied that normally 10,000 students voted in the spring election, when the president and certain other officers were selected, and about 5,000 in the fall election. Graduate

students were not identified when they voted, but there was some evidence that a larger proportion of graduates than undergraduates voted. There were now two law students and two Rackham graduate students on SGC.

Professor Longone asked what proportion this was of the Council. Mr. Scott replied that it fluctuated, but that an amendment had been passed so that the balance would be maintained when vacancies occurred.

Professor Sawyer asked about the refusal to appoint students to committees. Mr. Scott said that the policy had changed recently, and that he had disagreed with it all along. Since student members had been appointed to committees, SGC was getting more information about how the committees operated, and would be able to arrive at more intelligent judgments about issues.

Chairman Norman then invited Mr. Robert Kuhbach, a student in the Law School who was chairman of the Graduate Federation, to come forward and present the views of that organization.

Mr. Kuhbach said that the charter of the Graduate Federation which had been distributed to Assembly members, had been ratified on December 8, 1971 by the eight subscribing graduate student governments. A dual voting system was incorporated into the charter so that small schools would not be overwhelmed by larger ones in making decisions. He felt that the linkage with students was close, pointing out that 67% of the Law School students voted in their student government election and 30% in Business Administration; these figures contrasted with 5,800 votes out of 34,000 for the SGC fall election. Each member of the Federation would represent his own constituency rather than having been elected by the student body at large. The group felt that they had a good case for asking to be the body to select graduate students for committee memberships.

Professor Bowditch said that he did not think the Assembly should act immediately without further consideration. He asked whether GF would be a viable organization. Mr. Kuhbach replied that it was off to a good start and that the most important question was whether its nominees would be selected for committees. They had tried at first to work with SGC on this issue, but had been unable to because SGC had expected GF to make all the concessions.

Professor Lloyd asked whether all appointments would be referred back to each student government, and how long this would take. In reply, Mr. Kuhbach said the answer was yes, and that the process would take not more than 2 weeks in each instance.

Professor Goodman asked how the Rackham student government worked. Mr. Kuhbach said that he was not sure, as he was mainly familiar with his own Law School government. He said that about 800 turned out for their election, which was perhaps 15% of the total.

Professor Darvas asked why they thought SGC did not suffice. Mr. Kuhbach said that there had been no graduate students on SGC until recently. Also their at-large voting did not provide adequate representation for minority interests. Professor Darvas asked what special interest graduate students might have. Mr. Kuhbach used the status of teaching fellows for an example.

In answer to a question from Professor Schuman, Mr. Robert Nelson, a law student and member of SGC, said that SGC had now adopted proportional representation. A group of students who wanted to vote as a bloc could elect members to SGC in proportion to their own members.

MOTION TO
REFER ISSUE
TO SACUA

Professor Loomis said he didn't see how a conclusion could be reached by the Assembly's considering the matter as a group. He moved, with a second from Professor Bowditch, to refer the question of student representation on Assembly committees to SACUA for its recommendations and to return to the Assembly with the matter for its disposition at the next month's meeting.

Professor Franken asked whether steps had been taken to guarantee that this year's boycotting of committees would not be repeated. Mr. Scott replied that while there was no way of guaranteeing what future SGC's might do, a permanent interviewing board had been set up; thus there was a definite mechanism for making nominations to committee vacancies. This had been in effect for about a month.

Chairman Norman pointed out that in an earlier SGC resolution, there had been statements ruling out restrictions on the appointments of student members of committees, such as requirements that some of them should be graduate students. There was also a refusal to name panels larger than the number of vacancies to be filled. He asked whether SGC was still adhering to these points. Mr. Scott said that nominations were being made at present, subject to the prescribed restrictions. However, SGC still did not accept the restrictions in principle. They had decided to leave these issues aside for the present, however. In that way they could find out what the situation was on each committee, and what the bases were for imposing limitations.

Chairman Norman said that he interpreted this response to mean that SGC would not be willing to abide by the restrictions imposed on membership in the Classified Research Committee at least. Mr. Scott said that he didn't think that this was really an issue in the present discussion, since the groups composing GF felt the same way about this matter.

Professor Ehrenkreutz said that the Assembly was being asked to serve as both a coroner and mid-wife with respect to the graduate student groups. He asked whether this could not be left up to the students.

Chairman Norman replied that in the past SACUA had gingerly stayed out of internecine warfare among students, hoping that they would resolve their own issues. In this case a decision could not be avoided because of the Assembly by-laws.

MOTION
PASSED

Professor Loomis' motion was put to a vote, and passed unanimously.

RIGHTS AND
RESPONSI-
BILITIES
REPORT

Turning to the report of the Rights and Responsibilities Committee, Chairman Norman drew attention to the resolution of December 8 from the Economics Status Committee, and the resolution of March 13 from the Academic Affairs Committee. He said that about \$1,000 had been spent for printing the report in the Daily, this sum having been authorized by the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. There had been some discussions of the report by various college faculties, but no written report of these deliberation had reached SACUA. The Rights and Responsibilities Committee was still active, and was preparing further recommendations.

Professor Loomis asked whether the Assembly could hear from Professors Reed and Tice, who were present, and whether the report of the Committee was officially before the Assembly as a motion. Chairman Norman replied that it was, and invited Professor Reed to come forward and address the Assembly.

Professor Reed said that because of the phraseology used, the recommendations contained in the report had to be considered as advisory. However, the Committee had prepared an addendum, dated February 18, which had been distributed to the Assembly, and in which changes of phraseology were made; for example, changing "should" and "would" to "shall" and "will", to change the advisory language to statements on which actions could be taken.

The Committee had been asked to propose some by-law changes. A sub-committee had met and made some recommendations, but the full committee had not had a chance to consider these yet.

The Committee had reached the unanimous conclusion that developments elsewhere may have a strong effect on the picture here. Wayne University had had a representation election the previous week; the AFT and AAUP came in first and second, respectively, and would be contenders in a run off. Active developments were also under way at MSU and EMU. (Professor Loomis contributed the information that "no union" was third and MEA fourth at Wayne, that no agent had 30% yet at MSU, and that there was to be an election next Thursday at EMU.)

Professor Kahn asked whether the report would be mailed to Senate members individually. Chairman Norman said that there was no such plan at present, and that it would not be possible since only 500 copies were left over in SACUA hands. (The problem seemed to be that the Daily was not delivered to all departments.)

MOTION TO
TABLE

Professor Coon said that the Medical School had not yet had a chance to consider the report. He moved, with a second from Professor Kahn, to table the question until the next regular meeting of the Assembly.

Professor Sandalow pointed out that a third of the Assembly membership would be changed at the next meeting. Professor Bowditch said that the problem was a complex one, which would probably take several meetings to resolve, but he thought that the time should not go by without the issue being discussed. Moreover, since senior faculty members were strongly over-represented relative to junior ones in the Assembly, it would be desirable for members to sound out their colleagues.

Professor Scherer said that it was very likely that the Resource Allocations Commission would be giving its report to the Assembly at the next meeting. This was pertinent because the report might serve to illuminate some of the issues; on the other hand, consideration of it would be quite time-consuming, and would crowd the agenda.

Chairman Norman said that the Resource Allocations Commission was scheduled to report to the full Senate on April 10. Professor Scherer said that the report would be 90 pages long, and no more than a summary would reach the Senate.

Concern was expressed by several members about how a full discussion of the issue in the near future by all units of the University could be

assured. It was agreed that discussions at the departmental level, as well as at the college level, would be desirable. Professor Mohler remarked that several members of his department, such as musicians, were well acquainted with unions. They thought that the approach suggested in the report was a good beginning step.

MOTION
PASSED

The motion to table was passed by a voice vote.

Chairman Norman promised that notes urging consideration would be sent to appropriate units, with attention directed specifically to the recommendations about the enhanced role of the Economic Status Committee, contained on pp. viii-x of the resumé.

Professor Overseth commented on the unsigned communication that he and many other faculty members had received recently about collective bargaining; he asked where it had originated. Professor Loomis said, amid laughter, that it looked like the product of an MEA typewriter to him.

CLASSIFIED
RESEARCH
POLICY

Chairman Norman said that it was time to take up the policy statement on classified research. The consultative committee could be considered to have moved and seconded its adoption.

Professor Kish said that he thought it was not appropriate to ask whether we had won or lost. The point was that some ground was covered and a lot of information obtained. It seemed that most of the classified research that the Assembly objected to would not continue; he hoped that the departure of Willow Run would ease the whole question. For the record he thought the provision for Regental reconsideration was not necessary. Professor Bowditch said that it was important to select those who would be reviewing proposals for research carefully. Chairman Norman said that SACUA had not had a chance to consider this question, and awaited suggestions.

Professor Allen asked if there was any alternative other than adopting the proposal. Chairman Norman said that the range of possibilities was almost infinite, but that unless the report was adopted we would still be operating under the old rules.

Several questions were raised about proprietary research, which were ultimately referred to Professor Zander, who was present as a member of the Research Policies Committee. He said that very little proprietary research would fail to satisfy the one-year publication criteria. There were several contracts that forbid revealing the identity of the sponsor outside of University circles, but since there was no restriction within the University, these posed no serious problems.

Chairman Norman said that the policy that was now to be voted upon differed from the policy previously passed by the Assembly only by the addition of a preface, the limitation of its application to classified research, and the addition of statements about procedures.

POLICY
RATIFIED

The proposed policy on classified research was put to a vote and passed unanimously.

In response to a question by Chairman Norman, Chairman George Kish of the Classified Research Committee, said that the Committee was receiving better information than heretofore. There had been instances in the past

where the information received from research groups making classified proposals had been inadequate. This situation had been greatly improved since Willow Run had assigned Dr. Holter to check all proposals emanating from the Laboratory before they were forwarded to the Classified Research Committee.

Chairman Norman drew attention to the documents received from the Classified Research Committee in this connection. He also referred to the recommendations still pending from the Research Policies Committee. Some of these had already been enacted. He suggested delaying further consideration of these until the Classified Research Committee report was received; there was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

Wilfred M. Kincaid
Secretary