

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Assembly Meeting, April 19, 1971

ATTENDANCE

1970-1971 Assembly

Present: Alston, Barnes, Bassett, Bett, Birch, Bole, Bowditch, Bowman, Brown, Coon, Cornish, Crawford, Eggertsen, Gilbert, Goodman, Graebel, Handler, Hauenstein, Hinerman, Huntington, Jensen, Kish, Schaefer, Lind, Lloyd, Marsden, Meyer, Mills, Morgan, Nelson, Norman, Overseth, Price, Richards, Rucknagel, Ryder, Sandalow, Scherer, Dunn, Schuman, Shappirio, Cooperrider, Sonntag, Wilkes, Youngdahl, Weinberg, Yablonky

Absent: Abrams, Asgar, Bertolaet, Bishop, Carter, Castor, DeKornfeld, Dowson, Frye, Galler, Hooper, Iglehart, Kahn, Rhodes, Magee, Michelsen, Hazlett, Porter, Rigan, Sears, Votaw, Yagle

1971-1972 Assembly (new members)

Present: Allen, Buning, Cohen, Darvis, Ehrenkreutz, Farrand, Franken, Heller, Higgins, Kerr, Paul, Sana, Sawyer, Verheyen

Absent: Anton, Hood, Nystuen, Preston, Simpson, Smock, Zweifler

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Weinberg called the April meeting to order at 3:20 p.m. in the Rackham Amphitheater.

For the benefit of new members, Chairman Weinberg made a few remarks about seating arrangements, and invited both retiring and newly-elected Assembly members to be present for the entire meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Weinberg announced that the Regents had adopted the new Judiciary procedure, but had rejected the changes proposed by the Assembly. They have under consideration the resolution on housing passed by the Assembly.

INTRODUCTION
OF NEW
SECRETARY

At this point, Chairman Weinberg paid warm tribute to Professor Ben Yablonky's years of devoted service as Secretary of this body. He then introduced the new Secretary, Professor Wilfred Kincaid of the Department of Mathematics.

REPORT OF
SACUA
ACTIVITIES

Professor Eggertsen reported on SACUA activities. These included a regular meeting on April 5, a meeting with President Fleming on April 9, a special meeting on April 13, and a meeting with the Regents on April 15.

On April 5, progress reports were received from the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty Members and from the Research Policies Committee (regarding classified research). There was a brief meeting with faculty members of the Opportunity Program Committee.

At the meeting with President Fleming, the matters discussed included ROTC, budget questions, judiciary proposals, redistribution of Vice-President Spurr's duties, and voting of stock.

The April 13 meeting concerned the hearing to be held the following day under the Interim Rules.

At the meeting with the Regents, SACUA members proposed that such meetings should take place on a regular basis.

NAME CHANGE
OF
COMMITTEE

The proposal, presented in a memorandum by Professor Cleveland with the call to the meeting, that the name of the Advisory Committee on Campus Planning and Development should be shortened to "Advisory Committee on Financial Affairs", was adopted by a voice vote.

ADDRESS BY
VICE-PRES-
IDENT NORMAN
(RESEARCH)

The Chairman now invited Vice-President Norman to address the Assembly.

Vice-President Norman opened by saying that the health of the research enterprise was about as good as one could expect under the circumstances. In dollar terms research expenditures have been stationary for about three years at roughly 62 million dollars. This year there was a decline of more than a million dollars, the first such decline in 20 years. There have of course also been shifts in the sources of support, decreases from some agencies being matched by increases from others. The decline has been most marked from the Department of Defense with increases from NSF and NIH. It must be recalled, however, that there is a time lag of about two years between the appropriation of money by Congress and actual spending by investigators. The picture has been further complicated by the fact that in some agencies appropriations for a fiscal year have not been completed until well after that fiscal year is under way. Also in some instances the Bureau of the Budget has not released funds appropriated by Congress.

Although there has been a \$100 million increase in the NSF budget, it has gone primarily into the new RANN program (Research Applied to National Needs). There has been no restoration of money for facilities, and some institutional grants have been stopped; there has been some picking up of programs dropped by DOD. One small bright spot is that appropriation for the National Foundation for Humanities and Arts has been doubled.

Turning to the status of graduate student support, Vice-President Norman said that this is really a disaster story with all programs turning sharply downward. There has been a decrease in funding of 30%; this falls most heavily on new starts, which will receive only 30% of their 1970 funding in 1972. One reason for this state of affairs is a conviction that there has been overproduction of highly trained people in recent years. While this has been somewhat exaggerated, there is no question that the market situation has changed in some fields. In the last few years there was a tremendous demand for new faculty members to staff expanding programs and new institutions. Now expansion has slowed down; there are a great many young faculty members around and very few retirements. A recent article by Allen Cartter in "Science" spells out the situation. Another reason has been the philosophy of the current administration of putting more of the cost on the students and their parents and less on society at large. As a result, loans, or rather interest guarantees, have been replacing subsidies, thus cutting the direct expenditure from the federal budget. Unfortunately loan money is not always available, and students are reluctant to mortgage their futures when the job market is uncertain. Thus, both students and universities lose out.

There is no sign of an early turnaround in this situation. In the meantime it may be well to offer graduate students somewhat less specialized training that will prepare them for a greater variety of careers.

Vice-President Norman then turned to classified research. He began by remarking that he was generally regarded as an apologist for classified research, which was probably true. Anyone holding his position would have the responsibility of aiding faculty and staff in obtaining the resources and facilities to carry out research in their fields of choice and at the same time seeing that what was done was consistent with University policies and that there was proper attention to accountability, both fiscal and programmatic. It should be realized that an investigator working in areas of potential importance to national security cannot control the fact that some of his work would be classified. No one would choose to have a classified tag on his research activities if he had the choice to make. One could say of course that he could abandon that particular field and pursue some other, but each faculty member might think what it would mean to be forced to leave his present field of intellectual interest. This would not be a completely hypothetical exercise, since quite a few broad areas of research other than defense-related might be subject to criticism for one reason or another.

Vice-President Norman stressed that those engaged in classified research were not evil men, and from where he sat he could not see any desire to stretch the guidelines or subvert the policies that had been established. He said that he felt he should say a few words in defense of the Classified Research Committee, which he pointed out was the Assembly's committee, not his. They were a hard-working group that had taken its charge seriously and had attempted to represent the academic community responsibly. They had had much more business than was originally anticipated, mainly because the funding pattern had changed from one of a few large contracts to one of many smaller ones. One difficulty had been that some of these latter could scarcely be judged by themselves but only in the perspective of their connection with others. He felt that the Classified Research Committee was entitled to high grades for its performance and that the procedure suggested by the Elderfield Committee had been a success.

Vice-President Norman believed the time was ripe to think out together not so much the role of research in a university but the research role of faculty in a university. To what extent was the University obligated to use some of its resources to further the intellectual activities of faculty members? If the funding came from some outside source, did this change the situation? Research activities and personal professional aspirations were clearly linked; to what extent could the University legitimately be used to promote the latter, or to what degree was it in the University's interest to foster the latter? What about interpersonal relationships? Was every man an island, or was he one of a team? These and many more questions he would like to have addressed by thoughtful men who maybe like himself were troubled by the disarray into which the cities and citadels of learning had descended as a result of multiple pressures.

Questions from the floor were invited.

Professor Scherer asked Vice-President Norman for his response to allegations that a proposal had recently gone through without the Classified Research Committee approval. Vice-President Norman said that the proposal involved was a small supplementary one. The Committee had heard some defense of the proposal, but took no definitive action on it for three meetings. The deadline for submitting the proposal was approaching. Vice-President Norman independently concluded that the guidelines had not been violated, and allowed the proposal to be submitted. He advised Professor Charbeneau of his action. Professor Sandalow said that the Elderfield Report specified that there should be a full report to the

Assembly in such cases; would one be presented? Vice-President Norman replied that this was specified only in the case of disagreement between the Committee and the Vice-President. In this case there had been no disagreement. Chairman Weinberg remarked at this point that he interpreted the report a little differently. Professor Rucknagel asked if the Committee had disagreed among themselves about the proposal. Vice-President Norman said that they had not; the matter had merely been crowded out by other items on the agenda.

Professor Lind asked what success there had been in reducing classification levels in line with the exhortation of the Elderfield Report. Vice-President Norman said that there had been considerable success but that it was hard to quantify. Professor Sandalow pointed out that the Report asked the University to try to form a united front with other universities and asked if there had been any success in this direction. Vice-President Norman said that not many institutions wanted to enter this kind of an alliance. The most progress had been achieved through the National Academy of Sciences. In answer to a further question by Professor Rucknagel along the same line, Vice-President Norman said that he had talked to the Chairman of the Defense Sciences Board about this problem but that it was very hard to get a policy decision at the top level that would be effectively implemented lower down.

Professor Bole asked what other major universities have done in the way of controlling classified research. He had the impression that some of them had set up off-campus arrangements of one sort or another at which classified research was done and asked for comments on this. Vice-President Norman remarked that we have a stricter definition of classified research here than at a number of other places. When clearances are required in order that there may be access to classified equipment or information, we count a project as classified, but some other institutions consider it so only if the output is to be classified. Some universities have received little or no support from DOD and so they can exclude classified research without really giving much. Schools with a strong commitment to science and engineering, on the other hand, usually have some DOD-sponsored research. Statements received from other schools on these matters are often rather hard to interpret. For example, Berkeley has no classified research on campus but it conducts the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory and other laboratories which are engaged in nuclear weapons development. To a request by Professor Rucknagel for further clarification, Chairman Weinberg said that some research that is called classified here would not be called classified at other institutions. It was not a matter of pretense on the part of the other places, just differences in policy. Professor Rucknagel then asked what proportion of the classified research was for access only. Vice-President Norman did not have figures at hand, but replied that the answer depended on whether it was counted in dollars or in numbers of contracts. Chairman Weinberg suggested to the Research Policies Committee that they should consider this point and the information requested should appear in the report.

ADDRESS BY
PROFESSOR
SARRI
(RESOURCE
ALLOCATION
COMMISSION)

Chairman Weinberg introduced Professor Rosemary Sarri, Chairman of the Resource Allocation Commission. He remarked that four faculty members and four administrators had been appointed to the Commission, and they would soon be joined by students. Professor Sarri then gave the report of the Commission, as follows.

"The Commission on Resource Allocation became an active unit only in January, 1971, despite the high interest throughout the University in the responsibilities which were assigned to this group. A number of factors including agreement about procedures for selecting student members of the Commission delayed it from beginning earlier in the year. It is expected that Commission activity will accelerate considerably in the months ahead.

"The initial charge to the Commission specified that it was to study and make recommendation:

- 1) on priority setting and budget making process throughout the University;
- 2) on the current and projected allocation of resources; and
- 3) on means for allowing the University community to be better informed on budgetary matters.

The Commission was given considerable autonomy to carry out the above objectives, but thus far little has been developed in the form of sub-committees or working groups. Soon after the Commission got under way it became obvious that operationalizing the above mandate would require time and careful study. Until now most of the work of the Commission has involved participation in decision making about current and projected allocation of resources rather than on structures and mechanisms for priority setting and budget making. It is expected that greater attention will be given to this latter area and to means for better informing the University community. The Commission hopes to be able to present specific recommendations by the spring of 1972 about the Commission and about the areas of study.

"Because several members of the Commission were not fully informed about the extant budget and financial planning, some time was spent in obtaining general background knowledge. More recently attention has been directed toward budget and allocation issues for the fiscal year 1971-72. It is expected that work in this area will continue and probably accelerate in the immediate future.

"The Commission met with representatives of the Faculty Reform Coalition to consider the areas and problems which they have identified thus far. Further study will be given to their recommendations for action regarding allocation and budgetary procedures. It is expected that similar hearings will be held with other campus groups and committees to review their proposals and recommendations. It is also apparent already that the pattern of decentralization in the University is such that many areas and units must be examined if one is to comprehend how priorities are established and become operational. The Commission has become sensitive to the fact that greater attention must be given to the long-run consequences of decisions today about programs, buildings, and units.

"Because of the recency of its organization only a progress report can be given today. It is hoped, however, that a more detailed statement can be submitted to the faculty early next year."

Professor Sarri now answered a few questions. Professor Eggertsen asked if the origin of the resources, namely tuition, was a part of the Commission's charge. Professor Sarri responded that it was but that it was too late in the year to be considered. In future this would be given further consideration. Professor Kish asked whether the committee would deal with, for example, the Yale plan in the future. Professor Sarri responded that more attention would be given to allocation than to recruitment of resources. Chairman Weinberg announced that Professor Scherer was the Vice-Chairman of the Commission.

RESOLUTION
ON MEDICAL
INSURANCE
(REMARKS BY
PROFESSOR
NESBITT)

Chairman Weinberg now called on Professor Nesbitt to discuss the resolution concerning improvements in the major medical insurance that had been distributed with the call to the meeting.

Professor Nesbitt pointed out that (i) is in line with the recommendation of the 1969-70 Economic Status Committee, while (ii) was new. In response to questions, Professor Nesbitt said that \$5,000 would presumably cover all but catastrophic cases. He also said that it was not certain whether the \$100 deductible feature applied to (ii).

Professor Gilbert moved and Professor Lind seconded the resolution, which was passed.

ADJOURN-
MENT OF
1970-71
ASSEMBLY;
CONVENING
OF 1971-72
ASSEMBLY

It was now time for the 1970-71 Assembly to adjourn, and Professor Gilbert moved a standing vote of thanks to Chairman Weinberg. Chairman Weinberg commended Mrs. Janice Downs, the administrative assistant to SACUA and the Assembly, stressing the importance of her services, and paying warm tribute to her efficiency and helpfulness. The Assembly then adjourned and the 1971-72 Assembly convened.

ELECTION
OF SACUA
MEMBERS

The report of the Nominating Committee had been distributed with the call to the meeting. It included a list of nominees for SACUA with biographical information and statements from each. Professors Jensen, Lloyd, Rigan, Sandalow, Scherer and Youngdahl were candidates for three year terms, and Professors Bowditch and Kish for one year terms. Ballots were then distributed. After a second ballot that was required to break a tie, it was announced that Professors Lloyd, Sandalow and Scherer had been elected for three year terms and Professor Bowditch to a one year term.

ADJOURN-
MENT

The meeting was then adjourned.

Wilfred M. Kincaid, Secretary