

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting, April 21, 1980

ATTENDANCE

Present: Ackley, Bacon, Barnard, Barritt, Baumgarten, Beck, Berg, Bishop, D.B.Brown, D.R.Brown, M.Brown, Browne, Burdi, Crane, DeKornfeld, Dixon, Duderstadt, Eckert, Fearn, Holbrook, Fraser, Friedman, Frost, Gordon, Green, Haddock, Hinerman, Hollinger, Hultquist, Kirkpatrick, Koran, Liepman, Lindberg, Loup, Rinne, Lynch-Sauer, Darsky, McClendon, Nelson, Mosher, Nagy, Naylor, O'Meara, Parkinson, Pollock, Portman, Rowe, Senior, Sisman, Tek, Vinter, White, Wyers, Wynne.

Absent: K.Brown, Cares, Carpenter, Cassidy, Cohen, Gray, Groves, Gull, Hilbert, Edwards, Holland, Kahn, Millard, Nisbett, Powers, Root, Rush, Verhey, Weiner.

Guest: Raymond H. Kahn.

MINUTES

The minutes of the Senate Assembly meeting of March 17, 1980 were approved.

ANNOUNCE-  
MENTS

Chairman Corpron began the meeting by welcoming the newly elected members to the Assembly. He also recognized the two annuitant members, Emeritus Professors Raymond Mosher and Norman Nelson, who served as alternate for Henry Meyer.

ELECTION  
OF SACUA  
MEMBERS

Chairman Corpron explained the procedures for electing three new members of three year terms on SACUA and the ballots were distributed. The following Senate members were elected:

1. Ronald C. Bishop
2. Richmond Browne
3. Thomas B. A. Senior

TRIBUTE  
TO RE-  
TIRING  
SACUA  
CHAIR-  
MAN AND  
MEMBERS

SACUA Vice Chairman Naylor read the following statement in tribute to Richard E. Corpron, chairman of SACUA for 1980-81.

"Professor Corpron, in the name of the Assembly and SACUA, I would like to express our appreciation to you for your leadership during the past year. It was, as probably most are aware, a year that had its surprises. It was also a year that placed great demands on you. In spite of the surprises and the demands, you have calmly led us with wisdom and fairness. We have all enjoyed working with you and we will miss you in Assembly and SACUA."

Chairman Corpron then recognized Professors Janice B. Lindberg and Donald J. Portman, who were also completing their three-year term on SACUA. They were asked to stand and receive the applause of appreciation from the Assembly.

AD HOC COMMITTEE TO EVALUATE THE DIVISION OF RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT AND ADMINISTRATION - A REPORT BY PROFESSOR RAYMOND H. KAHN

Chairman Corpron introduced Professor Raymond H. Kahn, chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate the Division of Research Development Administration (DRDA).

Professor Kahn informed the Assembly that the committee was appointed by President Shapiro in March 1980, to review and evaluate the operation of DRDA. The committee is currently composed of five members, Paul Rasmussen (LSA), Albert Price (Medicine, Biological Chemistry), Larry Jones (Physics), William Kerr (Engineering and Energy Office), and Elaine Gazda (Humanities), who declined because of an impending sabbatical leave. He made it clear that the committee is sensitive to the fact that they represent the entire institution.

Professor Kahn emphasized two of the committee's charges. First, the committee will review the functions and responsibilities of DRDA as perceived by research administration personnel, individuals actively engaged in research, and potential researchers.

To meet this charge, the committee composed a letter which was distributed to the entire faculty, deans, directors and department heads. The committee has also been meeting with research administrative personnel such as Vice President Charles Overberger, James Lesch and Joseph Keeley, and has plans to meet with other research administrators in May.

The second charge brought to the attention of the Assembly was that the committee will evaluate interactions between DRDA and other University organizations providing services for researchers (i.e. Federal Funds Accounting). To address this charge the committee plans to meet with persons from the Controller's office and Vice President Brinkerhoff.

Professor Kahn revealed that the committee had received seventy-two letters in response to its letter, of which two-thirds were favorable to DRDA. The remaining third speak to a number of issues of concerns about DRDA's functions.

It is becoming clear to the committee that there are some misconceptions about the DRDA's functions. For example, DRDA is not Federal Accounting, although it interacts with Federal Accounting. It is apparent that some people believe that some of the ills of Federal Funds Accounting, Personnel, Purchasing and Travel are all the fault of DRDA. Also, DRDA does not develop indirect cost rates or receive indirect cost monies.

Professor Kahn said that one of the issues that is clearly a concern is the centrally organized DRDA (geographically isolated) versus a diversified organization which will be much more perceptive and aware

of investigation problems in the field. It is also apparent that some people are interested in the strengthening of the development aspect of DRDA.

Professor Kahn concluded his comments by reviewing briefly the five functions of DRDA. "DRDA," said Professor Kahn in summary, "sees themselves as business administrators, not scientists."

Members of the Assembly were then invited to comment and ask questions. Professor Friedman asked how the committee was weighing the responses to the letters referred to earlier in the presentation. Professor Kahn said that the committee will analyze the critical letters to see if the suggestions are valid and will see if the problems can be improved upon. For example, would it be feasible to place scientists in the departments who would have the knowledge and expertise to assist the proposal writer? Can we afford it?

Professor Friedman added that he feels that some of the deans perceive themselves as fulfilling the role of supporting their faculty members in their research efforts. Might not be duplicating the efforts of DRDA? Might not the deans be surveyed to address this issue? Professor Kahn replied that this has been discussed with one dean who felt that this was his job - he did not expect DRDA to provide any sponsor relationship, but felt it was DRDA's function to provide all of the interface with federal agencies that dealt with the policies and procedures of those agencies, and to insure budgetary relationships with other offices such as Accounting and Personnel.

Professor Burdi asked about DRDA's role in non-sponsored research. Professor Kahn said that there is a real concern that DRDA measures its experience and capabilities in terms of the dollars its sponsorship has generated. However, DRDA is involved in non-sponsored areas (playing a role in preliminary research) by getting groups together in attempting to initiate new areas of concern. As examples of this, he related the role of DRDA in the development of the Highway Safety Research Institute and the new Energy Office.

Professor Nagy said that he appreciated the efforts of the committee in seeking the comments about DRDA from the faculty, deans, etc., but is concerned about the many discontented faculty members who will not respond to letters. He wondered if open meetings at the various units across the campus, or random attendance by committee members at faculty meetings might provide a forum for these people to express the reasons for their discontent over DRDA. Professor Kahn strongly encourages the faculty to share facts and opinions about DRDA with the committee.

Professor Nagy suggested that the committee seek opinions about DRDA from those who have experience as directors of sponsored research projects. He wondered if there was some efficient way to narrow down the more concrete aspects of the problems with DRDA and the interface with other support organizations.

Professor Kahn replied that the committee doesn't want to be less sensitive to people who have not had sponsored support, but wants to see to what extent DRDA is responding to scholarly needs, not just the dollar needs. He added that the committee has tried to approach the entire faculty, and placed no emphasis on a special group of highly and personally involved people. Professor Nagy reiterated his point that people with recent experience in sponsored research should be contacted. Professor Kahn agreed that it was a good suggestion and said he would try to identify that population.

Professor Friedman suggested that perhaps a personal letter as opposed to a form letter might generate more response.

Chairman Corpron thanked Professor Kahn for his presentation.

PROCED-  
URES FOR  
THE  
ELECTION  
OF  
SACUA  
OFFICERS

Chairman Corpron brought to the attention of the Assembly the SACUA resolution of March 24, 1980 concerning the election of SACUA officers.

"That the people eligible for voting for SACUA chairperson in April be the nine members who constitute SACUA the previous March, and that the persons eligible for the position of chairperson are the nine members of the newly constituted SACUA."

He explained that in the past, the new chairman was elected by six continuing SACUA members and the three newly elected members. The SACUA resolution altered the procedure so that the new chairman would be elected by SACUA as it was constituted in the previous March, in order to allow for a more informed vote.

Chairman Corpron then introduced Professor Joseph Ullman, chairman of the Rules Committee, who wished to address this issue.

Professor Ullman said that some members of the Rules Committee were concerned that the SACUA resolution might constitute a change in the Assembly Rules, and that rule changes come under the charge to the Rules Committee. He then asked for permission to call on Professor Wilfred Kaplan, a member of the Rules Committee, to make a detailed statement.

Professor Kaplan read the following statement prepared jointly by Professor Ullman and himself.

"As chairman of the Rules Committee, I, Professor Ullman, should like to point out that this action might be construed as a change in Assembly rules. If so, it should properly be referred to the Rules Committee and then acted on formally by the Assembly. As background, I would like to point out that in the present rules, Article III, Section 8, states only that SACUA shall elect the officers of the Assembly. No

further details are given except in Section 6, "...the committee shall act by a majority of those voting, provided a quorum is present. Article II, Section 4 states that "the officers of the Assembly shall be the chairman and vice chairman, chosen by SACUA from among the members of SACUA and the secretary."

The proposed new procedure is to deny a vote in the election of chairman by the newly elected members of SACUA, and also gives the vote to three non-continuing members of SACUA.

In practice, to the best of our knowledge, the newly constituted SACUA has always met soon after the elections were completed, and elected officers with all nine members voting. In view of the possible deviations from established rules and practice, we leave it to the Assembly to act as it sees fit. This particular Assembly may wish to refer the matter to the Rules Committee. Even if no such action is taken, a member of the Rules Committee has already moved that the whole subject be on the agenda for our next meeting."

Chairman Corpron invited members to comment on Professor Kaplan's presentation.

Professor Dixon asked if there was any strength to the argument that the new members of SACUA should be eligible to vote for the new SACUA chairman. Chairman Corpron replied that he sees little strength in such an argument. He related his personal feelings of discomfort when he voted for someone he did not know when he was a new member of SACUA. He feels that the outgoing SACUA members can experience an informed vote, because they have closely observed the performance of those likely to be considered for the chairmanship. He pointed out that under the SACUA resolution, the new members are eligible for election to the chairmanship.

Professor Corpron disagreed that the SACUA resolution disenfranchises the new members. In fact, it only postpones their vote for one year, but they will still vote three times during their three year term on SACUA.

Professor Bishop then made the following motion:

"The Assembly requests that SACUA suspend implementation of the election procedure adopted in its meeting of March 24, 1980, and asks the Rules Committee to review the whole matter of how officers are elected and to report back to Assembly with its recommendation in the fall of 1980. The Assembly further resolves that the election of officers following this meeting be carried out in the traditional manner, with all 9 members of SACUA voting."

The motion was supported

Professor Nagy agreed that the SACUA resolution seems reasonable, but that the matter goes deeper than just the voting for the chairman

of SACUA. He was concerned about the fact that one-third of the Assembly had just arrived and was immediately asked to vote for SACUA members. He asked if Professor Bishop would amend his motion to ask the Rules Committee to examine the issue of voting for SACUA members in addition to how the officers are to be elected. Professor Bishop said that this would be agreeable with him.

Professor Portman pointed out that all Assembly members received information about the candidates for SACUA prior to this meeting, the newly elected SACUA members will have information about those eligible for the chairmanship of SACUA, even though the election is held on the same day.

Chairman Corpron responded to Professor Nagy's comments by saying that although SACUA agrees that the entire election procedures should be reviewed, he does not see an exact parallel between the new Assembly members voting for SACUA members, and the newly elected SACUA members voting for the new chairman. He stated that SACUA did not consider their resolution as a change in Assembly rules.

Professor Deming Brown considered the Bishop motion impractical and therefore was opposed to it. He agreed that the whole process of Assembly and SACUA elections be examined by the Rules Committee, but urged that today's election of SACUA officers be conducted under the procedures set forth in the March 24, 1980 SACUA resolution.

Professor Barritt spoke in favor of passage of Professor Bishop's motion on the grounds that the procedural issues are in dispute.

Chairman Corpron returned to Professor Kaplan's earlier remark concerning the present rules governing voting procedures. Referring to Article II, Section 4, he failed to see anything in the rule that either supports or does not support the assertions in the Kaplan-Ullman statement. He reiterated the belief of SACUA that their resolution of March 24 does not constitute a rule change, and that it provides a more informed vote for the new chairman.

Professor Browne asked if the practical effect of defeating Professor Bishop's motion would be that the present SACUA would have to reconstitute its March membership in order to elect a new chairman? Chairman Corpron said that if the motion passed, the newly constituted SACUA would elect the chairman.

Professor Gordon pointed out that regardless of whether the motion passes or is defeated, the consequences are slight because the matter of Assembly and SACUA voting procedures is already on the agenda of the Rules Committee.

Professor Friedman noted that there is some ambiguity as to what constitutes the April and March SACUA. He noted that technically, the April SACUA is the same as the March SACUA until the commencement of the three newly elected members is made. The SACUA resolution clear

defines which members (March SACUA) are to elect the new chairman. This, in SACUA's opinion, does not constitute a rules change, and provides a more informed vote.

Professor Ullman responded by saying that two of the people who are speaking in favor of Professor Bishop's motion are candidates for SACUA and that they apparently would not feel uncomfortable about voting for SACUA chairman if elected.

Hearing no further discussion the chairman, brought the motion to a vote. The motion was defeated.

Chairman Corpron then announced the results of the election for SACUA membership. Ronald C. Bishop, Richmond Browne, and Thomas B. A. Senior were elected to three-year terms. They were congratulated by Professor Corpron and received an applause from the Assembly.

OLD AND  
NEW BUSINESS

There was neither old nor new business.

ADJOURNMENT

The Senate Assembly meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Charles C. Kelsey  
Senate Secretary

