

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Regular Assembly Meeting, May 15, 1972

ATTENDANCE

Present: Rutledge, Anton, Asgar, Birch, Bowditch, Brockway, Buning, Caldwell, Cassidy, Crawford, Danielson, Ehrenkreutz, Evaldson, Fader, Floyd, Franken, Goodman, Graebel, Higgins, Taylor, Hymans, Jaini, Dunlap, Kerr, Lands, Larkin, Lloyd, Loomis, Nystuen, Oberman, Ostrand, Paul, Rowe, Sana, Schuman, Moore, Simpson, Vander, Wilkes, Williams, Zweifler, Mohler, Kincaid, Hinerman

Absent: Allen, Cartwright, Cohen, Cooperrider, Cornish, Darvas, Bohr, Reade, Krachenberg, Heller, Hertzler, Colburn, Kish, Magee, Marshall, Rothman, Hafter, Overseth, Preston, Ryder, Sandalow, Sawyer, Vaughn, Verheyen, Votaw

Guests: Chairman and members of Classified Research Committee

CALL TO ORDER

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the April 17 meeting were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Hinerman had a number of announcements.

1. The following letter had been received from Mr. Jack Hamilton:

"This is reiteration, but merits saying from time to time-- and the election of a new SACUA chairman seems an appropriate time.

"University Relations is on call -- Information Services, Broadcasting, Publications, State and Community Relations and just general PR counsel when you think it would be helpful. We regard ourselves as a service agency of the University and all its units, and that includes SACUA.

"Look upon us as you would upon an agency, available to assist and advise as you wish and we have capability to respond."

2. The September Senate Assembly meeting had been rescheduled for September 25, in order to avoid a religious holiday. The President's State of the University address and reception would be that same evening.

3. Representatives of SACUA, of the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee, Financial Affairs Advisory Committee, and the Committee on Economic Status of the Faculty were scheduled to meet with the principal executive officers on the following day to consider the best ways of handling a projected \$1 million plus deficit in next year's budget. The same group had met with Vice-President Allan Smith recently to consider the disposition of the special 5% budgetary allocation to hard-pressed units.

SACUA REPORT

Professor Frederick Goodman reported on SACUA activities as follows:

Since the April Assembly meeting, SACUA has met on April 18, 19 (with President Fleming), 24, and 29, and on May 1, 3, 8 and

15 (preceding the present Assembly meeting).

The great bulk of the time was spent discussing appointments to committees, particularly associated with the new Office of Budgets and Planning. Other topics taken up included the planning of health services and issues stemming from the "R&R" report (particularly legal questions). In this connection, a meeting has been set up to obtain informal legal advice.

At the meeting with President Fleming, the status of the Opportunity Program and the divesting of Willow Run were discussed.

HEALTH
SERVICES
RESOLUTIONS

Chairman Hinerman presented the following two resolutions on behalf of SACUA concerning health care for faculty members and the University Community:

Resolution #1

Senate Assembly endorses the optional selection of a health care plan which would provide a system of comprehensive and continuous health surveillance and maintenance for faculty members and their families. It requests that at the earliest opportunity, Dr. John Gronvall provide SACUA with specific details for the plan which is under consideration by the University Medical Center and its newly appointed Director of the Community Health Program.

Resolution #2

Senate Assembly directs SACUA to appoint an ad hoc committee to investigate improvements in health care delivery systems for the University Community.

Professor Mohler complained that the first sentence of the first resolution was insufficiently clear. It seemed to refer to the health care plan discussed in the report of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, which was not completely spelled out. He moved, with a second from Professor Taylor, that the first sentence of the resolution should be deleted, and that the opening word "it" of the second sentence should be replaced by the words "Senate Assembly".

After a brief discussion in which the Chairman and Professors Loomis, Mohler, and Zweifler took part, the amendment was passed by a voice vote.

Professor Crawford claimed that the amendment just passed deprived the resolution of meaning. Professor Bowditch, seconded by Professor Loomis, moved reconsideration of the amendment; the motion to reconsider passed by a vote of 15 for to 12 against. Chairman Hinerman made it clear that the first sentence of the original resolution was meant to refer to a health maintenance plan like the well-known Kaiser Permanente Plan. Professor Hymans moved that the resolution should be amended by beginning with the words "Senate Assembly expresses its interest in the concept of an optional health care plan" and replacing "plan" with "plans" in the second sentence.

RESOLUTION #1
AMENDED AND
PASSED

The amendment was passed unanimously, after which the amended resolution was passed unanimously. Its wording, as passed, was as follows:

Part I. Senate Assembly expresses its interest in the concept of an optional health care plan which would provide a system of comprehensive and continuous health surveillance and maintenance for faculty members and their families. It requests that at the earliest opportunity, Dr. John Gronvall provide SACUA with specific details for the plans which are under consideration by the University Medical Center and its newly-appointed Director of the Community Health Program.

The second resolution was now before the Assembly. Professor Zweifler moved, with Professor Birch seconding, to add the words "and their potential impact on health care delivery in the community at large". Professor Bowditch asked whether the further words "and that the committee report within six months" could be added to the amendment. This was accepted.

An active discussion followed, participated in by numerous Assembly members. In defending his motion, Professor Zweifler pointed out that there was health planning going on in Ann Arbor that would have an impact upon our own planning. Professor Franken maintained, however, that the resolution as it stood already implied an investigation of all aspects of the situation. With regard to the sufficiency of the six-month study period, Professor Loomis said that a great deal of planning had already taken place, so that we would not be starting from scratch; hence six months should be sufficient time.

Professor Lands argued that the two parts of the amendment were independent and should be divided. The Chairman agreed with this, and asked for votes on the two parts separately.

RESOLUTION #2
AMENDED

The first part of the amendment was defeated with 17 votes in favor to 21 against. The second part of the amendment was passed unanimously.

During the earlier discussion, questions had been raised about the meaning of the phrase "health care delivery systems". Following the votes recorded above, Professor Moore moved to strike the words "delivery systems". The motion was seconded by Professor Higgins, and passed by 23 votes to 10.

RESOLUTION #2
PASSED

The resolution was then passed unanimously. Its final wording follows:

Part II. Senate Assembly directs SACUA to appoint an ad hoc committee to investigate improvements in health care for the University community, which committee shall give a report to the Senate Assembly within six months.

REPORT FROM
CLASSIFIED
RESEARCH
COMMITTEE

Chairman Hinerman now invited Professor George Kish, Chairman of the Classified Research Committee, to address the Assembly.

Professor Kish began by referring to his letter of May 4 to Professor Hinerman, in which he reported that two classified research projects, nos. 72-43 and 72-44, were forwarded to the sponsor (DOD in both instances)

by the Vice-President for Research although they had not received the 7 affirmative votes required for approval by the Committee's rules. The votes were 6-2-0 and 6-3-1 respectively. This had happened on previous occasions. He reminded the Assembly that the Committee was advisory to the Vice-President for Research, and did not have a veto on his actions. The reason for the disagreement within the Committee was that some members of the Committee thought that the projects were primarily civilian in their orientation, while others thought that they were primarily military.

In response to a question by Professor Bowditch, Professor Kish said that the Committee had not considered resigning. In accordance with the most recent Regental and Assembly action, the Committee was to operate until the end of 1972 under its old rules.

Professor Bowditch noted that votes favoring these and earlier proposals in the same status had been 6. He felt, however, that there had been more sentiment opposed to the proposals than the vote indicated.

Professor Kish said that in making further comments he could speak only for himself. The members of the Committee had given a great deal of time to deliberations. The votes had fluctuated from one proposal to another, with many approved almost or fully unanimously. The task of the Committee was an almost impossible one. Among the questions to be asked about a given project were whether it dealt primarily with weaponry, how much general value it would have in the long run, whether its military applications would be offensive or defensive, whether there was hope that other agencies besides DOD would come to support the research, and so forth. "We all search our souls." It would be better if the research could be carried out outside the University, but that was not possible at present. The Committee members were not happy with the present situation, but there was nothing more that they could do than what they were doing now.

The discussion continued for a considerable time, with widespread participation. One issue that received considerable attention was the extent to which failure to approve a proposal could be called disapproval, and thus a mandate to the Vice-President to withhold the proposal. Several members asked why a larger vote could not be secured. It appeared that in many cases action was required on proposals with very little time to spare, and it was difficult to secure full attendance on short notice.

Professor Kish said that the proposals that were not approved and still sent out were less than 5% of the total. There had been four of these since January. On the other hand, many projects had not been submitted that would have been if the Committee had not existed.

Professor Anton raised a question about the wording of one of the proposals, which included a reference to weapons delivery. Professor Kish said that the projects involving radar posed quite a dilemma. On the one hand, radar had tremendously valuable applications in earth resources analysis. It was also extremely important for navigation. If it had not been for the work carried out here in past years, the world would not have remote sensing devices and the University would not lead the world in this kind of research. On the other hand, some applications of radar had resulted in terrible damage in warfare. The representatives from Willow Run had spoken of the civilian applications, and six of the persons on the Committee thought their value outweighed the deleterious effects of the military applications.

MOTION TO
ACCEPT
SUPPORT

Professor Mohler, saying that the discussion didn't seem to be getting anywhere, moved that the report of the Committee should be accepted; there were several seconds. Professor Moore, with a second by Professor Rutledge, proposed that the motion to accept should be amended by adding the following words:

. . .; and that the Assembly Chairman communicate to the next meeting of the Board of Regents an accounting of the recommendations of the Classified Research Committee, and express the concern of the Senate Assembly for the number of administrative actions taken which were contrary to the recommendations of the Classified Research Committee. Copies of this communication should be distributed to Assembly members.

Professor Franken objected to the amendment, saying that with a 6 to 3 vote in favor of a proposal, he couldn't see that Vice-President Norman had defied the Committee. Professor Caldwell asked whether a vote of 6 in favor with 2 abstentions would constitute disapproval. Professor Kish replied that the only possibilities were approval and absence of approval. In reply to Professor Franken, he said that to some extent one was dealing with imponderables. A virtue of the Committee was the opportunity it gave those opposing a project to formulate their position clearly. Professor Fader said that since it was almost impossible to gather 12 persons on 24-48 hours' notice, it was not reasonable to require an absolute majority of the Committee for approval. Mr. Flynn, a member of the Committee, said that in close cases, all members were urged to be present. Professor Bowditch said the Committee was a very responsible one. Projects that presented difficulties was usually discussed at three meetings. The final vote was sometimes taken under pressure. The tendency was to vote favorably if possible.

Professor Anton said that the relationship between the Assembly and the administration was involved. Such instances were important. The Assembly should express both its support for the Committee and its dismay at what had taken place.

Professor Evaldson, speaking from the background of his association with Willow Run, asked the group to consider how people who were to work on a project would feel if the Vice-President refused to forward a proposal which had been voted on at a meeting where only eight of the Committee were present and only one more vote was needed for approval from among five absentees.

Professor Lands said that he would like to see an expression of dissatisfaction that was not expressed in terms of conflict.

Professor Moore's amendment was put to a vote and was defeated. Professor Wilkes then proposed an amendment as follows:

Senate Assembly expresses its appreciation to the Classified Research Committee for the conscientious and effective discharge of its assigned duties, often performed under very constrained circumstances.

MOTION
PASSED

This amendment was passed, and the amended motion of acceptance was then passed unanimously.

RIGHTS AND
RESPONSI-
BILITIES
REPORT

The next item on the agenda was the consideration of Parts B and C of the report of the Rights and Responsibilities Committee. Professor Loomis said that he was going to offer a motion whose intent was to let the new committees associated with the Office of Budgets and Planning run for a year before deciding on the part of the report that dealt with them. Accordingly he moved (seconded by Professor Wilkes) that the following statement should be substituted for part B of the report:

"That SACUA study and report on the activities of the new Committees, long range planning, program evaluation, budgetary priorities and steering to safeguard the missions and integrity of present Assembly Committees by arranging for the coordination and flow of information between present and the newly constituted committees. SACUA will evaluate both sets of committees and report to the regularly scheduled Assembly meeting in March, 1973."

ACTION
POSTPONED

Both the motion to substitute and the substituted motion were passed unanimously.

In view of the lateness of the hour, Professor Loomis then moved, with a second by Professor Kerr, to postpone consideration of Part C of the report until the next meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

NOMINATIONS
AND
APPOINTMENTS

The next item of business was the election of faculty members to posts in the Office of Budgets and Planning and on the Office of Student Services Policy Board.

The Office of Budgets and Planning was taken up first. There were nine positions to be filled on each of the Committees on Budget Priorities, Program Evaluation, and Long-Range Planning, or 27 positions in all; SACUA had proposed one nominee for each. For the post of Member-at-Large of the Steering Committee, SACUA had proposed two nominees, Professor William Porter of Journalism and Professor James Wendel of Mathematics. (Professor D. Hinerman, as SACUA chairman, would be a member of the Steering Committee ex officio.)

Professor Bowditch asked for biographical information on the two nominees to the Steering Committee. Professor Lloyd replied that both nominees had served on SACUA and had had broad experience in University affairs. However, a number of other members echoed Professor Bowditch's request, and it was also pointed out that many members were absent.

MAIL BALLOT
CALLED FOR

Professor Wilkes, with several seconds, moved that biographical information should be gathered and mailed to Assembly members together with ballots, the ballots to be returned within ten days of mailing. The motion was passed by a voice vote.

There were no additional nominations for the rest of the slate, and the Secretary was instructed to cast a unanimous ballot for the SACUA nominees.

For the positions on the Office of Student Services Policy Board, SACUA had nominated Professor Gwendolyn C. Baker of the School of Education and Professor John Kolars of the Department of Geography to two-year terms. There were no additional nominations, and the Secretary was instructed to cast a unanimous ballot for both nominees.

OLD BUSINESS
Under the heading of old business, Professor Loomis moved, with Professor Kerr seconding, approval of the report of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty.

Professor Hymans moved, with a second by Professor Lands, to defer action until the next meeting. The motion to postpone was passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT
There was no new business, and the Assembly adjourned at 5:21 p.m.

Wilfred M. Kincaid
Secretary