

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Assembly Meeting, May 17, 1971

ATTENDANCE

Present: Abrams, Allen, Buning, Bett, Birch, Bishop, Bowman, Cohen, Coon, Crawford, Darvis, DeKornfeld, Farrand, Franken, Goodman, Graebel, Heller, Higgins, Hinerman, Hood, Jensen, Kerr, Kish, Lloyd, Magee, Meyer, Nelson, Nystuen, Overseth, Preston, Rucknagel, Ryder, Sana, Sandalow, Sawyer, Scherer, Schuman, Sears, Simpson, Smock, Votaw, Wilkes, Youngdahl, Zweifler, Kincaid, Norman

Absent: Alston, Anton, Asgar, Bertolaet, Bowditch, Castor, Cooperrider, Cornish, Dowson, Ehrenkreutz, Hauenstein, Huntington, Iglehart, Kahn, Schaefer, Lind, Longone, Michelsen, Paul, Hazlett, Rigan, Schulze, Verheyen

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Norman called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m. in the Dow Auditorium, Towsley Center.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Norman made the following announcements:

Professors Alfred Meyer and Shackleton Bailey had been appointed to the University Press Editorial Committee replacing Professors Daniel Katz and John D'Arms.

SACUA had submitted a panel of six names to President Fleming from which he would fill three vacancies in the Board in Control of Intercollegiate Athletics.

SACUA continued present appointments on the Committee on Rhodes and Marshall Scholarships through December 1971, and agreed that any future new appointment on this committee should take effect at the beginning of a calendar year.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes for the meeting of March 15 and the continuation session of March 16 were approved with the following corrections: On Page 10, paragraph 3, the word "without" should be substituted for the word "for". Minutes for the special meeting of March 22 were approved with the following correction: the second line of the last paragraph on Page 2 should be replaced by "...the belief that further study by the committee is needed, but he said he believes...".

REPORT OF SACUA ACTIVITIES

Chairman Norman called upon Professor Hinerman to report on SACUA activities since the last Assembly meeting. A summary of his report follows:

SACUA meetings were held on April 27, May 3, and May 10.

At the April 27 meeting, it was announced that the State of the University address and reception would be held on Monday, September 27. A request for

setting up a forum on Classified Research, and some problems that had arisen with respect to the use of the Senate mailing list, were discussed. It was agreed that SACUA meetings would be on Mondays from 2 to 4 p.m. until further notice during the summer, and meetings with President Fleming were announced for May 12, July 9, and August 13. The agenda for the May 17 Assembly meeting and items to be discussed with President Fleming on May 12 were considered.

At the May 3 meeting, arrangements for a SACUA retreat at Inglis House on May 13 were discussed. There was further discussion of the Assembly agenda, particularly concerning the resolution to be presented by Professor Dunn about fire and police services.

At the May 10 meeting, it was announced that the next meeting would be a luncheon meeting at which Senator Bursley and Representative Smit would be present, together with Vice-President Fauri and members of the Proper Role Committee. Difficulties that the Library was having in getting some faculty members to return books were referred to. There was further discussion of the Assembly agenda and the meeting with President Fleming.

At all these meetings, considerable time was spent on personnel questions, mainly filling vacancies on committees.

The May 12 meeting of SACUA members with President Fleming was concerned with (1) the work of the Kidd task force, (2) the initiation of the Judiciary System, (3) some issues that had arisen in the Big Ten, and (4) the proposed renovation of the Health Service Building and construction of a new TV Center.

RE AKS BY
VICE-PRESIDENT
KNAUSS

Chairman Norman invited Vice-President Knauss to address the Assembly. Vice-President Knauss then spoke for a few minutes along the lines of the memorandum on the reorganization of the Office of Student Services that had been distributed with the call to the meeting. In his spoken remarks he added the comment that one objective of the reorganization was to eliminate wasteful duplication of services and facilities. Speaking of the Intra-University Development Task Forces, he stated that the supportive services for first year students will be supervised by Professor Bordin and that those for Black students will be supervised by Professor Kidd.

Questions were then invited from the floor.

Professor Nelson asked whether the career planning role would increase absolutely or only relatively as other roles decrease. The answer was the former. He inquired about rumors that letters of recommendation received by the Placement Office that were deemed unfavorable to the student concerned might be removed from the files at the latter's request. Vice-President Knauss said that he knew nothing about this.

Professor Cohen asked about the role of the Policy Boards. Vice-President Knauss said that his own Policy Board consisted of five students and four faculty members. It happens that at present four of the five students are graduate students. His opinion was that after an initial period of adjustment, a satisfactory relationship has been worked out. The chief effect of having a policy board is that decisions receive more publicity at an early stage than they would otherwise. Consequently, decisions have had more general acceptability. One problem that requires

further thought is the position of the professional staff. As things stand, their views are represented only by the Vice-President. Questions arise also from the relationships of the various units, each with its own policy board. These matters will take a certain amount of working out but present no insuperable difficulties.

Professor Darvis asked how students are made aware of the services that are available. Vice-President Knauss replied that the Task Force on Communications is concerned with this. An effort is being made to put out more adequate publications, and, also to spread information through dormitory visits and the like. Professor Darvis then asked the meaning of the expression "non-establishment jobs" which appears under (10), Page 2 of the memorandum.

Vice-President Knauss said the expression "job freaks" is sometimes used, and refers to jobs where the emphasis is not on the employer, for example Vista.

Professor Hinerman asked about academic counseling, especially for disadvantaged students. Vice-President Knauss replied that in the past this has been done through each college separately, and that the Task Forces are aimed at this problem. He pointed out that it is hard to draw the line between academic and non-academic counseling.

Chairman Norman now drew attention to the report of the Classified Research Committee, copies of which had been placed on the chairs before the beginning of the meeting. He explained that the committee had not had time to get the report out sooner, and pointed out that it included no proposals requiring action by the Assembly. Accordingly, it was being presented for later consideration, except for answering immediate questions. In the absence of Professor Charbeneau, he asked Professor Leslie Jones to come forward and respond to these.

Before answering questions, Professor Jones remarked that the most important suggestion embodied in the report was that the Research Policies Committee should audit the procedures of the Classified Research Committee to see if the guidelines had been carried out. He indicated that this audit was now proceeding.

Professor Jensen asked for further interpretation of the last sentence on Page 4 of the report. Professor Jones responded that the whole point of that paragraph was simply that remote sensing work constituted the bulk of Classified Research at present.

Professor Cohen inquired what was meant by the statement that a high degree of artificiality would result from using quantitative measures. Professor Jones replied that the only definitive measure in the list was that of access only. The others were inherently vague. For example, secret research might be almost all publishable. A project for setting up a conference might involve very few students directly, and so on.

REPORT OF
CLASSIFIED
RESEARCH
CQ TTEE

Professor Cohen asked further about the committee selection procedures, in particular with reference to the exclusion of extreme views, suggesting that such views might play a useful role in a discussion. Professor Jones pointed out that the criteria for membership were not set by the committee itself but by the Assembly and said that if the Assembly or the Research Policies Committee wanted to propose changes that was their prerogative. However, he added that total polarization of the group might make it inoperative.

Professor Kish asked if the function of the Committee was to enforce rules rather than make them; the answer was yes.

Professor Rucknagel asked how the Research Policies Committee could be expected to make better judgments than the Classified Research Committee in view of secrecy restrictions. Professor Jones responded that persons on both committees have clearance and that the Research Policies Committee would have access to more complete information than was available in the pre-proposal summaries. Professor Rucknagel suggested, however, that in view of the secrecy the cleared members would not be able to convey what they found out to the others. Professor Jones pointed out that secrecy generally applies only to the values of certain parameters and not to the nature of the research. He also said that secrecy is not the only reason for not giving out summaries before contracts are awarded, but that the interests of the researcher himself have to be considered.

Professor Jensen asked if the Office of Research Administration was just a clearing house for paperwork or whether they made the initial contacts with sponsoring agencies, in other words, is the University in the role of salesman of sponsored research? Professor Jones replied that there is a large element of entrepreneurship in securing research contracts, chiefly on the part of researchers themselves. While the ORA plays some role in this, it should not be overestimated.

Professor Scherer asked whether the reports would be made publicly available. The response was that this would depend upon SACUA, to whom the reports will be submitted.

Professor Sandalow commented on the reference to "a range of ideological convictions" as being desirable on the committee. He asked if this meant the standards for judging proposals were insufficiently defined. Professor Jones responded that the committee had not found phrases like "specific purpose" very definitive in judging whether a proposal should be approved or not. Professor Rucknagel remarked that this could be considered the nub of the problem and suggested that the decision could in effect be handed to the sponsors; if they regarded a project as important enough to be classified, we shouldn't do it.

Professor Rucknagel asked if copies of the original Elderfield Report could be obtained. Chairman Norman said that some of these would be made available. He also drew attention to the report from the Reform Coalition that had been distributed.

RESOLUTION
ON POLICE AND
FIRE SERVICES

Chairman Norman turned the discussion to the resolution presented by Professor Dunn on police and fire services. Since it seemed likely that the discussion might become somewhat complicated, he asked Professor Cohen to serve as Parliamentarian.

Since Professor Dunn, although present, was not now a member of the Assembly, the resolution that had been distributed was formally moved by Professor Scherer and seconded by Professor Darvis.

Professor Dunn said part of the problem might be that the members of the legislature were more familiar with MSU, which has a campus that is pretty well closed off by itself as compared with ours, which is interfingered with the town.

Several members of the Assembly took part in the active discussion that followed. Several questions were raised about what the legislators actually had in mind. Chairman Norman said the practice of paying money to the city was established after an enabling act was passed in 1925. No similar act was passed for other state colleges, and now a number of other cities, finding themselves in situations comparable to ours, have been putting pressure on the Legislature. To preserve equity, the Legislature apparently felt that they had either to pass similar enabling acts for other cities in a like situation or repeal ours. In view of the current State financial situation they chose the latter alternative. Apparently they did not expect us to establish our own fire protection but they did have in mind our setting up a small campus police force. Their expectation was that the city would continue to supply fire protection and a certain amount of police protection free of charge.

Professor Sandalow pointed out that despite various speculations to the contrary, the city was legally obliged to provide protection whether paid for or not. Professor Rucknagel mentioned a conversation he had had with Mr. Borup, the Assistant City Administrator, who had said that the abruptness with which the cutoff was to take place would greatly aggravate its bad effects. Professor Rucknagel proposed an amendment adding the words "if the contractual agreement between the city of Ann Arbor and the University is to be terminated, at the very least it should not be done abruptly but rather phased over an appropriate period of time". This was seconded by Professor Kish. Several persons indicated that they thought the amendment was weakening in its effect and it was defeated by a voice vote.

Professor Bowman moved the addition of the words "representing the entire faculty" following the words "Senate Assembly" in the resolution. This was seconded by Professor Votaw and passed.

Professor Crawford moved and Professor Sandalow seconded an amendment to delete the numbered paragraphs of the resolution and the words "from both fiscal and safety points of view". The amendment was supported with the argument that it was important to be accurate in our statements, and

that references to a separate fire service did not appear to agree with what the Legislature had in mind. Again a number of persons expressed the opinion that this was a weakening amendment and it failed.

Some questions were raised about the effectiveness of the resolution. It was pointed out that President Fleming had seen it and had not objected to its being introduced. While the Administration had certainly made strong representations on this matter, there was reason to think that a resolution from the faculty would have added effect. Also our expressing ourselves in this matter would help preserve good relations with the city. Questioned where the resolution would go if passed, Chairman Norman said that SACUA would send it to the Governor and the Legislature. Professor Sandalow suggested that since SACUA would be meeting with Representative Smit and Senator Bursley on the following Monday, they might be consulted about the most appropriate tactics.

The resolution was passed. Its wording, as amended, follows:

"In that:

"(1) the University of Michigan is not a self-contained, isolated campus clearly separate from the City of Ann Arbor but is completely interlaced by the public roads of that city,

"(2) the establishment of a separate police and fire service will raise artificial barriers between the University and the City at a time when interrelationships between universities and the community at large have been increasing,

"(3) the final cost of setting up such a police and fire protection service at the University will undoubtedly be greater than the present collaborative arrangement with the City, as well as being less efficient;

"We, the Senate Assembly, representing the entire faculty of the University of Michigan, having due regard to the present financial difficulties of the State of Michigan, nonetheless respectfully request the Governor and the Legislature to reconsider that part of the Governor's budget statement requiring the cessation of payments by the University to the City of Ann Arbor for police and fire protection. We believe that from both fiscal and safety points of view it is in the best interests of the citizens of the State of Michigan, the faculty and students of the University and the citizens of Ann Arbor that the present system of police and protection be continued."

STATEMENT
ON UNIVERSITY
POLICIES IN
HANDLING STOCKS

Consideration now passed to the statement of the Senate Advisory Committee on Financial Affairs on University policies in handling stocks. Professor Nystuen indicated three concerns that had motivated the Committee. (1) The University should not be used as a propaganda amplifier for special interests. (2) It is important to maintain an atmosphere of mutual understanding and trust on the campus. (3) To the greatest extent possible the University should maintain a low profile relative to the rest of the society.

Professor Cohen asked what was before the house for action. He indicated that he was agreeable to accepting the report if that did not imply

a full acceptance of the views and recommendations expressed in it. Chairman Norman said that the report had been submitted with no request for action although the body was of course free to give a charge to the Committee. Professor Crawford said that the background of the report went back to a year earlier, when Vice-President Pierpont asked the opinion of the Advisory Committee. Nothing emerged at that time and it was felt that some statement should be made in order to give the Regents a basis for making decisions. It became apparent that a number of persons felt that the issues raised were worthy of further discussion, for which there was no time remaining in the meeting. Professor Crawford, suggesting that the proper course was to move the acceptance and endorsement of the report and then move to table the matter until a subsequent meeting, moved accordingly, whereupon a motion by Professor Rucknagel to table the question until September passed.

NOMINATIONS
AND APPOINT-
MENTS

Turning to the final item on the agenda, Chairman Norman stated that SACUA recommended that Professor Mermier should be replaced on the Classified Research Committee by Professor Estep during the period from June 1 to January 1, 1972. Also Professor Yates was nominated to replace Professor Loving on the Board for Student Publications for a three-year term starting May 31, 1971. In both cases no further nominations were made from the floor and the Secretary was instructed to cast a unanimous ballot.

Chairman Norman announced that Professor Frank Kennedy, chairman of the Senate Advisory Review Committee, was leaving the campus June 1. SACUA was nominating Professor Hoch as Chairman and Professor Carl Hawkins as a new member of the Committee. There being no further nominations, these candidates were declared elected.

ADJOURN-
MENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.