



NOM- BUDGET PRIORITIES  
INAT- Sylvan Kornblum - Psychology/MHRI, Charles F. Lehmann -  
IONS Education, Frizell L. Vaughn - Public Health for 3-year  
AND terms replacing J. Raymond Pearson, Harvey Whitfield  
APPOINT- and Robert P. Weeks; Robert P. Weeks for 2-year term to  
MENTS complete term of John Romani.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RECREATIONAL, INTRAMURAL AND CLUB SPORTS  
Robert S. Tickle - Physics, Lois M. Verbrugge - Public  
Health for 2-year terms replacing L. Ann Hartman and John  
M. Powers.

COMMITTEE ON HENRY RUSSEL AWARD  
William I. Higuchi - Pharmacy, Philip A. Kalisch - Nursing  
for 3-year terms replacing Philip Elving and George Johnson.

COMMITTEE ON HONORARY DEGREES  
Harriet Braunstein (Social Sciences), Philip H. Peter  
(Fine Arts) replacing Norma J. Diamond and Willis C. Patterson.

FACULTY AWARDS COMMITTEE  
Muriel D. Ross - Medicine, Thomas B. A. Senior - Engineering,  
J. Frank Yates - LSA for 3-year terms replacing Hubert I.  
Cohen, William Morse and George Nace.

SENIOR SCHOLARSHIPS  
Ilene H. Forsyth - History of Art, Frances K. McSparran -  
English Language and Literature for 3-year terms re-  
placing James D. Clarkson and George Kish.

MILITARY OFFICERS EDUCATION PROGRAM  
M. Rasin Tek for a 4-year term to succeed himself.

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY BROADCASTING  
Charles B. Cartwright - Dentistry, for a 3-year term to  
succeed himself, Theophilus S. Lynch - Foreign Languages,  
Flint for a 3-year term succeeding Hansford W. Farris.

ANNUAL REPORT-- Professor Duderstadt described the role of the  
1978-79 Committee and referred the Assembly to the written report  
OF THE included in the call to meeting. He then commented on  
COM- its chief topics. The revision of the program discon-  
MITTEE tinuance document occupied the Committee throughout the  
ON AC- year. He predicted that still further revisions would be  
ADEMIC presented to the Assembly in 79-80. The question of  
AFFAIRS: faculty development was also important and will continue to  
PROFESSOR be discussed this year. A prominent aspect of this question  
is the research environment at the University.

JAMES DUDER- He referred to the Report on Research Incentives  
STADT, prepared by the Committee and distributed today to the  
CHAIR- Assembly. He explained that the Committee agreed that  
MAN

a healthy research program was absolutely vital to the health of the University. The quality of the University depends on the quality of its research more, perhaps, than on any other element. Severe discontent about the environment for research, therefore, was perceived by the Committee as a problem needing immediate attention. The Report and its recommendations are designed to encourage solutions.

The Report, he went on, tried to identify the factors that might be either incentives or disincentives for research. A draft describing these was generated and distributed for criticism before the final report was produced. The Report itself has generated responses, including a highly spirited one from the Vice President for Research. The Committee, in its turn, has responded to the Vice President. Copies have been distributed today to the Assembly.

Professor Duderstadt summarized the Committee's position. The research environment at the University has seriously deteriorated over the last decade. A number of specific disincentives have been discovered. The Committee urges the University to alleviate these in specific ways and also to take positive steps to improve the environment. The Committee hoped the report would stimulate university-wide debate about what these positive steps should be. He then called for questions.

Librarian M. George asked whether the Committee in imagining an expanded role for SCRIPT (computerized data on faculty research projects and interests) had considered the problem of establishing an historical record? Would the forms gathered from faculty members become part of the archives? Professor Duderstadt said that the issue was under study. He explained that SCRIPT will act as a replacement for the defunct University Bibliography.

Professor Gordon said that in recent years instructional units had not been filling vacant positions. The result has been an increased teaching load for many faculty members. He asked, has the Committee looked into the question of standard teaching loads across the University? Professor Duderstadt replied that enormous variations in teaching load exist across the campus. The Committee has asked the Deans to supply information so that unit-by-unit norms might be identified. Once the

norms are clear, perhaps greater flexibility can be urged and worked out. Vice President Shapiro has strong interest in improving research incentives, and has encouraged the identification of norms. He has also encouraged comparison of norms with peer institutions rather than between units on our own campus.

Professor Nagy complimented the Committee's report. He suggested, however, that the research environment for faculty members was only part of the problem, that the environment for research scientists has also deteriorated, and that a two-tier system is developing. Professor Duderstadt said that the issues Professor Nagy referred to were to be studied this year.

Professor Friedman then asked what reforms had been put forward in the past by the Research Policies Committee? Professor Duderstadt cited three: 1) alleviation of the tuition "tax" on indirect costs to projects employing graduate research assistants -- GRA's are now charged the same tuition as GTA's; 2) proposed alleviation of the restrictions to 2/9ths pay for faculty members with contracts for research projects that run throughout the summer; and 3) proposed changes in the computation of departmental administrative support for sponsored research--the problem being that support for research is traditionally treated as inferior in importance to support for teaching. He said that Vice President Shapiro has been deliberating on these proposals. Professor Duderstadt added that he was personally optimistic about solutions. Professor Corpron then thanked Professor Duderstadt for his Report. He announced that SACUA through the good efforts of Professor Romani, was preparing a response to the Report on Research Incentives, and that the Assembly will hear more about the issue.

ANNUAL  
REPORT--  
1978-79:  
THE COM-  
MITTEE  
ON FINAN-  
CIAL  
AFFAIRS,  
PROFESSOR  
PATRICIA  
SHONTZ  
LONGE,  
CHAIR

Professor Longe began by describing the role of the Committee and its work last year. She said that the year's activities divided into two. The Committee's first six meetings were devoted to a variety of problems affecting the financial policies of the University. Its last eight meetings were devoted to the single problem of University investment policies in companies doing business in South Africa.

She summarized the several topics of the first six of the Committee's meetings, such as, capital outlay, the University financial report, recruitment of clerical

staff, the establishment of a health maintenance organization, travel reimbursement, wage-price guidelines, energy management and labor relations.

Beginning in mid-March, she went on, the Committee worked, at the request of the Regents, on investment policies related to South Africa. Two students were added to the Committee for that purpose. Several meetings were spent reviewing Committee's 1978 recommendations on the issue, and ultimately the Committee agreed on the basic philosophical position of the 1978 report. The Committee then explored the specific recommendations of that report and considered revisions. After several more meetings final agreement was reached on the substance and basic language of a new report. In June of '79 the chairman completed the final draft and presented the report to the Regents.

Copies of the report to the Regents as well as of the Committee's annual report had been distributed to the Assembly. Professor Longe asked for questions, but there were none. Professor Corpron thanked Professor Longe for her work and the work of the Committee.

REPORT  
ON THE  
APPEAL  
OF JONA-  
THAN  
MARWIL  
-- PROF-  
ESSOR  
SHAW  
LIVER-  
MORE  
CHAIR-  
MAN OF  
SARC,  
1979-80

Professor Livermore began by refreshing the memories of members of the Assembly about the facts of the case. Until now certain facts, such as the identity of the appellant, had to be held in confidence. He emphasized that the case involved the failure of the Department of Humanities and the College of Engineering to appoint a formal tenure review committee to consider Marwil's qualifications. SARC had decided unanimously, he said, to recommend that such a committee be formed and a tenure review conducted.

The failure of action on those recommendations led, he went on, to SACUA's becoming interested in the case. SACUA in turn interested the administrative officers, who asked the Department and the College for additional information about Marwil's qualifications. The requests were carried out but there was no change in the decision not to appoint a tenure review.

It was by then May of 1979, that SACUA decided to appeal to the Regents. The Regents took no action, and appeals by other friends of Marwil's case were made to

the Regents in June and July. The Regents finally responded by asking the administrative officers for a report and explanation. The administrative officers responded, and in their response defended the procedures employed by the Department and the College. The Regents have since expressed no further interest in the case.

In August Mr. Marwil filed a suit in federal court claiming that he had been deprived of his rights under the first and fourteenth amendments. He asked also for injunctive relief. The judge denied injunctive relief but accepted the case, which is expected to come to trial in February.

Professor Livermore than attempted to summarize the positions taken on the issues. He acknowledged deep divisions of opinion. He said that SARC has met again on the case and considered the consequences of pressing further its own position and interests. Thus, he concluded, while SARC makes no recommendations at this time to the Assembly, there has been no closing of the veil. He called for questions and comments. Professor Ackley asked what considerations were given to involving the Regents in matters properly belonging to the faculty. Professor Corpron responded that SACUA's deliberations had been both informed and serious. He read the statement he had presented to the Regents.

Honorable Regents of the University of Michigan:

This letter is presented to you in the public comment section in order to comply with the stipulations of the Open Meetings Act. We request your consideration of the decision of a Department in the College of Engineering to deny a tenure review for an assistant professor whose current two year appointment will terminate on May 31, 1979. In consideration of his claim to a tenure review, the eleven faculty members of the Senate Advisory Review Committee who heard the case concluded un-animously that he should be granted a tenure review based upon: 1) the guidelines and practices of the Department and the College of Engineering, 2) the professor's expectation that he would be reviewed for tenure, 3) the interest of that Department as a whole in collegiality. The members of SACUA are in support of the position taken by SARC that he should receive a tenure review. The importance that SACUA

places upon this request is illustrated by the lack of a precedent of direct representation on behalf of an individual faculty member to the Board of Regents.

We request the Board of Regents to authorize the extension of this professor's contract and that you direct the Dean of the College of Engineering to constitute a committee to conduct a tenure review in accordance with customary procedures in that College. We emphasize that this is a procedural request, not a claim that tenure be granted.

He added that he thought there had been no erosion of faculty control over tenure and promotion decisions.

Professor Donald Brown noted that the SARC decision cited procedural deficiencies in the case. He asked if the AAUP had been asked for reactions. Professor Corpron replied that the case had been considered by AAUP but no action was taken. Professor Brown then asked what the difference was between the action taken by the Department and the College and a tenure review. Professor Livermore responded that opinions differ on this point. To many the formal constitution of a committee charged to review qualifications for tenure is a fundamentally important procedure. It assures the participation of faculty colleagues, and not just administrators.

Professor Hinerman then rose to offer a resolution. After a brief discussion of parliamentary rules and devices that would facilitate deliberation on the subject of Professor Hinerman's resolution, a motion was offered to dissolve the Assembly into a Committee-of-the-Whole. The motion was seconded and passed by a vote of 28-16. There was a further motion to close the Assembly to visitors for the duration of its deliberations as a Committee-of-the-Whole. This motion was seconded and passed by unanimous vote. Assembly business was thus suspended for forty-five minutes.

When the Assembly returned to its agenda, Professor Hildebrand requested that the Assembly receive from SARC 1) a copy of its report on the Marwil case, and 2) a list of options from which the Assembly might choose to exercise its responsibility at this stage of the affair. Professor Livermore said he would return next month with

the material requested. Professor Corpron thanked Professor Livermore for his report.

OLD  
BUSINESS

1. University Judiciary

Professor Corpron called attention to the revised constitution of the University Judiciary that had been included with the call to the meeting. He gave the background to the document and explained that different versions have been given to the Assembly before. He called for discussion (there was none) and then a vote. The document was accepted unanimously.

2. Program Transference

Chairman Corpron explained that SACUA has been asked by the Regents to give its reasons for recommending that the approval of the governing faculty of the receiving unit be required in all cases of program transference. There was no discussion.

ADJOURNMENT      The Assembly adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Earl J. Schulze  
Senate Secretary