

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Regular Assembly Meeting, September 27, 1971

ATTENDANCE

Present: Abrams, Allen, Anton, Asgar, Birch, Bishop, Bowditch, Bowman, Cohen, Cooperrider, Hildebrant, Darvas, Dowson, Ehrenkreutz, Reade, Franken, Goodman, Graebel, Heller, Higgins, Hinerman, Hood, Huntington, Colburn, Kerr, Kish, Lind, Lloyd, Longone, Magee, Meyer, Nystuen, Overseth, Paul, Pollack, Rigan, Rucknagel, Ryder, Sana, Sandalow, Sawyer, Scherer, Schulze, Schuman, Simpson, Verheyen, Votaw, Wilkes, Youngdahl, Zweifler, Kincaid, Norman

Absent: Stolz, Buning, Bertolaet, Bett, Castor, Ledger, Cornish, DeKornfeld, Hauenstein, Iglehart, Kahn, Krachenberg, Michelsen, Hafter, Preston, Moore, Smock

Guests: Members, Research Policies Committee and Classified Research Committee

CALL TO ORDER

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the June 21 meeting of the Assembly were accepted as distributed. (Later correction: Professor Zweifler pointed out that he was incorrectly listed as absent at the April 19 and June 21 meetings.)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Norman made the following announcements:

Professor Roger Lind had requested that he be relieved as vice-chairman of SACUA and Professor Dorin Hinerman had been elected to replace him.

On September 20, at the request of President Fleming, SACUA submitted a panel of six faculty members from which three will be selected to sit on the Search Committee for a Vice-President for Student Services.

REPORT OF SACUA ACTIVITIES

Chairman Norman reported that since the last meeting of the Assembly in June, SACUA had held eleven meetings on its own, three with President Fleming, and two with Vice-President Smith, plus one with Vice-President Pierpont, and their Advisory Committees. Among the items discussed at these meetings were the problems and proposals for the improvement of the University registration procedures, consideration of the need for a faculty handbook for which preliminary steps now have been initiated selection of Assembly committees and chairmen, plans for the orientation session for new Assembly members and committees chairmen held on July 19, the implications of the resignation of Vice-President Spurr for the University Opportunity Program, State Legislature action on the University appropriations bill, implications of the wage-price freeze, classified research, University grievance procedures, review of University policies

relating to discrimination by sex or race, the status of Willow Run Laboratories, and creation of a Search Committee for the Vice-President for Student Services.

Following this report, Chairman Norman and Professor Hinerman responded to Professor Cohen's inquiry and assured him that the pay increases for teaching fellows were not considered to be included in the wage-price freeze and therefore will be included in forthcoming pay checks to teaching fellows.

Professor Hinerman asked to respond also to the statement expressed by Professor Kish that he continued to hear many complaints about University registration procedures. He indicated that the wide latitude of both students and faculty in registration procedures is one of the greatest problems. There is early registration of a greater number of students and special registration of certain schools and colleges. However, some of this is negated by time and other changes made later by instructors which in turn necessitate many changes by students. Another segment of students appears to register in advance with the intent that they will drop and add courses later during the registration period. An improved system of registration will require tightening up and reducing the freedom of choice by both students and faculty, he stated.

ELECTION TO  
FILL  
COMMITTEE  
VACANCIES

SACUA's nominations to fill committee vacancies were distributed with the call for this meeting. Opportunity was presented for additional nominations from the floor for each of the vacancies. There being none, the secretary was instructed to cast a unanimous ballot for the following:

Professor Sallie Churchill (Social Work) to replace Oliver Harris on the Michigan Union Board of Directors, 9/1/71 to 6/30/72

Professor James L. Miller, Jr. (Education) to replace Ejner Jensen on the Proper Role Committee, 9/1/71 to 9/1/72

Professor Stephen Paraskevopoulos (Architecture) to replace Deming Brown on the Academic Affairs Committee, 9/1/71 to 1/1/72

Professor Irene Heller (Education) and Dr. Frizell L. Vaughan (Public Health) to replace Nelson Hauenstein and Lawrence Gary on the Senate Advisory Review Committee for one year.

At the request of Chairman Norman unanimous approval was given to a motion to waive the rules associated with bringing appointments before the Assembly in order to consider SACUA's nominations for a three-member Interviewing Committee to select faculty members to be considered for the Appeals Court under procedures agreed upon for the establishment of a University Judiciary. Nominated were Professors Gerald Abrams (Medicine), Bernard Galler (LS&A), and James A. Martin (Law). A unanimous ballot was cast for these nominees on motion by Professor Kish.

RESEARCH  
POLICIES  
COMMITTEE  
REPORT

Before calling on Professor Bernstein to present the report of the Committee on Research Policies, Chairman Norman suggested that following presentation of the report the Assembly consider meeting as a Quasi-Committee of the Whole for a period of time to consider the recommendations

made in the report as well as any other resolutions or statements relative to the report. He also indicated the request of one non-Assembly member to address the Assembly on the subject of the report.

In his presentation Professor Bernstein indicated that only part 1 of the report had been mailed to all Assembly members and was being considered at this time; that part 2 of the report will be completed within the next 60 days. He called attention to the recommendations made by the Committee in its report and thanked his student and faculty colleagues for their assistance with the difficult task of the Committee.

QUASI-COMMITTEE  
OF THE  
WHOLE

The Assembly then adjourned at 3:45 p.m. to a meeting of Quasi-Committee of the Whole for a period of 30 minutes on motion by Professor Lind.

SUBSTITUTE  
MOTION

When the Assembly arose from Committee of the Whole at 4:25 p.m., Professor Rucknagel supported by Professor Lind moved that the following substitute motion be considered:

"In light of the extreme difficulty of handling the matters with which the Classified Research Committee must deal, the Senate Assembly considers satisfactory application of the criteria developed in 1968 to be impossible. The Assembly therefore urges the Board of Regents to adopt the following policy regarding classified research:

The University of Michigan shall enter into no research contract, contract extension, sub-contract, or grant that requires security classification by the federal government except where classification is for the sole purpose of providing access to classified materials or equipment and no restrictions are imposed on prompt and open publication of the results."

Discussion followed. In response to a request by Professor Goodman that he comment on the motion distributed by Professor Schuman, Professor Rucknagel pointed out that in his motion the issue of classified research would be removed from the campus and placed with the sponsors of such research.

Professor Darvas cited the whole question as highly moralistic. He called attention to a previous letter written by Professor Rucknagel concerned with responsibility as a member of this society and asked if there is need for this type of research why one should say it cannot be done by a colleague but should be done elsewhere. Responding to this, Professor Kish pointed out that all are members of several societies, that one could not be sure that research on war done elsewhere would be done as efficiently or more so, and that classified research was not a long tradition of universities, thus separating it from this or any other university campus might be of little consequence.

Professor Scherer indicated he favored the Rucknagel motion and yet he was not opposed to all classified research. He spoke of the need for a policy compatible with University criteria for other activities, notably excellence and trust. He cited examples to indicate his feeling that the trust criterion appears impossible to achieve under policies proposed in the Committee report.

Professor Kerr pointed out that reports issuing from classified research contracts can be published in large part (80-90%), that much of this information is publishable and is published, and thus one is able to judge the quality of the research. He expressed pleasure in being a part of a University concerned about moral issues and urged that the Assembly be cognizant of the many divergent viewpoints existing in the University just as in society and that even a minority may be right.

Professor Overseth commented on the number of journal articles published as indicated in appendix 8 of the report in comparison with expenditures for this research, and Professor Verheyen suggested the need to look into the nature of these publications.

Professor Longone inquired about the intent of the resolution before the Assembly. He questioned the concern for the quality of research at Willow Run and for open publication if these criteria are not applied to all research including that of proprietary nature. Chairman Norman pointed out that the Research Policies Committee is charged to look at proprietary research as well and will report on this within 60 days in part 2 of their report.

Following some comments by Professor Lind about statements in the Research Committee Report, the Rucknagel motion, and the Reform Coalition statement, Professor Cohen expressed his feeling of confusion regarding the business before the Assembly, whether it concerned agreement to act on the proposal made by Professor Rucknagel or to accept this proposal. He pointed out that some members might wish to make changes in the proposal. Professor Ryder also called for clarification expressing the feeling that the Research Policies Committee Report was before the Assembly.

Chairman Norman ruled that if a vote to substitute the proposal made by Professor Rucknagel was favorable amendments to it then would be possible, if unfavorable the Assembly would then return to the Committee Report. A vote on the substitute motion proposed by Professor Rucknagel was then called for. The motion failed by a vote of 21 for and 25 against.

VOTE ON  
SUBSTITUTE  
MOTION

Professor Schuman supported by Professor Kish moved that the following resolution be substituted for the Report of the Research Policies Committee:

SECOND  
SUBSTITUTE  
MOTION

- I. General Policy: It is the general policy of the University not to enter into or renew federal contracts or grants that limit open publication of the results of research.
- II. The General Policy stated in Paragraph I will be suspended only in cases where the proposed research can be shown to be of such exceptional positive value to mankind as to justify infringement of the freedom to publish openly. In all cases the burden of proof rests with the faculty member who proposes the contract or grant.
- III-VI. REPEAT POLICIES I-IV FROM ORIGINAL ELDERFIELD REPORT.
- VII. A Review Committee will be established to consider all requests for exemption from the General Policy stated in

Paragraph I. The Committee will be composed according to the following criteria:

- (a) There will be twelve members, elected by the Senate Assembly.
- (b) Two members of the Committee will come from Departments or other units of the University that have contracts for classified research at the time of their appointment to the Committee. The other ten members shall not come from such Departments, but shall otherwise be broadly representative of the University in terms of discipline.
- (c) The Assembly will attempt to include on the Review Committee two persons who indicate that they are philosophically opposed to all classified research.
- (d) A proposal must obtain at least seven votes in order to be exempted from the General Policy stated in Paragraph I.
- (e) The Committee will make public full minutes of its discussions and a record of its votes.

Professor Cohen spoke in favor of the motion expressing his feeling that it would block some important negative aspects of classified research, maintain a certain degree of openness and freedom for the University, and improve on some of the general policies of the Rucknagel proposal.

Professor Rowe, of the Research Policies Committee, spoke against the proposal, indicating that it would have a deleterious effect on some worthwhile research.

Professor Franken also spoke against the motion. He pointed out that the Research Policies Committee was charged to prepare a report and that it would be easier in his opinion to work toward the improvement of this report than to work on the proposal covered by Professor Schuman's motion. To this Professor Cohen expressed the opinion that the motion made by Professor Schuman presented a principle to which it would be easier to shape the Committee report than vice versa.

VOTE ON SECOND  
SUBSTITUTE  
MOTION

Following some discussion a vote on the motion was called. The motion to accept the substitute proposal made by Professor Schuman passed, 31 voting in favor, 15 against.

SPECIAL  
MEETING

In order to continue further deliberations on research policies, it was agreed on a motion duly supported to convene a special meeting of the Assembly at 7:30 p.m. on Monday, October 4, in Dow Auditorium, Towsley Center.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Robert A. Bowman  
Secretary pro tem