

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting, October 15, 1979

ATTENDANCE Present: Ackley, Barnett, Baumgarten, Berg, Bishop, D. B. Brown, M. Brown, Browne, Carpenter, Cohen, Cooper, Corpron, Dingle, Dixon, Fearn, Holbrook, Friedman, Frost, Christensen, Gay, George, Gordon, Gray, Hilbert, Hildebrandt, Hinerman, Holland, Hungerman, Juvinall, Kirkpatrick, Koran, Lynch, Lynch-Sauer, McClendon, Millard, Nagy, Naylor, Parkinson, Porter, Portman, W. Powers, Rowe, Rush Schulze, Senior, Sinsheimer, Tilly, Outcalt, Trojan, Verhey, Vinter, J. White, N. White, Wynne.

Absent: Abdel-Massih, D. R. Brown, Burdi, Dabich, DeKornfeld, Eckert, Fowler, Groves, Gull, Lindberg, Morley, Nisbett, L. Powers, Bacon, Romani, Scearse.

MINUTES The minutes of Senate Assembly meeting of September 17 were accepted as written.

AGENDA Chairman Corpron asked that the agenda be rearranged to accommodate those faculty members wishing to attend a memorial service for Professor Leslie Jones. The Assembly approved, agreeing to consider first the report on Research Incentives and second, the Marwil Case.

REPORT ON RESEARCH INCENTIVES Chairman Corpron introduced the subject and called for commentary. Professor Senior spoke first. He referred to the SACUA Response that had been distributed to the Assembly, and especially to Recommendation #2, which urged a review of the role and operation of the Division of Research Development and Administration (DRDA). He said the problems raised by the Report itself were crucial and that the timing specified in Recommendation #2 of the Response seemed insufficient. He thought it would be October of next year before action could be taken and the problems are too critical for that long a delay. He suggested moving up the time-table so that a report would come in by February 1 instead of April 1, 1980. He also suggested that, if the Assembly preferred the SACUA recommendations to those of the Report, the review urged by Recommendation #2 ought not to be restricted to DRDA. Chairman Corpron responded that the restriction to DRDA was intended to be a first step, that a review of research incentives would eventually be expanded.

Professor Nagy reinforced Professor Senior's idea that review of DRDA might be inadequate. He said it might be counter-productive because DRDA is a minor part of the problem. Corpron reiterated that the review of DRDA is but a beginning. He did not think the kind of massive job that needs to be done could be accomplished by April 1. Professor Barnett cited accounting and personnel procedures as needing reform.

Professor Gordon said that the first recommendation of the SACUA Response, calling for forums on the whole issue of research incentives, would provide a good means of surfacing additional problems needing broader review. Chairman Corpron added that he hoped Assembly members would bring forth specific problems for debate. Professor Friedman said that it seemed that the time is ripe for a review of DRDA. Other issues need to be developed, since DRDA will not be the only aspect of research reviewed.

Professor Naylor said that Professor Senior had made a good point about the time-table. We can speed up the process of getting results on the DRDA investigation; he continued. He moved that the date of the report be changed to February 1, 1980. Professor Nagy seconded the motion.

Professor Corpron then asked the Assembly members to consider the section of the SACUA Response on inter-disciplinary research. Professor James Duderstadt, former chairman of the Committee on Academic Affairs that had prepared the report, urged the Assembly to accept the four recommendations of the entire SACUA Response. He said they moved in the right direction. The open forums (Recommendation #1) would be especially valuable in broadening the perspective of the review of research incentives.

Professor Friedman asked if the Committee on Academic Affairs would be able to develop the issues on interdisciplinary research more concretely. Professor Duderstadt replied that the Committee would do so through interaction with the Graduate School.

Professor Outcalt said that he had hoped for more specific recommendations for change from the Report. Some of the problems, he said, were not mysterious, but apparent to everyone. Some structural changes were needed. Professor Duderstadt agreed about the needs, but reminded the Assembly that important reforms in the Purchasing Department, a relatively uncomplicated organization, were effected only after a full year of study. Reform of DRDA is but the beginning of an effort to solve a complex range of problems.

There followed some discussion of parliamentary procedure, which the parliamentarian, Professor Hildebrandt, clarified. Professor Senior then rose to amend Recommendation #2 so that February 1, 1980 would become the date for a report. The amendment was accepted. The first three recommendations of the SACUA Response were then moved and seconded, and passed unanimously. The fourth recommendation (requiring a 2/3 majority because of its introduction) was moved and seconded. Professor Juvinal offered an amendment to change the date for the report on recommendation #4 to February 1, 1980. His amendment was accepted. The amended motion then passed unanimously. Professor Parkinson ascertained that faculty members should address their comments on the issues of research incentives to SACUA.

REPORT
ON THE
MARWIL
CASE--
PROFESSOR
SHAW
LIVERMORE,
CHAIR
OF SARC

Before Professor Livermore began his report to the Assembly, the members elected to dissolve into a quasi-committee of the whole and ask all visitors, except for Professor Ullman, Chairman of the Rules Committee, to leave.

This being accomplished, the members heard Professor Livermore's report and discussed the implications of a variety of actions. The discussion lasted 50 minutes.

When the Assembly rose from the quasi-committee of the whole, Professor Hildebrandt moved:

that the Assembly take no action on the Marwil case because the case now resides in a court of law.

Professor Baumgarten questioned whether all the issues of the case confronting the faculty were in fact to be decided by the court. Professor Hinerman said that he would rather support the resolution of regret that had been prepared by SACUA. The question was called on the Hildebrandt motion, and it passed 24-19.

ANNOUNCE-
MENTS

Chairman Corpron now asked the Assembly to return to its original agenda.

Chairman Corpron advised the Assembly on the progress of the search for a new Vice President for Academic Affairs. He explained that a special effort was being made to attract minority and female candidates and that the deadline for nominations had been moved back to November 15.

NOMINA-
TIONS
AND
APPOINT-
MENTS

The Assembly approved the following nominations and appointments.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Eva Mueller, Economics, 1-year term replacing Lorraine Perry; Arthur Rich, Physics, 2-year term replacing Lyall H. Powers.

BUDGET PRIORITIES COMMITTEE

Thomas Cianciolo, Business Admin-Dearborn; Bruce Rubenstein, History-Flint, for 3-year terms.

MILITARY OFFICERS EDUCATION PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

Barbara J. Norman, Nursing, 3-year term replacing John Batsakis.

RESEARCH POLICIES COMMITTEE

Morton Brown, Mathematics, 2-year term replacing Eric Rabkin.

RESIDENCY APPEALS COMMITTEE

Joan M. Keevil, Dentistry, 1-year term replacing John Milholland.

SENATE ADVISORY REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mary L. Hunter, Nursing, 3-year term.

THE
REPORT
OF SARC--
1978-79

Professor Friedman presented the Report to the Assembly in place of Professor Bartman who was obliged to be elsewhere. He highlighted three items:

1. A case in the Literary College, which SARC rejected for consideration, raised two interesting issues. First, when units change their standards for promotion, is notification necessary, and, if so, in what form? Second, should the same body (here, the LSA Executive Committee) that judges a case, constitute the hearing committee investigating its own decisions?
2. SARC was asked if its jurisdiction extended to librarians, who are members of the University Senate? SARC decided that it did not have jurisdiction, at least at this time.
3. A case in the Nursing School illustrated an important fact: despite the establishment of a good grievance mechanism, where antagonism is

high, it appears, even the best grievance mechanisms will fail. In this instance, both sides to a dispute must participate in the selection of a grievance panel but there has been no progress because the sides refuse to accept each other's nominations.

There were no questions addressed to Professor Friedman.

ADJOURN-
MENT

There being neither old nor new business, Chairman Corpron received permission to adjourn the Assembly at 5:00 p.m.

Earl J. Schulze
Senate Secretary

