

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting of 17 November 1986

ATTENDANCE

Present: Singer, Bassett, Bissell,
Borcherts, Briggs, Burdi,
Chudacoff, Comninou, Craig,
Dandekar, DeCamp, Dobbins,
Durrance, Eggertsen, Gage, Glover,
Gray, Yang, Haefner,
Hollingsworth, Hook, Lavoie,
Lehmann, Lenaghan, Leonard, Lewis,
Lockwood, Lorey, Lougee, Loup,
Lusk, Malvin, Manis, McCarus,
McClamroch, Meyer, Miller,
Moerman, Moore, Mosher, Nadelman,
Ness, Oleinick, Olsen, Olson,
Pierce, Reed, Rosenthal, Ross,
Rutledge, Sanders, Sargous,
Schteingart, Seidler, Nystuen,
Stapp, Stebbins, Thomson, Borer,
Weiler, Yocum

Absent: Arnett, Ascione, Brewer, Vorus,
Checkoway, Cohen, Debler, Ard,
Goldberg, Han, Hanks, Larson,
Margolis, Moran, Muirhead, Hudson,
Schauer, Shannon, Silverman,
White, Wiseman, Berent

Professor William Stebbins convened the meeting at 3:21 p.m.

MINUTES

Two changes were offered to the minutes of 20 October 1986 before they were approved:

p. 3, paragraph 3, line 2, change "scare" to scarce" resource.

p. 5, paragraph 2, line 17, change "\$400B" to "\$4B" endowment.

MATTERS ARISING

Professor Stebbins asked members to rise for a minute of silence in remembrance of Professor William Williams, a valued colleague and former Chair of the Research Policies Committee, who died November 11.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Professor Stebbins announced that a joint CESF/AAUP meeting will take place at noon in the Michigan League on November 21. Also, the Committee to Review Honorary Degree Policy will hold an open hearing 7-9 p.m. on November 18 in the Rackham Amphitheatre.

RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF MINORITY GRADUATE STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, GEORGE JONES, ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR MINORITY AFFAIRS, RACKHAM SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Despite the University's commitment to increasing minority enrollment, Professor Jones explained, enrollment of black and Spanish surnamed graduate students declined significantly over a ten year period, 1975-1985. The nature of this problem is in twofold: recruitment and retention.

To address the recruitment part, the Rackham Office for Minority Affairs has taken several steps. It has increased publicity about programs at the University through increased advertising, an extensive mailing program to colleges across the country (both majority and minority campuses), and establishment of an toll-free telephone number so that prospective students may contact the Office directly and, as appropriate, be transferred to academic departments and faculty members. The Office has become active on college campuses by sending out recruiting teams consisting of staff and current U of M students.

There have also been some new initiatives. To better tap the large pool of minority students in the area, the Office sponsored a recruiting conference last spring in Ann Arbor for colleges and universities in Southeastern Michigan. Deemed a success, the conference may be repeated and enlarged. For the first time, the U of M participated in the annual CIC conference on Summer Research Opportunity Options. The program, designed to stimulate students to consider post-baccalaureate work, affords selected undergraduates the chance to spend two months doing research with a faculty member. Last summer, the U of M hosted eighteen students, the highest number of any CIC institution. In all, between 40 and 50 students applied to the U of M. All were qualified to participate but the lack of "spaces" restricted opportunities to 18. The Office hopes to expand the U of M's capacity to handle more students in the near future.

Once minority students enroll, the University faces the problem of retaining them. In discussions with current minority graduate students, Professor Jones found two factors universally cited: financial aid and socialization/integration. In his view, the U of M is in a position to handle

most cases of financial need on both a basic and emergency level. Data indicate that the U of M devotes more of its General Fund money to meeting needs of minority students than any other university in the country. The socialization/integration problem is more difficult. Most financial support for minority students comes from Rackham rather than from the academic departments with which the students are affiliated. There is thus a feeling that these students are a different "class" and, when problems arise, departments look to Rackham for solutions, reinforcing the notion of separateness for these students. In addition, departments tend to give Teaching Assistantships and Research Assistantships to students who are not eligible for Rackham support as minorities are. In the process, minority students can inadvertently be shut out of important facets of interacting with faculty mentors. While departments are autonomous, they can be encouraged to recognize that minority students may need special but not preferential treatment. Minority students themselves are working to diminish the feelings of isolation. They have organized a fledgling but functioning campus organization, the Minority Organization of Rackham, which helped sponsor last Spring's campus conference. Currently the group is drafting a constitution and electing its second slate of officers and is committed to continuing its efforts.

The effect of these and other efforts are reflected in recent statistics. In Fall 1986, 519 minority students enrolled, up 10% from 1985. Applications for 1986 were up 33% and offers of admission up 40% from the previous year. Increases were seen for Black and Hispanic students as well as Asians. There was disappointment, however, because the proportional increases were not what the University would like and because the number of offers to Blacks was up only 5% whereas the number of applications was up 15%. The University also needs to improve efforts to attract more of the students who are admitted but choose not to come to Ann Arbor. Marketing efforts also need to be increased. For example, the Office has just learned that minority students receive four to six follow-up contacts from other schools after the initial inquiry. Because the presence of minority faculty members can be a significant factor in minority student recruitment and retention, the University must also redouble its efforts to recruit minority faculty.

The U of M, Professor Jones said, has a strong commitment to increasing enrollment of minority students and continues to implement and inaugurate mechanisms and programs to achieve this.

Professor Stapp asked how the summer program matches students and faculty members. Professor Jones explained that the program encourages students to apply and to indicate areas of research interest. Faculty members interested in the program are solicited simultaneously but do not specify research areas. Participants are then tentatively matched, but much if not most of the initiative lies with the students who are encouraged to contact faculty

members directly. Agreements are worked out between student and faculty member. In other instances students are encouraged to identify faculty members with whom they would like to work and then persuade them to take the students on to a research project. The Rackham Office has funds to support a campus visit by a minority student interested in speaking with faculty members about the program.

Professor Nadelman noted that the decline in minority enrollment overlapped a period of decline in the enrollment of majority students. Professor Jones agreed but explained that the decline among Blacks and Hispanics dropped by over 50% in this period.

Professor Briggs asked if there were sufficient data to correlate performance with potential. He also suggested that the U of M's efforts to increase minority enrollment coincide with those of other institutions to increase their minority enrollments. Professor Jones replied that there is no statistical answer to correlate potential and performance. His impression is that in the near future the U of M will continue to attract students whose credentials, like those of majority students, suggest that success is likely. It will also attract students in the moderate risk category who are nonetheless evaluated as worth taking risk on. Students in both groups seem to succeed at the same rate. However, minority students on the whole do not complete their degrees at the same rate as majority students do. The first two years are critical. Once they pass these, they succeed at the rate of other students.

RESOLUTION ON THE AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORT ON CLASSIFIED RESEARCH MAJORITY REPORT

Professor Stebbins acknowledged that the upcoming debate would be complex and, to aid discussion, he summarized the motions likely to be made. In addition, Professor Lehmann, Assembly Parliamentarian, stated his intention to move for "informal discussion" for 45 minutes to allow for the widest involvement of members and to insure that individual members would be allowed to speak more than twice to the same matter.

Professor Moerman moved, Professor Olsen seconded, that,

SACUA and Senate Assembly recommend that the Executive Officers and Regents adopt a research policy based on the "majority report" of the Ad Hoc Committee on Classified Research (Converse Report).

We recommend further that the Research Policies Committee monitor the implementation and operation of the policy to be certain that it achieves the letter and spirit of that report.

Professor Lehmann moved, Professor Briggs seconded, that the body agree to informal discussion of the topic. Motion passed unanimously. Informal discussion then commenced for 45 minutes. At its conclusion, Professor McClamroch spoke in support of the majority report for these reasons: the balance it strikes between oft competing University values, its consistency in treating all rather than just some types of research, and its logical presentation, effectiveness and simplicity. He concluded by saying that he would not support an end use statement as part of the Regents policy but would support it as a personal statement.

Professor Comminou moved, Professor Ross seconded, that the following be substituted for the SACUA motion:

The Senate Assembly recommends that the Executive Officers of the University and the Board of Regents adopt the Research Policy set forth in the statement on research policy approved by the Senate Assembly in March, 1983.

The vote on the substitute motion was 19 Yes, 26 No. Motion failed.

Professor Oleinick moved, Professor Ness seconded, that the following amendment be added after the first full sentence of the SACUA motion:

In the event that either the sponsor or the investigator requests that restrictions be permitted on the publication or other public dissemination of the results of the research beyond approximately one year from the end of the funding period as specified in the contract or grant on the grounds of extraordinary circumstances and the request has been approved by the Dean or Director of the appropriate unit, or the subject is classified after the award of the grant or contract, the following procedure shall be followed in determining whether the restriction shall be permitted or the classified project continued.

1. The Vice President for Research shall appoint a committee to decide the case, which committee shall consist of the Vice President for Research, a representative appointed by the Provost, two faculty members appointed from the Senate Assembly Committee on Research Policies and one student elected by the Michigan Student Assembly.
2. The committee shall hear the case and reach a decision by majority vote. In making its decision, the committee shall be guided by the policy favoring an open research enterprise contained in the present policy and by the policy on classified research as approved in March, 1972 and revised October, 1976.

3. In its deliberations, the committee shall have access to all relevant documents. If access is denied on the grounds that the material is now classified, and at least two of the committee members do not obtain the necessary security clearance, the classified grant or contract shall be terminated.

4. The committee shall issue a written report regarding the basis of the majority's decision, as well as any minority reports.

Professor Moore moved to amend Professor Oleinick's amendment as follows: Retain paragraph one through the phrase "after the award of the grant or contract;" delete all that follows beginning with "the following procedure shall be followed " There was no second. Professor Oleinick spoke in support of his amendment, noting that it would maintain faculty involvement in the decision-making phase of proposal submission before a contract is signed. In contrast, the SACUA motion provides review only after the contract has been signed and thus does not provide enough protection against unsuitable contracts. The amendment would involve a small but critical amount of time and insure faculty involvement in the process.

The subsequent vote on the amendment was 27 Yes, 19 No. Amendment passed.

Professor Comminou moved, Professor Rutledge seconded, the following amendment to the amended SACUA motion:

It is the policy of The University of Michigan not to enter into or renew any agreement or contract, or to accept any grant, supporting research a substantial purpose of which is to destroy or permanently incapacitate human beings.

Professor Oleinick stated that the implication of the amendment was unclear and lacked an enforcement policy. He questioned if faculty were to be involved. He moved to lay the motion on the table but that move was ruled not applicable. Professor Weiler noted that by the rules established at the outset of discussion, such a "surprise" amendment was inappropriate. Professor Comminou stated that the amendment was not a surprise but a logical extension of the discussion.

The question was called: the vote was 19 Yes, 28 No. Amendment defeated.

Professor Pierce requested that a typescript of the motion as amended be presented to the Assembly so that members could be certain where the discussion and action now stood. Research policy may be the most important issue to come before the Assembly in a long time and merits the clear understanding of the body. Professor Stebbins noted that members all had

copies of the written motions already. Professor Thomson requested that the Assembly vote on the motion as amended, with an understanding that it could be clarified next month if necessary. The subsequent vote on the main motion as amended was 32 Yes, 12 No. Motion passed.

Ms. Loup then moved a SACUA resolution on classified research, separate from the resolution to be transmitted to the Executive Officers and Regents. Professor Singer seconded the motion:

A University should be a humane institution, demonstrating a commitment to the preservation and enrichment of human life rather than to its destruction. This faculty therefore asserts that its members ought not carry out any research, classified or not, funded or not, the clearly foreseeable or probable result of which would be to destroy or incapacitate human beings.

Noting that this would preclude research on such things as the automobile, Professor Ness offered an amendment so that the second sentence would read [changes underlined]:

This faculty therefore asserts that its members ought not carry out any research, classified or not, funded or not, a substantial purpose of which would be to destroy or incapacitate human beings.

Professor Burdi seconded, Ms. Loup accepted the friendly amendment as did Professor Burdi. Motion passed on a voice vote.

OLD BUSINESS

Professor Rutledge reminded the Assembly that a few months ago he had inquired about the financial costs of the new telephone system. The matter was referred to the Financial Affairs Committee but there has been no report back. In view of the rising costs and charge backs, he stated that it was imperative that the matter be examined. Professor Stebbins will contact Professor DeMuth, Chair, Financial Affairs Committee, for an update.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m

Respectfully submitted,



Patricia B. Yocum
Senate Secretary