

The University of Michigan

Senate Assembly

Minutes of Regular Meeting of 21 November 1983

ATTENDANCE

Present: Lindner, Bailey, Blass, Brown, Boyd,
Bulkley, Caldwell, Carter, Cooper,
Dahl, Danielson, Easley, Eaton,
Green, Kahn, Harber, Hilbert, Loup, Janecke,
Kalisch, Kaplan, Kelsey, Kusnerz,
Lawrence, Humesky, Bassett,
McClamroch, Mermier, Meyer,
Moerman, Morash, Mosher, Nagy,
Payne, Powell, Radine, Rae,
Ringler, Scholler, Sears, Stebbins,
Solomon, Warschausky, Wieland

Absent: Barald, Briggs, Brooks,
Burdi, Burt, Caffesse, Catford,
Courant, Eschman, Evans, Farley,
Fellin, Grosse, Hopwood,
Keren, Knudsvig, Lehmann, W.G.
Lockwood, Dunlop, Ludema, More,
Rucknagel, Scheele, Smith, Taylor,
Whitehouse, Young, Zweifler

CALL TO ORDER AND MINUTES

The meeting was called to order by Professor Hilbert at 3:18 p.m., and the minutes of the meeting of 14 October 1983 were approved.

REMARKS BY CHAIR

1. Professor Hildebrandt is unable to chair today's meeting because he is president of the American Association of Business Communication, which is meeting in New York.

2. The report of the Subcommittee on Microcomputer Policy is available at the SACUA office.

3. Assembly members are reminded of the importance of maintaining contact with their constituents. All faculty should feel that they can have their opinions heard in the Assembly.

REPORT ON INDIRECT COSTS OF RESEARCH

Professor Nagy, SACUA liaison to the Research Policies Committee (RPC) introduced for the RPC the following motion:

Resolved: Senate Assembly accepts the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Indirect Costs and endorses their first four recommendations for further discussion and adoption by the University.

The motion was seconded.

Professor Janecke asked whether the recommendation of a uniform indirect cost rate applies to the Institute for Social Research. Professor Nagy answered that this Institute has a long-standing agreement with the University exempting it from the uniform rate. Professor Janecke asked whether there were other such exemptions. Professors Nagy and Hilbert said that they believed there were none.

Professor Danielson asked why the RPC did not endorse the Ad Hoc Committee's fifth recommendation. Professor Nagy replied that the RPC felt that the recommendation was not clear enough and could not be easily and usefully implemented as University-wide policy; he read the RPC's own explanation, the last two paragraphs of the report distributed with the agenda. In reply to a question from Professor Hilbert, Professor Nagy said that the RPC intends to pursue the intent of recommendation 5 and make it more specific; Professor Danielson urged that the idea of research incentives not be dropped. Professor Janecke said that rejection of recommendation 5 indicated that cost recovery has higher priority than rewarding researchers. He stressed the importance of removing disincentives and asked for reassurance that research incentives will be a high priority topic. Professor Hilbert said that the matter had been discussed by SACUA and will be on the SACUA and RPC agendas in the weeks and months ahead.

The RPC resolution was put to a vote and carried unanimously.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Professor Green introduced for SACUA the reapportionment plan combining the recommendations of the Rules Committee and the Academic Affairs Committee:

1. That each school and college on the Ann Arbor campus have a minimum of two representatives;
2. That the size of the Assembly be increased from 65 to 72 members; and
3. That the Flint and Dearborn campuses have a total of not more than eight representatives.

To explain the background of these proposals, he said that seven units now have only one representative each; despite the existence of alternate representatives, some schools can be ineffectively represented, which is particularly undesirable in a period of retrenchment. Recommendation 1 is intended to reduce the probability of ineffective representation. Recommendation 2 is to prevent larger units from losing representatives when the small units get their second representatives. Finally, recommendation 3, which was agreed to by the faculty governance organizations at Flint and Dearborn, is a response to the feeling that past (and potential future) growth of the regional campuses has cut (and may further cut) the representation of Ann Arbor units. It is a compromise between the status quo and proposals to stop regional campus representation altogether since these campuses have their own governance systems.

In reply to a question from Professor Kaplan, Professor Green said that the new rules, if adopted, would go into effect with the triennial reapportionment, which the Rules Committee is expected to bring to the Assembly next month.

Professor Blass pointed out that the second recommendation would require Regental approval, since the size of the Assembly is specified in the Regents' Bylaws.

Professor Nagy said that the first recommendation cuts the voting strength of the next-to-smallest schools, which would have no more representation than the smallest ones. Later, Professor Cooper suggested that a formula be found to increase the mid-sized schools representation also. Professor Kahn said that the Rules Committee's intent in formulating recommendation 1 was to assure all units of effective representation, not to increase the power of small schools. It hoped to keep the Assembly's size down. Professor Dahl agreed and noted that the Rules Committee had originally proposed, as its first choice, only recommendation 1.

Professors Moerman, Radine, Dahl, and Howe spoke against recommendation 3. Professor Moerman called it "disconcerting" and "hard

to swallow" and asked why Dearborn and Flint, rather than LSA and Engineering, should have artificial limits. Professor Radine called it "outrageous" and said that it would have a negative impact on faculty morale at the regional campuses by reinforcing the impression of second-class citizen treatment by Ann Arbor. He added that the regional campuses are no longer growing and that their representatives do not vote as a bloc. Professor Dahl agreed with the position taken by Dearborn's Faculty Advisory Committee on Collegiate Affairs that a limit on regional campus representation was acceptable but not particularly desirable. He said that it singles out Dearborn and Flint, perhaps unfairly, and he expressed the opinion that the growth of the regional campuses had slowed to the point where the limit would have no effect.

Professor Hilbert said that the system could be changed again before the next apportionment, and Professor Moerman suggested that consideration of recommendation 3 be postponed until then to avoid unnecessarily insulting people. Professor Green said that the Rules Committee had hoped to settle these matters last year, when the principles could be discussed without the specifics of this reapportionment. Professor Howe moved to delete recommendation 3. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried unanimously.

The amended motion, consisting of parts 1 and 2 of the original motion, was then put to a vote and carried unanimously.

REPORT ON STUDY OF UNIVERSITY TELECOMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

Samuel Plice, Director, Administrative Systems and Financial Analysis, reported on the study of the University's telecommunications system. The study was motivated by the need to provide telephone service for the new hospital and other new buildings, by the University's growing data transmission needs, and by recent regulatory and technological developments that make it practical for the University to acquire its own "third generation" switching equipment. A Voice Systems Task Force was set up to direct and monitor the project, an oversight committee was appointed to review the task force's findings and report to the executive officers, and the executive officers themselves have become actively involved in the project. Systems Telecommunications Corporation (STC) is serving as consultant.

The plan that has been developed is in fourteen phases, from June 1983 to early 1987, and covers the whole University including the hospital, the regional campuses, and connections to Detroit. The University will operate its own programmable switch and do its own billing. Other features of the system include least-cost routing of long-distance calls, mes-

saging, call accounting, forwarding, hold, transfer, conferencing, automatic call-back, call-waiting, and an automatic telephone directory generated by the switch. It will be a very flexible and responsive system, yet cheaper than today's; it is expected to pay for itself in about five years.

DISCUSSION

Professor Kaplan asked about the effect of the proposed changes on WATS service. Mr. Plice replied that we could probably get it, at lower cost, from other carriers, like MCI.

Professor Bulkley asked about the cost of the consultant and of the new equipment. Mr. Plice replied that STC is being paid \$450,000, and the new equipment will cost approximately \$28 million. In reply to a question from Professor Carter, Mr. Plice said that the projected savings are at least \$5 million per year for the next five years and that the system would last for 15 to 20 years, though we may want to replace the switch in about 10 years. In reply to a question from Professor Hilbert, he said that the \$28 million cost includes \$7 or 8 million for the telephone system of the new hospital.

Professor Nagy expressed concern that the twisted wires to be used in the new system will become obsolete as data transmission rates increase. Mr. Plice said that an effort is being made to minimize the number of junctions to permit faster transmission.

Professor Brown asked about localities not reached by MCI. Mr. Plice said that the number of these is decreasing and that MCI can "drop you off" at a nearby place from which the connection can be completed via AT&T. He added that the University will retain some AT&T service, for example, for international calls. Callers will not know which system their call is on.

Professor Nagy commented that AT&T is likely to become competitive with other carriers. Mr. Plice said that AT&T prices are decreasing but not to the level of the others. Professor Moerman said that the other services provided by AT&T (e.g., information) should be kept in mind; if other carriers offered these services, their prices would be as high as AT&T's.

Professor Janecke asked about links between the computing center and the main campus. Mr. Plice said that four broad band cables are being installed now, with more lines than we can use.

Professor Lindner remarked that AT&T has better voice transmission quality than other carriers; he asked whether voice transmission quality was being sacrificed to reduce costs. Mr. Plice agreed that voice transmission quality is a problem with MCI, but he said that much of the difficulty is due to poorer connections to the local loop and that this situation is expected to be remedied soon.

NEW BUSINESS

Professor Kaplan requested that the Assembly discuss the role of SARC in the grievance process. He would like to keep SARC in existence, to act as a watchdog for the new grievance procedures. Professor Hilbert said that SACUA will put the matter on the Assembly's agenda.

Professor Bassett said that the Regents' rejection of the guidelines for non-classified research does not mean that the reasons which led to the Assembly's approval of those guidelines have disappeared. The two principles, that of harmful research and whether it has a place at a university, and that of academic freedom and its essentiality to a university, have come into obvious conflict. In areas like research with human subjects and recombinant DNA research, where such conflicts arose in the past, wide discussions have led to generally accepted decisions. He therefore proposed that the University convene a major conference to deal with all significant aspects of the topics of (1) research a substantial purpose of which is to destroy or incapacitate human beings and (2) academic freedom. He requested that the Assembly direct SACUA to consider the advisability of this proposal and to bring to the Assembly, within a reasonable time, a recommendation for further consideration and action. Professor Hilbert said that SACUA would consider the proposal and report back to the Assembly.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Andreas Blass
Senate Secretary