

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting, December 15, 1980

ATTENDANCE

Present: Bacon, Barnard, Barritt, Berg, Bishop, D.B. Brown, D.R. Brown, K. Brown, M. Brown, Browne, Burdi, Cassidy, Dixon, Duderstadt, Flener, Friedman, Frost, Green, Ehrlich, Hildebrandt, Hinerman, Hollinger, Hultquist, Kelsey, Kirkpatrick, Koran, Liepman, Lynch-Sauer, Maassab, McClendon, Meyer, Millard, Mosher, Naylor, Parkinson, Pollock, Romani, Rowe, Senior, Sisman, Tek, Vinter, Weiner, Wynne.

Absent: Ackley, Baumgarten, Beck, Cares, Carpenter, Cohen, Crane, DeKornfeld, Eckert, Esteban, Rinne, Fraser, Gordon, Gray, Groves, Haddock, Hilbert, Holland, Cooper, Loup, Lynch, Nagy, Nisbett, O'Meara, Powers, Root, Rush, Verhey, White, Wyers.

MINUTES

The minutes of the Senate Assembly meeting of November 17, 1980 were approved as written.

ANNOUNCE-  
MENTS

There were no announcements.

REPORT  
OF THE  
COMMIT-  
TEE TO  
EVALU-  
ATE THE  
DIVISION  
OF  
RESEARCH  
DEVELOP-  
MENT AND  
ADMINIS-  
TRATION -  
RAYMOND  
H. KAHN

Chairman Naylor introduced Professor Raymond H. Kahn, chairman of the DRDA Review Committee. Professor Naylor commented that the Committee's report has been presented to President Shapiro, and that the report has taken on added significance since President Shapiro has stated that he is looking upon the report as a springboard for ongoing discussions of the research climate at the University.

The report, Review of the Division of Research Development and Administration: A Report to Dr. Harold T. Shapiro, President, The University of Michigan (Revised September 22, 1980) was distributed to the members of the Assembly.

Professor Kahn explained that the process of the Committee was one of trying to understand DRDA, not one of trying to make a significant quantitative review of reaction to that organization. He explained that the nineteen recommendations contained in the report were summarized under four general headings:

1. Administration of DRDA.
2. Funding of DRDA.
3. Publications of DRDA.
4. Other (Federal Fund Relationships and Indirect Costs).

Concerning the administration of DRDA, Professor Kahn said that the Committee felt that based on the presence of five senior project representatives, there was a tremendous investment with little back-up. He said that DRDA is responsible, in the business sense, for the administration of over 100 million dollars in funds. He emphasized the word business, stating that the representatives are not resource people for research activities. The Committee therefore recommended that a new arrangement be formed to provide the necessary back-up and provide the training ground for senior project representatives.

Professor Kahn said that the Committee did not agree with some members of the faculty who favored decentralization. They did not believe that the business-oriented representatives could effectively go out to individual units and interpret the diversity of knowledge within the University. To provide decentralization of some DRDA developmental functions, the Committee recommended the inclusion and strengthening of the role of the department/unit administrator in the DRDA process (Report Recommendation #8).

In the area of funding, Professor Kahn said that the Committee felt that those funds available should be widely publicized, including travel funds, to bring faculty and sponsors together. Another area for making the faculty more knowledgeable about faculty research interests and potential sponsors is SCRIPT, or the development of a similar computer-based system for sharing computer-stored information about faculty and investigator research interests (Report Recommendations #9, 10 and 11).

Professor Kahn said that the Committee believes that the University should take a much more aggressive approach to patents. Committee members feel that the faculty does not understand patents as incentives or how faculty members share in the royalties. Therefore, the Committee recommended that the current patent policy be publicized further (Report Recommendation #12).

Concerning publications, Professor Kahn reported that the Committee felt that some savings could be obtained by combining the Reporter and the DRDA columns in the University Record into one publication. The Committee also recommended that the Research News be eliminated as a publication of DRDA, not because it is not a creditable publication, but because it does not fulfill the objectives of DRDA (Report Recommendation #14 and 15).

On the subject of Federal Fund accounting, Professor Kahn indicated that the Committee found serious problems in this area. It seems that accountants move through Federal Fund accounting as a training ground for General Fund accounting, and therefore Federal Fund accounting does not receive the kind of support it should have. The Committee recommended that this area be reviewed and efforts be made to make the accounting more efficient (Report Recommendation #16).

The problem of indirect costs was addressed by the Committee. Professor Kahn explained that confusion concerning these costs is common at all research institutions, and that the Committee recommended that the Vice President for Research, and Deans and Directors publicize detailed information about the indirect cost recovery from sponsors (Report Recommendation #17).

Professor Kahn concluded his remarks by listing various committees that have already received a presentation on the report. He then welcomed the Assembly members to make comments or ask questions about the report.

Professor Hildebrandt said that he had been hopeful that the report would recommend more ways in which individual faculty members could get help from DRDA. He thought that he could be helped more under the recommendations #'s 7,8 and 9 except for the lack of support for decentralization. He asked Professor Kahn to provide more arguments against decentralization of DRDA.

Professor Kahn said that the Committee recognized that there were going to be attempts to look at research incentives in general (not just as they pertain to DRDA). The Committee addressed the issue of research incentives almost as an afterthought when it came to the Committee's attention from President Shapiro late in the deliberations.

Concerning decentralization of DRDA, Professor Kahn said that when dealing with a large number of agencies for such a diversified research institution as ours, it is not reasonable to expect business-oriented project representatives, without technical expertise, to be able to aid researchers over a broad range of disciplines. He added that the best way to bring technology together with administration is with an individual within a department (i.e., an administrator or even the chairperson) who has had previous experience in sponsored research in that discipline and is knowledgeable about possible sponsors.

Professor Duderstadt asked if the Committee had an opportunity to explore the interface between DRDA and the Office of the Vice President for Research, particularly in regard to definition of responsibilities versus development, administration, etc.? Professor Kahn said that the Committee addressed the issue, and that it is clear that there is a close relationship between DRDA and Vice President Overberger's office. He said that ties between the two should be strengthened, and that he believes that Vice President Overberger agrees with this objective. (See page 25 of Report).

Professor Duderstadt then asked if there will be an attempt to make more precise the definition of the development effort, for example, where does one go to obtain "seed money" or travel funds - DRDA or Dr. Overberger's office? Professor Kahn reiterated the

Committee's recommendation to make the availability and amount of such money more visible through wide publicity.

Professor Donald Brown asked what rationale the Committee used to discover that DRDA was in fact not under Vice President Overberger? Professor Kahn said that indeed it is directly under him, but the question was, how well does that relationship function? The answer is that it is functioning well, but could use some strengthening.

Professor Friedman brought up the subject of patents, referring to Recommendation #12, and asked Professor Kahn to review the current patent policy. Professor Kahn replied that the Assembly would have to invite Dr. Overberger to address this issue as there is some disagreement between him and the Committee. He said that the Committee believed strongly that the faculty should play a more aggressive role in using patents as incentives in research.

Professor Friedman then asked if there is a danger in going too far in the direction of using patents as incentives. Professor Kahn said that, speaking for himself, he felt that patents could be used to our advantage without compromising academic freedom and mentioned several examples where universities have done so successfully.

Professor Pollock returned to the issue of centralization versus decentralization and said that he felt that DRDA project representatives would have little incentive (organizationally) to help him, whereas a representative associated with his unit would have a tremendous incentive to help. Professor Kahn said that placing DRDA representatives in among units would dramatically increase the number of employees.

Professor Pollock and Professor Kahn then exchanged views about the issue of indirect cost and DRDA. Professor Kahn pointed out that indirect cost is a major contributor to the General Fund - it does not go to DRDA.

Professor Pollock was still confused about the fact that there are two different roles of DRDA, research exploration, counseling etc, and administration. He felt that these roles must be brought together - in a decentralized manner. Professor Kahn agreed that the counseling aspect ought to be decentralized and that people already exist within units and departments who can do this. He said that there should be some form of formalized relationship between these decentralized people and DRDA so that the expertise can flow both ways.

Professor Vinter asked what financial support incentives are available to units to continue to strengthen DRDA-like roles. Professor Kahn responded by saying that there is obviously a cost, and the Committee recommended that the cost be recognized and that some support be made at the department level to fulfill that cost.

Professor Weiner said that he feels that certain policies inhibit rather than foster interdisciplinary research. As an example, he mentioned the situation where two units cooperate equally in preparing a research proposal, but the decision about from which unit the grant proposal should originate is based on which unit has the best chance of being awarded funding. This leads to pressure on the unit that is not getting its "fair share of credit". Attempts to solve this problem have been extremely difficult if not impossible. Professor Kahn recognized this situation and shared Professor Weiner's concern, but did not have an answer to the problem.

Professor Duderstadt commented on funding support for in-unit research development and noted that such funds are not earmarked for that purpose but just included in the unit budget. He also brought up the issue of the accountability of DRDA effort and other University support agencies. He felt that one of the motivations behind decentralization is to, in some way, reestablish some kind of accountability so that you actually get the services you pay for.

Professor Kahn agreed, but felt these were two separate issues here - the new issue being the decentralization of different functions (i.e., purchasing, personnel and Federal Fund accounting). He said that this disparity is being addressed.

Professor Kahn also noted what is commonly believed by faculty members that Federal Fund accounting is a unit of DRDA - which it is not.

Professor Morton Brown asked if Professor Kahn felt that it might be beneficial for both DRDA and the faculty to have a more regularized form of input from the faculty to DRDA. Professor Kahn explained that there is some faculty input at this time.

Professor Kahn thanked the Assembly for its attention and Chairman Naylor thanked Professor Kahn for his presentation.

REDIRECT-  
ION OF  
THE  
UNIVER-  
SITY: AN  
ANALYSIS  
OF THE  
DATA -  
PROFESSOR  
ARCH W.  
NAYLOR

Chairman Naylor introduced the subject by reminding the Assembly that our main concern this year is to have an informed public debate on the issue of redirection of the University. He said that SACUA and the Assembly have been working all semester to provide information affecting redirection through speakers and compiled data. The goal is to begin the debate on the subject at the January, 1981 meeting of the Assembly. As a basis for discussing redirection, a "working paper" has been prepared which contains difficult-to-find facts about the University which should aid in providing an informed debate on the subject.

Professor Naylor stressed the point that the "working paper" is not a SACUA position paper, it is not a plan - it is only part of

the background information needed to provide meaningful debate at the January Assembly meeting.

The chairman then proceeded to describe highlights of the "working paper" with the use of projected illustrations. Following an explanation of fifteen tables and figures from the "working paper", Professor Naylor explained to the Assembly that SACUA has developed two proposals (motions) that will provide the basis for the debate on redirection. These proposals will be included in the member's packet for the January 19, 1981 meeting of the Assembly.

In addition to our debate on redirection, Professor Naylor reminded the Assembly that Vice President Frye will speak on the subject at the February meeting. Dr. Gerald Miller, Director of the Department of Management and Budget for the State, will speak in March, and President Shapiro has been invited to address the Assembly in April, 1981.

The chairman concluded his remarks by saying that it is becoming apparent that the Regents' Program Discontinuance Guidelines are becoming very important and advised the members to review them.

He then reminded the Assembly that the University is currently under crisis management, and that we should not confuse the steps that are taken in the next few years with what we consider the long-term redirection of the University.

Professor Barritt expressed his concern that six months after President Shapiro's address to the Assembly on the subject of redirection, there has been no Assembly debate on the issue. After reading the "working paper" he was prepared to discuss it - along with a few other members at this meeting and give SACUA some input how to improve the document in order to make a reasonable decision. He was also surprised that SACUA had met with the Regents without having discussed the paper with the Assembly.

Another concern of Professor Barritt was that we should examine options for redirection other than "a smaller University with a better paid faculty and staff". He said that he is convinced that that is not the only viable option. He mentioned the option of "shared poverty" and discussed the issue of reducing the costs of administration.

Chairman Naylor responded by reviewing what SACUA has done on the subject of redirection since the June, 1980 Assembly meeting and that the planned and publicized time-table has been followed.

He reiterated the fact that the "working paper" is only a document of basic information to form a basis for an informed debate on redirection.

Concerning administrative costs, Professor Naylor noted that the Spivey Report offered data from an investigation of that issue which showed that over a ten-year period, administrative costs, (as a fraction of the General Fund), had changed very little.

Professor Weiner felt that there was a danger in the type of data in the "working paper" in that there were certain assumptions. The danger is that eventually the assumptions become believable and they might not be correct.

Professor Hildebrandt commented that he was comfortable with the procedures that SACUA was following on the issue of redirection. He was also sympathetic with the divergent views and felt that these views could possibly be represented in a final document that may issue from the Assembly.

NOMINA-  
TIONS  
AND  
APPOINT-  
MENTS

C. William Colburn, Associate Professor of Communication, will replace Bernard W. Klein on the State Relations Committee. James E. Crowfoot will succeed himself on the Board of Directors of the University Cellar for a three-year term.

REPORT  
OF  
SENATE  
ASSEMBLY  
RULES  
COMMIT-  
TEE -  
JOSEPH  
L.  
ULLMAN

Referring to a document from the Rules Committee, "Recommendations for Apportionment Changes", November 20, 1980, that was distributed to the Assembly members, Professor Ullman asked if there were any questions concerning #1, "Apportionment of Assembly Members among Senate units", the only item to be acted upon at this meeting.

Professor Romani expressed his concern that the representation of members from the Dearborn (5) and Flint (3) campuses was high considering that both campuses have their own legislative bodies. He referred to the second recommendation, which would fix the number of Assembly representatives at 3 for Dearborn and 2 for Flint beginning in 1984.

Because the second recommendation was not previously publicized, both Chairman Naylor and Professor Hildebrandt felt that approving the new allocation (1981-84) for Dearborn and Flint was a courtesy to these campuses.

After some discussion on Assembly Rules and parliamentary procedure concerning the issue, Professor Romani made the following motion:

"That at the February, 1981 meeting of the Senate Assembly, the Assembly members examine the recommendations by the Senate Rules Committee that there be a fixed number of Senate Assembly representatives from

the Dearborn and Flint campuses".

Professor Romani upon the request of the Chairman agreed to accept the guarantee that SACUA would bring the matter before the Assembly as described in the motion.

NEW  
BUSINESS

Professor Barritt expressed his concern about the plight of annuitants and felt that SACUA should have an annuitant as a member.

He moved that:

"An annuitant be added to the membership of SACUA".

After discussion by parliamentarian Hildebrandt and Chairman Naylor, who noted that SACUA membership is established by the Board of Regents, Professor Romani noted that discussion on the motion was out of order as there had been no second. Chairman Naylor called for support. There was none.

OLD  
BUSINESS

There was no old business.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

Charles C. Kelsey  
Senate Secretary