

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting of 17 December 1984

ATTENDANCE

Present: Aberbach, Ascione, Bailey, Bassett, Beutler, Briggs, Bulkley, Burdi, Catford, Chudacoff, Cohen, Courant, Danielson, Easley, English, Green, Hanks, Hilbert, Hopwood, Howe, Jacobs, Janecke, Kalisch, Kaplan, Kelsey, Kusnerz, Larson, Lehmann, Leonard, Lougee, Loup, Lusk, McClamroch, Mermier, Moerman, Mosher, Nadelman, Powell, Radine, Reed, Rutledge, Sanders, Schteingart, Sears, Stapp, Stebbins, Warschausky, Whitehouse, Zweifler, Yocum

Absent: Barald, Boyd, Burt, Dahlke, King, Eschman, Farley, Fellin, Glover, Grosse, Gulari, Herbert, Kahn, Knudsvig, Lawrence, Lockwood, Lorey, Ludema, Luther, Margolis, Meyer, Payne, Rae, Robinson, Rucknagel, Schauer, Scheele, Simon, Snyder, Solomon, Lewis, Borders

CALL TO ORDER

Professor Hilbert convened the meeting at 3:20 p.m.

MINUTES

The minutes of 19 November 1984 were approved as written.

REMARKS BY CHAIR

1. Faculty who tax defer more than the standard 5% will now need to sign forms by January 1 each year. SACUA has recommended that the Office of Staff Benefits notify affected individuals directly.
2. As a result of a request voiced at the November meeting to keep members informed of major issues prior to their discussion at Senate Assembly meetings, SACUA is attempting to develop agendas farther in advance. Upcoming topics include Health Care Benefits (January) and undergraduate education (February).

3. The University Relations Committee is sending a letter to all faculty this week regarding the Campaign for Michigan. Advance copies were distributed to Assembly members.

ELECTION OF SACUA NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Ballots for the election of the SACUA Nominating Committee members were distributed. Members elected were Alphonse Burdi, Jonathan Bulkley, Morton Hilbert, Wilfred Kaplan, Donald Rucknagel, and Frank Whitehouse. Alternates are Kate Barald, Lee Danielson and Janet Lawrence. Professor Hilbert asked that each person signify his/her availability for the committee as soon as possible.

PROPOSAL FOR A NAME CHANGE FOR THE STATE RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Because the Regents recently changed the name of the Office of Vice President for State Relations to the Office of Vice President for Government Relations, the State Relations Committee has proposed that its name be changed accordingly. Bailey moved, Lehmann seconded, the motion which passed without objection.

RECOMMENDATION FROM THE RULES COMMITTEE REGARDING SENATE ASSEMBLY REPRESENTATION FOR THE DIVISION OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION

The Committee has recommended that the Senate Assembly not be reapportioned until its regularly scheduled time two years hence, that membership be raised temporarily from 72 to 73 members and that the additional seat be assigned to the Division of Physical Education. In the near future the Senate Assembly would also consider requesting a change in Regents' Bylaw 4.03 to delete the specification of Senate Assembly size and instead confine that specification to Senate Assembly Rules.

Professor Warschusky asked for a clarification of the "exceptional history and anomalous position of the Division of Physical Education." Professor Briggs and Hilbert volunteered that over several years the unit had been moved administratively and that "divisions", as provided in Regents' Bylaws have historically not been considered schools and colleges, the units upon which Assembly representation is based.

Professor Lehmann moved, Professor Bailey seconded, adoption of the motion which passed without objection.

OVERVIEW OF THE NEW TELECOMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

Renee Frost, Systems Development Coordinator, and Stewart Robinovitz, Systems Project Coordinator, provided progress reports on the development of

the new system. Ms. Frost noted that the contract with Centel Business Systems of Chicago would provide not only a new telephone system but also add capacity for voice and data communication. Everyone on campus will be affected by the new system. In an attempt to inform the campus of developments, the Office of Administrative Systems publishes a newsletter, Communication Lines, every six weeks. Faculty members can add their names to the mailing list by contacting the office. Also, the slide show which Ms. Frost subsequently showed, will be available for viewing by anyone after January 1, 1985.

All Deans and Directors have been asked to name a coordinator in their units to help determine needs, schedule hands-on training and keep current on developments. The new telephone instruments will be touch-tone, single line sets which will also be amenable to routing through a receptionist. Development of the telecommunications system is still in the planning phase and with some questions remaining to be addressed.

Mr. Robinovitz reported on the technical aspects of the system which will use digital microwaves to link the three campuses (Ann Arbor, Dearborn, Flint), fiber optics to link the North, Central, Medical and Athletic campuses in Ann Arbor and coaxial cables to connect all buildings on the Ann Arbor Campus. Each building will house a communications room, usually in the basement. From there, wires will run to a phone closet on each floor and then to each phone jack. The wiring plant will remain in place and useable even if the University subsequently switches to a different communications system (e.g., Bell Telephone). For data transmission typical uses could include:

- o Terminals or PC's to UMnet SCP
- o Access to MTS or other UMnet resources & LAN junctions
- o Terminals or PC's to DSC Protocol Converter

There will also be capacity, on a selective basis, for video transmission but specifics remain to be worked out.

Referring to a statement made in the slide show that the new system would provide better quality transmission, Professor Stebbins asked if that includes acoustic transmission. Ms. Frost replied that that is the hope. Present telephone wiring is often very old; virtually all wiring is being replaced throughout campus. Mr. Robinovitz noted that while the University can't control the quality of other systems (e.g., MCI, Sprint) it will be able to monitor vendor performance and advise users of its strengths and weaknesses. In effect the University will have a local phone company which should be able to diagnose, pinpoint and resolve trouble spots, thereby providing good service. He also stated that there would be phones for the hearing impaired.

In response to a question on costs to individual units, Ms. Frost replied

that the office is presently working on an analysis and a number of factors are involved. Initial results suggest that prices will be similar to those in the past but that more features will be provided. Long distance rates, however, are expected to decrease as the equipment will choose automatically the "least cost" route available; the user nonetheless retains the capacity to choose a "higher cost" route. Mr. Robinovitz added that the use of voice lines for data transmission is rising. Costs could be reduced if data transmission lines were used instead.

Professor Janecke noted that electronic interference caused problems in the Dennison Building laboratories and asked that no more antennas be installed atop the building. Acknowledging awareness of the problems, Mr. Robinovitz reported that the new technology should be less prone to creating interference.

Professor Bailey asked what assurances there were that the new system would be more efficient than are AT&T and Bell. Mr. Robinovitz replied that there could be no such assurance. Rather, the University's goal is to provide a good system at a cost lower than a vended system. The existence of the external systems should provide pressure to keep performance of the University's system high.

Referring to the \$31.8 million contract, Professor Bulkley asked what it purchases, whether or not that included all the features mentioned today, and if there would be additional contracts in the future. Ms. Frost believed that the contract included all the components discussed today, reiterated that it would replace present telephone instruments with new ones, and provide some enrichments especially for data transmission. Additional instruments, jacks, etc., however, are not included in the contract.

Professor Lehmann asked if personnel costs were in addition to the \$31.8 million. Ms. Frost said they are and the estimate is available separately. Professor Larson asked if video transmission will be universal or restricted to selected buildings. Mr. Robinovitz explained that while the coaxial cables will run to every building, the decision to extend them into a given building is separate and could result in additional costs. Some sets of buildings already have capacity for video communication, e.g., Dow and West Engineering, and the new and old TV studios.

In response to Professor Lusk's question, Ms. Frost reported that the installation of the wiring will be done by groups of buildings beginning in January 1985 and continuing throughout the year. There will be only two "switch overs": one for the Medical Campus and one for the rest of the Ann Arbor Campus.

Professor Bailey asked for an elaboration on how the University could

structure contracts with providers to capture new technology and avoid technology which shortly becomes obsolete. Mr. Robinovitz replied that the search for the proper vendor includes this criterion and that because of its growing reputation in the communications field, the U of M is being sought out by manufacturers. Future benefits in this regard could be significant and include industrially co-sponsored research, price reductions, or equipment contributions from manufacturers.

Professor Sanders observed that companies are vulnerable to take-over and merger, and that such changes could affect system performance. Mr. Robinovitz acknowledged that this can happen and that the attendant issues required discussion at a level higher.

Noting that the effect on cost-savings could be enormous, Professor Cohen asked if the new system would permit video conference calls. Mr. Robinovitz stated that the possibility exists for the future but is not included in the present proposal.

#### GUIDELINES FOR PROCEDURES FOR INVESTIGATING ALLEGATIONS OF FRAUDS IN RESEARCH

Professor Bailey began the discussion by noting that SACUA would like the principles articulated to be considered by schools and colleges as they develop procedures and that the Senate Assembly considers these principles to be important but not exhaustive. Referring to paragraph 11, Professor Chudacoff appreciated the clarification on the limits of the role of the appellate body but observed that the appellate body did not appear to be intrinsically more qualified to judge on the substance of a complaint than is the initial review body. Professor Moerman asked if Professor Chudacoff was suggesting there be only one rather than two reviews on substantive grounds. Professor Chudacoff replied that his concern was to identify the end-point of review. As presently provided, a case could receive two different outcomes. Professor Moerman noted that it seemed reasonable to have a case considered more than once. Should a split decision result, it is unclear what the next step should be. This would be a matter that schools and colleges will need to consider. Professor Briggs noted that CLB wanted to assure the right of appeal while Professor Moerman added that SACUA emphasized this right in its addendum to the CLB Guidelines. Professor Chudacoff replied that the thrust of his concern was with the qualifications of the second group to judge the substance of the case.

Professor Kaplan agreed with SACUA's initial idea to provide a model for the guidelines and suggested it would be helpful if one unit did so. Results could then be reviewed and adapted by other units. Professor Green reported that the Medical School had already developed a procedure. Its usefulness as a model would be left to the judgment of other schools and colleges.

Professor Bailey moved, Professor Stebbins seconded, the motion to adopt the two documents in principle. Motion passed. Professor Lehmann asked SACUA to extend the Assembly's appreciation to Professor Gold and his committee for their thoughtful work and writing on the matter.

#### OLD BUSINESS

1. Professor Bulkley commended SACUA for pursuing articulation of the criteria used to evaluate units under review at the U of M. The pursuit needs to be done to the highest level and the results distributed widely.

2. With respect to Professor Steneck's committee, Professor Leonard observed that the work was creative but left some matters unresolved. To sensitize the Senate Assembly to variations in the University, Assembly documents should include parallel wording. For example, future documents should define or at least indicate that in some schools creative arts are equivalent to research. Professor Hilbert stated that SACUA will take these comments into consideration.

#### NEW BUSINESS

1. Professor Lusk stated that a number of Nursing faculty travel to clinical locations as part of their duties. They have recently learned that effective December, travel reimbursements for use of personal cars has been revised downward. Were any Senate Assembly committees or sub-committees consulted about this change? Professor Easley replied that the announcement came as a surprise and that CESF was not consulted. Professor Green reported that Financial Affairs was not consulted either. Professor Briggs noted that the current IRS rule states that the University must issue W-2 forms to cover payments in excess of the allowance as income and that individuals still need to report payment when filing their income tax returns. Professor Green will raise the matter with the Financial Affairs Committee at its next meeting.

2. Professor Sanders asked if any questions have been raised with the Administration regarding HMO's and notification to CESF. Professor Easley reported that CESF heard about the proposed HMO's during summer 1984 and began work on the subject. Professor McClamroch noted that while there has apparently been much discussion of HMO's in various staff benefits offices, there has been no formal presentation to the Executive Officers or the Regents. The matter came to the faculty's attention late and without much material. Professor Hilbert reported that SACUA has not yet been asked to comment on the program and has placed HMO's on the January Senate Assembly agenda. Professor Reed stated that HMO's are a recent example of a lag in information about developments affecting the faculty. CESF has discussed these delays with Mr. Thiry and will continue to do so. Professor Green voiced concern over the slowness in distributing information regarding changes


Senate Assembly Minutes of 12/17/84  
Page Seven

in general University policy and will raise the question in the Financial Affairs Committee.

ADJOURNMENT

Professor Hilbert wished all a Happy Holiday and a joyous and prosperous New Year. The meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Patricia B. Yocum  
Acting Senate Secretary