

Minutes of 24 August 2015 SACUA  
Circulated 30 August 2015  
Re-circulated 4 October 2015  
Approved 5 October 2015

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN  
Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA)  
6048 Fleming Administration Building  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1340  
Phone: (734) 764-0303

**Present:** Fagerlin, Mondro, Schultz, Smith, Szymanski, Weineck (chair), Wright, Ziff, Potter, Schneider, Snyder

**Absent:** Lehman

**Guests:** none

3:15 Call to Order/ Approval of Agenda and Minutes

3:15 The meeting was called to order

3:15 Approval of the minutes will be done by e-mail

3:16 Agenda approved

3:20 Announcements

The Provost has requested that Faculty Senate approve the Provost's letter that students representing the University should be allowed to compete.

Professor Schultz pointed out that the letter should include reference to the maximum class excused absences expectations

3:21 SACUA approved the endorsement on behalf of the Faculty Senate

In September Chair Weineck and Professor Schultz will attend the CIC meeting at the University of Illinois Urbana Champaign

3:25 Status Reports

- Model and unit grievance procedures and ongoing grievances  
Nothing new
- Office for Institutional Equity procedures  
Nothing new
- Professional Standards for Faculty SPG  
Nothing new
- Unit deviations from University-wide policies and procedures  
Nothing new
- Total compensation propriety and transparency  
Nothing new
- Administrative Services and IT Rationalization, implementation and oversight

Minutes of 24 August 2015 SACUA  
Circulated 30 August 2015  
Re-circulated 4 October 2015  
Approved 5 October 2015

Nothing new

- Regents Faculty Governance Update

Nothing new

### 3:30 Priority Issues and President Schlissel's suggestions

Professor Schultz introduced discussion of President Schlissel's suggestions:

#### 1. Challenges of interdisciplinary tenure.

The President does not feel that there is enough cooperation between schools; Chair Weineck noted that younger scholars might not be well served by equal demands placed on them by two units. We will ask Deans for data on tenure denials. Professor Smith asked about the location of appointments (the difference between dry appointments and budgeted appointments). We should also look at job satisfaction of people with joint appointments; Professor Fagerlin suggested that there should be a survey of the experience of people with joint appointments. Chair Weineck will ask ADVANCE for data on job satisfaction. Professor Szymanski suggested that we should ask Deans about the proportion of faculty with joint appointments in their units. Professor Schultz noted that the Research Policy Committee wrote a letter of concern about the program to make new interdisciplinary hires, and discussed the challenge of intra-college teaching assignments. There is no business model for getting the proper budget for shared assignments, and research is easier to arrange to the teaching. Chair Weineck asked how SACUA can play a role in advancing discussion of these subjects, and suggested that SACUA could perhaps have a more interactive web page. Professor Schultz noted that there is not a University policy concerning people who are denied tenure in one unit and not the other in which they hold an appointment. The Provost is leery of issuing regulations in these cases if they could bind her hands.

Professor Smith suggested that we develop data on percentage of people with budgeted joint appointments. Professor Szymanski noted that we should look for mechanisms for improving interdisciplinary teaching. He asked if this was the best mechanism for promoting interdisciplinary scholarship. Chair Weineck observed that interdisciplinary appointments are good for the intellectual climate in the humanities, but can lead to administrative difficulties. Professor Schultz notes outside funding sources stress interdisciplinary collaborations. Professor Smith notes that the NCRC combines people who have 100% lines in specific fields. We should gather data to guide best practices.

#### 2. Public values engagement and high-level discourse.

We could put out a statement about the value of public engagement. Professor Szymanski suggested that we should do a survey to see what faculty thinks about the issue. Professor Mondro suggested that we should look to getting information from the executive committees in different units. Chair Weineck noted that there are disciplinary differences in defining national visibility. Professor Mondro asked how working in the community was weighed against going to conferences. Chair Weineck noted that the status of social media expressions was ill defined, as evidenced by the Salaita case at UIUC. Professor Fagerlin noted that we could refer this to the Tenure Committee as tweets can have a significant impact on public awareness of academic issues. It was also suggested that the AAAC could take this up. Professor Wright noted that what is defined as public engagement is expanding, from blogging, expert witnessing, tweeting,

composing Op Ed pieces etc. Professor Szymanski noted that this is about borderlines. Professor Wright noted that being an expert witness can hurt or be perceived to hurt one's scholarship, as it takes up time. Professor Szymanski asked what we should tell untenured faculty about how they should spend their time? Professor Mondro noted that in the Arts, the distribution of work is changing. She said that it had to do with exhibitions, performances, visiting artist presentation events and other activities that indicate that professional expectations for distribution are moving beyond traditional modes of exhibition. Professor Smith asked about the importance of external letters in tenure cases as a guide to the acceptability of non-traditional forms of public communication in building an academic profile, noting that the external letters are often decisive. Evolving disciplinary standards in this regard will influence the composition of dossiers sent to external reviewers. Chair Weineck said that SACUA could encourage all units to develop specific policies. Professor Smith observed that people might be unwilling to articulate strict rules. Professor Fagerlin asked how often units review their tenure requirements. Professor Smith noted that such discussions are regular in Pharmacy. Professor Wright observed that there were two ways to look at things, one is as part of the promotion policy, the other way is to use it as corroborating evidence for quality. Professor Smith agreed that the indirect effect is very important. The AAAC will be asked to discuss the issue.

3. Inclusiveness in the classroom (recognizing the needs of student athletes)
4. Faculty to play a special role in sexual assault/harassment issue
5. Reversal of negative tenure decisions

### 3:59 Professional Standards SPG 201.96

Chair Weineck asked if there were issues that could be included in the professional standards SPG beyond the bullying provisions in Section II that do not violate academic freedom? Professor Wright noted that Section I governs behavior outside the University community, while Section II deals with conduct within the community. Professor Potter raised the issue of people attacking their colleagues on social media. Professors Weineck and Fagerlin noted that this was unacceptable as a form of cyber bullying. Professor Smith noted that there were issues about freedom of speech not considered politically correct in University settings. Professor Szymanski feels that faculty have a collective responsibility to exhibit good behaviors. Chair Weineck noted that there are ethical expectations but the University should not be able to punish people for non-criminal behaviors outside the University that do not affect community members, even if they are distasteful. Professor Smith asked what is turpitudinous behavior that would lead to sanction, noting that what people do in their personal lives should not be sanctioned by their employer. We would like a policy that is restricted to behavior within the University community and professional lives.

### 4:10 March Faculty Governance Conference Planning

Deferred to the next meeting

4:30 Executive Session

Personal matters discussed

5:03 Executive session ended

4:55 Unfinished Business/Matters Arising

5:03 Adjournment

Next SACUA Meeting: September 14, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

David S. Potter

Interim Senate Secretary

University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents, Sec. 5.02:

Governing Bodies in Schools and Colleges

Sec. 4.01 The University Senate

"...[t]he Senate is authorized to consider any subject pertaining to the interests of the university, and to make recommendations to the Board of Regents in regard thereto. Decisions of the University Senate with respect to matters within its jurisdiction shall constitute the binding action of the university faculties. Jurisdiction over academic polices shall reside in the faculties of the various schools and colleges, but insofar as actions by the several faculties affect university policy as a whole, or schools and colleges other than the one in which they originate, they shall be brought before the University Senate."

Rules of the University Senate, the Senate Assembly and the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs:

Senate: "In all cases not covered by rules adopted by the Senate, the procedure in Robert's Rules of Order shall be followed."

Assembly: "The Assembly may adopt rules for the transaction of its business. In appropriate cases not covered by rules of the Assembly, the rules of the University Senate shall apply."

SACUA: "The committee may adopt rules for the transaction of its business."