

Minutes of 17 April 2017
Circulated 18 September 2017
Approved 18 September 2017

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SENATE ASSEMBLY MEETING
April 17, 2017
Monday, 3:15 pm
Forum Hall, Palmer Commons

Present: Alam, Atzmon, Azizi, Beatty, Bertacco, Broglio, Casida, Cohn, Dolins, Djuric, Ellis, Erikson, Friesen, Gaggio, Jacobsen, Jones, Kaartinen, Kileny, Krivokapic, Kupferschmid, Larson, Lehman, Lenk, Likosky, Liu, Malek, McInnis, Ortega, Pecina, Sanchez, Schmidt, Schultz, Schwank, Skolarus, Smith, Wright.

Alternate Requested: Aidala (LSA), Bhattacharyya (Business), Beck (LSA), Bruch (LSA), Carlos (Medicine), Eaton (Medicine), Gallo (LSA), Whiting (STMD), Zeisberg (LSA), Zimmerman (Taubman)

Alternates: Lusman (STMD), Stoddard (Nursing), Bishop (STMD)

Absent: Bagley, Cattaneo, Chatterjee, Chen, Mortenson, Freeman, Ghaferi, Gocek, Greve, Keshamouni, Li, Lyman, Menon, Mondro, Moss, Noll, Orady, Princen, Roddier, Shaefer L Smith, Szymanski, Veatch, Vinkur, Wang, Weineck, Welsh, Woodard

3:00 Meet and Greet and Eat

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

Chair Schultz called the meeting to order. He asked the Assembly to revise the agenda so that the two resolutions will follow the presentation by Professors Armstrong and Curzan. The revised agenda was approved.

The minutes for March 17 were approved.

3:20 Athletics Guests: Professor Ketra Armstrong Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR), Professor Anne Curzan (former FAR)

Professor Armstrong discussed the duties of the FAR, which are related to ensuring the academic integrity of the athletic enterprise, and the wellbeing of student athletes. Professors Armstrong and Curzan presented the report of the Academic Performance Committee (APC) (attached). Professor Curzan stressed the diversity of the student athlete population, and Professor Armstrong called

attention to the diversity of the academic programs that student athletes pursue, as well as their success. She pointed to section B of the report where academic achievements are catalogued.

A Senate Assembly member asked about the national ranking of the Athletic Department in terms of academic success (top 1%). Professor Curzan also noted the high ranking was a result both of the number of student athletes (which has increased through the addition of men and women's lacrosse), and of their success. Professor Armstrong added that coaches are concerned about the academic success of their student athletes, they recruit good students, and the athletic department provides excellent academic to student athletes.

A Senate Assembly member asked whether the academic success of the athletic department was sustainable is the success. Professor Armstrong replied that the University has made significant efforts to create a sustainable system.

Professor Curzan discussed overall achievement by student athletes, pointing out that their careers track those of students generally—that the first year is often a period of adjustment, followed by increasing success. In some categories student athletes do a bit better than members of the student population (e.g. they attend class a bit more regularly because teams track attendance). Chair Schultz pointed out that student athlete GPAs track those of the overall student population.

Professor Ortega asked about areas where there were special challenges. Professor Armstrong singled out the transition to college and self-management, especially time management. She has stressed the importance of building relationships with faculty members to student athletes they stress the importance to create relationships with faculty to counteract stereotypes some faculty may have about student athletes. She also stressed the importance of making use of available resources pointing out that, in addition to the facilities on central campus, the Academic Support Program (ASP) provides both academic coaches who teach them study skills and subject tutors. Professor Curzan said that the ASP works with student athletes to ensure they take advantage of services on campus, with which the ASP has been very good at building links, as well as its own services.

Chair Schultz asked if the Athletic Department had special concerns about the mental health of student athletes. Professor Armstrong, replied that athletes come with a very strong mental constitution, but the department provides confidential services to make sure that student athletes get good help when they need it. Professor Curzan discussed the 2016 Mock Rock program, which was dedicated last year to mental health issues for student athletes. She added that the Athletic Department is concerned to make mental health a topic that can be discussed safely in the community.

A Senate Assembly member asked about efforts to track student success after graduation. Professor Armstrong said that the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) has a program to track former student athletes; Professor Curzan added that the Athletics Department has better links with its alumni than the university as a whole.

A Senate Assembly Member asked for an explanation of the Academic Progress Rate (APR). Professor Armstrong said APR is based on 2 metrics for student athletes receiving athletically related financial aid, retention and eligibility. The score is computed by assessing 2 points for each athlete (1 for being enrolled, 1 for being eligible). A team's total points are divided by the points possible and then multiplied by 1000 to equal the team's APR score (a team with 20 student athletes, all of who are eligible, will score 40 points which translates into an APR of 1000). The NCAA requires a score of 930 APR for postseason participation. A small team (e.g. tennis with 8 members) can sometimes suffer in APR dip if a single student becomes a professional (hence an

APR based on a score of 15 out of 16). A student who leaves in good academic standing is worth 1 APR point.

A Senate Assembly member asked about the Graduation Success Rate (GSR). Professor Armstrong said that the GSR should be compared with the Federal Graduation Rate, which measures the number of students who graduate from an institution within 6 years. The federal rate does not consider transfers and punishes institutions for students who transfer. NCAA does consider transfers giving universities credit for students who transfer but still graduate. Professor Curzan pointed out that there is a 6-year lag in GSR so the relatively low rate in football reflected coaching changes in the past.

Professor Smith asked how the percentage of student athletes who graduate compares with the percentage for all students. Professor Curzan said that the graduation rate for student athletes was 84% as opposed to 90.4% for the University as a whole.

Professor Armstrong said that the University should be proud of its numbers, and that the NCAA is trying to create greater accountability for institutions, overall. She discussed her efforts to help faculty understand the pressures on student athletes—and how best to make reasonable accommodation for student athletes who are required to miss class time.

A Senate Assembly member said faculty are concerned that about student athletes who ask to be excused from class on short notice, and wondered if this was because student athletes did not want to identify themselves as such. Professor Armstrong said she recommends that student athletes discuss potential scheduling conflicts at the beginning of the term, but sometimes student athletes do not know if they are travelling until the day before. She tries to help student athletes communicate with faculty about these issues, and to help faculty understand the best practices for accommodation (it is not “best practice” to penalize students who have legitimate excuses).

A Senate Assembly member observed female athletes have a higher graduation rate than male athletes. Professor Armstrong said that education means a bit more for women because there is not a great living to be made as professionals.

Professor Ortega noted that three former student athletes were pursuing a Master of Social Work (MSW), and asked about other degree programs that student athletes pursue. Professor Armstrong said the majority are enrolled in the College of Literature, Science and the Arts, Kinesiology, the College of Engineering and the Ross School. Professor Curzan said that constraints some student athletes have felt as compared to other students are being eliminated and that the Center for Global and Intercultural Study (CHIS) is developing programs for student athletes.

Professor Smith raised the issue of compensation for student athletes. Professor Armstrong said she is not a proponent of financial compensation because there are logistical issues, but believes that student athletes should be awarded scholarships which pay “full cost of attendance.” Professor Curzan said that Michigan’s “full cost of attendance” scholarships and four-year scholarship guarantees for all student athletes are not matched by most other schools.

Chair Schultz asked Professor Armstrong what it meant to be a FAR. Professor Armstrong, who is a former student athlete (she played basketball at Virginia Tech), said that the job combines her abilities and interest in academics and athletics. The position exists because every university must have a faculty member not employed in athletics as a liaison between the athletics department and the academic side of the university. As a presidential appointee, she has monthly meetings with President Schlissel. She sees her job as facilitating a shared understanding to help coaches, student athletes and faculty understand their roles. She attends Big 10 and NCAA meetings to make sure

the University is involved in national conversations. She has found that people are responsive to her efforts.

Chair Schultz asked Professor Armstrong about the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA). Professor Armstrong said that at the last meeting of Big 10 FARS there was discussion of suspending the Big 10's association with COIA.

4:15 SRAC Resolution

Whereas the Student Relations Advisory Committee SRAC has requested Senate Assembly to make a statement regarding student health issues, therefore be it

Resolution 041717

RESOLVED, that Senate Assembly supports developing centralized education for instructors and faculty to raise awareness of physical and mental health issues facing students, and knowledge of supportive resources on campus, to promote accessibility, self-care and school-life balance.

Professor Potter introduced the motion, and discussed the business of the SRAC (free speech in the first semester, health issues in the Winter Semester).

The resolution passed unanimously.

4:22 Immediate Past Chair Resolution

Moved that the immediate past chair of SACUA, if not a current member of SACUA, join SACUA ex-officio as a non-voting member to ensure that institutional memory be preserved and the continuity of ongoing SACUA initiatives be safeguarded and that both the SACUA chair and the immediate past chair be awarded the same \$3,000 honorarium as regular members of SACUA.

Chair Schultz introduced the motion.

Professor Smith stressed the importance of the position for institutional memory and stated that the funding for the next few years is coming from a surplus in the SACUA current account. Professor Lehman stated that Professor Smith's premise was false, and that the position would impede transparency. Professor Ortega spoke to the need for the position.

The motion passed.

4:35 Tri-Campus Task Force Report: Robert Ortega

Professor Ortega said meetings had been sporadic while the group collected data and did background analysis to learn about faculty governance structures across the three campuses, each of which has unique features. He feels that there should be a Tri-campus governance standing committee to improve communication across campuses and to ensure that faculty codes on all three campuses stay in compliance with Bylaws and other university-wide policies. He plans to bring a

motion in the Fall 2017 that will affirm the unique needs of governing bodies on the different campuses and the authority of the University Senate. The committee should also look to issues where central faculty governance can help with Flint and Dearborn.

Chair Schultz asked when there will be a formal report. Professor Ortega said that there is a draft.

4:40 Senate Assembly Committee Chairs' Reports

The reports are provided in appendices

4:55 Final Remarks of the Chair: William Schultz

Chair Schultz said that his hope for better communication between SACUA and its committees had not been achieved, nor had there been an expansion of communication between the faculty and the Regents. He is, however, pleased that SACUA has more say in presidential committees, and with the initiation of the ongoing tri-campus discussion. He said that unfinished business included arriving at updated definitions of faculty and faculty governance, and hoped for a stronger relationship with faculty governance peers in the Big 10 and with faculty in general.

Chair Schultz passed the gavel to Professor Ortega who will chair SACUA in 2017-18.

5:00 Matters Arising

Professor Wright acknowledged outgoing SACUA members, Professors Lehman, Smith and Weineck.

5:05 Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

David S. Potter
Senate Secretary

University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents, Sec. 4.01:

The University Senate

The 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.

University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents, Sec. 4.04:

The Senate Assembly

The Senate Assembly shall serve as the legislative arm of the senate.

The assembly shall have power to consider and advise regarding all matters within the jurisdiction of the University Senate which affect the functioning of the university as an institution of higher learning, which concern its obligations to the state and to the community at large, and which relate to its internal organization insofar as such matters of internal organization involve general questions of educational policy.

Rules of the University Senate, the Senate Assembly and the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs: In all cases not covered by rules adopted by the Senate, the procedure in Robert's Rules of Order shall be followed.

Appendix 1: Committee Reports

General Counsel Advisory Committee (GCAC)

There were no formal motions or resolutions on agenda items, and the committee did not prepare formal minutes of these meetings.

Meetings held: Oct. 11, Nov. 8, Feb 10, and March 17

Topics of discussion:

- Conditions in University business agreements that might affect Privacy Rights
- Asking prospective students about criminal records and prospective employees about prior salaries
- Impact on university community of possible changes in Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) Policy, Changes in Immigration Policies, and Concept of “Sanctuary” Jurisdictions.

Communications and External Relations Advisory Committee (CERAC)

Discussions tended to devolve again into constituent areas, Communications, Government Relations and Development. While there was obvious overlap and synergy in certain cases, the chair believes this committee is rather large and cumbersome. We can seem to get two of the groups closely involved in discussions, but that usually leaves one of the VPs with limited input. There was a suggestion that the committee either meet in subsets of the entire group or meet more frequently, or hold longer meetings. The second suggestion was not met with enthusiasm since it has been difficult to get all the committee members at the meetings we have had, let alone trying more meetings. Also, there was little appetite for longer meetings.

In summary, it is the chair’s opinion that this committee should be redivided into two or possibly three. Perhaps Government Relations and Communications could continue as a single committee, but the chair thinks that Development would be better served if it was supported by its own committee.

Information Technology Committee (ITC) Preliminary Report

Meeting Dates:

Mon 10/31/16 Organization

Mon 11/28/16 guest: Andrew Rosenberg, UMHS CIO

Mon 01/30/17 guests: Graduate Students (S. Husain, A Kalinin)

Mon 02/27/17 guests: Sol Bermann & Jack Kufahl

Mon 03/27/17 Internal UMich Cloud discussion

Mon 4/24/17 guests: Kelli Trosvig / Scott Williams

Administrative Evaluation Committee (AEC)

On February 27 prepared for the winter 2017 survey by adopting the following questionnaire changes:

- 1) The President’s questionnaire now includes: “The President actively provides leadership in promoting diversity, equity and inclusion across the University.”
- 2) Because of centralization of research administration, the prior chair Q13 question on research support has been moved to the large-school dean’s questionnaire and reworded accordingly: “My

Minutes of 17 April 2017
Circulated 18 September 2017
Approved 18 September 2017

college /school provides excellent support for research grant submission and management” (already Q13 on small-school dean’s questionnaire).

3) Opinion of Ann Arbor faculty questions deleted from previous year’s survey:

- Q11/Q12 – awareness and approval of AST
- Q19 – approval of course evaluation scores release
- Q21 – Assembly motion on Friday classes to deter alcohol abuse
- Q23 – Use of online education by UM students

4) Revised Ann Arbor faculty opinion questions:

- Q2 – replace “CTools” with “Canvas”

5) New Ann Arbor faculty opinion question topics:

- Satisfaction with CRLT services
- Satisfaction with the Advance Program
- Awareness of faculty grievance procedures
- Use of MHealthy
- Awareness of International Center services
- Public safety concerns at UM
- Support of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion initiative
- Growth of non-tenure-track faculty
- Weighting of public outreach in promotion/raises
- Eagerness to do public outreach

Committee for an Inclusive University (CIU)

Meetings

Sept. 30 – Focus on issues that pertain to faculty.

Oct. 21 – Post-Doc Programs, contacted Robert Sellers

Nov. 4 – met with Robert Sellers regarding DEI’s new program of Post-Doctoral Fellows, which aims to diversify the faculty, asking questions and making suggestions regarding implementation.

Dec. 1, - met with Tabbye Chavous, Director of NCID, and Elizabeth Cole, Associate Dean of LSA, regarding the implementation of DEI’s new program of Post-Doctoral Fellows

Building, Facilities and Infrastructure (BFIC)

Met once. Couple of key points:

-- That the committee must identify a meaningful executive contact. Otherwise, discussion would have no impact.

-- Although big issues should not be ignored by the BFIC, it would be productive to look for some “low-hanging fruit” that we might focus on in the first year of the committee. Regarding the second point, it was noted on Wednesday that the University does have a master plan about physical plant development. We really should become very knowledgeable about this plan. I hope that in our next meeting or two we have a chance to have someone involved with implementing the plan talk to us about it.

