

Minutes of 10 October 2016 SACUA
Circulated 25 October 2016
Approved 31 October 2016

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA)
Monday, October 10, 2016 3:15 pm
Regents' Room, Fleming Building

Present: Atzmon, Carlos, Lehman, Ortega, Schultz (chair), Smith, Szymanski, Weineck, Wright, Potter:
Scheider, Snyder

Absent: none

Guests: members of the Press

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

3:16 Guest: Vice Provost Sara Blair

Vice Provost Blair said that she was one of two Vice provosts for faculty in academic affairs (other is Lori Pierce in the Medical school), they are responsible for working with faculty Vice Provost Pierce handles health sciences, Vice Provost Blair has the other units, On behalf of the Provost behalf the Vice Provosts support the planning and development of academic plans in schools and colleges, manage the promotion process for their units, respond for requests for funding from the Provost. Provostal support places a significant role in recruitment and retention. The Vice Provosts advise the Provost on the full range of activities that constitute the work of faculty, and help the Provost stand up programs to help. Vice Provosts Pierce and Blair also attempt to support diversity efforts in faculty and she also works with the Center for the Education of Women (CEW) and ADVANCE to articulate their mission and push forward their programs. Her job is assisting the Provost to promote academic excellence and sustain the faculty who do that.

Professor Schultz asked how the support works for other units for such as Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT); and the Institute for Social Research (ISR). Vice Provost Blair said that ISR reports into faculty affairs through Vice Provost Pierce. Usually there is a logic for the reporting line. Chair Schultz asked how the recruitment of faculty is going to change because of the new Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) program. Vice Provost Blair said that the Faculty Affairs group in the Provost's office wanted deans to be aware of the support available to them, while unit plans and funding for these efforts are managed through the Vice Provost for Diversity, Equity and Academic Affairs (VPEAA) Robert Sellers (soon to be Chief Diversity Officer). Vice Provost Blair said that there are longstanding programs, connected with recruitment, such as STRIDE, that are supported through Faculty Affairs, and that there will be new resources for such programs as part of the work that is being done. Although it currently does not have new resources, but there has been a good deal on recruitment in the DEI plan.

Professor Szymanski asked for clarity about the role of Faculty Affairs in DEI. Vice Provost Blair said that it was not her role to track the budgets, which is the business of Vice Provost Sellers, both Vice Provost Blair and Vice Provost Pierce discuss best practices around recruitment and retention with Deans and Associate Deans, make the best possible use of resources for recruitment and retention, as well as to support scholarship, research, and teaching that support diversity and equity. They could, for instance,

Minutes of 10 October 2016 SACUA
Circulated 25 October 2016
Approved 31 October 2016

support a cluster hire. They would be involved because they are charged with building an excellent faculty.

Professor Smith if Vice Provosts Blair and Pierce help to find money to help deans recruit. Vice Provost Blair said that such funding is already available, adding that there are pools of centrally-available funds, which are typically subject to cost sharing with the unit. Examples of the use of such funds might be to support very high startup costs (in the expectation that long term gains will be considerable). If a smaller unit does not have sufficient resources to absorb the costs of a new hire, the money is available to help with that.

Professor Szymanski asked if the support offered by the Provost's office is involved in tenure decisions. Vice Provost Blair said that such funding has to do with external hires and she works to encourage Deans to understand the best practices for hiring and retaining people. One task that the Vice Provost faces in the provision of broader context, another is to help with goal setting.

Chair Schultz asked about President Schlissel's concern with dual career hires. He expressed concern for people who do not see themselves as full colleagues, and asked if she had advice how this issue could be broached with the faculty at large since many people who were not the "first hire" feel that they are stigmatized. Vice provost Blair said that the Provost's office has a direct connection with spousal employment through the Dual Career Program, but allowed that it can be hard to get a fix on questions of culture by looking only at the data. Vice Provost Blair discussed a study that ADVANCE conducted that was based on data from Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) subjects about people who came in through the dual career program. Such faculty members wanted to "swim in the same sea" as everyone else, but allowed as how there is no tracking of dual career faculty, and the gap between data sets and distinctive concerns.

Professor Smith said there is a hidden subtext, that if the dual hire was outstanding neither unit involved in a dual career hire would complain, but, if there was a feeling that the unit making the "second hire" had no choice in accepting or rejecting a candidate that could be a problem. In addition to academic standing there could also be problems if the "second unit" did not feel that a person would not be a good fit in terms of subject etc. Vice Provost Blair said that there may be an issue with how units approach the whole process. The conversation that the Provost's office tries to have with Deans concerns "the long game."

Professor Carlos, asked if there was an overlap between the conversation about dual careers and the conversation about DEI. She asked whether Vice Provost Blair's office could mitigate concerns about "fit." Vice Provost Blair said that the Provost's office can remove some of the financial pressure for small units that are financially challenged and make fewer hires. Such relief can ease concerns about "fit," because resources can then be available for later hires that a unit sees as being more important to its development. She sees that the DEI effort offers an important context or opportunity to reanimate these conversations to look at partnerships and collaborations for building the faculty.

Chair Schultz asked about the tenure process when it reaches the Provost's office. He said that the process in the College of Engineering (COE) sets up an ad hoc review committee at the departmental level with evaluations at the department advisory committee and the college executive committee. Candidates know who makes the decision so long as the process is within COE. He added that things become opaque when the case reaches the Provost's office. He wondered what happened to case books after they arrive at the Provost's office.

Vice Provost Blair explained that when case books arrive in the Provost's office the process is slightly different from that at the unit level. The Provost has a committee of readers from across disciplines. Members of the committee do not ordinarily read primary scholarship, they are evaluating the way the case book has made its way through a unit's governing structure, looking at the voting record and external letters, they have an overview of the process with the recommendation, either affirmative or negative, signed by the Dean. The unit recommendation is advisory. The Provost and President both have to sign

off on any recommendation (positive or negative). There is no paper trail; if readers at the Provost's level are uncertain about what is in the record, they send questions back to the unit.

Professor Smith asked about why the provost would overturn a unit's decision. He further asked if the Provost had to put something in writing at this point. Vice Provost Blair said that while deans are required to inform the faculty members of the decision, she does not know if there is a written record of that notice.

Professor Smith said that basically everything is oral at this stage. He noted that promotion committees are never told why a decision was made that was contrary to their advice, and that there is lack of transparency about the final decision that leads to a lot of speculation about what happened and why. He reiterated that the single most important part of the process—the final decision—is not transparent. Vice Provost Blair said that the Provost has the ultimate authority to grant or deny tenure and that the case book is the archival record of the process through the final Regental vote. Vice Provost does not know if there is a written record at the final stage, and asked if there should be an audience for such a record. Professor Szymanski asked if Vice Provost Blair would return to speak with SACUA. Vice Provost Blair said that SACUA should ask the Provost. She would be willing to come back with the Provost.

3:50 Approval of minutes

Minutes of 26 September were approved

Minutes of 3 October were approved

3:55 Leadership Breakfast, Diversity, Inclusion, DEI, AI (Academic Innovation initiative) updates
Chair Schultz described the Leadership Breakfast on Wednesday, October 5, saying that the main matter of substance was the elevation of Rob Sellers; additional business consisted of advertisements for DEI, AII and the antipoverty program.

Chair Schultz said that at the DEI rollout on Thursday, October 6, unit plans were made public, even though some were summary.

Chair Schultz is on a DIG committee connected with the AI initiative.

4:02 SACUA Rapid Response/Social Media Discussion

Professor Szymanski discussed the importance of having a social media strategy pointing out that this is the way that people get their information. There are lots of social media outlets, but, if planning a new social media program, it would be wise not to pick too many platforms because of the burden of maintaining plentiful content. This is especially important because the impact of communication through social media is determined by the frequency the volume of messages. It is desirable to have a lot of content, but it is also a lot of work.

Professor Lehman said there could be sensitivities to a SACUA presence. Professor Szymanski suggested that this be brought up to senate assembly. He noted that social media is not just about opinions, it is also about information and that most social media outlets are only effective if messages are sent out regularly in order to develop a large audience. He pointed out that SACUA minutes could be put out on Twitter. Ms. Snyder, who manages the SACUA Twitter account, said that she does not want to make a sole decision about content, she has been waiting for guidance. Professor Weineck agreed with Professor Lehman that deliberative statements should be distinguished from information points, which could increase visibility. Professor Wright returned to the issue of rapid response pointing out that a more active social media presence means that there will be more followers on occasions for a rapid response to a crisis.

Professor Wright asked if audiences could be pointed to the Chronicle of Higher Education (CHE), and if "retweeting" constituted implicit agreement. Professor Szymanski said that people do not necessarily agree with things you retweet. Professors Potter and Weineck observed that getting faculty to

feel more involved with the academic profession involves getting them to read the CHE and Inside Higher Education.

4:10 Tri-Campus Faculty Governance Task Force

Chair Schultz introduced the discussion of Tri-Campus governance, and invited Dr. Fraser to discuss the most recent draft of the proposal for the Tri-Campus Task Force. Dr. Fraser said this was stimulated by the discussion of governance issues raised by the faculty from the Flint campus in their meeting with SACUA. After that meeting Dr. Fraser was asked to make a presentation at the Senate Assembly meeting, at which point he and Professor Ellis were asked to write the first proposal, which has been discussed by SACUA. As an example of the influence of the Senate Assembly's influence on overall University life, Dr. Fraser pointed to the statement on Academic Freedom (<https://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/handbook/1/1.C.html>).

Dr. Fraser noted that Professor Lehman had suggested a discussion of the issues at Flint and Dearborn through the AAUP. At the same time the question arose of the relationship between actions taken with the Ann Arbor campus and faculty governance groups at Flint and Dearborn. There is a perceived need to have some leverage with administrators at Flint and Dearborn. Should there be parallel structures (e.g. mandatory advisory committees)? There should be a study of the relationship between University Senate as a whole and the institutions at Flint and Dearborn. He feels that this might be a multi-year process, but hopes that scope can be laid out within a year.

Chair Schultz said that he encouraged Dr. Fraser to revise the proposal because he feels that rather than evaluating Flint and Dearborn there should be a study of the relationship the Ann Arbor faculty and the institutions at Flint and Dearborn. Professor Lehman said that when setting out to do something like this, you have to identify the problem needed to be solved, he reviewed the concerns of the visitors from the previous meeting, and asked how central faculty governance resolve any of these grievances. He knows that there are significant problems at Flint, but that Flint faculty had not participated in the Administrative Evaluation Committee (AEC) process. The Flint Faculty Council had done its own survey of faculty views of administrators, then released the results, which caused considerable friction between the Faculty Counsel and the administration. Professor Lehman continued by observing that until SACUA and Senate Assembly know the lay of the land they cannot make recommendations. Professor Lehman also noted Flint 45% are part-time and 38% of full time faculty are not on tenure track.

Chair Schultz said that the web presence of Flint faculty governance is dated. He is concerned that we might be getting into more work than we can manage if we attempt a full audit. He feels that we will gain information from reviewing communication between Ann Arbor and Flint. Dr. Fraser agreed with Professor Lehman that a visit under the auspices of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) could handle individual faculty grievances, but believed that the proposed audit would be more enduring because it would explore the proposition that the three campuses are part of one University so as to remove inconcinnities in practice between the three campuses. He said that while, constitutionally, there is one University Senate and one Senate Assembly for all three campuses, the Ann Arbor faculty have a great deal of power as compared to the faculties at Dearborn and Flint when grievances are brought up. The Ann Arbor campus offered a basic platform for the description of faculty governance. When Flint and Dearborn are acting with support from Ann Arbor, their situations worsen.

Chair Schultz noted that AAUP was stronger in Dearborn than in Flint, he favored having the AAUP at Dearborn conduct the audit. Professor Ortega said that the presentation of the representatives from Flint was compelling. He was concerned that if Flint and Dearborn are inviting Ann Arbor to participate in the governance conversations, nothing will happen if SACUA waits too long. Professor Lehman said he could predict that a committee would recommend the creation of committees like the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee (AAAC), and wondered if this this work at Flint and Dearborn since there will need to be serious buy in from Faculty Governance institutions on those campuses. Dr. Fraser asked what

would happen if faculty governance groups at Flint and Dearborn picked the committees and had them approved by the Senate Assembly? Chair Weineck drew attention to the problem of the asymmetry of governance structures on the three campuses.

Professors Potter and Weineck said that we could request official numbers about faculty composition from the Provosts offices at Flint and Dearborn.

Chair Schultz asked if SACUA was willing to have an e-mail discussion of a revised version of the draft document with the aim of bringing the subject before the October Senate Assembly meeting? There was general agreement to this proposal

Professor Wright asked about the significance of changes in the document about the composition of the committee and the removal of language about interviewing key academic administrators. Dr. Fraser said that this language could be returned to the documents.

4:50 Matters Arising

None

4:50 Executive Session - Recreational Sports Replacement Member(s)

[the conversation with Sara Blair]

[Recreational Sports committee membership]

4:55 Non SACUA Committee member update

[Committee on the Military Education of Officers]

[This is a Committee to which SACUA traditionally makes the appointments]

5:04 Approval of October 24 Senate Assembly Meeting Agenda

5:05 Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

David S. Potter
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 policies 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."