

Minutes of 3 October 2016 SACUA  
Circulated 10 October 2016  
Approved 10 October 2016

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

Present: Atzmon, Carlos Lehman, Schultz (chair), Szymanski, Weineck, Wright, Potter; Snyder and Schneider

Absent: Ortega, Smith

Guests: The Record, and Michigan Daily

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

Approval of the Minutes for September 27 was postponed pending comments from the Provost.

3:17 The agenda was approved

Chair Schultz asked Professor Potter for details of the most recent incident concerning the flyers (this involved a response from a group of LSA faculty). Professor Potter pointed to the following story: <https://www.michigandaily.com/section/campus-life/online-faculty-petitions-condemning-racially-charged-flyers-erased-unknown-0>.

3:30 Report on Big Ten Academic Conference

Professor Wright discussed the meeting of the Big Ten Academic Conference at Michigan State University (MSU) on September 28-30. He said that most of the sessions were led by representatives from MSU, and described MSU practices. He suggested that in the future there should be panels consisting of representatives from three universities, and noted that the next meeting will be at Pennsylvania State University (PSU). Professor Wright found the most interesting sessions were the first and the last. The first concerned interaction of the MSU Trustees with faculty and student governance. He observed that representatives from other institutions were interested in the nature of regental elections in Michigan, which are atypical as most boards consist of political appointees rather than elected officers.

There were two MSU trustees present at the session. These were Diane Byrum and Melanie Foster, who led the discussion. From the discussion it emerged that, in order to interact with faculty and student governance, the eight trustees of MSU are divided into two groups, four being charged with faculty governance relations, four with student relations. Professor Lehman observed that the consultative structure at MSU would not have been constitutionally mandated.

Professor Wright said the last session dealt with student athletes. In the course of this discussion there was an hour long presentation on the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) (<http://www.thecoia.org/>). The COIA website states that sixty-four of the FBS schools that have faculty senates are members of COIA. Some of the participant schools disputed whether they were members; there are no dues and no votes have been held in the last two years (though there is a report of the steering

committee available at the COIA website). There was some concern that the COIA bylaws are not well structured or routinely observed and that the COIA steering committee and the COIA chair speak for the organization without prior consultation of the membership.

Professor Wright said that some of those attending the meeting felt that the Big Ten should pull out of COIA, others felt that the conference should advocate for reform, others simply felt that it was important faculty governance representatives of our institutions at the very least participate to monitor the actions of COIA. Professor Szymanski theorized governing faculty involvement in athletics is to promote the academic mission of the University.

Chair Schultz noted that faculty governance at some universities has poor contact with the Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR). If this could be remedied, a meeting of FARs could obviate COIA. To get a better impression of COIA, Professor Wright said that he will reach out to Professor Colas, the University's COIA representative. Chair Schultz said that the FAR at MSU discussed career ending injuries and the fact that athletes are kept on full scholarship.

The President and the Provost of MSU were at the dinner with the group, during which the president of MSU said that she regularly met the Faculty Grievance Monitor and the Ombuds.

#### 3:45 Senate Assembly Quiz Results

Professor Schultz discussed the results of the Quiz reflecting the interests of Senate Assembly members

#### 3:50 SACUA Rapid Response

The question arose as to whether SACUA's chair should tweet without having prior agreement on consent of SACUA so as to offer a "faculty voice" when the University is confronting difficult circumstances such as the recent, widely publicized, posting of racist flyers of the Ann Arbor campus (<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/grade-point/wp/2016/09/26/racially-offensive-flyers-found-at-the-university-of-michigan-why-white-women-shouldnt-date-black-men/>). Professor Potter favored having the chair make a response for the group when speed is needed. Professors Lehman and Szymanski objected that it would be better to take a more deliberate approach, especially if the chair is speaking for the group; their view had general assent. Professor Weineck pointed out that if one has a social media presence one has to use it. There was discussion of whether the people who engaged in the flyers were internal or external, Professor Potter suggested that the evidence was that the people who initiated the flyers incident were internal or had access to internal media. Professor Szymanski said that the development of a social media strategy for SACUA should be brought to Senate Assembly. Professor Szymanski will introduce a draft proposal for action to the meeting next week.

#### 4:00 Tri-Campus Governance Resolution

Professor Lehman said that he and Professor Ortega had met and recognized that they should work on an action item from SACUA to the Senate Assembly, though he noted that any two members could bring a motion to the floor of the assembly. Professor Lehman discussed their draft proposal in the context of an emended version offered by Dr. Fraser and Professor Ellis from UM Dearborn. One issue is the extent of SACUA's jurisdiction with respect to faculty governance institutions at UM Dearborn and UM Flint. Discussion of this issue focused on the changes introduced into the draft document that the subcommittee had shared with Dr. Fraser and Professor Ellis. The key points are the variations in sections 2 and 3 of the charge to the committee in the draft documents. The Subcommittee's proposal is as follows:

The Task Force shall

- (1) Identify, review, and assemble for comparison all source materials pertinent to the faculty governance structure and operation of each UM campus – Ann Arbor, Dearborn, and Flint;
- (2) Assemble statistical summaries of the compositions of instructional, clinical, and research personnel at the three campuses including both tenured/tenure-track faculty by rank, and non-tenured individuals by status (e.g., university designated title, LEO rank, etc.);
- (3) If deemed appropriate by the Task Force, conduct surveys of Senate members at the regional campuses to assess their opinions about the vitality and effectiveness of the current faculty governance structure and operation;
- (4) Interview Senate members and key academic administrators about shared governance, faculty rights and prerogatives, and degrees of conformity of governance with all written policy documents identified in charge (1);
- (5) Deliver a written report to the Senate Assembly by 1 May 2017 that summarizes its fact-finding, identifies strengths and issues of concern, and offers recommendations for action by the Senate Assembly.

The response from Dr. Fraser and Professor Ellis is as follows:

The Task Force shall

- (1) Identify, review, and assemble for comparison source materials pertinent to the faculty governance structure and operation of each UM campus – Ann Arbor, Dearborn, and Flint;
- (2) If deemed appropriate by the Task Force, conduct surveys of Senate members at the regional campuses to assess their opinions about the vitality and effectiveness of the current faculty governance structure and operation;
- (3) Weigh the impact on faculty governance of a single University with a single faculty distributed on three campuses;
- (4) As deemed appropriate by the task force, to interview Senate members and key academic administrators about shared governance, faculty rights and prerogatives, and degrees of conformity of governance with all written policy documents identified in charge (1);
- (5) Deliver a written report to the Senate Assembly by 1 April 2017 that summarizes its fact-finding, identifies strengths and issues of concern, and offers recommendations for action by the Senate Assembly.

In Professor Lehman's view, the audit recommended in section 3 should be modelled on external reviews of academic units. Once this data was assembled it would be necessary to determine if unhappiness on the part of faculty arose within the parameters of the existing governance rules, or from failure to follow the rules.

In discussing the model for a review Chair Schultz and Professor Lehman stressed that SACUA would need to be clear on what the limits of the inquiry. Professors Weineck and Potter raised the issue of the lack of parallel structures between the three campuses (whereas the Flint and Dearborn campuses have faculty governance entities in addition to and independent of the University Senate, the Ann Arbor campus does not have such an entity—the Senate Assembly could only fill the role that faculty governance groups on the Flint and Dearborn campuses fill if it were to exclude Flint and Dearborn faculty).

Chair Schultz raised the issue of the involvement of administrators from Flint and Dearborn in the audit, noting that President Schlissel has asked for their involvement. Professor Szymanski suggested that Chair Schultz talk with President Schlissel about the structure of these discussions. Chair Schultz

proposed that a SACUA meeting at Flint, which had previously been raised as a possibility, should come sooner rather than later.

There was general agreement that fact finding would be needed. Chair Schultz said that the draft committee report will have to be recirculated to Flint and Dearborn for comments. There was general agreement amongst SACUA members that the draft received back from Dearborn cannot yet be endorsed. Professor Weineck suggested replacing clause 3 in the document from Dearborn with the following language “Investigate the structures of faculty governance institutions and their relationship with each other.”

There was general agreement that any draft proposal should include provisions to assemble statistical summaries of the compositions of instructional, clinical, and research personnel at the three campuses including both tenured/tenure-track faculty by rank, and non-tenured individuals by status (e.g., university designated title, LEO rank, etc.).

4:40 Matters Arising  
None

4:48 Executive Session:

[Davis Markert Nickerson Academic Freedom Lecture and Professorship]

5:00 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."