

Minutes of 11 April 2016 SACUA

Circulated 6 June 2016

Approved 6 June 2016

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA)
April 11, 2016
Monday, 3:15 pm
Regents Room, Fleming Building

Present: Lehman, Schultz, Smith, Szymanski, Weineck (chair), Potter ; Schneider, Snyder

Absent: Mondro, Wright, Ziff,

Guests: Provost Martha Pollack; Kelly Cunningham; Assistant Vice President Kedra Ishop; Reporters from the *Daily* and the *Record*

3:20 Call to Order/Approval of Agenda and Minutes

3:23 The minutes for April 4 were approved

3:20 Announcements

Chair Weineck and Professor Schultz reported that they met with Regent Mark Bernstein this morning and that the tone of the meeting was positive.

3:30 Guest: Provost Pollack

Provost Pollack gave a number of updates. The first was that there will be a search for a new Vice President for Information technology (<https://record.umich.edu/articles/president-recommends-new-vp-information-technology>).

Several searches for new deans have been completed and will be going to the Regents.

This is also the time when the Provost's office reviews promotion cases. There are more than 200 promotion and tenure cases pending.

The University is nearing the end of the Admissions season for next year's entering class. The University has established a goal of increasing diversity on campus. To contribute to this effort, Professor Susan Dynarsky of the Ford School (<http://fordschool.umich.edu/faculty/susan-dynarski>), an expert on Financial Aid policy recommended that the University adopt a program of writing simple letters to in-state students in the free- and reduced-fee lunch lists informing them that if they apply and are admitted they will pay no tuition or fees. As of last week 74% of students who received the letter applied.

Diversity/Strategic Planning initiative. The Unit plans were due earlier this month and are now being reviewed by the Office of the General Counsel (OGC), and then will then be reviewed by deans. There are two initiatives in place. One is Wolverine Pathways (<https://wolverinepathways.umich.edu/>) in which 200 high school students are enrolled. The other is the Inclusive Teaching Initiative (<http://www.crlt.umich.edu/FCIT>) designed to build faculty capacity for supporting an inclusive campus climate through their teaching in classrooms, clinics, studios, or labs. It was piloted in LSA and will be rolled out to all units.

The Michigan Institute for Data Science (MIDAS) (<http://midas.umich.edu/>) is seeking candidates for full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty positions in data science, has its first two offers out to candidates. The first four projects in the Humanities Collaboratory (<https://sites.lsa.umich.edu/collaboratory/>) have been seeded. The goal is to expand the scope in humanities research, stressing the value of collaboration, and reimagining the scholarly expression in the Humanities.

There is a new Poverty initiative being planned. [Professor Vonnie McLloyd](#) assembled a faculty committee to develop a proposal with education and research/outreach/engagement program components dealing with poverty alleviation, initially concerning the United States. Topics may include the impact of employment education and health care. The program will have traditional components and innovative aspects, such as having fellows apply in clusters to a faculty center. The President will raise money for the program.

The Provost has just received the working report on Sustainability (<https://sustainability.umich.edu/report/2014/>).

The President is leading the search for the Director for the Life Sciences Institute (LSI).

Digital Education and Innovation Initiative (<http://digitaleducation.umich.edu/>) has run 14 MOOCs, they are now rolling out a number of new programs. One example is a MOOC that will help students move directly into an advanced course in Finance in the Ross School.

Chair Weineck said that SACUA would like to have a general conversation about the Office of Institutional Equity (OIE), The Professional Standards SPG and the recent discussion of the chalking on the Diag and reactions to them. Provost Pollack said that there are meetings scheduled on the first two issues, and that they should not be discussed in general terms in advance of the scheduled meetings. Chair Weineck said that in the case of Professional Standards, there are three sorts of behaviors that needed to be distinguished. One is behavior that interferes with other people. These behaviors should be sanctioned. The second was behavior that might bring the University into disrepute. She said that faculty represent the University and have an ethical responsibility not to bring the University into disrepute. The third was private behavior, not the University's business. Provost Pollack said that the policy will ensure that people behave professionally, but said that the SPG will be discussed in detail later. Professor Smith asked if there was a policy on social media, Provost Pollack said that there is no plan to have such a policy—but that one could imagine behavior that would be covered by other policies.

In addressing the issue of appeals of OIE findings, the Provost said that she wanted to see the student sexual misconduct policy put in place and then look at what might be done for faculty. She said there are two differences between students and faculty with regard to these policies. One is that in the student policy there are not issues of power imbalance (for the most part). The second is that faculty, as employees, are subject to different laws.

Professor Lehman said that there would need to be some dovetailing of the appeals with Professional Standards. Provost Pollack said that the distinction is that an OIE finding that the behavior is not harassment or discrimination but that does not mean that the behavior does not violate another policy for which there should be a sanction. She pointed out that sanctions can be grieved. Chair Weineck said that she would like to discuss general principles—such as a case in which sanctions were imposed despite the fact that no policy has been violated. The Provost did not want to discuss the issue in the abstract, but invited SACUA to provide specific cases in a future executive session.

With respect to the chalking, Chair Weineck said that there was an issue with militant vulnerability nationwide—that students demanded that that the administrations act to stop things because they were disagreeable rather than illegal. The Provost referred SACUA to the piece by the president in the Huffington Post (<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/mark-s-schlissel/>). Her sense in that this is a fraught issue and that the administration will respond in a way that it feels is effective. Professor Schultz brought up the incident between a University Student and an Uber driver. Provost Pollack said that very few comments in public discussion of the incident associated the student's conduct with the University. She pointed out that the University must both respect free speech and be respectful of the fact that some students feel hurt and scared. These student concerns should be acknowledged and support. She pointed out that the President has argued in his piece in the Huffington Post that defending free speech and respect for people's feelings is not a false dichotomy.

With respect to promotions, Provost Pollack said that every year the Provost's office overturns 2 or 3 cases, and wondered why SACUA was upset about her decision to reverse a negative decision last year. When asked what the University should expect, the Provost said that the future would likely look like the past; SACUA should expect that in the overwhelming majority of cases, the Provost's office will approve the decision, and that in a small number of cases the office will overturn a case after extensive discussion with the Dean, most frequently because of procedural irregularity.

4:00 Faculty Grievance Monitor (FGM)

The question is whether the SACUA Vice Chair should be appointed to the position of FGM, or whether there should be a permanent FGM appointed for a fixed term. Professor Schultz said that there was only one grievance this year, but that many are brewing. Professor Potter discussed his experience as FGM, saying that he thought that having a permanent person might be problematic. He suggested that SACUA keep a list of people who could be called in if the caseload became overwhelming. It was decided that the issue would be discussed further at a later meeting

4:15 Guest: Associate Vice President Kedra Ishop for Enrollment Management

Chair Weineck said that SACUA was interested in having a discussion with her because before 2009 there had been some significant faculty role in admissions. SACUA was wondering if she could outline what the faculty role should be. Associate Vice President Ishop said that there were processes that had evolved over time. The Office of Undergraduate Admissions (OUA) reads files multiple times, engaging with the associate deans in units that admit undergraduates to involve them in decision making around cases and files as needed. She said that the OUA engage with units admitting first year students—first set of questions connected with identifying the types of students that OUA should look for. Every year OUA works with the relevant dean usually with the associate dean with undergraduate education; staffing for the committees within the units is determined by the relevant dean. Chair Weineck said that she had written to deans of two major units who said that they had nothing to do with the process. Associate Vice President Ishop said direct relationships within units are through with associate deans. There is an annual meeting between deans and associate deans at the beginning of each admissions season. Admissions can shape a large part of the class through general guidelines. One of her goals was to stabilize the class size and to go through an evaluation of class size.

Professor Szymanski asked about faculty involvement in Kinesiology's admissions, VP Ishop said that that admission subcommittee was entirely staff. She indicated different units have different levels of faculty involvement in recruiting. She does not have dealings with professional schools. Professor Schultz asked about Junior College transfers, Associate Vice President Ishop said that faculty made policies about the acceptance of credit. Professor Schultz recalled his service as a reader after Grutter vs Bollinger. He asked what now went into a holistic evaluation. Associate Vice President Ishop said that there were still faculty readers working with the admissions office. When there is disagreement in evaluating a file, the admissions committee (including faculty) reviews the file.

Professor Lehman asked if the yield on offers has stabilized. Associate Vice President Ishop responded that, prior to the last couple of years, there was no change in yield at the University of Michigan. In the last few years offer acceptance has increased (last year the yield jumped four points). We expect steady state plus or minus one point. There is a disparity between in-state and out-state offers with the yield being 41% for in-state to 46% out-state. The University makes offers based on expected yield. Early action students yield at a higher rate, there is more variation in yield rates for the highest rated students. By the time that early admissions season is closed, 80% of in-state applicants and 50% of out-state are in the pipeline. She said that the yield for admitted in-state applicants had increased from 68 to 89%; the yield for out-state students jumped from 27 to 31% and that the yield for international students was 29%. Two-thirds of applications are out of state, and one challenge is the declining population in the state of Michigan—under the current admissions regime the University is still serving

the same proportion of Michigan residents even though the proportion of in-state to out-state have changed. The number of High School graduates in Michigan is projected to dip below 100,000.

Chair Weineck asked if there was a tipping point for the in-state out- state ratio? Associate Vice President Ishop said that roughly 40% of in-state students gain admission, and that the quality metrics are consistent across all groups. She said that 4% of freshmen are international.

Professor Lehman asked how Associate Vice President Ishop is evaluated. She said that her metrics were access and affordability/the soundness of the admissions process/bringing in the class on target. The policy is to admit to ceiling (no more than) as opposed to admit to a floor (will not come under).

Professor Smith asked for our diversity goals. Associate Vice President Ishop said that the University was seeing a steady decline in diversity, last year the University improved diversity, minority enrollment is now 12% up from 9% with a 50/50 gender split. Chair Weineck why there was no female majority as elsewhere? Associate Vice President Ishop said that our applicant pool still attracts the best of both genders, which is why the class is more balanced.

Professor Schultz asked about scholarships to out of state students. Associate Vice President Ishop said that the policy is to ensure residents and non-residents can afford to be here for socio-economic diversity.

The University is also committed to ensuring that students graduate with manageable debt. The University meets full demonstrated need for in-state students (it is the only Public University that does that), the University has been increasing aid to meet full cost for students whose families are in the \$70000 income range, and is trying to do the same for out-state students. The aim is to avoid having two Michigans, with only wealthy out-state students and less well off in-state students.

Chair Weineck asked about the “top 10%” admissions policy in Texas. Associate Vice President Ishop said “top 10%” worked in Texas because of regional segregation, there are not the same large pockets in Michigan as in Texas. She recalled that students had gamed the system by changing schools in their last year.

Professor Szymanski asked about distribution of aid. Associate Vice President Ishop said that the goal is that students graduate with manageable debt. Most needy student receive no loans, and that when we talk about meeting full demonstrated need is when there is a gap between demonstrated need and actual cost. The way that a package is constructed is Pell grant first, Michigan aid next. There is less aid more parental contribution for families that are higher up the income scale; the University is not in the merit scholarship business. The University awards aid to families the \$120,000 income range. Professor Szymanski asked what percentage of students pay sticker price. Associate Vice President Ishop said 70% of students receive some aid (40% excluding loans).

Chair Weineck asked about the lack of basic skills amongst entering students. She said that the question is connected with the role of the institution in guiding students in the development of skill sets they need to thrive at college.

Associate Vice President Ishop concluded by saying that the University is looking for an entering class of 6682—the number is driven by engagement with schools about their target numbers. Schools tell admissions how many students they want, and then look at that in terms of infrastructure (space for everyone in our facilities).

4:59 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

Minutes of 11 April 2016 SACUA
Circulated 6 June 2016
Approved 6 June 2016

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."