



FACULTY SENATE
SENATE ASSEMBLY
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Minutes of 22 February 2016

Circulated 4 March 2016

Approved 21 March 2016

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SENATE ASSEMBLY MEETING
22 February 2016

Present Adunbi, Aidala, Atzmon, Bhattacharyya, Beck, Broglio, Brown, Cattaneo, Chen, Ellis, Fraser, Friesen, Gaggio, Jones, Kaartinen, Kileny, Kupferschmid, Lehman, Liu, Lyman, Malek, Moss, Orady, Ortega, Pecina, Rothman, Schultz, , Schmidt, Schwank, Smith, Szymanski, Vinokur, Weineck, Winful, Woodard, Wright, Ziff, Zimmerman

Alternate Requested: Bruch, Casida (Stoddard), Cohn, Dolins, Gocek , Grosh, Kirshner, Krivokapic, Raphael, Schloss, Smith

Absent Adlerstein Gonzalez, Atchade, Bagley, Baker, Bertacco, Carlos, Mortenson, Erikson, Fossum, Freeman, Jacobsen, Keshamouni, Lenk, Li, Lim, Mondro, Nielsen, Pandey, Princen, Roddier, Sanchez, Shaefer, Skolarus, Swain, Veatch, Wang, Welsh, Zeisberg

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED

1. Agenda for University Senate and Senate Assembly
2. Draft Minutes of the 22 January Senate Assembly meeting

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

The Agenda was approved

Approval of the Minutes was deferred

3:20 Announcements

Chair Weineck discussed progress on Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs), recalling the decision by the faculty senate to ask that Provost review the proposed release of SETs until policies for release could be formulated with input from both faculty and students and a new instrument could be designed to avoid at least some of the pitfalls of concern to faculty. The Provost appointed two committees, one of which James Holloway, Vice Provost for Global and Engaged Education, convened, chaired by Peter Bahr (Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education), with the charge of “recommending a small set of closed-ended survey questions to be used on course evaluation instruments across the university for the purpose of collecting data on student ratings of teaching.”

The second committee comprised of four faculty members (including one LEO representative) and four student members (two grads, two undergrads) met to recommend guidelines for future release of SET data. The Provost has now said that she is satisfied with the work of the committees, but is checking for congruence with FERPA regulations.

The Recommended questions for future SETs will be:

Minutes of 22 February 2016

Circulated 4 March 2016

Approved 21 March 2016



- This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter.
- My interest in the subject has increased because of this course.
- I knew what was expected of me in this course. [Almost Always, Frequently, Sometimes, Occasionally, Hardly Ever]
- The instructor seemed well prepared for class meetings. [Almost Always, Frequently, Sometimes, Occasionally, Hardly Ever]
- The instructor explained material clearly [Almost Always, Frequently, Sometimes, Occasionally, Hardly Ever]
- The instructor treated students with respect.
- I had a strong desire to take this course.
- As compared with other courses of equal credit, the workload for this course was... [Much Lighter, Lighter, Similar, Heavier, Much Heavier]

An Assembly member asked what the point of the question “I had a strong desire to take this course” was. Chair Weineck pointed out that this is a control question.

This are the core questions that the committee recommended for all students, the old Q1 (“The Instructor is Excellent” and Q2 (“This is an Excellent Course”) questions will not be included on the revised forms. In Chair Weineck’s view, the new questions are much more targeted and she said that the committee worked through a great deal of research concerning the evaluation of teaching

The recommendations of the Second Committee are as follows:

- Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs) will be released, using the new instrument currently developed by the committee convened by James Holloway, starting with courses taught in F16.
- SETs will be released to students only, not to the UM community at large or the general public. Students accessing the system will be asked to acknowledge that the data are for their consumption only.
- SETs will be released if one of two thresholds is met: a 50% participation rate or a minimum total of 30 evaluations per class.
- No SETs for classes taught by faculty or lecturers during their first three years at UM will be released
- Under significant unforeseen circumstances affecting their teaching (such as illness, personal trauma, or other factors affecting teaching success), faculty can opt out of having SETs for a given class released. Such an opt-out will require permission from the department chair and has to be requested before the end of the term, with the understanding that it will be rare.
- Courses for which SETs are not released shall be marked with a code explaining the reason (low participation, new faculty, faculty opt-out)
- The SET portal will direct students to a brief framing statement containing caveats established by the relevant literature (such as the correlation between grading and evaluations; potential bias due to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious affiliation, etc.; lack of established correlation between SETs and learning outcomes)

The Provost is inclined to accept them all after checking that they are FERPA congruent. Professor Lehman asked for clarification about the release of the information, asking if administrators and departments will have access to teaching evaluations. Chair Weineck



said that they would be available to departments and the administration as the current forms are.

Professor Lehman said that the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee (AAAC) had recommended that faculty member could issue a statement saying that this was the first time he/she had used the methods employed in the course. Chair Weineck said that the committee had rejected this suggestion as complicating the process.

Chair Weineck stressed the importance of the 50% response threshold for release. She also said that this policy would only affect the Ann Arbor campus. A senate member asked if there would be a question dealing with diversity issues. Chair Weineck said she would ask the Provost. She also said that the first committee would continue its work, it will explore the validity of the five point scale, which will be retained for now. An LSA faculty said that the removal of Q1 and Q2 would be a radical change. Chair Weineck said that what we are looking for was covered in Questions 1 and 4. Professor Schultz asked about very small classes as anonymity would be difficult and might amount to a FERPA violation. Professor Weineck said that there will be an explanation for non-release of the forms.

SACUA nominations. This is the last day for nominations to come to the Faculty Senate Nominating Committee. Nominations from the floor of the Assembly are possible on election day. Statements for the Record are due on March 3. Nominees should send a brief statement to the record. Nominees will usually give a short statement at the meeting. There will be between four and six places on SACUA, as three members are rotating off after serving for three years and one member had accepted a position at a different university. Two members may be off-campus for the entire next academic year, and will be off-campus in Winter 2017. We expect to know for sure by the March assembly meeting.

Nominees are

Sara Ahbel Rappe, LSA
Michael Atzman, Engin
Ruth Carlos, Med
Beau Case, Library
Weiyun Chen, Kinesio
Bogdan Epureanu, Engin
Robert Fraser, UM Dearborn-Library
Kim Kearffoot, Engin
Paul Kilney, Med
Neil Marsh, LSA
Robert Ortega, SW
Bill Schultz, eNGIN

Chair Weineck introduced recommended election procedures:

1. Insurmountable problems holding separate elections for separate duration terms
2. Term Blind elections



3. Rank order the results
4. Person getting the most votes will serve the longest term they are willing to serve
5. Next highest vote total; serves for the longest term they are willing to serve—If that term is still available
6. Process continues until all 6 sports are filled
7. Professor Lehman said that this was the standard way of doing things. Dr. Fraser recalled that Professor Friedman, a former SACUA member, had announced that he was only running for a one-year term when he stood for election. Chair Weineck said that this was unusual, and that is why SACUA feels that the procedures should be discussed at the present time. This will hopefully clarify the situation for the future

Senate Assembly unanimously approved the procedures.

3:50 Replacement Procedures for SACUA Members Who Are Going on Leave

The question is whether SACUA members elected to serve for three years (Option A) or during a three-year period (Option B). If the Senate Assembly accepts the first option, a person who has served for two years could return for a third year after an absence of a year. Chair Weineck noted that the Rules committee had reviewed the proposals and favored option B. Usually SACUA members with one term of leave have continued to serve, those with a full year have ended their service. Dr. Fraser asked if current SACUA members would be bound by the Assembly's decision. Chair Weineck responded that the Assembly's decision would apply to current and future members. In response to a question from Professor Lehman about which SACUA members would be affected by the change in policy, Chair Weineck said that she will be on leave next year, as will be Professor Szymanski. Professor Lehman asked if some one who was elected next month could defer his/her first year. Professor Lehman also said that we had always followed option B and he had asked Chair Weineck to solicit the Rules Committee for its views. He read out e-mail from Professor Masten who was on the Rules Committee favoring Option B; Professor Lehman said that a change in the rules would require a vote of the Senate. Chair Weineck said that the issue arose because of the number of vacancies and the need for experience on SACUA and that the last time there was a revision of the SACUA rules it was voted on by Senate Assembly. John Rothman, University Library, asked if anyone was arguing for option A. Professor Szymanski said that the benefit with Option A was that it would ensure that there was more experience on SACUA, which is important because of the time it takes for a person to build relationships, which are important for effective policy formation. Chair Weineck said that it is important that SACUA be filled with research active faculty. Dr. Fraser pointed out that new rules should only apply to new SACUA members. Professor XXX from the Rules Committee asked what happens if the Senate Assembly votes to eliminate Option A? Chair Weineck said it is important for the rules to be clear and for the need for ad hoc decisions be minimized; hence if the Assembly decided against Option A, it would be eliminated as a possible model for SACUA service.



The following motions were introduced to the Assembly for vote:

WHEREAS, it is not uncommon for SACUA members to be awarded a leave during their SACUA term of office due to a sabbatical, a fellowship, duty off campus or other circumstances such as medical leaves, and

WHEREAS, it is of benefit to the University that faculty participate in these leaves, and

WHEREAS, it is of benefit to the University Senate, Senate Assembly and SACUA to have SACUA members with experience in faculty governance who might assume leadership roles, and

WHEREAS, it most closely matches the intent of the original election,

therefore, be it

Either:

A. RESOLVED, a SACUA member who goes on leave within his or her scheduled term in office may choose to defer the remainder of his or her term by the duration of the leave up to one year.

Or:

B. RESOLVED, a SACUA member who goes on leave within his or her scheduled term in office may return to SACUA after the leave is completed to serve until the original scheduled date of the end of the term.

Professor Weineck asked for a motion to hold a vote. The motion was approved

Chair Weineck asked for a vote on option A. Option A was not passed. Chair Weineck called for a vote on Option B, Option B carried.

RESOLUTION 022216

WHEREAS, it is not uncommon for SACUA members to be awarded a leave during their SACUA term of office due to a sabbatical, a fellowship, duty off campus or other circumstances such as medical leaves, and

WHEREAS, it is of benefit to the University that faculty participate in these leaves, and

WHEREAS, it is of benefit to the University Senate, Senate Assembly and SACUA to have SACUA members with experience in faculty governance who might assume leadership roles, and

WHEREAS, it most closely matches the intent of the original election,

therefore, be it

RESOLVED, a SACUA member who goes on leave within his or her scheduled term in office may return to SACUA after the leave is completed to serve until the original scheduled date of the end of the term.

Approved by a majority vote

4:10 Academic Affairs Advisory Committee (AAAC) Chair John Lehman

Professor Lehman said the strength of Faculty Governance is the Committee structure, which he feels should be shared. The AAAC is an excellent committee, and he said that AAAC had dealt with the following issues, he invited Senate Assembly members to review the minutes which may be accessed through the following links:

Minutes of 22 February 2016

Circulated 4 March 2016

Approved 21 March 2016



FACULTY SENATE
SENATE ASSEMBLY
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

September minutes (http://facultysenate.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2015/03/MIN_AAAC_11Sep15-approved.pdf)

October 9 minutes (http://facultysenate.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2015/03/MIN_AAAC_9Oct15-approved.pdf)

October 15 minutes (http://facultysenate.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2015/03/MIN_AAAC_9Oct15-approved-1.pdf)

December 11 minutes (http://facultysenate.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2015/03/AAAC_11Dec15-approved.pdf)

Professor Lehman said that the issues that the committee had dealt with included SETs; limiting course assessments (final examinations) during the final week of classes (SA approved this motion); dean searches; the strategic plan for diversity and the cultural obstacles by the separation of Student Affairs from Academic Affairs; Academic Freedom; the proliferation of Programs offering Minors and Certificates that cut across unit boundaries; the impact of the University's budget model on interdisciplinary research; guidance to units about recognizing faculty and the construction of promotion case books; the Biosciences Initiative; CAPS; procedures for evaluation of promotions at the Central Administration level; health services on North Campus; Faculty Emeritus applications (everyone who has applied for emeritus has been approved); Shared Services; building name changes; BiCentennial Colloquia; printed page Limits for Students; Sexual Misconduct Policy; Faculty expertise concerning the Flint Water Crisis.

4:25 Student Relations Advisory Committee (SRAC) Chair David Potter

Professor Potter introduced the work of the SRAC, and the structure of the Division of Student affairs. The Division of Student Affairs is run by Vice President Harper, saying that it had four major sections, one, headed by Associate Vice President Loren Rullman dealt with areas that included Housing, Dining and Recreational Sports; one headed by associate Vice President Anjali Anturkar dealt with Student Legal services, Human Resources, Information Technology; a third, headed by Associate Vice President Simone Himbeault Taylor, includes the Career Center, the Office of Student Conflict Resolution (OSCR), and the International Center; Dean of Students, Laura Blake Jones had primary responsibility of the Greek system, and services for students with disabilities (further information is available at <https://studentlife.umich.edu/>). Professor Potter then proceeded to outline the significance of the Division of Student Life for the University community, and the role of the division's administration in defusing potential controversies of the sort that have been extremely damaging to the communities at (e.g.) Missouri and Yale.

Professor Potter reviewed the recent work of the SRAC, which completed its contribution to the current amendment cycle of the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities in January (<https://oscr.umich.edu/article/statement-student-rights-and-responsibilities-1>). The revision takes place on a three-year cycle. He said that the committee had significant discussions in the past two years of campus climate issues; alcohol use (connected with the Senate assembly vote in October to recommend more robust teaching of courses for first and second year students on Fridays); the development of the Sexual Misconduct Policy, which was extensively discussed in the SRAC with members of the Office of



FACULTY SENATE
SENATE ASSEMBLY
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Institutional Equity (OIE); the Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center (SAPAC) and OSCR (those discussions contributed to the recommendation for a more robust teaching schedule on Fridays); Greek Life, and Recreational Sports (where the committee had been active in supporting the current initiative for improving the University's facilities while noting the significant issue cost issues).

Professor Potter urged members of the Senate Assembly, especially those involved with undergraduate teaching to put themselves forward for membership on the SRAC.

4:45 Unfinished Business/Matters Arising

Chair Weineck said that President Schlissel had expressed support for strengthening the committee structure

Chair Weineck asked SA members to discuss the change to CANVAS with their colleagues

4:40 Adjournment

Next Senate Assembly Meeting: March 21, 2016

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.