

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SENATE ASSEMBLY MEETING
MINUTES OF 23 JANUARY 1995
APPROVED 13 FEBRUARY 1995

Loup convened the meeting at 3:20 PM.

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED

1. Agenda
2. Draft minutes of the Senate Assembly meeting of 12 December 1994
3. Minutes of SACUA, 28 November 1994
4. Faculty Governance Update
5. Report on the Department of Communication
6. Revisions to the report: The Quality of the Climate for Minority Faculty at the University of Michigan
7. Announcement for forum on the meaning of tenure
8. Motion presented by Professor Montalvo, dated January 23, 1995

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT DUDERSTADT

Chair Loup introduced President Duderstadt who addressed the Senate Assembly regarding the impending search for University Provost. President Duderstadt stated that the role of the Provost was one of immense importance and also great difficulty. He said that Provost Whitaker had provided strong leadership, and he recounted the accomplishments during his term.

President Duderstadt then explained that he was consulting with deans, the Michigan Student Assembly, and with SACUA regarding a search committee, which he thought would probably be 10 in number. He said that the search process should be deliberate so as to interact with schools and colleges. He said that the UM would best be served if a national search were conducted. He expressed the opinion that the more that faculty became engaged in the search process, the more support the final candidate would enjoy. He said that he had invited SACUA involvement, and was looking for a way to include SACUA in the search process.

The president then referenced the retreat he had held with the Senate Assembly during Fall Term 1994. He said that from interactions at the retreat he had realized that there was a need to work harder at communicating ideas, and thus he would like to schedule a second retreat either late in the Winter Term or during the early spring. He proposed two items related to the Senate Assembly agenda: (1) the climate for minority faculty, and (2) the issue of faculty tenure. He added that more items were possible, and that the Senate Assembly should decide on the agenda. He concluded his remarks by stating that it was important to sustain a dialog, and if Senate Assembly liked it, it would continue. He said that he would work with Chair Loup and SACUA to do so.

President Duderstadt left the meeting at 3:30 PM.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Loup introduced Mr. Tom Schneider, the new Executive Assistant for SACUA. She introduced and welcomed Professor Bill Colburn, who had agreed to serve

as the Senate Assembly Parliamentarian. She also introduced Ms. Charlene Kolar, who has served as temporary staff member in the SACUA office, and Ms. Nancy A. Anderson, who had assumed those duties permanently.

THE QUALITY OF THE CLIMATE FOR MINORITY FACULTY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Loup introduced Professor Bashshur to continue discussion of the report from the Committee for a Multicultural University.

Professor Bashshur reported that a number of Senate Assembly members had responded to his call for comments about the draft report, and that Provost Whitaker had responded as well. He referred members to a distributed copy of proposed revisions (item 6) based on this feedback, which included a list of 6 revised recommendations. Professor Bashshur stated that the recommendations represented no significant deviation from existing University policy, but that the committee thought reaffirmation was important, and the committee wished to reach closure on the report. He said that subsequently the committee would try to develop more specific recommendations.

Professor Yahannes asked if there was uniformity in the criteria for promotion and salary increase among units. Professor Bashshur responded that a common weighting seemed to be 40%-40%-20% by research, teaching, and service. Provost Whitaker interjected that he did not think there was such a declared policy, and that individual schools have their own policies. Professor Bashshur acknowledged the correction.

Professors Deskins and McNamara introduced suggested changes in wording for three of the revised recommendations, and Professor Bashshur accepted the suggestions on behalf of the committee.

Professor Montalvo made a motion that the recommendations of the report be approved as amended; several members seconded the motion.

Professor Coward asked if the report would be published and whether aspects of the report would be revisited in the future. Professor Bashshur reiterated the committee's goal of reaching closure on the report, and subsequently pursuing more specific recommendations. Professor Coward noted that the issue of retention was confounded with the pool sizes in different disciplines. Provost Whitaker added that the issues were complicated. He said that the recommendations seem to apply to executive committees and faculties in different schools. He said he thought there would be problems getting every school and all executive committees to adopt uniform procedures. He asked if the motion was asking the Senate Assembly to send these recommendations to other governing structures.

Professor Zorn asked if the text of recommendation #3 reflected the Provost's concerns. Professor Bashshur replied that it did not. Chair Loup then ruled that after approval of the motion, the Senate Assembly could decide how best to proceed. Professor Deskins added that he didn't see any confusion in the process. He noted that passing along recommendations was not tantamount to imposing an implementation plan. Professor Coward relied that he wanted it expressed on the record that there were some concerns. He added that he commended the committee, nevertheless. Professor Maloy added that he had concern about the language of recommendations as they affected the unit for which he served on the executive committee.

The text of recommendations offered for vote follows:

1. The recent efforts by the University of Michigan to recruit underrepresented minority faculty should be acknowledged and complimented. During the last decade, the number and proportion of such individuals on the faculty have increased in some units. However, the success in recruitment has not been matched by an equivalent success in improving retention and promotion.
2. The University of Michigan should recommit itself to its established policy of advancing diversity and integration in academic life, and it should look for ways to strengthen this policy. Diversity consists of enriching the cultural, ethnic, and gender composition of the faculty. Integration consists of increased collegial interaction, the pursuit of common goals in teaching, research, and service, interdisciplinary work, and greater tolerance and understanding among the various groups on campus.
3. The University should develop and implement mechanisms to ensure the uniform adoption of an explicit policy by all units and departments within the campus community to achieve the common goals of diversity and integration. All units within the University should be asked to develop strategic plans for reaching these goals and to monitor their progress in achieving them. All departments within the University should be asked to hold discussions and develop specific plans for improved mentoring and the provision of effective support to promote retention not only of minority but of all faculty.
4. A policy focused on issues of retention and climate should be enacted. It must establish clear and attainable paths to promotion, merit review, and tenure within the University. These paths must be based on the use of fair and uniform criteria for merit review and promotion. Consistent with declared University policy, the criteria must provide for appropriate weighting of quality of teaching, student advising, and university and community service, in addition to scholarship and research funding.
5. The policy must pay special attention to the concerns of minority women faculty, including cultural sensitivity, merit review, promotion, and compensation.
6. The University should continue to support programs aimed at promoting diversity and integration such as faculty exchange, visiting professorships, and centers for underrepresented minority and women faculty.

Chair Loup called the active motion for vote. The motion carried by voice vote.

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES OF 12 DECEMBER 1994

The minutes were approved with corrections.

MOTION FROM THE COMMITTEE ON A MULTICULTURAL UNIVERSITY

On behalf of the committee, Professor Montalvo introduced and distributed the motion (Smith seconded):

"The Senate Assembly Committee on a Multicultural University is charged to monitor the recruitment and retention efforts regarding faculty of color of the schools and colleges and central administration. The Committee should advise the Provost and Executive Vice-President for Academic Affairs as well as the Vice-Provost for Academic and Multicultural Affairs of its findings, and should report them annually to the Senate Assembly."

Professor Montalvo explained that both the Provost and the President have asked that the faculty play a larger role in this matter, and that the motion was intended to meet that challenge. He added that the motion was introduced for discussion at this meeting.

Professor Coward asked for clarification of the advisory function of the committee. He expressed his concern that a small group should not be speaking for the Senate Assembly. Professor Kaplan asked what was different about the proposed charge from the previous charge to the committee. Professor Montalvo replied that the proposed monitoring function was new. Provost Whitaker then stated that if the motion was an effort to have one body of faculty governance audit another, it would seem the other group has to accept the audit.

Professor Beam asked if the motion was intended to represent future committee recommendations promised by Professor Bashshur's remarks. Professor Montalvo replied that such was not the intent. Rather, he said, it was an effort to keep the faculty informed and involved in the issues. The motion was presented for discussion in the hope that it could be voted at the next Assembly meeting.

Professor Maloy asked how the proposed monitoring would impinge on executive committee authority, and questioned matters of uniform governance versus unit governance. Professor Marich expressed a need for more information.

Professor Wahl moved to place the active motion to the table; several members seconded the motion.

The motion to table was approved by voice vote.

FORUM ANNOUNCEMENT

Professor Kaplan referred to a printed announcement (item #7) of a forum on the meaning of tenure, sponsored by AAUP, SACUA, and the Academic Women's Caucus, Thursday, 9 February 1995, from 4 to 5:30 PM in the Henderson Room of the Michigan League.

PROPOSAL TO SENATE ASSEMBLY FOR A CHANGE IN THE MANNER OF ELECTING AND NOMINATING THE SACUA/SENATE ASSEMBLY CHAIR

Professor Brewer moved to postpone indefinitely the motion to change the manner of election of the Chair (Dunn seconded). He noted that not enough time remained to implement the proposal this year, and that SACUA had voted to withdraw the offer. He explained that the motion had been altruistic, and that he thought the Senate Assembly had "looked a gift horse in the mouth" by postponing action previously. He added that he hoped interested Senate Assembly members would get together and develop a proposal to SACUA for such a change in the future.

The motion to postpone indefinitely was approved by voice vote.

FEEDBACK ON NOVEMBER RETREAT WITH THE PRESIDENT

Chair Loup invited comments from members regarding the November retreat. Professor Coffin expressed disappointment that the format of discussions had been structured that she did not agree were most important, and that interaction with the President had been slight. Professor Maloy responded that he thought the retreat was the best thing he had participated in since being in the Senate Assembly, and that he hoped it would be continued. Professor Brandle expressed his positive impression, as well, and

offered the suggestion that in the future there be more direct interaction with the President. Professor McNamara suggested some modification to the structure of future retreats, with emphasis on interactions with the President and de-emphasis of panel summations.

Professor Kaplan suggested that one novel approach might be a radio or television call-in program with the President. Professor Shirley endorsed the suggestion, and recommended that subsequent retreats deal with substantive matters. Professor Wahl recommended that in the future the Senate Assembly should develop some of the questions discussed at the retreat.

Chair Loup invited additional comments by phone or electronic mail to SACUA members.

FEEDBACK ON VALUE CENTERED MANAGEMENT

Chair Loup invited feedback from members on Value Centered Management. Professor Shirley expressed great concern. Professor Taylor said there seemed to be no opportunity to consider implications for the future. He said the discussion centered on economics, not education, and that faculty were passive participants in a structure dropped on them. Professor Shirley added that the focus seemed to be on proving one's worth bottom-lined on financial worth, which he found tremendously disturbing.

Chair Loup invited a response from Provost Whitaker. The Provost replied that university revenue sources were threatened. He said he sought to preserve our values in the face of pressure for accountability. He cited a return to unit reviews to provide quality assessments. He also reported that pressures to keep tuition costs down were enormous. He said that a budgeting system doesn't change the resource base, but that it lets the institution focus on some things. He expressed his sense that VCM may drive some changes, such as more Spring Term courses. He said it might also drive some undesirable changes, such as a proliferation of courses taught by TV, with all students receiving A's. He said that under VCM there would be some relevance of the activity of the unit to the size of the budget. He noted the existence of an oversight committee, with the Chair of the Senate Assembly installed as a member.

The Provost explained that at present, costs incurred by somebody, such as those for heat, light, and power, are typically paid by someone else's budget. He expressed the need to get the values in line with the needs of the institution.

Professor Volakis replied that he agreed that VCM could make the units more accountable. He noted that the UM was losing students because it was more expensive than other Big 10 schools. He expressed concern, however, over how the implementation would occur at local levels. He said he feared it would be difficult and unless done with care, it could compromise the ability of faculty to teach. He asked if each faculty member was to be looked at as a revenue source under VCM.

Provost Whitaker replied that he could not respond because the units are still thinking about implementation. He said there may well be modifications within the units.

Professor Dunn asked if there was a timetable for implementation. Provost Whitaker replied that the plan is to give units budget information both traditionally and by VCM accounting next year, but without any adverse budget consequences at that time. He said the units would have to understand there could be consequences in the future.

He said he thought the rules of mechanisms for VCM should be monitored, as should be the philosophy of resource allocation.

Professor Griffin stated that the cost of higher education is a big public issue. He said that the Senate Assembly needed to engage this discussion so that academic values will live through the challenge.

OLD BUSINESS

No old business was proposed.

NEW BUSINESS

Professor Coward expressed thanks to the parliamentarian for his guidance and advise to Senate Assembly.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

John T. Lehman
Secretary, pro tempore

Appendix: Remarks by Professor Bashshur, dated 23 January 1995