

Minutes of 26 January 1998  
Circulated 27 January 1998  
Approved 18 May 1998

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN  
SENATE ASSEMBLY MEETING  
MINUTES OF 26 JANUARY 1998

ATTENDANCE

**Present:** Assanis, Baker, Bleske, Burnstein, Castle, Christiansen, Curley, DeCamp, Deskins, Ensminger, M. Feldman, Francis, Freese, Hultquist, Karnopp, Kibbie, Kleinsmith, Kossoudji, Lafortune, Lawson, V. Lee, Lomax, Loveland-Cherry, MacAdam, MacAlpine, Malamud, Marshall, Nagel, Nolen-Hoeksema, Olson, Perakis, Rahme, Rogers, Rosenberg, Schneider, Schteingart, R. Sharp, Shotwell, Steneck, Ward, Yeo

**Alternates:** Deborah Walker for Jeanne Raisler (Nursing), Robert Megginson for Robyn Burnham (LSA)

**Absent:** Bartlett, Bernal, Browder, Bryant, Burdi, Colletti, Cooney, Croxton, DeWoskin, E. Feldman, Flynn, Freedman, Gull, Jamerson, Jensen, Julius, Kabamba, Keyserling, D. Lee, Maloy, Mann, Martin, Navvab, Pastalan, Pintrich, Rush, Shapiro, Sharf, W. Sharp, Siebers, Teasley, Turcotte, Wagaw, Wasserman, Yeung, Zorn

Chair D'Alecy convened the meeting at 3:20 P.M.

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED

1. Agenda for 26 January 1998
2. Draft minutes of the Senate Assembly meeting of 15 December 1997
3. Minutes of the Senate Assembly meeting of 17 November 1997, with requested changes by Provost Nancy Cantor.
4. SACUA and Senate Assembly Skeletal Agendas
5. Item for action: The Value of Diversity, draft resolution

CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF 15 DECEMBER 1997

The minutes of 15 December 1997 were approved as submitted.

RE-CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF 17 NOVEMBER 1997

Chair D'Alecy reported that Provost Cantor had requested some changes in her remarks to Senate Assembly, as indicated in the distributed minutes. The minutes were approved as amended.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair D'Alecy announced:

1. Four deans will be evaluated this year. Three of them (Business, Music, and Public Health) have already supplied a supporting document for transmittal to their faculties. The fourth dean, LSA, recently called the Senate Assembly Chair expressing her support for the process, and simultaneously referencing supportive comments by Provost Cantor at a meeting of the Academic Programs Group.
2. The model grievance document has been transmitted to the Provost, and it may be completed by the end of the semester.
3. With the elevation of the position of General Counsel to that of vice president, Regents Bylaws mandate the creation of an advisory committee by the Senate Assembly. SACUA has begun developing a draft charge for the advisory committee.

4. Technical revision of the Faculty Handbook will be complete by the end of the semester. Already 16 of 20 chapters are ready for review by SACUA.
5. An initial slate of candidates for SACUA and the DPSS grievance board will be announced at the February meeting.
6. Electronic mail addresses for the professoriate and admissions study groups will be distributed to members of the Senate Assembly in order to encourage communication and discussion.

#### REPORT FROM THE MEDICAL AFFAIRS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Chair D'Alecy introduced Professor Peter Ward, chair of the MAAC at 3:29 P.M. Professor Ward said that the MAAC had been meeting monthly since September, and had met once with the EVPMA. Ward said that the EVPMA had made it clear that his schedule would not permit him to meet monthly with his advisory committee.

Professor Ward reported that MCare now has 141,000 enrollees and is growing rapidly. He said that the growth has brought challenges to the health care system. He said that discussion of MCare steerage plans were still on-going. He pointed out that there has been a strong shift to the use of ambulatory settings for training of both residents and medical students, and that the shift has created pressures for appropriate training sites. He noted that the shift also had economic consequences.

Ward said that increased patient loads and reduced turn-around time meant that clinical faculty had less time for scholarly pursuits. He pointed out that the pressures were causing a predictable shift to more and more strictly clinical faculty, and that the trend would likely continue. He said that the trends would likely cause the Medical School to reconfigure its criteria for promotion, and that the clinical faculty at some point will outnumber the tenured faculty.

Professor Ward said that there was a possibility that the NIH budget will as much as double in the future, raising the probability of grant funding success to as high as 40%. If so, he said, there would be increased opportunity for researchers to raise their salaries from grants.

Ward stated that the UM Health System will probably have to respond to more changes than any other academic sector of the university. He concluded his presentation at 3:40 P.M. and invited discussion.

Professor MacAdam remarked that Ward had raised profoundly important issues, and that the interaction of the faculty advisory committee with the EVPMA was critical. Ward replied that when the committee had definitive advice, it would meet again with the EVPMA. Ward said that the EVPMA responds to the committee minutes and has recommended people to meet with the committee. He said the committee was accumulating diverse views and good input from multiple sources.

Professor Kleinsmith asked how the Senate Assembly would be informed of recommendations developed by the committee. Ward replied that he would bring the committee recommendations to the Senate Assembly before presenting them to the EVPMA. He said that he would provide the Senate Assembly with approved copies of committee minutes. Professor Ward completed his remarks and discussion at 3:47 P.M.

#### REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE FOR A MULTICULTURAL UNIVERSITY

Chair D'Alecy invited Professor Charles B. Smith, chair of the SACMU, to address the Senate Assembly. Professor Smith referred to item 5 and identified it as a statement on diversity that was generated at the request of the Senate Assembly at its October meeting. Smith noted that the SACMU had sent a statement on diversity to the Senate Assembly in 1996, and that the Assembly had modified the original document. Smith said that the present document explains why diversity is beneficial to the university, and that it lays the foundation for future action.

Senate Assembly members discussed the draft resolution and several members suggested editorial changes. Professor Steneck remarked that the statement seemed to follow from the argument that the UM is an academic institution, and he asked if alternative arguments could be raised because it

is a public institution, as well. Professor Ward stated that it would be undesirable to create the impression that there were two sets of criteria owing to the two factors.

Chair D'Alecy asked Smith to explain the relationship of the draft resolution to future steps by the Multicultural Committee. Smith replied that the committee was proceeding in incrementalist fashion. He noted that 28 responses had been received from the Senate Assembly to a questionnaire distributed during the previous term. He noted that the deadline was approaching, and he invited further input. He said that the committee was reviewing 8 to 10 major reports of recent past years with attention to the embedded recommendations, and that the SACMU would like to develop a set of specific recommendations for implementation of a diversity strategy.

Chair D'Alecy invited a motion to adopt the resolution. Several members signified consent. Professor Steneck asked if the intent was to publish the resolution in the University Record. He stated that the piecemeal process did not appeal to him, and that he would like to see the whole picture at once. Professor Castle expressed agreement with Professor Steneck. Professor Kleinsmith responded that there are many people on campus for whom the resolution itself would be an important statement. Chair D'Alecy remarked that members of the Multicultural Committee have made an argument to him that the process is not piecemeal, but rather orderly and progressive. Another member declared that the resolution was a remarkable statement. She said the biggest change was the statement that we benefit from diversity, and she said she would like to see the statement publicized.

Additional editorial changes were discussed by Assembly members. The revised draft finally read:

### **THE VALUE OF DIVERSITY**

The University of Michigan Senate Assembly, the elected governing body of the faculty, believes that the goals of an institution of higher learning should be to generate new knowledge, to convey knowledge to others, and to involve its faculty, students, and staff in using this knowledge to address contemporary social problems. For the University to excel in reaching these goals, the rich diversity of contemporary society is a resource that needs to be tapped. Not only does the education of students from diverse backgrounds itself address societal problems, but collaborative efforts within the University among persons with diverse experiences and points of view can facilitate the development of new ideas in traditional areas of our intellectual enterprise and help us to formulate creative solutions to societal problems. Civility in discourse and the generation of mutual empathy among diverse parties are crucial to the effectiveness of this process.

Our commitment to diversity means at the most basic level a willingness both to recognize the value of disparate experiences and visions and to weave them into the fabric of our institution. Because of this, we are committed to a policy of recruiting and maintaining a culturally and racially diverse student body and faculty that are representative of contemporary society, and to assuring that these diverse influences are respected and incorporated into the structure of the university. In this way, we can provide students with the unique educational experience and intellectual stimulation that can only come from interacting with and learning to respect a broad range of people with differing backgrounds, life experiences, beliefs, and ideas.

In order for the university to retain its leadership role within the educational community, it must continue and expand upon these efforts to reach out and include all who comprise our diverse society in order to engage effectively its students, faculty, and staff with the major societal problems of the present and future. It is only through such a commitment that the University of Michigan can positively and effectively influence the future of American education and the world of the twenty-first century.

Vote on the active motion:

Number approving- 32

Number disapproving- none

Abstentions of record- 5

Chair D'Alecy declared that the resolution had been approved.

## ISSUE ARISING

Chair D'Alecy invited Professor MacAlpine to address the Assembly. MacAlpine referred to an insert section present in the Michigan Daily from the previous week in which students were offered coupons for free samples of chewing tobacco. He expressed dismay with the situation and stated that he regarded it as potential endangerment to the health of university students. Professor Deskins asked if the coupons were present in a paid advertisement. MacAlpine replied that they were.

Professor Lawson commented that it should ordinarily be the policy of a student newspaper to consider their own ads. She cautioned against abridging the rights of journalism students. Professor MacAdam also urged caution against acting heavy handedly on the subject of student publications. MacAlpine replied that he did not advocate any censorship of ads, but that he opposed the free coupons.

Various SACUA members urged that SACUA leadership and concerned members of the Assembly convey their concerns in a non-provocative manner. Members pointed out that the Daily had carried an editorial endorsing the Senate Assembly recommendation for divestment of tobacco stocks from the University portfolio.

Chair D'Alecy asked if the Assembly would endorse the drafting of an open letter to the student body that expressed faculty concerns about open provision of addictive drugs in this manner. He queried the members by straw vote and declared that the position was favorably endorsed. D'Alecy said that he would try to develop a draft letter with e-mail consultation.

## VISIT OF CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF ITD, JOSE-MARIE GRIFFITHS

Chair D'Alecy introduced Jose-Marie Griffiths and invited her to address the Assembly at 4:33 P.M. Ms. Griffiths provided an overview of Information Technology. She pointed out that technologists and the users of technology often have different views of the environment. She characterized the vision of University of Michigan Information Technology as being:

- 1) to enhance and extend the formation, quality, and evolution of "knowledge communities",
- 2) to be recognized as a leader in the design and delivery of supporting technology solutions, and
- 3) to be seen as a seamless extension of the units they serve.

Griffiths said that Information Technology is a campus resource for physical infrastructure, enabling services, core applications such as e-mail, and other products and services. She explained that IT has formed a group to develop strategic directions for the unit, and would be working to coordinate operations in a collective manner.

Griffiths said there were several issues that required strategic thinking: the increasing costs of ownership of computer technology and support services, increasing faculty and student needs, and failures of the "one size fits all" model. She explained that IT was moving toward an environment that will feature network centered computing, collaboration technologies, upgraded telecom infrastructure, and flexible student and faculty access.

Griffiths' prepared remarks were concluded at 4:50 P.M. and she invited discussion from the audience. Professor Freese asked how much departmental computing was supported by ITD. Griffiths replied that it supported some, and she offered specific examples, but added that more information was needed from the units.

Professor Deskins asked who takes care of instructional computers, many of which are obsolete and in need of maintenance. He noted that massive backlogs often develop at exam times. Griffiths replied that instructional computers were managed by both ITD and individual units. She said the issue was one of communication about what is available and what is expected. She cited the long-standing dichotomy between "Mac" and "IBM" PC platforms, and remarked that historical purchasing patterns had bequeathed over 6000 MacIntosh computers to the campus. She said that even at present purchasing power is not being leveraged, citing a recent example in which the same machine could be

purchased through medical purchasing for \$1700, whereas the rest of the campus was paying \$2200 for it.

Professor Lomax pointed out that many granting agencies were fast moving toward electronic submission of grant proposals, and she asked who would provide the necessary boosts to faculty expertise in the technology. Griffiths replied that she hoped her unit could help. She pointed out that it may be necessary to give up some things in order to have the necessary functionality elsewhere.

Professor Burnstein declared that Griffiths role was critical to the future of the institution. He said that ITD must take a leadership role because if the units are left to their own initiatives, they cannot attend to the necessary degree of connectivity in all computing applications.

Professor MacAdam suggested that the profile of incoming students suggests that a distributed model of computer availability may be more natural than the large lab model that presently exists. Griffiths replied that the IT Strategic Directions Group, consisting of some deans and executive officers, is already considering alternative models of computer distribution. She said that one idea was to explore leasing options for students, which she said would add the leveraging power of student budgets to that of internal university resources. She said that security and disaster prevention are additional issues.

Professor Shotwell asked if it would soon be possible to have the most recent versions of specific software packages available on-line in a distributed manner, so that each user could have the same, most recent, packages. Griffiths replied that the possibility was under exploration. Professor MacAlpine asked if redundancy was built in to the system at a sufficient level. Griffiths assured him that sure was the case.

#### OLD BUSINESS

No old business was presented.

#### NEW BUSINESS

No new business was presented.

The meeting adjourned at 5:06 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

John T. Lehman  
Senate Secretary