

Minutes of 27 January 2003  
First Circulated 9 February 2003  
Approved 17 February 2003

**THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN  
SENATE ASSEMBLY MEETING**

**27 January 2003**

---

**ATTENDANCE**

**Present:** Andersen, Bartlett, Bradley, Brown, Burdi, Byosiere, Carlisle, Combi, Drach, Elenbogen, Ensminger, Fisher, Frier, Giordani, Gobetti, Goldman, Gould, Green, Gull, Huntley, Karr, Keller-Cohen, Koopmann, Moore, Powell, Prasad, Raisler, Riebesell, Robertson, Sagher, Schwendeman, Simpson, Thornton, Wechsler, Winter, Yeo; Lehman

**Alternate:** Charles Smith

**Absent:** Akerlof, Alfred, Andre, Atreya, Barsky, Berent, Bhavnani, Boyd, Cho, Clark, Colas, Faerber, Fishman, Hall, Hills, Ketefian, Kim, Kosch, Johnson, Lindner, Lithgow-Bertelloni, McDonagh, Ni, Norris, Okada, Orr, Overmyer, Page, Pedraza, Pennell Ross, Peterson, Remick, Ruffin, Savage, Sension, Seyhun, Shelden, Shimp, Tappenden, Tropman, Watkins, Whatley, Yakel

**MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED**

1. Senate Assembly agenda
2. Draft minutes of the Senate Assembly meeting of 18 November 2002
3. Recommendation from Research Policies Committee to F. Ulaby, dated 10 January 2003 (corrected 16 January 2002 [sic]) regarding establishment of research professori
4. Memorandum and supporting documents from C. F. Koopmann and W. W. Schultz, dated 27 January 2003, regarding proposed revisions to the Deansí Evaluation Process
5. Draft revisions to the Faculty Appeals Procedures for Schools

Chair Koopmann convened the meeting at 3:19 P.M. The proposed agenda was adopted.

**CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF 18 NOVEMBER 2002**

The minutes of 18 November 2002 were approved as submitted.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS/UPDATES**

Chair Koopmann announced:

1. SACUA elections are slated for the 17 March 2003 meeting of Senate Assembly. Five candidates have been identified so far.
2. The status of Senate Assembly's Legal Advisory Council and options are being studied by a SACUA subcommittee. The possibility of outside legal counsel for the faculty ombuds is one item under consideration.
3. A recommendation for research professor track has been developed by vice president for research Ulaby (distributed item 3).

Professor Burdi asked whether the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee (AAAC) has studied the proposal and taken any stance. Mr. Schneider responded that AAAC approval was not required because the proposal had come to Senate Assembly through the committee structure of the Research Policies Committee (RPC). Professor Burdi pointed out that the proposal has implications for the entire academic community. Chair Koopmann said that if the AAAC is going to take up the issue they need to do so very rapidly.

## **VISIT OF LIFE SCIENCES INSTITUTE GUESTS A. SALTIEL AND L. BARRY**

The guests arrived at 3:28 P.M. Professor Saltiel made a PowerPoint assisted presentation with references to supporting documents and information at URL <http://www.lifesciences.umich.edu/institute/index.html>. At the conclusion of his prepared remarks, he invited questions from the Assembly.

Professor Burdi commented that the academic areas identified with the Life Sciences Institute (LSI) are probably being covered elsewhere on campus, and he asked how exclusive the LSI was intended to be. Saltiel replied that the LSI is not meant to be exclusive and that collaboration is important. He said that LSI staff hopes to reach out and be a hub for collaboration. He pointed out that two of the charter faculty are clinicians and that it will be possible to find additional collaborations easily.

In response to a question about mathematical interactions, Saltiel replied that computational biology is an important area for interactions, and that there are opportunities in neuroscience, as well. He stated that the iCommons building of LSI would provide a home for biomathematics.

Professor Burdi asked whether the LSI would be tenure-granting. Saltiel replied no, that LSI scientists would be research scientists, but that all faculty would have tenure homes in other units. He said that decisions about their academic careers would be made in home units. Chair Koopmann asked for an explanation of the financial arrangements for funding each LSI faculty line. Ms. Barry replied that the faculty who achieve tenure

would have the right to retreat to their departments. Their funding would be worked out on a case by case basis. She said that the LSI is funded for additional faculty lines, not to take lines away from the units. She said that most of the charter faculty have 50-50 funding arrangements between their units and LSI, but that other arrangements would exist in the future for new hires.

Saltiel said that he expects to run the LSI on the Indirect Costs recovered from research grants. He said there would be a 90/10 split with the home department of the faculty. Ms. Barry said that the indirect costs would otherwise be treated no different by the central administration from the ICs generated by other units.

Professor Burdi asked how many undergraduates would flow through the LSI over time. Saltiel replied that it would likely vary by individual lab. Professor Riebesell asked whether the training aspect of the LSI would possibly lead to it becoming degree granting in the future. Saltiel said that he did not think so because the training would be mainly for postdoctorals and junior faculty.

A member of the Assembly commented that the difference between chaos and coherence results from specification of joint areas for study. He asked who decides on the areas and how the decisions affect home departments. Saltiel replied that the charter faculty along with the first new hires would start to decide the key areas.

Asked what incentive exists for a home department to send its stars to LSI, Saltiel replied that the LSI people would not ordinarily come to the university otherwise. He said they would hold 50% of their appointment in a department, but they would be raising most of their own salary from grants.

Professor Riebesell asked how many different research topics the LSI could accommodate. Saltiel said that the number was finite because there are 15 large laboratory areas. Riebesell asked if there is anything to prevent the LSI from evolving into a center that focuses on a single research area (such as diabetes). Saltiel replied that he did not think that would happen, that while it is a possible route to take, it is unlikely.

Professor Burdi asked what the opportunities were for off-campus people to be recruited as charter faculty. Saltiel replied that as the buildings open he thought there would be additional faculty. He said that future recruiting would be defined by lab space and available room for people by area of interest. He said he would try to find people who are excited about interactions in the institute.

The guests left the meeting at 4:12 P.M.

## **FACULTY APPEALS PROCEDURES REVISION**

Chair Koopmann gave the floor to Professor Gobetti to introduce proposed changes to the model Faculty Appeals Procedure. Gobetti reported that he and Professor Berent had worked with Valerie Castle in the provost's office to modify procedures in

cases where deans are respondents to grievances. Professor Riebesell pointed out that he and Professor Pedraza are inspecting the entire document and have found many inconsistencies and ambiguities. He said that other changes may be coming forward to the Assembly in the future. Professor Burdi asked whether it was worthwhile to revise the document in piecemeal fashion.

Professor Elenbogen and others voiced the opinion that committees that receive recommendations from Grievance Review Boards (GRBs) should be elected, not appointed. Professor Riebesell commented that Provost Courant told SACUA that the Academic Programs Group is concerned about the use of executive committees as review committees, because they say it could damage the working relationship between the executive committee and the dean.

---

**ACTION OF THE SENATE ASSEMBLY 012703-1**

Professor Elenbogen moved that Section E of distributed item 5 be amended to state that in cases where the dean is a respondent, a committee elected by faculty of the unit shall review the GRB decision (seconded by Professor Ensminger).

Vote on the active motion: The action was approved by unanimous vote.

---

**ACTION OF THE SENATE ASSEMBLY 012703-2**

Professor Ensminger moved to strike the following sentence from section E:

“The Dean will appoint as a Review Committee any standing committee of faculty members, or an ad hoc committee of faculty members or faculty members and administrators.” (multiple seconds)

Vote on the active motion: The action was approved by unanimous vote with one abstention of record.

---

**ACTION OF THE SENATE ASSEMBLY 012703-3**

Professor Ensminger moved that the Senate Assembly accepts the proposed draft revisions to the Faculty Appeals Procedure (distributed item 5) as amended. (multiple seconds).

Vote on the active motion: The action was approved by majority vote, with one vote opposing and no abstentions of record.

---

### **REVISION TO DEANSÍ EVALUATION PROCEDURE**

At 4:35 P.M. Chair Koopmann called attention to distributed item 4, listing proposed revisions to evaluation of deans that was introduced by AAAC.

---

### **ACTION OF THE SENATE ASSEMBLY 012703-3**

Professor Gobetti moved that the Senate Assembly accepts the proposed revisions to deansí evaluation procedures as specified in distributed item 4 (multiple seconds).

Vote on the active motion: The action was approved by unanimous vote.

---

### **OLD BUSINESS**

Chair Koopman reported that the administration has been concerned about issues related to its new Pharmacy Benefits Management (PBM) arrangements and use of Social Security numbers (SSNs) as the default identifier. He said that faculty and staff members who want their SSN removed from their cards can contact Benefits Office to do so.

Koopmann said that there are reports that budget cuts in state appropriations for the U-M will be severe next year. He said the administration's response may be to reduce faculty and staff benefits. He said that he has informed the administration that faculty want to evaluate the numbers and the data. Professor Burdi asked if the administration was planning to renegotiate its contracts with the trade unions. Chair Koopmann replied that non-unionized groups will watch developments closely and it might affect efforts to organize on the campus.

There was no other old business.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no other new business.

The meeting adjourned at 4:43 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

John T. Lehman

Senate Secretary

---

**University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents, Sec. 5.02:**

*Governing Bodies in Schools and Colleges*

In each school, college, or degree granting division of the University, including those at the University of Michigan-Dearborn and at the University of Michigan-Flint, the governing faculty shall be in charge of the affairs of the school, college, or division, except as delegated to the executive committee, if any, and except that in the School of Graduate Studies the governing board shall be the executive board, and in the Medical School shall be the executive faculty.

---

**January 27, 2003 Senate Assembly Meeting Agenda**

3:15 pm	Call to Order	
3:20 pm	Consideration of Minutes	
3:25 pm	Announcements	
	1. March 17 SACUA Election	
	2. Legal Advisory Council Update	
	3. Research Professor Title	
3:30 pm	Life Sciences Institute Guests	
	Alan Saltiel, Director	
	Liz Barry, Managing Director	
4:30 pm	Deans' Evaluation Process Revision	ITEM FOR ACTION
4:45 pm	Faculty Appeal Procedures Revision	ITEM FOR ACTION
5:00 pm	Old/New Business	
5:05 pm	Adjournment	