

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

MINUTES OF JANUARY 27, 1992 SPECIAL MEETING

ATTENDANCE

Present: Anderson, Angus, Birge, Bord, M. Brown, Burdi, Cameron, Chiego, Cowan, D'Alecy, Debler, Diana, Douthit, Duell, Eggertsen, Fellin, Goepfinger, Green, Griffin, Hayashi, Hirshorn (Alt Tentler), Hollingsworth, E. Jensen, Kabamba, Kunkel, Larson, Loveland-Cherry, Marcelo, Montalvo, Morley, Mosher, Olson, Penchansky, Razzoog, Russell, Schwartz, Silverstein, C. Smith, Stein, Thum, Tosney, Veroff, Warner, Watkins, Whitehouse, Woods, Yang; Schwartz, Thorson, Schessler, Heskett.

Absent: Billi, Blair, Borgsdorf, A. Brown, Cole, Cox, Crandall, Didier, Gidley, Gross, Jenkins, A. Jensen, Katehi, Kimeldorf, Koopmann, Kramer, Mosberg, Organski, Papalambros, Porter, Ross, Schwank, Senkevitch, Simpson, Teske, Tinkle, Vinokur, Wheeler, Woo.

JAMES DIANA, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF NATURAL RESOURCES,
SENATE ASSEMBLY AND SACUA CHAIR: AN OVERVIEW OF
FACULTY GOVERNANCE AT VARIOUS UNIVERSITIES

There are several models of faculty governance at U.S. universities. The structure at public institutions are different from those at private universities. Some governance structures include students and staff, some meet irregularly, and in some cases the President of the University runs the meeting.

HARRIS MCCLAMROCH, PROFESSOR OF AEROSPACE
ENGINEERING AND OF ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING AND
COMPUTER SCIENCE: FACULTY GOVERNANCE IN THE
DEPARTMENT, COLLEGE, AND CENTRAL LEVELS

Professor McClamroch based his comments on several assumptions:
1) Education is the fundamental mission of UM, and the faculty have the primary responsibility for that mission. The role of administration is solely to support the educational activities of faculty and students. 2) Because each UM faculty member is under enormous pressure to teach and do research, there is little impetus for the faculty to spend time on faculty governance matters, especially at the university level. 3) Faculty governance at UM is essential to the educational mission of the University; faculty governance includes departmental level governance, school and college level governance, and university level governance. 4) Faculty governance at UM is most effective at the lowest level. At the departmental level, faculty exercise almost complete control over curricular matters. At the school and college level, the faculty and their elected representatives on the executive committees have a strong voice in important decision making, according to the Regents' Bylaws. However, the university-wide governance system has no real decision-making authority,

and it often feels that the advice and counsel provided to the University administration is not properly heeded.

Professor McClamroch then made several suggestions: 1) SACUA and the Assembly should take its appointment power very seriously. Whenever possible, appoint faculty members with special expertise. 2) Don't be afraid to disband committees which are no longer playing an important role. Times and individuals change and the committee structure should change also. 3) SACUA and the Assembly should be selective about choosing major topics to emphasize; a scatter shot approach to faculty governance which attempts to be heard on too many issues is doomed to failure. 4) Don't feel compelled to reach consensus on all matters; it is not unusual that on some issues the faculty is ill-informed or divided, in which case the Assembly and SACUA can best contribute by facilitating discussion rather than by trying to reach a consensus decision. An important function of university governance, independent of its effectiveness in influencing university policies and decision making, is to inform and educate faculty members about educational matters of university wide importance. 5) Don't get involved in issues that are better left to consideration at the school, college, or departmental levels; on the other hand, make sure that important issues are brought to the attention of the faculty at the school, college, and departmental levels. 6) The university governance system should support faculty governance in the schools and colleges. Demand that all school and college executive committees be strong faculty representatives with powers for faculty hiring, promotion, and tenure decisions. 7) SACUA and the Assembly should represent faculty views directly to the public using the media; this is of great importance so that the public does not perceive the UM only through press releases from the central administration.

DAVID HOLLINGER, PROFESSOR OF HISTORY: HISTORY AND CRITIQUES OF ISSUES FOR FACULTY GOVERNANCE AT UM

Professor Hollinger described Senate Assembly as a community of frustration. He offered two suggestions for improving faculty governance. First, expectations for Senate Assembly should be adjusted to the constitutional division of powers at this particular university. Accept for the Senate Assembly a more modest role. The Senate Assembly is an institution designed primarily to deal with a crisis. Between crises, the Assembly should be content to be called into session only when a genuinely campus-wide issue of real importance is brought forward by a committee report presenting specific recommendations for action. Some of the frustration attendant upon being a member of the Assembly is that one is frequently called into session when there is no big issue to be resolved.

Second, faculty governance should resist the temptation to develop a kind of shadow government for the university, within which each committee reporting to SACUA and to the Assembly monitors every step of the Executive Officers, and act as ersatz administrators. It spreads the faculty's resources too thin and creates too extensive a network of committee responsibilities.

The more fully faculty governance does become associated with colleagues who are not leaders intellectually in their national and international communities of science and scholarship, the more justification the Executive Officers claim for not taking faculty governance seriously. Organizationally, it would be wise to have SACUA elected by the Assembly, but have candidates drawn from the faculty at large. Assembly

membership has proved to be a bottleneck between the faculty at large and SACUA. A reassertion of a strong, campus-wide faculty voice is especially desirable given the apparent eagerness of the Regents to be more intimately and directly involved in the affairs of the University than might be desirable. The classical model of governance of American public universities involves a set of countervailing powers according to which Executive Officers are obliged to lead while answering both to a faculty constituency and to a regental or trustee constituency. When the tension goes out of the faculty side of this system, as I believe it has here at Michigan, the pressure on the Executive Officers from the other side, the Regental side, becomes greater, especially if the mood of a particular group of Regents is more intrusive than the norm.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE DISCUSSION

The meeting was opened as a committee of the whole for further discussion.

George Brewer, Medical School, Intellectual Properties Office (IPO): Dr. Brewer reminded the Assembly that the Administration had refused to share their ideas for changing the IPO with the faculty. IPO will be dismantled into school centered mini-offices. He urged the Assembly to get a statement describing the changes in IPO. Dr. Brewer suggested: 1) Since the Assembly is the only generally elected faculty group, it must be willing to spend the time necessary to adequately deal with issues important to the faculty. 2) The Assembly should take control of the agenda; reports should be written and distributed and verbal reports should only occur when requested. The Assembly should become a debating organization. 3) The Assembly should require the Administration to inform it about contemplated substantive changes affecting faculty or students long before they are to be put in place, so that the Assembly can debate and provide input. 4) A faculty newsletter is desperately needed.

Wilfred Kaplan, AAUP Chapter Executive Committee: Professor Kaplan explained that the following statement was approved by the Chapter Executive Committee on January 23, 1992. The AAUP policy statement on Government of Colleges and Universities (1990 Redbook, pp. 119-124) contains the recommendation (p. 121): "Effective planning demands that the broadest possible exchange of information and opinion should be the rule for communication among the components of a college or university. The channels of communication should be established and maintained by joint endeavor." Kaplan stated that our Chapter's Executive Committee has followed with concern the development of plans for the Intellectual Property Office and finds that the faculty, which is much affected by such plans, has been left out of the planning process. We strongly urge the University Administration to open the channels of communication and to consult the faculty, through SACUA, Senate Assembly and faculty committees, regarding all matters of concern to the faculty.

Roy Penschansky, Public Health Representative and SACUA: Professor Penschansky submitted to Assembly members his proposal for improving the functioning of faculty governance at University level. Some of his assumptions were: Senate Assembly, SACUA, and Senate Assembly

committees are involved in too many activities; faculty elected to the governance structure are not being adequately consulted on issues of central concern to faculty; and too few representative faculty are participating in faculty governance.

He suggested that the faculty governance at the University level must: limit the range of involvement to issues of central concern to faculty; become more influential on these key issues, including evaluation of University administration and administrative accountability; better integrate its activities with those of School Executive Committees; and obtain wider participation of representative faculty.

He recommended that SACUA be directed to: attempt to reach agreement with University administration on topics central to the faculty, topics on which faculty will receive full communication and have an opportunity to express their views in a timely manner; limit SACUA and the Senate Assembly standing committees to those addressing these issues; develop a process with the Executive Officers of annually identifying one or two broad policy questions for analysis and presentation; obtain agreement from the administration that when ad hoc groups are established to deal with issues where faculty views are desired, but where there is no standing committee, SACUA will be consulted on membership; develop stronger linkages to the school Executive Committees; develop mechanisms for review of administrative performance; and make major efforts to recruit a broader range of participation of faculty for Senate Assembly, SACUA, and the Senate Assembly Committees.

Charles Smith, Medical School Representative: Dr. Smith proposed the following resolution: "At the University of Michigan in recent years, University and unit administrations with increasing frequency have made decisions of major significance to faculty and students without the prior knowledge of these constituencies that such decisions were under consideration. It is the sense of the Senate Assembly that the University Administration and the administrations of the individual units should engage in an open and frank discussion of all issues which affect the well-being and working conditions of faculty, students and administrators on our campuses. The University Administration should seek the timely advice and counsel of the faculty prior to making decisions of major significance and should seek the consent of the faculty through the formal faculty governance system prior to making such decisions."

Charles Olson, Natural Resources Representative: Professor Olson reminded the Assembly members that the Regents' Bylaws stipulate an educational role for the faculty and that faculty committees should serve as advisors to the Executive Officers. It is not necessary for officers to attend every meeting, the committee should still meet and discuss current issues. We need greater involvement and input from a broader audience.

Louis D'Alecy, Medical School Representative: Dr. D'Alecy asked the Assembly members if they are ready to accept the fact that the University is going to be managed like a corporation.

Amy Polk, Michigan Student Assembly and Student Member of the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee: Ms. Polk read a resolution condemning the concept of the "University as a Corporation", which will be introduced at the next Michigan Student Assembly meeting.

Lewis K. Yohn, Dental School: Professor Yohn stated that going through the executive officers to get to the Regents will create a bottleneck. We need to educate faculty and get their support. We should go to court if needed.

Melanie Fors, UM Alumna: Ms. Fors spoke on behalf of a group of students, researchers, and campus residents on the Citizens for Safe Waste Disposal. She reported that the director of the Radiation Policy Committee, which does have faculty expertise, was told in 1989 to report directly to Financial Operations. The citizens group wants better and a broader range of faculty expertise on the Radiation Policy Committee.

Cynthia Marcelo, Medical School Representative and SACUA: Dr. Marcelo asked whom we expected to respond to Smith's resolution.

Smith: The resolution should to be sent to the administration, executive committees and faculty.

Lillian Simms, Nursing, Rules Committee Chair: We have not taken advantage of the existing rules. We need to disseminate the rules information. What rights do we have to speak to the Regents?

Diana: We regularly have the right to speak to the Regents, sometimes by invitation, some times by request.

Walter Debler, Engineering Representative and SACUA: When Regents want faculty opinion they turn to the Provost.

The committee of the whole was closed and Senate Assembly was reconvened.

RESOLUTION

Two friendly amendments to Smith's resolution were offered and accepted. The resolution reads: "At the University of Michigan in recent years, University and unit administrations with increasing frequency have made decisions of major significance to faculty and students without the prior knowledge of these constituencies that such decisions were under consideration. It is the sense of the Senate Assembly that the University Administration and the administrations of the individual units should engage in an open and frank discussion of all issues which affect the well-being and working conditions of faculty, students and administrators on our campuses. The University Administration should seek the timely advice and counsel of the faculty prior to making decisions of major significance and should seek the consent of the faculty through the formal faculty governance system prior to making such decisions."

The resolution was unanimously approved. Diana announced that the resolution will be sent to Executive Officers, Regents, Executive Committees and faculty.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane G. Schwartz
Senate Secretary

a/m/jan2792