

Minutes of 26 January 2015 Senate Assembly Meeting
Circulated 27 January 2015
Re-circulated 13 February 2015
Approved 16 February 2015

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
UNIVERSITY SENATE MEETING
SENATE ASSEMBLY MEETING
26 JANUARY 2015

Present: Adunbi, Adler, Battacharrya, Biteen, Bradley, Broglio, Burrow, Campbell, Casida, Chen, Cohn, Custer, Dolins, Fagerlin, Fraser, Friesen, Gocek, Grosh, Hayes, Jones, Johnson, Keshamouni, Kupferschmid, Lavoie Smith, Lehman, Liu, Malek, Masten, Mondro, Oey, Princen, Rothman, Shaefer, Schloss, Swain, Turnley, Wang, Zeisberg

Alternate Requested: Danziger, Ellis, Kileny, Krishner, Jacobsen, Lim, Raphael

Alternates: Csankovszki, Myers, Prygoski, Wright

Absent: Atchade, Adlerstein Gonzalez, Baker, Beck, Barolo, Bertacco, Brown, Cervetti, Cotera, Fiore, Garcia, Holland, Katapodi, Kee, Mitchell, Nielsen, Pandey, Primus, Ro, Ryan, Schultz, Silveira, Smith, Weineck, Winful, Veatch, Young, Ziff

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED

1. Agenda for Senate Assembly
2. Draft Minutes of the 17 November 2014 Senate Assembly meeting
3. Toward a Definition of Tenure, endorsed unanimously by the University of Michigan Senate Assembly, 12 December 1994

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Chair Masten convened the meeting of the Senate Assembly at 3:17 P.M. The proposed agenda was approved.

MINUTES

The draft minutes of 17 November 2014 were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The next meeting of the Senate Assembly is scheduled for 16 February 2015. Agenda topics may include recommendations from the Ad hoc Committee on Committees, a SACUA/Faculty Hearing Committee Report on the Office of Institutional Equity procedures, Fitness for Duty and Professional Standards for Faculty SPGs and Tenure, and Senate Rules amendments.
2. SACUA met with representatives of IT Policy and Compliance and Sol Bermann, Interim Chief Information Security Officer, to discuss five SPGs under revision (see <http://cio.umich.edu/policy/policies-under-review.php>).

3. Assembly members from LSA are encouraged to attend the meeting of the LSA faculty on Monday 2 February at 4 P.M. in Angell Hall where revision of the LSA faculty grievance policy will be discussed and possibly voted.

SACUA NOMINATING COMMITTEE ELECTION

Ballots were distributed at 3:20 P.M. Professor-emeritus Jones and Professor Mondro served as tellers. The Assembly adopted rules for the election declaring (1) in the event of a tie, the nominating committee membership would be enlarged, rather than conducting a runoff election, and (2) the retiring Senate Assembly member garnering the highest number of votes would be named chair of the nominating committee.

The tellers reported the election outcome as follows:

Masten

Oey

Adler (chair)

Burrow

Campbell

Winful

VISIT OF PROVOST MARTHA POLLACK

1. The provost arrived at 3:30 P.M. She reviewed some of the initiatives underway on campus.

She related the topics to four priorities she established.

Teaching and learning innovation

Bold research and scholarship projects that draw on the broad excellence of the UM

Making the campus more diverse and inclusive

Access and affordability

2. The provost said that she does not expect MOOCs to displace a UM education, but the emergence of inexpensive online educational opportunities pushes the university to think deeply about the value that the UM offers its students, and to demonstrate that value. It also encourages thought about the world into which our students are graduating. She described the challenges of a global and VUCA (volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous) environment. She said the breadth of talent at the UM is particularly matched to these challenges. She touted the increasing connections between professional schools and undergraduate education and offered several examples of Third Century Initiative teaching and learning programs.

3. The provost insisted that the UM is not seeking to replace face to face instruction with digital education, but that it is seeking to enhance the classroom experience. She said that some techniques borrowed from MOOCs could be beneficially applied. She said that there is great interest in learning analytics and evidence-based learning in general.

4. The provost described the Unizin consortium and its aim to promote university ownership of intellectual property and to ensure that universities heavily influence how digital technologies evolve.

5. The provost said that research excellence must be maintained. She pointed to closer relations between the provost's office and OVPR, and to increased connections across units. She cited the work of a panel appointed by President Schlissel that is exploring connections in biological sciences. She said a central question is what kind of a culture of research we want on campus.

6. The provost described a new initiative on data sciences and her interest in developing an initiative for the humanities. She noted that M-cubed initiatives are producing research funding returns on the initial investments.

7. Provost Pollack said that the executive officers have a strong commitment to diversity and equity, and are working to promote these goals within the limits of the law. She reported that the university president will host a dialog on diversity in a few weeks. She cited interest by students in changing race and ethnicity requirements. She said the administration is working hard on increasing the diversity of undergraduate enrollment, and she referenced the report of a committee chaired by vice provost Sellers ([http://provost.umich.edu/reports/Diversity Equity Inclusion Report.pdf](http://provost.umich.edu/reports/Diversity%20Equity%20Inclusion%20Report.pdf)). She said the broad goals were to develop a pipeline, to recruit and attract students, and to build a more inclusive and equitable community.

8. The provost said that the challenges facing college affordability were multifaceted, and linked in part to State disinvestment. She said that the UM receives from the State only 60% of the funding per student that was provided a decade ago. She noted that there are broad economic forces that drive up the cost of labor intensive activities vis-à-vis activities that can be substituted with technology. She cited competition for faculty and the high cost of preserving knowledge as other contributions to cost. Nonetheless, she said, the administration was able to cut close to \$300M in costs and reinvest those funds in other initiatives. There has also been increased reliance on philanthropy. She stated that philanthropic priorities were student support, bold ideas, and engaged learning.

The provost ended her prepared remarks at 4:03 P.M. and invited questions.

9. Professor Gocek asked for information about faculty retention, demographics, and other points. In response, the provost cited another report posted to her website ([http://provost.umich.edu/reports/Being A Faculty Member 21 Century Report.pdf](http://provost.umich.edu/reports/Being%20A%20Faculty%20Member%2021%20Century%20Report.pdf)), and said that she would like to continue that work. She said that retention has generally been greater than 80%. However, she said, there has been no change in faculty diversity, but a survey indicates that the climate is better than it was five years ago. She offered to supply a copy of that report to the Assembly.

10. Professor Cohn pointed out that challenging topics invite failure, and that faculty are inherently failure-averse. The provost acknowledged that failures do occur, and that the UM has so far failed to increase its level of diversity despite best efforts. She also mentioned M-Cubed as a program that encourages high-risk research that may sometimes fail.

11. Professor Oey pointed out that engaged learning is more faculty-intensive and thus costly. The provost replied that outside the university there is a rapid growth of MOOCs. But, she said, that education provides little of the education that students get here. She added that she did not know of anyone who knows how to pay for intensive university education long term.

12. Professor Schloss asked the provost for her opinion about President Obama's call for free community college educations. Provost Pollack replied that it was a complex issue. She noted that transfer students do well at the UM and that it is terrific that federal officials recognize importance of college education. She said that her concern was that some low income students might undermatch themselves by opting for community college rather than the UM. She said that a UM education for students from low income families was remarkably inexpensive.

13. Professor Gocek cited the perennial problem of finding classrooms adequate for teaching needs. The provost replied that space is a premium, and that there is a shortage of the kinds of classrooms that are needed for modern innovations. She suggested that faculty talk with their deans about the subject.

The provost left the meeting at 4:17 P.M.

ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY 012615-1

Chair Masten introduced the following Action Item on behalf of SACUA:

RESOLUTION: GUIDANCE ON CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENTS FOR UNIVERSITY SENATE MEMBERS

As part of the shared governance of the University, Senate members may from time to time be called to serve on committees or advisory boards that develop and review policies and procedures or that render professional judgments. Although certain sensitive matters, such as personnel decisions and other personal matters, are appropriately (and in some case may legally only be) discussed in confidence, confidentiality should, in the interest of transparency and full deliberation, be invoked only for compelling reasons after deliberation by and the approval of the committee members and not as a means to avoid debate or accountability.

Therefore, the Senate Assembly advises Senate members that

1. whereas executive session deliberations are appropriate only for certain limited matters, members are discouraged from signing agreements or agreeing orally not to disclose committee activities as a whole;
2. when asked to accept broad confidentiality restrictions as condition for serving on committees or advisory boards, members are asked to disclose such requests and their rationales to SACUA through the Faculty Senate Office so that the extent of such activities can be documented for review on request by members of the University Senate.

Vote on the Active Motion:

Number approving- 35
Number disapproving- 1
Abstentions of record- 1

ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY 012515-2

Professor Lehman introduced an Action Item on behalf of the AEC:

ADMINISTRATION EVALUATION COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

The Senate Assembly authorizes the Administration Evaluation Committee to amend the evaluation question set for unit deans with one or more questions about each associate dean in the unit.

Rationale: The AEC has received many requests that there be an opportunity to comment about the performance of associate deans. Faculty report that in many units interactions with and actions by associate deans are more consequential than their interaction with their deans. This Action Item is intended to be responsive to grassroots requests.

Assembly members expressed their willingness to leave the specific wording of the questions to the AEC.

Vote on the Active Motion:

Number approving- 37
Number disapproving- none
Abstentions of record- none

Chair Masten declared the vote to be unanimous.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:48 P.M.

Respectfully submitted

John T. Lehman
Senate Secretary Pro Tempore

University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents, Sec. 4.01:

Minutes of 26 January 2015 Senate Assembly Meeting
Circulated 27 January 2015
Re-circulated 13 February 2015
Approved 16 February 2015

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.