

Per your request
Faculty Senate Office

The minutes of February 15, 1993 Senate Assembly meeting were approved on March 15, 1993.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 15, 1993

ATTENDANCE

Present: Aisen, Anderson, Beam, Blair, Blinder, Bord, Brewer, M. Brown, Brusati, Cameron, Chiego, Cole, Cowan, D'Alecy, DeCamp, Didier, Douthit, Ensminger, Gazda, Gidley, Greene, Griffin, Gull, Hacker (Alt for Frey), Irani, E. Jensen, Kabamba, Kaplan, Kelley, Kunkel, Larson, Lynch-Sauer, Marcelo, Margolis, Olson, Penchansky, Shirley, Silverstein, C. Smith, R. Smith, Stein, Stensones, Thum, Voss, Warner, Watkins, Whitehouse, W.J. Yang, V. Yang; MacAdam, Thorson, Heskett.

Absent: Angus, Billi, Birge, Coward, Cox, Crandall, Danley, Eklund, Fellin, Gross, Hayashi, A. Jensen, Katehi, Kaviany, Koopmann, Kramer, Lawson, Lopez, Montalvo, Mosher, Mukasa, Razzoog, Saunders, Scheppele, Schwank, Semetko, Sutton, Tinkle, Tremper.

MINUTES

The minutes of the February 1 Assembly meeting were corrected and approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ejner Jensen, Chair, announced that on Thursday, February 18, AAUP is having a luncheon at the Michigan League prior to the Academic and Intellectual Freedom Lecture. Chandler Davis and Clement Markert will be present. The third annual lecture on Academic and Intellectual Freedom will be held at 4:00 in the Rackham Amphitheatre. Catharine Stimpson, University Professor at Rutgers University, will give the lecture entitled "Dirty Minds, Dirty Bodies, Clean Speech."

On Friday, February 19, Garry Brewer, Dean of the School of Natural Resources and Environment, will deliver the fourth in a series of lectures on ethics and science sponsored by Sigma XI. His lecture entitled "Environment, Economy and Ethics" will be given at 4:00 in the Rackham Amphitheatre.

SACUA has elected officers for 1993-94: Henry Griffin (LSA) will serve as Chair and John Birge (Engineering) as Vice Chair.

Jensen noted that volunteers are needed for the Faculty Perspectives Editorial Advisory Board.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF SACUA CANDIDATES

The candidates for the March 15 SACUA election include: Stanley Berent (Medicine), Ronald Inglehart (LSA), Shake Ketefian (Nursing), Ronald Lomax (Engineering), Alfredo Montalvo (Art), Tom Moore (LSA), Larry Radine (UM-Dearborn), and Louise Stein (Music).

D'Alecy nominated George Brewer (Medicine) as a SACUA candidate and C. Smith seconded. Olson, parliamentarian, confirmed that nominations can be made from the floor. Jensen noted that SACUA can include no more than two members from Medicine and that one current member from the Medical School continues his term next year. This restriction will be clarified on the ballot.

RASHID BASHSHUR, CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE FOR A MULTICULTURAL UNIVERSITY

Bashshur described the committee's report entitled "The Quality of Life for International Students at the University of Michigan." He noted that one of the major goals was to make the U of M truly a world university. He added that the presence of international students on our campus provides a unique opportunity to create a truly multicultural community. He summarized the content of the committee's report including the issues affecting international students and specific recommendations. He highlighted specific problems for spouses, female students, and students of color as well as issues related to the academic experience.

Kaplan praised the report and suggested that consultation with John Rasmussen would be helpful. Bashshur thanked Kaplan for his suggestion.

Shirley asked if the committee was considering some kind of orientation for international students on helping them understand the academic expectations of the University as well as for faculty to understand issues affecting international students. Bashshur responded that the committee would like to see that new students are given adequate orientation materials.

Kabamba asked how the committee assessed the staff support needed for the recommendations outlined in the report. Bashshur replied that they had reviewed the workload and staffing at the International Center and determined that an additional half-time person would be necessary.

Beam asked if the committee had any ideas on how the complex issue raised by Professor Fox in the report's appendix could be addressed. Bashshur responded that the committee had discussed the possibility of engaging the University community in some kind of debate on these complex problems.

Kelly suggested that it was also important to prepare American students to be more sensitive to the needs of international students. Bashshur noted that the report outlined only the first steps and identified the need to learn from international students and faculty.

Penchansky asked where Bashshur saw the report going from here. Bashshur said that with the Assembly endorsement they would take it to the administration.

Senate Assembly approved the motion to endorse the report and thanked Professor Bashshur for the committee's work.

FACULTY OMBUD UPDATE

Jayne Thorson, Executive Assistant to SACUA, reported on the progress of the faculty ombuds project. She reviewed history leading to the program's creation and noted that ombuds have been appointed for each of the 17 schools and colleges. An orientation and training session was held, and a description of the role of the faculty ombuds has been sent to the deans and executive committees members. Additional workshops are being arranged, one about the University grievance procedures and the other on sexual harassment policy and procedures.

Margolis asked how faculty could find out who the ombuds were in each of the schools and colleges. Thorson indicated that the information was available from the Dean or executive committee members or by calling the SACUA Office.

FACULTY ANTI-HARASSMENT POLICY DRAFTING COMMITTEE UPDATE

Elizabeth Anderson reported that she and George Cameron had met to discuss the preliminary draft. She reiterated the Fundamental Tenets of Membership in the University Community document, the strong principle of freedom of inquiry, and the strong principle of equality of access in research and education. The goals and principles of free expression in the academic community and within the academic institution's mission are not identical to the rights of the first amendment in the outside community. She also noted the distinction which needs to be made between faculty in their roles as faculty and in their actions as private individuals as well as the need to distinguish between intentional and unintentional discriminatory conduct. There is clearly a need for educational as well as

punitive sanctions. She also noted the importance of language specific to the classroom arena that might be different from that which applies to non-teaching staff. She also emphasized the importance of consultation with students including students of color. Anderson said the Drafting Committee would welcome input from faculty.

Aisen asked if additional members might be appointed by SACUA and if a draft could be circulated to all members of Assembly before discussion. Anderson replied that a draft would be circulated before discussion. Jensen replied that additional members will be appointed.

Stensones asked whether the policy would address harassment of one faculty member by another. Anderson indicated that it would.

Kaplan described problems he envisioned on imprecise language and false accusations.

Jensen invited Assembly members to provide comments to Anderson or Cameron and indicated that Senate Assembly would take up the matter again at the March 15 meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Jensen reviewed the background of the decision to discontinue the School of Public Health's Department of Population Planning and International Health (PPIH) and the failure to follow established procedures in this regard which are outlined in SPG 601.2. Bord made the following motion:

WHEREAS the recent announced discontinuance of the School of Public Health's Department of Population Planning and International Health in advance of any thorough and open review has created uncertainty and distress for current and prospective students and faculty in this program, and may have done harm to the professional reputations of those affiliated with the program, and

WHEREAS the example set by the administrative leadership in the School of Public Health is unfortunate in light of the standards of the University of Michigan which require broad, timely, and meaningful discussions before major decisions concerning academic programming are undertaken,

BE IT RESOLVED that Senate Assembly reaffirm its support for the strict adherence to Standard Practice Guide 601.2 (procedures governing program discontinuance within the University), particularly its call for an independent assessment of the quality and viability of programs by a peer review, and

BE IT RESOLVED that Senate Assembly urge the Provost to consult with the Dean and Executive Committee of the School of Public Health and the faculty and students of the Department of Population Planning and International Health in establishing the composition of any peer review group to ensure fairness and absence of prejudice in the conduct of any review.

W.J. Yang asked if Professor Takeshita, Chair of PPIH, could speak on behalf of the PPIH. Takeshita expressed appreciation for the Senate Assembly resolution but emphasized his belief that no review could be conducted without prejudice at this point. He noted specifically the moratorium on student admissions and the climate of the school and the University as factors making the review process unfair unless it were postponed for a length of time.

In response to a question by Kabamba, Takeshita replied that a year's postponement of the review was recommended. Provost Whitaker suggested that the discussion of the matter (including any recommendations about the review and the moratorium) were the proper business of the school's faculty rather than of Senate Assembly. He stressed his commitment to a fair review.

Penchansky raised the issue of the moratorium on student admissions. He noted that irrespective of the review, such a step would destroy the program; some steps had to be taken to assure this didn't happen again. Whitaker responded that it was only fair to let students know that the program was under review.

Olson reviewed a number of long-standing issues which justified the concerns of Senate Assembly about the administration's need to follow the SPG guidelines in good faith. He suggested a statement expressing extreme distress at this failure.

Cole suggested that given the growing importance of international studies, it was unfortunate to eliminate a leading department in these areas. Brewer expressed support.

Cowan asked if the letters to PPIH applicants telling them to apply to other programs were part of established procedures. Whitaker responded that procedures were not explicit in this regard, but moratoria were not unusual in the university and the executive committee was motivated by concern for students. He emphasized the role of the elected executive committee in this process.

D'Alecy asked for clarification of how this process had gone forward. Takeshita indicated that the Dean had conveyed the Provost's approval for the decision. Whitaker contradicted this and clarified.

Hacker asked why SACUA had not recommended postponing the review. Penchansky and Marcelo outlined SACUA's discussion on this matter; Smith clarified that SACUA did not have a specific recommendation on the review and Senate Assembly was free to amend the resolution. Bord noted that the SPH faculty should decide about the review and that SACUA had not been part of the school's internal discussion, nor had SACUA heard from the executive committee or the SPH Dean; therefore he was only comfortable with expressing in the strongest terms possible an endorsement of the procedures and the importance of adhering to them.

Ensminger suggested that there had to be a check on the system to see that this didn't happen in the future.

Cole suggested an amendment and the following was seconded. BE IT RESOLVED that Senate Assembly urges a one-year moratorium on the review of the Department of Population Planning and International Health.

Greene spoke against the amendment citing the rancor that was inevitable in such a review regardless of when it took place.

Cowan argued that the fair procedure could be completely undermined by the letter apprising students of a moratorium.

Shirley asked Professor Takeshita what would be accomplished by the postponement. Takeshita replied that it would provide a more neutral, objective review after a "cooling off" period.

Whitaker reiterated that the decision was to be made by the School of Public Health and that the Senate Assembly resolution would simply be advisory to the SPH faculty.

The Assembly defeated the amendment by a vote of 21-23. The original resolution passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara MacAdam
Senate Secretary, pro tempore

a/m/feb1593