

Minutes of 18 February 2002
Approved 18 March 2002

**THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SENATE ASSEMBLY MEETING
MINUTES OF 18 FEBRUARY 2002**

ATTENDANCE

Present: Andrews, Askari, Brown, Burdi, Cho, Combi, Erickson, Fisher, Gobetti, Green, Gull, Hall, Karr, Ketefian, Korobkin, Lehman, Lindner, Lubeck, Marcelo, Navvab, Ni, Okada, Pedraza, Raisler, Remick, Riebesell, Savage, Thornton

Alternates: Jackson (Music)

Absent: Akerlof, Alcock, Alfred, Andersen, Antonucci, Atreya, Barsky, Bhavnani, Boyd, Brusati, Clark, Dick, Drach, Elenbogen, Frier, Frost, Guthrie, Hills, Jacobsen, Juster, Karni, Keller-Cohen, Kim, Koopmann, Lithgow-Bertelloni, Masson, Mateo, McDonagh, Moore, Moseley, Norris, Overmyer, Page, Peterson, Powell, Reisch, Rocchini, Sears, Taghaboni-Dutta, Uribe, Vicinus, Ward, Watkins, Yakel, Yeo

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED

1. Senate Assembly agenda
2. Draft minutes of the Senate Assembly meeting of 28 January 2002
3. Memorandum from P. N. Courant to M. Navvab, dated 14 February 2002, regarding guiding principles for tenure review for instructional track faculty at the University of Michigan
4. Guiding principles for tenure review for instructional track faculty at the University of Michigan, 7 February 2002.
5. Memorandum to M. Navvab from P. Courant, dated 11 February 2002, regarding University Librarian Recognition Award and University Librarian Achievement Award
6. Summary of information on tuition benefits for children of faculty members at CIC institutions- 2001
7. Letter from M. Navvab to P. Courant, dated 12 February 2002, regarding SACUA Chair and APG

8. Electronic mail message from B. Butterfield to M. Navvab, dated 15 February 2002, regarding prescription drugs

9. Memorandum from P. N. Courant and R. Kasdin to M. Navvab, dated 11 February 2002, regarding prescription drug benefits

10. Electronic mail message to SACUA members from J. Riebesell regarding prescription drugs benefits

11. The University of Michigan Faculty Ombuds.<http://www.umich.edu/~sacua/Facres/ombov.html>

12. Faculty Ombuds List, 2001-2002

13. Faculty Composition 1987-2000

14. Item for Action, dated 18 February 2002

Chair Navvab convened the meeting at 3:15 P.M. The proposed agenda was adopted.

CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF 28 JANUARY 2002

The minutes of 28 January 2002 were approved as submitted.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Navvab announced:

1. Librarian Awards (distributed item 5)- A delegation of university librarians petitioned SACUA several months ago about the possibility of recognition and achievement awards for university librarians. The office of the provost has subsequently agreed to finance the annual award. The nomination process is open to all members of the university community. The responsibility for evaluation and selection still remains to be clarified.

2. Tuition assistance (distributed item 6)- The Chair of Senate Assembly has discussed the subject with the interim provost, interim president and the CFO; responses have been non-committal. SACUA wishes to assess the attitude of the faculty and may distribute inquiries. Senate Assembly members commented that tuition assistance is an important issue nationally. Opinion was expressed that disparities of this benefit across institutions could lead to loss of faculty diversity at the U-M. Professor Marcelo pointed out that an estimate of the numbers could prove instructive, considering that costs at resident tuition rate might be relatively modest. She noted that it is a recruitment and retention issue, and that the U-M already spends large sums on people who ultimately do not join the institution.

3. Childcare- This item has been discussed with the interim provost and the CFO. They responded that it would be very costly. SACUA wished to assess attitudes of the faculty on this item, as well.

4. Participation in APG meetings (distributed item 7)- On 15 February, the interim provost reported the content of that week's APG meeting to the Senate Assembly chair. The information is contained in the SACUA minutes of 18 February.

5. Parking- H. Baier, associate vice president for facilities and operations, has reported that new technology for automatic vehicle identification is being introduced on a trial basis. This raises privacy concerns, which Navvab has transmitted to the interim provost. The interim provost responded that he will discuss the issues with plant operations.

6. Copyright Policy- public hearings are scheduled for UM-Dearborn and UM-Flint. The interim president has expressed optimism for implementation this term.

7. Teaching Principles- Professors Riebesell and Koopmann will consult with the interim provost about the document endorsed by Senate Assembly.

8. Tenure Principles (distributed item 4)- The office of the provost has issued a set of guidelines for tenure review.

9. Grievance Procedures- The interim provost has declined to form the committee called for by Senate Assembly at its previous meeting. SACUA has determined that there are serious concerns, nonetheless. This will be a discussion topic for Senate Assembly.

THE ROLE OF SENATE ASSEMBLY

Chair Navvab pointed out that in a variety of venues, administration officers and staff have been asserting that SACUA and the Senate Assembly do not represent the faculty at large. He called on Secretary Lehman to review rules pertaining to the Senate Assembly. Professor Lehman cited a commentary written by former Senate Assembly chair Thomas Dunn, published in *The University Record*, 8 October 1997 and titled *iFaculty Governance, Its Jurisdiction and Process*. As most of you know, the Senate Assembly is elected by the faculty at large on a proportional representation basis with the proviso, until recently, that each school or college should have at least two members regardless of numbers. Exceptions to this are the recently formed School of Public Policy Studies and the Division of Kinesiology, which are limited to a single representative. The executive committees of the various schools and colleges are diverse in structure and composition ranging from a form of proportional representation from their internal constituencies (such as Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities in LS&A) to those comprising a significant majority of departmental chairs. These disparate forms make it difficult to generalize about their operational modes or even their classification as a part of faculty governance. Department chairs, for most significant purposes, are part of the University's administrative structure.

The Role of Senate Assembly and SACUA The school and college executive committees are assigned a more restricted role than the Senate Assembly or SACUA since their concern is with their own particular school or college. The Senate Assembly and SACUA, on the other hand, are charged by Regents' Bylaw: to consider any subject pertaining to the interests of the University.... 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 [sic, the University's] internal organization insofar as matters of internal organization involve general questions of educational policy. The assembly shall advise and consult with the president on any matter of university policy which the president may place before it. The assembly may request information from any member of the University staff, and may invite any such person to sit with it for the purpose of consultation and advice. These are broad responsibilities but are limited to the "power to consider and advise." Unless mechanisms for communication of faculty attitudes at large are both in position and used, these powers are purely academic.

There is another important function of the assembly and this is the directive that: The assembly shall establish standing committees to advise and consult with the vice presidents of the University on matters within the areas of their responsibilities. These committees are nominated by SACUA but confirmed by the Assembly and are among the connective components of the faculty advisory network. The duties of the school and college executive committees are, in general, restricted to the policies and operations of their own school or college and their powers are given explicitly in Regents' Bylaw 5.06: ...the dean, director, or head shall be assisted by the executive committee of which he or she shall be, ex officio, the chair. The executive committee in addition to assisting with administrative functions shall be charged with the duties of investigating and formulating educational and instructional policies for consideration by the faculty and shall act for the faculty in matters of budgets, promotions, and appointments. It would be invaluable for efficient and effective faculty and administrative governance if the various jurisdictions were understood by all faculty members and administrators.

There are two other issues concerning executive committees which require further comment. First, even for executive committees which are composed of non-administrative personnel, the faculty members are actually selected rather than elected. This refers to the fact that, for the most part, the school or college faculty make their choice from a slate of nominees recommended by a faculty nominating committee but the names of the major vote-getters are then submitted to the Provost for his or her selection. This archaic method has been justified on the grounds that the selection process is intended to "balance" the fields of the already sitting members of the executive committees. In fact, this prerogative is really the province of the nominating committee whose task is to offer an appropriate slate to the faculty. The Senate Assembly and SACUA have the strength of being the only groups fully elected by the faculty and which, therefore, promulgate their views without any "filtering" from the administration.

Professor Brown asked whether the claim asserted by administrators was not primarily directed at the apparent lack of participation by faculty in central governance. Professor Burdi pointed out that the Senate Assembly represents the University Senate and that it is empowered under Regentsí Bylaw to represent the faculty at large. He further pointed out that the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (CESF) makes an annual report directly to the Regents on behalf of the faculty at large. Professor Green observed that the comments from administration are really just an excuse to mask their actions. He observed that they say the same thing about student organizations. He said that he realizes that central governance is not a big concern of many faculty.

Professor Ketefian remarked that this has been the first opportunity of the year for the Senate Assembly to have an animated discussion among members. She observed that previous meetings had been consumed by receiving reports from executive officers and making pro forma resolutions. She said that one reason for lack of interest is a lack of substance and decision making at the Assembly meetings. She further commented that university reward structures do not recognize service, and hence faculty do what brings benefits to them. Professor Pedraza called attention to the Senate Assembly minutes and to the list of people who are repeatedly absent. She said that she felt cheated by their lack of participation, and further stated that there ought to be an attendance policy.

Chair Navvab asked whether Senate Assembly members were given opportunity to report back to the faculty in their units. Members from several schools responded affirmatively. Professor Burdi suggested that the Senate Assembly should examine whether there might be a better structure that would facilitate Assembly business. He questioned whether a new paradigm for organization is needed. Chair Navvab said that in order for the Assembly to have proper deliberation, engagement by its members is a prerequisite.

GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

Chair Navvab called attention to distributed item 14. He pointed out that he would personally have great difficulty advising any friend of his to submit to the Grievance process as it is presently constructed. Professor Gobetti reviewed the general structure and process of Grievance Review Boards. Professor Lindner commented that there previously had been a Senate Assembly Review Committee (SARC). He said that in one case during the 1980s SARC found unanimously in favor of a faculty member, but that the administration refused to accept their judgment. Navvab said that this item will come before the Senate Assembly for action at its next meeting.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFITS

Chair Navvab reported that the Senate Assembly has finally received responses from the administration to its queries about prescription drug benefits (distributed items 8 and 9). The Chair then gave the floor to Professor Riebesell, who briefly reviewed the history of faculty governance engagement and concerns about the administrationís proposed changes to benefits. Professor Riebesell called attention to distributed item 10, in which he challenged the logic behind the administrationís numerical figures. He said that his

own analysis of the data suggests that a potential cost claimed as \$2.9 million by the administration is in reality only \$160,000 or at most \$424,000. He said that the administration's consultants used an unreasonable worst case interpretation to bolster their excessive claims.

Professor Burdi asked whether the decision has already been made; he noted that distributed item 9 indicates that the administration is moving into a final phase. Chair Navvab replied that he has learned that bids have already been solicited from vendors, but that the responses have not been received. Professor Ketefian asked when the faculty would have a chance to have input on the subject. She reminded the Assembly that members had been told to keep the information about potential benefits changes in confidence because the administration claimed they were still under study. Professor Riebesell pointed out that distributed item 8 suggests that the details are still not resolved. A member of the Assembly noted that the administration's current plan differs little from the original, and seems to have little sign of effect by Senate Assembly input. Professor Burdi declared that it is essential to communicate this information to the faculty at large. Chair Navvab confirmed that all of the current communications to Senate Assembly can be freely shared with faculty colleagues.

FACULTY COMPOSITION

Chair Navvab called attention to distributed item 13. He noted that there is an accelerating trend downward in tenured and tenure track faculty at the U-M. He said that the trend has alarming implications for curriculum and governance. Professor Pedraza responded that it also raises an issue of who is teaching the courses and their commitment to students. Ultimately, she said, it raises questions about the integrity of degrees. Professor Burdi pointed out that the topic is a current agenda item before the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee (AAAC).

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 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.

