

The minutes of the April 18, 1994 Senate Assembly meeting were approved on May 16, 1994.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SENATE ASSEMBLY MEETING
MINUTES OF 18 APRIL 1994

ATTENDANCE

Present: Beam, Bike, Birge, Blair, Blinder, Brandle, Brewer, Canine, Christiansen, Coward, D'Alecy, DeCamp, Driscoll, Eggertsen, Eklund, Elta, England, Ensminger, Fox, Frey, Gidley, Griffin, Irani, Kaplan, Kennedy, Kunkel, V. Lee, Lomax, Loup, Lykes, Marich, Moore, Mukasa, Mutschler, Myers, Nairn, Nostrant, Nowak, Saunders, Scheppele, Shirley, Silverstein, Smith, Warner, Weinstein-Garcia (Alt for Maloy), Whitehouse, Williams; MacAdam, Olson, Thorson, Heskett.

Absent: Awkward, Brown, Brusati, Bryant, Cameron, Chiego, Cowan, Greene, Gull, Katehi, Kelley, Lawson, T. Lee, Levine, McNamara, Princen, Raymond, Rodriguez-Hornedo, Rogers, Rush, Schteingart, Simms, Sisson, Stenson, Tinkle, Tremper, Woo.

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES FROM MARCH 21, 1994

Moore requested that the minutes be amended to read (Under Old Business) "the motion [to table] was seconded and passed in an Assembly vote." [] indicates amendment. The amended minutes were approved by the Assembly.

STUDENT AFFAIRS EVALUATIONS -- VICE PRESIDENT HARTFORD

Vice President Hartford reviewed the organizational structure and function of the Office of Student Affairs and outlined the evaluation process currently underway in the Office of Student Affairs. The internal evaluation is being conducted using a set of nationally established standards and guidelines for the profession and an indicated process to evaluate each of the divisions. Hartford indicated that the Office has goals and objectives for each division and reviews in progress; she invited Assembly members to a presentation about the Career Planning and Placement review. Hartford estimated that the upcoming review as part of the Senate Assembly Evaluation of Offices could take up to two years in order to complete a meaningful review of all Student Affairs units. She suggested that Senate Assembly might want to select a division for evaluation or participate in the ongoing evaluation process currently underway. Hartford said she would be willing to explore a model involving faculty in this process. In response to a question by Kaplan as to whether Assembly might do both, Hartford agreed that Senate Assembly members could certainly review the internal evaluations and select target areas for the Evaluation of Offices. Marich asked if the Student Relations Committee would be involved with the Evaluation of Offices and Hartford responded that she hoped this would be the case since the members would bring a good understanding of operations and the issues facing Student Affairs. Hartford noted the changing role of Housing as possible area of faculty interest. Griffin thanked Hartford for her presentation. (Overheads from Vice President Hartford's presentation are available from the Office of Student Affairs.)

UPDATE ON FLEXIBLE BENEFITS

Griffin summarized the upcoming report from the Flexible Benefits Advisory Committee (FBAC) as well as the meeting of FBAC with SACUA. He reported that FBAC might recommend moving toward a flexible benefits plan or to continue studying a flex plan. Brewer added that the SACUA subcommittee charged with reviewing flexible benefits from a faculty perspective had identified a number of outstanding questions and issues. In response to a

question on how much input SACUA actually had in this process, Brewer stressed that it was very important that faculty give their input.

UPDATE ON THE DEANS' EVALUATION

Griffin urged Senate Assembly members who had not yet completed their evaluation forms to do so, reporting that to date, 467 of 1549 forms had been returned. He summarized the return rates by school and college and noted that they would soon be tabulated.

REPORT ON FACULTY GOVERNANCE (GEORGE BREWER)

Brewer summarized five areas of consensus emerging from the March 2 faculty retreat: the importance of faculty governance; the importance of good communication among faculty; clear differences between small and large schools; the need for flexibility among schools and colleges; and a clear directive not to use financial rewards for faculty governance service. Brewer summarized the tentative plan for restructuring faculty governance and establishing a communication system and noted that it had been approved by SACUA and was being recommended to Senate Assembly for approval. He outlined the implementation sequence: approval by Senate Assembly, formation of the faculty governance groups in the schools, election of chairs, meetings of the groups, and development of the communication system. Smith moved that Senate Assembly endorse and recommend implementation of unit governance communication groups as outlined in the plan presented by Professor Brewer. In brief subsequent discussion, it was pointed out that some units are extremely small (e.g., Kinesiology) and that a vote for support would in essence be a vote for such a unit structure in principle. Coward emphasized that it was of critical importance to have options at the school or college level included as part of the restructuring plan and requested that this be noted specifically as part of the record of the discussion. He reminded Assembly that options were proposed and then ignored during the deans' evaluation implementation and urged SACUA to avoid a "top-down" method. Brewer responded that the concern was duly noted and reiterated that the restructuring was essentially for better communication. Assembly voted to approve the motion by Smith. In response to a questions from Assembly members on implementation details, Brewer indicated that members could go ahead with the implementation, but that SACUA could send a letter to the Deans; Brewer also agreed that the SACUA office staff could assist in getting unit group names established.

BUDGET STUDY COMMITTEE REPORT

Kaplan summarized the background of the budget study work as an AAUP initiative and praised the formation of a Senate Assembly Budget Study Committee. The AAUP committee is scheduled to present a report on the study at the May meeting of the state AAUP. Kaplan emphasized the need to determine the cause of increases in the budget and noted that faculty salaries are clearly not contributing to the problem. He suggested that faculty productivity might be one issue for analysis. Kaplan noted that members of the administration had cooperated fully in the committee's work and concluded by pointing out that the rise in costs was serious and had been ignored by increasing tuition. Kaplan also noted his recent presentation to the Student Relations Committee and Vice President Hartford's willingness to assist in an assessment of the impact on students of increases in tuition and fees. (A summary of Kaplan's presentation is available from the SACUA office). In response to a question by Birge on how the data were gathered since comparing institutional figures is difficult, Kaplan noted that comparative data had come from IPEDS (formerly HEGIS) and was based on HEIDI data at the state level. In

response to a question by Smith on the possible cause of flat faculty salaries during a period of significant tuition increases, Kaplan agreed that this was an issue that warranted further investigation. Assembly members noted that Frank Stafford in the Economics Department was looking at this issue and that Allen Spivey had studied this several years ago. Provost Whitaker warned that every number in the budget had a story attached to it and that an analysis of the budget was incomplete without such qualitative information. Whitaker indicated that he would be glad to review the report and provide such additional information. Elizabeth Duell noted that she had served on the Budget Study Committee because she believed that it was imperative that faculty understand the University budget. Griffin suggested the need for communication between the Budget Study Committee and ACUB and reported that the standing Budget Study Committee was scheduled to begin in September 1994.

REMARKS BY HENRY GRIFFIN

Griffin thanked the SACUA office staff and Barbara MacAdam, Senate Secretary, for their work during the past year. He also thanked Provost Whitaker for his participation in Senate Assembly and SACUA meetings. Griffin challenged the members of the Senate Assembly to consider the importance of a harmonious relation with the administration and whether the mission of the faculty senate was to advance the interest of the faculty as a group or the interests of the institution at large. Griffin expressed his belief that the Senate Assembly advisory committees were the best conduit between the faculty and the executive officers and suggested that SACUA and Senate Assembly should not regularly be second-guessing the administration. He suggested faculty-administration relations as a possible discussion Jean Loup might bring before the Assembly at a future meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

Loup thanked Griffin for his service to Senate Assembly. Loup moved that Senate Assembly confirm the appointment of David Blair to SACUA for a one-year term. Assembly approved the motion to appoint Blair.

NEW BUSINESS

Moore announced that a report on the research track and a report on a study conducted by the Committee for a Multicultural University would both be presented at the next Senate Assembly.

Griffin closed the meeting by passing the gavel to Jean Loup as the incoming chair of SACUA and Senate Assembly.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara MacAdam
Senate Secretary