

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 1993

ATTENDANCE

Present: Aisen, Anderson, Beam, Birge, Blair, Blinder, Bord, Brewer, M. Brown, Brusati, Cameron, Chiego, Cole, Coward, D'Alecy, DeCamp, Didier, Douthit, Ensminger, Fellin, Frey, Gazda, Gidley, Griffin, Gull, Hayashi, Irani, E. Jensen, Kaplan, Keener (Alt. for Scheppele), Kelley, Larson, Lawson, Lynch-Sauer, Marcelo, Montalvo, Mosher, Olson, Penchansky, Saunders, Shirley, C. Smith, R. Smith, Stein, Stensones, Voss, Warner, Watkins, Whitehouse; MacAdam, Thorson, Stillman, Heskett.

Absent: Angus, Billi, Cowan, Cox, Crandall, Danley, Eklund, Greene, Gross, A. Jensen, Kabamba, Kannatey-Asibu (Alt. for W.J. Yang), Katehi, Kaviany, Koopmann, Kramer, Kunkel, Lopez, Margolis, Mukasa, Razzoog, Schwank, Semetko, Silverstein, Sutton, Thum, Tinkle, Tremper, Wheeler, V. Yang.

MINUTES

The minutes of the March 15, 1993 Senate Assembly were approved as written.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

No announcements were given.

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON RETIREMENT, STEPHEN DARWALL, CHAIR

Darwall reviewed the report, noting that the study of possible retirement patterns suggested that a significant number of faculty will elect to stay on after the age of 70 now that mandatory retirement has been eliminated. Recommendations within the report include provisions that health benefits be maintained for retired faculty; that retired faculty be provided with research and professional support; and that the Staff Benefits Office expand its retirement services to include more personal counseling and annual projections of retirement income for all faculty over the age of 60. Some possible future steps include incentives to retirement such as phased retirement with incentives or a retirement bonus, or capping University contributions to retirement funds.

Kaplan noted that another Michigan university is also concerned about the budgetary implications of the change in retirement law, but they are looking at a way to have faculty continue teaching after retirement.

Brewer thanked the committee but expressed disappointment over the negative tone of the report; he suggesting that retaining senior faculty could strengthen the institution, both through their own scholarship and teaching and as mentors attracting and supporting junior faculty. He also expressed concern over the proposal to cap contributions to retirement funds. He suggested that Senate Assembly receive the report but not endorse it at this point, and refer the economic aspects of the report to the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty. Darwall responded that there are pragmatic considerations. For example, salaries of senior faculty are much higher than salaries of junior faculty.

Penchansky noted the original recommendation for capped contributions to retirement funds had come from the Carnegie Commission. He added that the effect of retaining senior faculty without selectivity would not strengthen the institution.

Whitehouse expressed support for Brewer's comments, in particular concern over the suggestion in the report that older faculty would be less productive. Darwall responded that this was not the intent of the report.

Coward commended the committee for the report and pointed out that one of the missions of the University is the training of young minds. This seems to be at odds with the idea of retaining senior faculty at the risk of not having room to bring in younger faculty.

At Jensen's request for a resolution, Bord moved that Senate Assembly receive the "Report of the Task Force on Retirement" and thank the committee members for their work. The resolution passed.

INSTRUMENT FOR FACULTY EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS, THOMAS DUNN, CHAIR OF THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Dunn thanked the members of the Academic Affairs Committee and the subcommittee which includes George Brewer, Charles Garvin, Wilbert McKeachie, and Bruce Watkins. He reviewed the reasons for the survey evaluation instrument, primarily the ability for faculty (particularly younger faculty) not formally involved in faculty governance to have the opportunity to contribute feedback without the heavy time commitment of many faculty governance activities. He noted the concerns about avoiding administration-bashing, and also noted the design of the form which allows the respondent to identify his or her adequacy of information in making an assessment.

Shirley asked if an assessment of administrators' internal versus external commitments and the proportion of administrators' time spent on campus could be included.

Penchansky asked if the respondent's personal information would be included (e.g. rank, sex, race, etc.). Dunn responded that the committee had not considered this appropriate but indicated that the committee hopes Senate Assembly would have recommendations on questions.

Stein objected to the consistency in the use of language referring to colleges or departments. Dunn responded that the language would change to reflect the college or department being evaluated.

D'Alecy asked whether Senate Assembly were being asked to accept the document in principle. Dunn indicated that the final draft of the document will be brought back to Assembly.

R. Smith questioned whether the committee had considered including summary questions relating to overall performance. Dunn responded by calling attention to several questions that did this.

Cole noted concerns which had been expressed over response rate, in particular that the response rate might be higher from faculty with negative viewpoints, and suggested that no results be published unless an adequate response rate was obtained.

DeCamp suggested that the level-of-information component might make the instrument more cumbersome, offering the alternative of adding a sixth category (N/A) to each question. Dunn replied that the committee planned to report data under the three categories of information adequacy, but would have to assess the instrument after that.

Coward asked for clarification on what would be reported to the faculty and to the administration. Dunn replied that the administrator being evaluated will receive all information; only a summary will be released to the public.

Larson questioned the reason for including a question on reward structure, and asked how the committee had defined reward. Dunn replied that they had been thinking of financial compensation.

Jensen referred to Cole's concerns and reiterated the suggestion that the results might not be published unless the response rate was above a certain level.

Birge asked for the basis of averaging under each category. Dunn responded that the committee had some differences about what level of detail to report to faculty in order to balance privacy with adequate feedback to the faculty.

Whitaker noted the extensive validation of the CRLT questionnaire, and asked if such a process was planned for this questionnaire. Dunn indicated that this was not planned. Whitaker noted the movement away from CRLT questionnaires because of problems with the method.

In response to a procedural question, Jensen indicated that he felt Senate Assembly had already approved the process in principle.

Brewer moved that the recommendations of the committee be accepted. In the subsequent discussion Penchansky expressed concerns over the specific questions, averaging of responses, etc. Jensen suggested tabling the motion to allow further

refinement of the document, but instead a vote was taken on the motion. The motion failed by 23 to 19 votes.

ATHLETIC DEPARTMENT PRESENTATIONS

Jensen introduced Jack Weidenbach (Athletic Director), Peggy Bradley-Doppes (Associate Athletic Director), and Percy Bates (Faculty Representative to the Big Ten), noting in particular Jack Weidenbach's contributions as Athletic Director (Weidenbach has announced his retirement). He asked about the major challenges facing the next Director of Athletics at Michigan.

Weidenbach cited financial issues, the challenge to meet gender equality and equity, the Big Ten Conference, and commercialism in some sports.

Bates suggested that one of the major difficulties was in predicting how intercollegiate athletics would be restructured over the next five to ten years and how to continue to guide Michigan's outstanding programs within those changes.

Bradley-Doppes concurred and noted facilities infrastructure, program refinancing, and maintaining excellence within the primary mission of the University.

Weidenbach described the importance of identifying demand and trends in undergraduate sports. Women's soccer will be added and men's gymnastics will be dropped as Michigan intercollegiate sports in response to such identified trends.

M. Brown questioned the movement from intercollegiate to club sports and the effect on gender equity. Weidenbach responded that the shifts were in response to demands both regionally and nationally and the need to allocate finite financial support.

Stein asked if there were moral issues involved since Michigan's programs were so visible. Bradley-Doppes responded that this certainly was an issue, that it was important for Michigan to exhibit leadership in terms of gender equity, sound academics, and diversity. Bates emphasized the importance of balance between high academics and a nationally successful program.

Jensen asked if athletes were able to participate and benefit fully from their academic experience at Michigan. Weidenbach noted the difficulty because of time limitations for athletes to take full advantage of their academic experience. As students leave, the department holds exit interviews; most student athletes indicate that they have enjoyed their experience here at Michigan.

Kelly emphasized the importance of athletic scholarships for women students. He described a disturbing trend in which student athletes who were enrolled in his class never attended and could receive an automatic withdrawal. He suggested the importance of addressing these matters through academic advising. Weidenbach concurred.

Shirley asked what the time commitment to sports was required of students during the off-season. Bradley-Doppes indicated that it averaged 14-18 hours a week during the off-season, much of which was voluntary. She indicated that athletes did often take more difficult courses and a heavier courseload during the off-season.

Penchansky referred to a Chicago reporter planning a story on Michigan sports and the academic programs many athletes follow, in particular the quality of the Kinesiology concentration. Weidenbach expressed confidence in the Kinesiology program. Bates replied that he doubted such an investigation could or would result in an expose. The athletes are enrolled in a wide range of academic programs throughout the University.

Olson noted that Michigan's record in graduating student athletes was a matter of pride when compared with other national programs, but expressed agreement that the questions and issues raised by Senate Assembly were an important dialogue.

Jensen thanked Weidenbach, Bradley-Doppes, and Bates for their discussion.

FACULTY ANTI-HARASSMENT POLICY DRAFTING COMMITTEE POLICY PROPOSAL, ELIZABETH ANDERSON, CHAIR

Jensen asked that Senate Assembly try to come to a recommendation on the policy under review at this Assembly meeting.

Anderson reviewed the draft document, revised in consultation with the University General Counsel. She highlighted the definition of speech or conduct considered discriminatory harassment under the draft policy. Anderson outlined the operational

response and procedures suggested under the policy and emphasized the use of informal dispute resolution rather than institutional sanctions. She called attention to the protections for an individual behavior that was not part of a pattern.

Aisen again expressed his belief that such a policy was unnecessary, but noted a specific objection to possible free-speech infringement. Anderson described her review of the language with some of the law school faculty and summarized the legal opinion that the University must signal where it derived the authority for such a policy including existing statutes and precedents in employment, gender equity, etc.

Aisen also expressed concern that faculty were expected to read minds of minority groups. Anderson responded that one of the purposes of the policy was to educate and sensitize the University community, and called attention to the specific exclusion of sanctions for inadvertent and non-repetitive behavior. Aisen suggested changing the definition to "intentional and malicious."

Stein suggested that emotional distress was part of personal health and that a separate mention of emotional distress was unnecessary. She also mentioned the importance of protecting faculty from unfair accusation.

DeCamp cited a recent example at another institution where a coach was fired over a racial epithet, suggesting this policy was actually protecting faculty from similar sanctions.

R. Smith expressed concern over the arbitrary distinction between group-specific and individual-specific conduct. Anderson responded that legal experts had advised that to restrict the policy only to action toward an individual would exclude behavior that was directed toward, for example, two individuals at the same time.

Olson noted a specific example of remarks directed toward specific religious groups' beliefs which might stigmatize a specific group.

C. Smith moved that the discussion be tabled until the next Senate Assembly meeting. The resolution passed unanimously.

Penchansky on behalf of the Assembly thanked Anderson and the committee for all their work.

REMARKS BY EJNER JENSEN, OUTGOING CHAIR

Jensen expressed his belief in the process of reason and dialogue inherent in faculty governance, noting the work on faculty communication and the discussion of the faculty discriminatory harassment policy. He expressed thanks to departing members of SACUA: Donald Bord, Cynthia Marcelo, and Roy Penchansky, highlighting their contributions. Jensen noted the work of the SACUA office staff: Sandra Heskett, Phyllis Stillman, and Jayne Thorson. He also thanked the University administrative staff in particular Connie Cook and Provost Whitaker. In closing, he thanked Senate Assembly for the opportunity to serve as chair.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS

Griffin, on behalf of the Senate Assembly, thanked Jensen for his service as Chair.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara MacAdam
Senate Secretary