

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting of 19 May 1986

ATTENDANCE

Present: Ascione, Bassett, Bissell, Borcherts, Brewer, Briggs, Burdi, Checkoway, Chudacoff, Comminou, Craig, Debler, Berent, Durrance, English, Gage, Glover, Goldberg, Gray, Haefner, Han, Hollingsworth, Hook, Hudson, Larson, Lehmann, Lenaghan, Lougee, Loup, Lusk, Margolis, Manis, McCarus, McClamroch, Meyer, Moore, Moran, Mosher, Nadelman, Reed, Rizki, Marc Ross, Sanders, Stapp, Stebbins, Wiseman, Yocum

Absent: Arnett, Barlow, Carnahan, Dandekar, DeCamp, Eggertsen, Vinh, Hanks, Lavoie, Leonard, Lewis, Lockwood, Lorey, Malvin, Kearney, Moerman, Ness, Oleinick, Olsen, Olson, Pierce, Rosenthal, Muriel Ross, Sargous, Schauer, Schteingart, Seidler, Shannon, Silverman, Snyder, Thomson, Todor, Weiler, White, Zelenock

Professor Stebbins convened the meeting at 3:22 p.m.

MINUTES

The minutes of 21 April were approved as written.

REPORT FROM THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON PROGRAM - AL BURDI, CHAIR

Professor Alphonse Burdi, Chair, noted that the document distributed is a pre-submission report. The committee will continue to deliberate and is eager to consider comments and questions forwarded by Senate Assembly members.

The thrust of the committee's work has been long-range planning for academic programs and emphasizes a partnership among faculty, students, and the administration in the decision-making process. One objective is to identify strategies for the U of M to achieve its goals. To date the committee has identified several capacities that the institution will need.

These include the capacity: 1) for documented excellence; 2) to adapt for the future; 3) for collegial decisions even as we separate from "traditional" affiliations; 4) to sustain forward momentum in planning; 5) to encourage and sustain scholarly ideas in the University community. Professor Burdi then reviewed key segments of the report and invited Assembly members to complete the accompanying questionnaire either for oneself or on behalf of one's faculty. Professor Stebbins inquired if the committee believed that the University needs to excel in all arenas. Professor Burdi replied that those programs which remain in the University should be excellent. The U of M also needs to be mindful that as a public institution it also has responsibilities to the State.

REPORT ON RESEARCH POLICIES COMMITTEE, JEAN LOUP

In the absence of Professor Stephen Pollock, Chair, Jean Loup, SACUA liaison, gave the committee's annual report. Ms. Loup noted that this year RPC worked with a new Vice President for Research, Linda Wilson, and explored with her the role of the RPC as an advisory body. About half the meetings dealt with classified research, including review of one proposal and revision of the committee's internal protocol for handling such proposals. RPC also considered potential reductions in indirect costs and a draft of a "Protocol for Investigation of Allegations of Academic Misconduct" forwarded by Vice President Wilson.

Professor Sanders asked what role SACUA and Senate Assembly will have vis-a-vis the report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Classified Research. Ms. Loup replied that SACUA has been assured it will receive the report shortly after it is submitted to Vice President Wilson and that SACUA will have a chance to comment on it before it goes to the Regents.

REPORT FROM THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP, SEONG SOO HAN, CHAIR

Professor Seong Soo Han, Chair, distributed copies of the interim report and encouraged discussion about it. The committee had written to Deans and Directors, soliciting their input and had met with 20 individuals. Although the committee had hoped to avoid discussing the matter of finances, the problem emerged as a critical issue and was thus addressed. Other highlights of committee deliberations were: 1) the University's international relationships, both in educating foreign students and through its research and scholarly productivity; 2) internal support of research; 3) interdisciplinary research; 4) emeriti faculty as a resource; and, 5) maintaining intellectual vigilance.

Professor Briggs noted that interdisciplinary activities emerged in both ad hoc committee reports. Professor Han concurred that Rackham may serve as a

focal point to foster such study. Professor Margolis asked about the status of a long-term planning group for the University. Professor Han replied that one committee, started in the 1970's, has since been disbanded. Professor Mosher thanked the committee for recognizing the contributions retired faculty can make to the University. Suggesting that internal support of research is a very important matter, Professor McClamroch asked if the committee considered "unsponsored" research? Professor Han replied that the committee had uncovered two questions: 1) how extramural funds influence faculty research and alter scholarly activities as a whole, and, 2) the manner in which extramural, and especially Federal funds are given out.

Professor Stebbins invited members to provide additional feedback to the committee chairs and also to send comments to SACUA on whether or not the Assembly should continue to work on some of the issues and concerns identified. Interim reports of the remaining two ad hoc committees will be delivered at the June meeting.

TENURE COMMITTEE REPORT AND STATEMENT ON CREATION OF NEW CATEGORIES OF FACULTY APPOINTMENTS WITHOUT TENURE - JANICE LINDBERG

Professor Janice Lindberg, Chair, reported that the Tenure Committee held fifteen meetings regarding general tenure issues this year but had no requests to review individual cases. It also met with Charles Allmand to discuss items of mutual concern and with Dean Steiner and Associate Dean Walker to discuss the career lecturer proposal. The committee has produced four statements including the one presented today and another scheduled for the June meeting. In summary, all issues placed before the committee last Fall have been addressed.

Agreeing with Professor Sanders that it would be helpful to consult the June proposal in discussing the Statement on Creation of New Categories of Faculty Appointments Without Tenure, Professor Lindberg distributed copies of the draft, Proposed Revision of Regents' Bylaw 5.08, which deals with extending the length of certain lecturers' appointments from one to three years. Because it appreciates the desire for recognition of teachers with exceptional ability, the committee endorses the extension. At the same time, the committee is concerned about establishing new untenured slots and has expressed that concern in the statement on today's agenda.

Professor Brewer asked what impact the statements would have on the Medical School's clinical faculty. Professor Burdi explained that the idea of career lecturers emanated from LSA to address problems specific to that college. The Medical School, faced with other teaching and patient care needs, designed the clinical faculty track. Despite faculty concern about implications for the tenure track, with Regental approval of the clinical track, the precedent has been set for alternate faculty career pathways.

Professor Lindberg concurred and noted that the Tenure Committee decided it is advisable to issue a statement about potential pathways.

Regarding the career lecturer proposal, Professor Manis noted the absence of a provision for tenure and asked if the track is designed to parallel the tenure track. Professor Burdi replied that it is and that there are safeguards to preclude transfer between tracks. Professor McClamroch added that both SACUA and the Senate Assembly were unhappy with the parallelism, leading to development of the statement presented for consideration today.

Professor Lehmann stated that there are differences between the clinical track and the LSA proposal. The former has a cap on the number of faculty which will be reviewed. Professor Berent reported his understanding that the clinical track carries some long-term appointments. Professor Sanders disagreed with the Tenure Committee statement, saying that it misrepresents LSA and noting that foreign language teachers often can't be attracted with only one year appointments. Professor Gray noted similar difficulty in attracting qualified lecturers to the English Composition Board. Professor Lindberg replied that the committee's main concern was with the quality of research and teaching and that it was more intent on providing a reward of a three-year appointment to established teachers than with recruiting new lecturers. Professor Lehmann noted the committee's concerns over the danger of creating second class faculty and of encouraging overly flexible budgeting. Today's statement tries to address these concerns. Professor Goldberg suggested that the practices could affect graduate students by increasing the possibilities for replacing them with career lecturers. Professor Ross noted that some non-tenure track positions have existed for many years; he was not sure what the principle should be relative to the Tenure Committee statements.

Professor Lehmann moved, Professor Lusk seconded, that the Assembly support the Tenure Committee Statement on Creation of New Categories of Faculty Appointments Without Tenure. Professor Berent said that the statement is clear but the implications are in conflict with some current practices. Professor Gray suggested it would be difficult to castigate the creation of new categories of faculty and then next month approve extension of non-tenured appointments to three years. Professor Lehmann replied that the two are separate matters. The practice of appointing lecturers is not new; the proposed change applies only to the length of appointment for some of them. Professor Manis moved that the vote on the item be postponed until next month and that it be discussed in conjunction with the proposed revision of Regents' Bylaw 5.08. Motion carried, 21-13.

REQUEST FROM PIRGIM

Professor Lehmann spoke to a petition from PIRGIM to the Senate Assembly asking the Assembly to endorse the U of M students' decision to provide a

refusable PIRGIM fee at registration. Students recently voted by 53% to allow this fee. Professor Lehmann moved, Professor Checkoway seconded, that the Assembly endorse the resolution. Professor Lusk asked why the Assembly would be involved when students had already approved the proposal. Professor Ross explained that the request for support from the Assembly has to do with University governance. Students would like the faculty to support their decision for a refusible fee. Professor Stebbins explained that the matter was not a SACUA concern until broad support for it was expressed from schools and colleges. Motion passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Patricia B. Yocum
Senate Secretary