

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SENATE ASSEMBLY MEETING
MINUTES OF 19 MAY 1997

Chair D'Alecy convened the meeting at 3:25 P.M.

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED

1. Senate Assembly Agenda
2. Draft minutes of the Senate Assembly meeting of 21 April 1997
3. Approved minutes of the Senate Assembly meeting of 17 March 1997
4. Report of the Budget Study Committee, April 1997
5. Item for Action: approval of 1997-1998 Senate Assembly Committee appointments
6. Item for Information: Regents Communication- Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty Report, dated 16 May 1997
7. Faculty Governance Update, dated May 1997
8. Resolutions for adoption under New Business at the May 19, 1997 meeting of the Senate Assembly

CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF 17 FEBRUARY 1997

The minutes 21 April 1997 were approved with two corrections.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair D'Alecy announced that the document titled "Principles of Faculty Governance" had been distributed by the Provost to the academic Deans, and that the SACUA office would distribute it to all faculty, first by electronic mail and then in printed form in the fall after new mailing lists become available.

Chair D'Alecy announced that the meeting of the Senate Assembly originally scheduled for 16 June 1997 had been canceled.

CLINICAL TRACK PROFESSOR APPOINTMENTS

Provost Machen took the podium at 3:30 P.M. to discuss pending proposals to revise the Regents Bylaws. He said that the pending action would culminate activity that he has been working on since his entry as Provost, and would create a series of non-tenure track faculty appointments for 6 units. He said that the proposals would be presented to the Regents at their next meeting in June.

Provost Machen said that movement toward non-tenured faculty appointments had been the topic of intercollegiate study, and that either he or Ms. Karen Gibbons could be queried by e-mail for the results of the study. He explained that the targets of the new appointments would be individuals who had achieved a high degree of skill as practitioners of different professions. He said that in some fields it takes practitioners 20 years to become experts in practice. He added that many such people don't want to enter the tenure track at universities.

Provost Machen said that the issue of non-tenure appointments is a unit-specific issue. He said that only the schools which request the ability to hire nontenured faculty will receive that ability. He said that his recommendation to the units is that the new hires be treated as part of the governing faculty, but that the decisions were local issues within units, and that it was up to the Senate Assembly to decide how to treat the new untenured faculty within central governance.

Professor Hessler commented that expertise in professional practice does not always exist within faculty ranks, and therefore an outreach to industry can be helpful. He said that he did not see the proposed action as a necessary dilution of tenure. Professor Thornton asked the provost to explain the details of the proposal further.

Provost Machen replied that the proposed faculty positions would be term appointments only that never lead to tenure, but that the appointments could be in multiple sequence. He explained that the university categories would be clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor, and clinical professor. Within units, however, he said that other terms could be used, such as "Professor of Practice". Machen said that the untenured incumbents were intended to be identified through national searches, by use of search committees. He said that the untenured faculty should be subject to review in their second year, and that he hoped to have defined criteria for evaluation and promotion. He added that the untenured faculty appointments were not meant to infringe on the tenure track appointments within the same units.

Professor Burdi asked if the Provost foresaw creation of research professor tracks, as well. The provost replied that research professor lines were not part of his proposal, but that he did not preclude such positions in the future. Professor Kibbie asked if it would be possible for individuals to shift from the clinical track to the tenure track. Provost Machen said that shifts per se would not be possible. Chair D'Alecy remarked that the advice memorandum sent by the Provost to the Deans recommended that these new faculty positions be full-time appointments. Machen said that full time appointments were desirable because it would be hard to attract people part time. He explained that the Medical School has some people who teach only 1 or 2 days per week, who are identified as "Clinical Track I". He said that the untenured faculty would be "Clinical Track II", hired as full time. Machen added that there is also the title "Clinical Associate" applied when the University acquires someone's practice. Professor Feld noted that "full-time" is sometimes regarded as 50% employment effort, depending on the unit. Machen replied that whatever a unit defines as full-time will be accepted as appropriate.

Professor Marich asked if it would be possible for clinical professors to be renewed indefinitely. Provost Machen said that renewal was possible, but that reappointments would not constitute de facto tenure. Professor Marich said that it seemed to create a possibility for hiring cheap teachers without tenure. Professor Fraser asked if current tenure slots might be replaced by untenured clinical professors. Machen said that it was possible, but that doing so would harm the units that did so. He noted that there is such a problem at some of the other CIC schools that have initiated this practice. The Provost concluded his remarks at 3:55 P.M., and D'Alecy resumed his function as chair.

Professor Thornton said that it troubled him that full discussion of the untenured faculty lines would occur in the Fall, after the Regents Bylaws had already been changed. He said that it made more sense to him if the Provost presented the proposal to the Regents but asked that action be postponed until the Fall when faculty advice could be focused. Chair D'Alecy said that he had already discussed that point with the Provost, but that the Provost had replied that 4 units already have such authority under existing Regents Bylaws. For that reason, D'Alecy said, the matter must be addressed with the faculty of the individual units. Provost Machen commented that his proposal was not a new concept in higher education. He said that he was not willing to postpone action for units that have convinced him they need the untenured faculty.

Professor Julius asked if there would be a cap on numbers of untenured faculty hired. Provost Machen replied that there is no recording on control mechanism at present. He added that he planned to track the new appointments, but that he did not think that any certain number overall is appropriate. Professor Volakis said that other tracks, such as lecturers, have grown at an alarming rate in the past. He said that this new track may grow faster than anticipated. He asked if there is a sunset clause to force reevaluation in the future. Provost Machen replied that we can look at the track at any time. He said that if we have problems with the numbers of lecturers that is only because we didn't know what was going on. Chair D'Alecy said that more faculty attention should be directed to the matter.

Professor Maloy remarked that the proposal for clinical track appointments in the Division of Kinesiology had been initiated by the faculty of the unit. He said that in his unit the track was perceived as an expansion without harming the tenure track.

Chair D'Alecy closed the discussion at 4:10 P.M. to permit attention to the remaining agenda items.

POTENTIAL DIVESTMENT OF TOBACCO STOCKS

Chair D'Alecy invited remarks from Professor Bryant. Professor Bryant introduced information he had accumulated about institutional investments in tobacco stocks and companies. He said that he wished to instigate discussion about investment practices at the University of Michigan regarding these matters. Professor Bryant introduced the motion: In accord with action taken by SACUA on 28 April 1997, the Senate Assembly recommends to the Board of Regents that over the next two years, the University of Michigan stock portfolio be divested of tobacco company stocks. (Professor Hinman seconded the motion).

Chair D'Alecy invited discussion of the active motion. Professor Hessler said that diversification of the tobacco companies presented a problem. Professor Kleinsmith suggested that the CREF debate about divestment would be a good source of information. Professor Fraser asked where the line would be drawn on tobacco-related activity, including manufacture, transportation, and importation. Professor Perakis asked if the action should stop with tobacco or be extended to alcohol and even the fast food industry.

Professor Gobetti suggested that the financial aspects of the proposal should be investigated. Professor Steneck noted that this was a key time for the issue, owing to ongoing negotiations between the tobacco industry and states attorneys general. Professor Alvarez suggested that it seemed appropriate to ask the Regents to study the issue, and for the Senate Assembly to take its own position.

Professor Bryant said that based on the discussion, he wished to withdraw his original motion and to replace it with a substitute. Professor Hinman agreed to withdraw the active motion. Professor Bryant then introduced the motion:

The Senate Assembly expresses its concern with investment in tobacco stocks and recommends that these investment decisions be studied by the Senate Assembly, university investment officers, and the Regents.

Vote on the active motion:

number approving: 34

number disapproving: 3

number abstaining: 6

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chair D'Alecy invited a motion from the floor to accept recommendations by SACUA for nominations to Senate Assembly committees. The action was moved, seconded, and approved by voice vote without any votes of disapproval or abstention.

Chair D'Alecy next invited a motion accepting the reports from the Budget Study Committee and the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty. The action was moved, seconded, and approved by voice vote without any votes of disapproval or abstention.

NEW BUSINESS

Professor Steneck moved that the distributed list of resolutions (item 8) be adopted. Multiple members seconded the motion.

Professor Steneck explained that the resolutions were a product of discussions among LSA representatives, but that he did not regard the issues as exclusive to LSA. He said he had no preference as to whether the items were treated singly or together. Professor Feld said that the proposed Resolution I should be separated from Resolution II. Professor Steneck said that he agreed to the proposed separation. Chair D'Alecy confirmed Assembly agreement by voice vote.

Professor Hinman said that he would appreciate more frequent, brief verbal update reports from SACUA at the Senate Assembly meetings. Professor Maloy asked what the report could be other than the minutes that are already provided. Professor Steneck replied that the minutes are lengthy, and that reports should be distilled to 2 or 3 main points for Senate Assembly action. Professor MacAdam observed that SACUA could take the recommended steps directly.

Professor Thornton expressed his concern that little of substance eventuates in the Senate Assembly and that it is dismissed as an ineffective body. He said that more substance needed to be injected into its discussions. Chair D'Alecy said that it sounded as though there was a suggestion that the elected faculty should be bringing forward resolutions for action. Professor Feld said that the Senate Assembly should be a deliberative body characterized by less talk and more action. She recommended that in the Fall the Senate Assembly begin by setting priorities for its own agenda. Chair D'Alecy suggested a census of the group by mail to develop a list of potential items, and then a vote on priorities in the Fall. Professor Steneck said that his feeling was that the Senate Assembly needs a meaty agenda. Professor Volakis said that more time should be devoted to developing action items of advice, whether or not that advice is accepted by the administration.

Professor Curley asked whether the Assembly had a parliamentarian. Chair D'Alecy replied that the mechanism to select one was not clearly specified.

A motion to adjourn was offered and approved at 5:00 P.M. without action on the motion under discussion.

Respectfully submitted,

John T. Lehman
Senate Secretary