

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting of 16 June 1986

ATTENDANCE

Present: Bassett, Bissell, Borcherts,  
Brewer, Checkoway, Chudacoff,  
Craig, Dandekar, DeCamp, Dobbins,  
Durrance, English, Gage, Gray,  
Vinh, Haefner, Hanks, Hook,  
Larson, Lehmann, Lenaghan, Lorey,  
Lougee, Loup, Lusk, Malvin,  
Margolis, Manis, Moerman, Moore,  
Mosher, Nadelman, Ness, Oleinick,  
Pierce, Reed, Rizki, Rosenthal,  
Rutledge, Sanders, Schteingart,  
Shannon, Silverman, Stebbins,  
Berent, Wiseman, Blass

Absent: Arnett, Ascione, Barlow, Briggs,  
Burdi, Carnahan, Comninou, Debler,  
Eggertsen, Glover, Goldberg, Han,  
Hollingsworth, Hudson, Lavoie,  
Leonard, Lewis, Lockwood, McCarus,  
McClamroch, Meyer, Kearney, Moran,  
Olsen, Olson, Marc Ross, Muriel  
Ross, Sargous, Schauer, Seidler,  
Snyder, Thomson, Todor, Weiler,  
White, Zelenock

The meeting was called to order at 3:18 p.m. by Professor Stebbins.

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of 19 May 1986, were approved as distributed, and there were no comments on the SACUA minutes that had been distributed with the agenda.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Professor Stebbins announced that the next meeting of the Assembly would be on 15 September.

TENURE COMMITTEE STATEMENTS

Since Tenure Committee chair, Professor J. Lindberg, was unable to attend the meeting, the committee's two proposals, which had been distributed with

the agenda, were presented to the Assembly by Professor J. Gindin. The first proposal, recommending that Regents' Bylaw 5.08 be amended to permit two- or three-year appointments for instructors and lecturers, was moved by Professor Lenaghan and seconded by Professor Moerman. In reply to a question from Professor Manis, Professor Gindin said that the phrase "other teaching appointments" (which occurs in both the present bylaw and in the proposed one) would presumably refer to lecturers. The proposal passed on a unanimous voice vote.

The second item brought to the Assembly by the Tenure Committee was a statement opposing the creation of "career" or "senior" lecturer positions. Professor Gindin explained that, although the committee accepted the motive leading to the proposal to create such positions, namely to provide job security for teachers not eligible for tenure, it unanimously thought that the introduction of such appointments has undesirable implications for the concept of tenure. Among the difficult issues raised by the senior-lecturer proposal are (1) whether preparatory or ancillary programs requiring a long-term commitment from lecturers and having academic value should warrant tenure, (2) what constitutes a short-term need, (3) possible blurring of issues of what is tenurable, (4) possible diversion of resources from the tenure track, and (5) possible implications for the expectations of tenure-track assistant professors. Professor Gindin urged the Assembly to reassert its commitment to the structure and values of the tenure system.

Professor Lehmann moved that the Assembly endorse the Tenure Committee's statement, and his motion was seconded. Professor Bissell expressed approval of the changes made in the statement's last paragraph since the Assembly's previous discussion. He noted that the University Record had quoted the old last paragraph but not the objections expressed during that previous discussion, and he suggested that the changes in this paragraph be emphasized in the report on today's meeting.

Professor Pierce noted that one form of the LSA proposal for career or senior lecturers included the possibility of moving to the tenure track; this would require a modification of the first paragraph of the Tenure Committee's statement. Professor Gindin replied that the final version of the proposal passed by LSA does not include such a possibility.

Professor Lehmann's motion passed on a voice vote, with one negative vote.

#### BUDGET PRIORITIES COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Bailey referred to the statement "The Role of the Budget Priorities Committee," which had been distributed with the agenda, and he added the following information. Although the Budget Priorities Committee is de jure advisory to the President, it is de facto advisory to the Vice

President for Academic Affairs and Provost, so its scope is limited to budgets controlled by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Former Vice President Frye called it his most important advisory committee. Its members do their homework and come to meetings prepared to comment and advise. Service on the committee is quite educational for faculty, and several of its former chairs have gone on to administrative positions (though the present chair expects not to).

The committee's recurring duties in the fall term include looking at the current budget, receiving liaison reports on budget conferences with the deans and the director of the library, and monitoring the budget situation in Lansing. In the spring, the committee looks at various budget models for the following year, both by line items and by schools and colleges. Unfortunately, this process culminates around June, when attendance is down slightly.

In addition to these recurring matters, the committee looks at various special items. In recent years, these have included women's safety on campus, student aid in the light of federal cutbacks, the impact of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings bill on the University's research budget, energy management, deferred maintenance, plans to improve the basic sciences at the University, management incentives (making units responsible for their teaching assistants' outstate tuition differential and for the retirement furlough program), and the reviews of particular units. Professor Bailey remarked that, for the review process to work, we need the sort of dedication that members bring to the Senate Assembly. He urged faculty to become informed and not to cede their role to administrators.

Professor Lehmann asked how much of the University's budget falls within the scope of the Budget Priorities Committee and who looks at the rest of the budget. Professor Bailey replied that the committee's scope varies with the Vice President for Academic Affairs's view of his purview. At the moment, the committee has looked at only slightly more than the general fund (e.g., indirect costs of research). There are no advisory committees for the other budgets, but there are for the vice presidents who oversee them. Professor Lehmann inferred that the committee considers about a third of the total budget, and Professor Bailey agreed.

Professor Ness asked whether the committee's purview includes equity of salaries, both across units and between faculty, P&A staff, and clerical workers. Professor Bailey said that these were matters for CESF, not Budget Priorities. He added that budget authority is largely decentralized, and the central administration would usually not intervene if a unit decided to put more money into salaries and less into current account, for example, although the central administration does prefer big spreads in raises. He also added that he had suggested and former Vice President Frye had agreed that consistently low raises require justification as much as high raises.

Professor Hanks asked who sets the committee's agenda. Professor Bailey replied that it depends on the chair's leadership style. His own policy had been to put on the agenda whatever any committee member wanted to discuss and to assert that the chair sets the agenda. The range of potential topics includes almost anything except the athletic department. "Or the medical center," interjected Professor Lehmann, but Professor Bailey said that the committee is well aware of the growth in medicine while the rest of the University shrinks.

#### REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE UNIVERSITY'S INFLUENCE

Professor J. Durrance introduced the other three members of the committee, Professors B. Checkoway, B. Kalisch, and P. Margolis, and she called attention to the committee's written report, which had already been distributed to the Assembly. She read the committee's charge and added that the committee confined its attention to the University's influence via the faculty's role as developers and disseminators of knowledge; it also excluded influence resulting from the presentation of scholarly research to academic audiences, despite the acknowledged importance of this faculty role.

The committee surveyed the faculty via Senate Assembly representatives and interviewed selected faculty from selected disciplines to compensate for the bias resulting from the fact that all of the committee members are from professional schools. Although the committee has only scratched the surface of the subject, it hopes that it has stimulated thought and useful discussion.

Quoting from the report, Professor Durrance cited numerous instances of faculty influence outside the University, grouped under the general headings of instruction, consultation, and technical assistance. She listed various factors that inhibit such influence (under the headings of the university reward structure, emphasis on funded research, academic fragmentation, and inadequate mechanisms for communication between the University and society) as well as factors that could enhance it. The committee recommends:

1. That SACUA appoint a special committee or task force to conduct an in-depth analysis of professional service at the University. Such a committee could provide perspectives on the changing context of service; problems and issues in particular academic disciplines, professional fields, and sectors of society; and prospects for the future. It could analyze the scope and quality of service, identify major approaches and empirical cases, assess obstacles and factors affecting outcomes.

2. That SACUA charge an existing Senate Assembly Committee or create a new one to examine more fully the reward structure of the University in terms of the relative contributions of research, teaching, and service, with the aim of assuring that teaching and service are appropriately considered in faculty performance.

3. That SACUA examine ways to increase positive University influence in the community, and explore ways to make faculty expertise and university resources more readily available to citizens of the community, state, nation and beyond.

4. That SACUA communicate the importance of strengthening the scope and quality of communication mechanisms between faculty and society.

5. That SACUA support University efforts to expand methods to foster interdisciplinary activities designed to increase the University's influence.

Professor Brewer said that the committee seems to think we do too much research. Yet that is why we are a top-flight university. There may be overemphasis on research prior to tenure, but the emphasis decreases thereafter. Professor Durrance replied that the committee had not intended to imply that research is overemphasized but to say that there are other things to be considered. Levels of emphasis before and after tenure were not distinguished, as responses referred to whole departments.

Professor Schteingart pointed out that people who do outside consulting often get paid for it; he asked whether the University could target areas where it would provide money for consulting. Professor Berent asked about the impact of incentives such as the University allowing faculty to devote some time to consulting and to take honoraria and fees. He also asked about the amount of consulting done by the faculty. Professor Durrance replied that the committee did not have this information. Professor Nadelman said that, though it may come as a shock to the medical school, faculty in other units often do consulting without pay; this consulting is not rewarded by the University and can be counterproductive for one's career.

Professor Moerman asked what differences the committee found between the faculty of the professional schools and the rest of the faculty. Professor Durrance cited the comment of a humanities professor that "we often don't go beyond the walls of the University, but we should."

Professor Checkoway remarked that, though some survey respondents viewed public and community service as synonymous with professional service, the latter should be an application of scholarly work. There is evidence, from studies elsewhere, that such service can improve the quality of research.

Professor Margolis said that, although the committee did not feel that research is overemphasized, it did feel that teaching and service can exert more immediate influence outside the University and therefore should be rewarded.

In reply to Professor Ness's question about what action the Assembly was being asked to take, Professor Stebbins said that only comments were requested; the committee will revise its report and transmit it through SACUA to the provost.

#### REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON FACULTY

Professor Nadelman announced that the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty has no written report yet because some data are still coming in; today's oral report is intended to stimulate discussion. The committee, charged to study the conditions under which faculty perform their duties, began its work in mid November. It decided to focus on three areas: faculty governance, the merit review process, and collegiality.

Concerning faculty governance, the committee sent a questionnaire to Assembly members soliciting their opinions and those of their colleagues. Faculty in eleven schools had an opportunity to respond to the questionnaire, and responses, ranging from no concern to cris de coeur, were received from 425 faculty. (The lack of a larger response may be due to satisfaction with faculty governance, to apathy, to a belief that faculty governance is ineffective, and to the lack of a regular procedure for collecting faculty opinion.) The most positive responses were from LSA and the School of Music; the most negative from the schools that recently had major budget cuts and from two professional schools with non-rotating chairmanships and appointed rather than elected executive committees. Satisfaction with faculty governance was generally greatest at the department level, less at the college level, and least at the level of central administration. Among the concerns expressed about the college and central levels were (1) the corporate, management-labor model, (2) insufficient attention to collegiality, (3) the star system, (4) overemphasis on research, and (5) detrimental effects of service in faculty governance on professional advancement. Among the problems mentioned as facing faculty governance were (1) apathy, (2) insufficient faculty discussion before administrators decide, (3) insufficient mechanisms for soliciting faculty input, (4) top-down decision-making, (5) lack of administrative skill of department and committee chairs, (6) too much focus on issues of salary and tenure and not enough on the quality of the University, (7) demoralization and alienation, (8) overemphasis on research, and (9) desire to remain anonymous for fear of the dean. Suggested solutions to some of these problems included (1) a more proactive and assertive SACUA, (2) better communication between the Assembly, SACUA, the units, and the administration, (3) training for department and committee chairs, (4) efforts by administrators to solicit faculty opinions earlier, (5) more balanced reward systems, (6) improved collegiality, and (7) extending faculty governance to promotion and tenure decisions. In reading the responses to the survey, the committee was struck by the amount of pessimism and emotion, by the confusion about the limits of faculty governance, and by the confusion

about how centralized the University is. (The administration says that it is decentralized, but central budget decisions govern other decisions.)

Concerning collegiality, i.e., joint activities, shared goals, mutual support, etc., among the faculty, the committee found that, despite efforts such as those of Rackham Dean D'Arms to improve the situation, there is still a widespread perception of lack of collegiality. This appears to be tied to the merit reward system, because collaborative research takes longer and the principal investigator gets the most credit.

Professor Reed reported on the committee's efforts to study the merit review procedures of the various units. The study began in response to questions from CESF to then-Provost Frye, who asked the deans how they administer the merit review process. The question was not made more specific, so the answers came in quite varied forms, and the committee is still trying to fill in gaps in the information. Of the sixteen schools and major institutes, only two told how they evaluate the various criteria, and only five told how they weight the criteria. Three schools provided no information at all, one because it is reviewing its procedures, and two because the answers would vary from department to department. The information available so far shows a great deal of variation as to who reviews and evaluates merit.

Professor Sanders began the discussion of the report by saying that the system of vice-presidential advisory committees is not bad, but not all executive officers take their advisory committees equally seriously. The effectiveness of the advisory committees seems to be at the discretion of the executive officers. Professor Moerman noted that a survey of the vice-presidents and the members of their advisory committees showed that, with one exception, the vice-presidents considered the advisory committee more important than the committee members did. He added that he finds the almost apathetic response of the faculty disconcerting. Professor Ness said that the results of the survey cited by Professor Moerman are understandable, because the committee members don't see the other inputs that influence the vice-presidents. The committees can expect to be taken seriously though not literally. The importance of faculty advice may also vary with the issue, the worst case being the disbanding of the Geography Department, during the summer, despite three contrary votes of the LSA faculty.

Professor Nadelman said that these remarks tie in with the question of the domain of faculty decision-making versus the domain of faculty advice.

Concerning the impression that the Assembly is powerless, Professor Brewer remarked that it seems rather passive; we spend most of our time listening to reports and not enough time on real discussion and action.

REPORTS FROM SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

Professor Mosher spoke briefly about The University of Michigan Annuitants' Association. Membership in the Association is open to all retired members of the faculty and upper administration and their spouses. The Association has between 900 and 1000 members and is governed by a nine-member board (whose members serve three-year terms); the president and vice-president are chosen by the board. There are no dues. All members and spouses are welcome at the Association's three meetings per year; for \$2 per year one can get the meeting announcements and the newsletter. The attendance at meetings ranges between 40 and 100. Recent special meetings have featured a talk by President Shapiro and a discussion of health needs (particularly in connection with HMO's). Professor Mosher concluded his talk by telling the other Assembly members to "hurry up and retire; the Annuitants' Association welcomes you."

NEW BUSINESS

Professor Moerman reported that SACUA had considered the hypothesis that the Rackham Amphitheatre is not conducive to intelligent discussion. He suggested that anyone knowing of a better room, available at reasonable cost, inform a SACUA member. Professor Stebbins added that a central location is important.

Professor Durrance reported that, in keeping with recent curricular changes, the School of Library Science has changed its name to "School of Information and Library Studies."

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Andreas Blass  
Acting Senate Secretary