

The minutes of the September 20, 1993 Senate Assembly meeting were approved on October 18, 1993.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

MINUTES OF 20 SEPTEMBER 1993

ATTENDANCE

Present: Awkward, Beam, Bike, Birge, Blair, Blinder, Brandle, Brewer, Brown, Brusati, Bryant, Cameron, Canine, Christiansen, Cowan, Coward, D'Alecy, DeCamp, Didier, Elta, Ensminger, Fox, Frey, Gidley, Griffin, Gull, Irani, Kaplan, Keener (Alt for Scheppele), Kelley, Kennedy, T. Lee, V. Lee, Levine, Lomax, Lykes, Maloy, Marich, McNamara, Moore, Mukasa, Myers, Nowak, Princen, Raymond, Rodriguez-Hornedo, Saunders, Shirley, Silverstein, Simms, Sisson, C. Smith, R. Smith, Stein, Warner, Whitehouse, Williams, Woo; MacAdam, Olson, Thorson, Stillman, Heskett.

Absent: Chiego, Cole, Danly, Driscoll, Eggertsen, Eklund, Gray, Greene, Katehi, Kunkel, Nairn, Nostrant, Rush, Schteingart, Stensones, Tinkle, Tremper, Yohannes.

Griffin welcomed new and returning Senate Assembly members.

CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF APRIL 19 AND MAY 17, 1993

The minutes of both meetings were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Griffin reviewed the key items on the announcement summary sheet distributed to the Assembly. At his invitation, new members introduced themselves to Assembly.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS MEMBERSHIP RECOMMENDATIONS

SACUA's recommendation to expand the Academic Affairs Committee from six to nine members was moved and seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

It was moved and seconded to accept the SACUA recommendations for appointments to Senate Assembly committees. The motion carried unanimously.

FACULTY EVALUATIONS OF ADMINISTRATORS

Griffin summarized the history of the process for the evaluation of administrators, delineating the recommendations of a 1992 committee which proposed evaluating offices, a recommendation accepted by Senate Assembly. Senate Assembly at that time also affirmed their wish to have the administrators -- as opposed to administrative offices -- evaluated.

Thorson provided background and a status report on the process of administrative office evaluation; the report from the Evaluation Committee for the Office of the VP for Academic Affairs should be available in October. (Committee membership includes Mary Brake (Chair), Richard Altschuler, Joan Durrance, Peter Hinman, and Robert Van der Voo.)

Kaplan asked about the pace of the evaluation and Thorson indicated that it was felt that one office a term was realistic.

Mukasa inquired how the membership of the committee had been determined and Thorson responded that, per the original 1992 committee recommendations, SACUA had forwarded a list of nine nominees to the President who selected six.

Thorson outlined the support provided by the Faculty Senate Office, and introduced staff members Sandra Heskett and Phyllis Stillman. She invited Senate Assembly members to call upon the staff for help in their Assembly or Committee work.

Noting that the subcommittee of the Academic Affairs Committee which was formed to make recommendations on the evaluation of administrators had completed a report in June, Griffin summarized SACUA's work on Senate Assembly's behalf over the summer. SACUA has concluded that:

- Uniformity among the units is not required. The instrument for each particular school or college would be developed by the Senate Assembly representatives in consultation with the school or college. The evaluation instrument would include a context statement provided by the administrator being evaluated.

- Five units would be part of the evaluation process this Fall: Business Administration, Engineering, LS&A, Music and Pharmacy.

- An advisory group from ISR would be sought to assist units in developing an instrument.

Brewer emphasized that this process was in addition to the process recommended by the 1992 committee and would move ahead quickly, while the evaluation of offices would be a lengthier process.

Griffin invited discussion.

Shirley asked about the response at Georgia State where this process was instituted. He inquired about the decision to have administrators provide context statements under several categories rather than a single statement. Brewer responded that he believed it was well accepted at Georgia State but did not have comprehensive information.

Kaplan noted that faculty used to see such statements by administrators as part of the annual reports to the president. Griffin invited Provost Whitaker to respond to this point and Whitaker indicated that they did not do this any more.

Coward reported on a faculty meeting on the evaluation process conducted with considerable success at the College of Pharmacy. He reported concerns related to confidentiality and how the responses would be used, as well as how external groups would be involved. Griffin responded that the original committee did not know the implications that the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) might have. He noted that the general characteristics of the responding group and the tabulations would be seen by the Dean and the evaluation committee representatives. Coward reiterated that the original goal and thrust of the Assembly had been to improve dialogue with and provide better information to the deans, and it was important to maintain the proper level of confidentiality in the process.

Shirley suggested that there be some follow-up to see if this was even possible.

Griffin reported that SACUA had asked the General Counsel to advise on this issue; the response had been that, other than the identity of the individual respondent, the Counsel could not guarantee protecting the evaluation information should there be a suit to secure the information.

Bryant questioned who would define what constituted useful feedback and asked what would happen if the feedback didn't have the stated purpose. Griffin responded that this was up to the units who might, in fact, recommend that the unit not undertake the evaluation. He suggested that Assembly might feel it was important to ensure that faculty had this input.

D'Alecy asked to what degree the evaluation of offices would be subject to the same FOIA issues. Thorson noted that this evaluation report would be widely distributed so the issues were not the same. D'Alecy questioned why the "sanitized" data from the administrator evaluation could not be shared through the same open distribution.

Brewer reminded Assembly that the original recommendations of the subcommittee were that the summary questions be published.

As the discussion concluded, Griffin announced that a report on the evaluations in progress would appear on the faculty perspectives page in the University Record on September 27. He stressed the importance of developing an understanding from all parties as the process went forward.

### PROVOST GILBERT R. WHITAKER, JR., ADDRESS TO ASSEMBLY

(Note: the full text of the Provost's address is available from the Faculty Senate Office.)

Whitaker identified two key issues for his presentation: The importance of improving undergraduate education, and the issues of academic freedom, freedom of speech and academic climate. Praising undergraduate education at Michigan, he stressed the importance of doing better and the need to alter a widely held perception that research universities had de-emphasized the commitment to high-quality undergraduate education. He summarized the many complex reasons universities had diminished the importance of undergraduate teaching, ranging from financial necessities to a laudable desire to provide graduate students the opportunity gain teaching experience.

Highlighting the extraordinary benefits undergraduates could draw from the experience of senior faculty, Whitaker noted that many first- and second-year students have no contact with senior faculty. He emphasized that the responsibility did not fall solely to the schools and colleges with undergraduates, but that this was a University-wide obligation. Citing the University Research Opportunity Program (UROP) as an example, he outlined what mutual benefits students and faculty could draw from such contact.

Whitaker announced that he and the President have appointed a Task Force on the First Year Experience to explore ways to improve the living/learning environment for first-year students. Michael Martin (Associate Dean of LS&A) and Michael Parsons (Associate Dean, College of Engineering) will co-chair this group with the support and participation of Maureen Hartford, Vice-President for Student Affairs. Noting examples like UROP, the proposed Gateway concept, and the experimental, interdisciplinary course on global change, Whitaker stressed the extraordinary potential the University had as a leading research institution to provide a unique undergraduate experience to students, concluding that one of the goals was to create an environment that secured students' interest and involvement in curricular activities as well as extra-curricular activities.

Whitaker opened his remarks on the Interim Policy on Discriminatory Harassment by Faculty and Staff by expressing appreciation for the debate on the policy at Senate Assembly during the past year. He specifically praised the work of the committee chaired by Elizabeth Anderson in presenting a set of choices for the faculty to consider. Reporting that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission was planning to issue new guidelines on harassment in the workplace this fall, Whitaker indicated that it was important to see where the courts and agencies were headed on this issue, but equally important that the University begin a process of discussion and debate to develop a common understanding of the University community's shared values.

He noted two specific values that needed to be kept in balance: free speech and civility. Whitaker affirmed the importance of freedom of inquiry in academic endeavors and suggested

that ideas needed to be freely expressed so that they could be tested in the "market place" of ideas. At the same time, he described some of the challenges "hate speech" presented to collegial relationships in the classroom and cited a number of appalling examples provided by students in the CEW Survey of the Graduate Experience and in the Student Voices project. He asserted that civility and respect for human dignity were both critical values for the academic community. Whitaker said, however, that if the academic community were to err in the balance between freedom of inquiry and respect for human dignity, the value to increase knowledge through open inquiry must be given priority.

Whitaker outlined the steps he had taken or planned to take:

He had asked President Duderstadt to suspend the Harassment policy as it applied to the classroom while retaining it in respect to workplace matters. This will be subject to revision when the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission issues its guidelines. Whitaker strongly emphasized that suspension of the interim policy did not leave the University community without ways to redress discriminatory harassment by faculty, noting that this was covered in Regental Bylaw 14.06 and by mechanisms at the School and College level.

He suggested a series of discussions on values followed by a possible revision of "Fundamental Tenets of Membership in the University Community," a statement adopted by Senate Assembly. He indicated that he would ask that the discussion of the values of civility and free speech continue across campus and announced that the Regents would have a discussion on this issue, led by Lee Bollinger, Dean of the Law School, at their October meeting.

Whitaker concluded his talk by indicating that he would be asking faculty help in shaping revised policies to address challenges to scientific integrity. He thanked Senate Assembly for their dedication.

Griffin invited questions from Assembly for the Provost.

Kaplan asked if one major barrier to improving undergraduate teaching wasn't the reward structure for faculty. Whitaker replied that virtually everyone appeared to agree that teaching should have high value and suggested that faculty should take a few risks in committing to undergraduate teaching.

Moore expressed concern that a policy left too broadly to units could result in disparity in fairness. Whitaker said that the worry should be over whether a unit or central policy had gone through the process of discussion to identify central values. Such policies should come from the bottom up. He reiterated that the current policy had to remain in place for the workplace.

Whitaker invited Assembly members to the reception following Assembly.

The Assembly thanked the Provost for his address.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Senate Assembly adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara MacAdam  
Senate Secretary