

Minutes of 23 September 2013 Senate Assembly Meeting
Circulated 24 September 2013
Re-circulated 21 October 2013
Approved 21 October 2013

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
UNIVERSITY SENATE MEETING
SENATE ASSEMBLY MEETING
23 SEPTEMBER 2013

Present: Adler, Baker, Barolo, Bayraktar, Biteen, Brown, Burrow, Campbell, Cervetti, Cotera, Danziger, Dolins, Fagerlin, Fenno, Fiore, Fraser, Garcia, Grosh, Hayes, Holland, Hollingsworth, Johnson, Jones, Katapodi, Kirshner, Koopmann, Lehman, Masten, Mondro, Muehlberger, Mutschler, Nielsen, Odetola, Oey, Olsen, Poulsen, Raphael, Rothman, Schloss, Smith, Staller (Chair), Swain, Turnley, Winful, Wright, Ziff

Requested Alternate, None Available: Adunbi (LSA), Custer (Medicine), Mansfield (Engineering), Wong (Medicine)

Alternates: Wraight (Ro-UM Dearborn)

Absent: Atchade, Bradley, Christman, DiPietro, Friesen, Hershovitz, Jacobsen, Kee, Larsen, Lu, Mora, Nevett, Pandey, Primus, Princen, Prygoski, Ryan, Sarma, Shah, Silveira, Szymanski, Thompson, Trandafirescu, von Buelow, Young

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED

1. Agenda for Senate Assembly
2. Draft Minutes of the 15 April 2013 Senate Assembly meeting
3. Ballot for prioritizing 2013-14 issues
4. Committee nominations for Senate Assembly consideration
5. University of Michigan presidential search timeline (<http://www.regents.edu/presidential-search/timeline.html>)

Chair Staller convened the meeting of the Senate Assembly at 3:20 P.M. The proposed agenda was approved.

MINUTES

The draft minutes of 15 April 2013 were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. A presidential search forum will be held this Thursday at 100 Hutchins Hall in the Law School from noon to 1 P.M. Additional forum dates are listed in distributed item 4.
2. There is an access to education Policy and Law forum on Wednesday 10 October from 3:15 to 5:30 P.M. in Forum Hall of Palmer Commons.
3. The next meeting of the Senate Assembly will be 21 October 2013 in Forum Hall of Palmer Commons.

4. The Academic Freedom Lecture will be presented on Wednesday 23 October at 4 P.M. in 100 Hutchins Hall of the Law School.

STATE OF FACULTY GOVERNANCE

Chair Staller presented a State of Faculty Governance address describing the role and current status of Central Faculty Governance (Appendix).

INTRODUCTION OF SACUA MEMBERS

The chair invited the members of SACUA to introduce themselves to the Assembly and to provide a brief orientation to the emerging issues facing current faculty governance.

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS

The Senate Assembly gave unanimous approval to the nominations provided by SACUA for membership on Assembly committees (distributed item 4).

RESOLUTION ON A COMPLETE AND OPEN BENEFITS REVIEW

At 3:45 P.M. Chair Staller invited Professor Koopmann to introduce a Resolution and Action Item that SACUA proposed for Assembly consideration. Professor Koopmann stressed the need for transparency in decision-making regarding changes to faculty and staff benefits.

Professor Oey asked if there were any regular faculty on the benefits committee. Professor Koopmann said yes, but they were not representatives of faculty governance. Professor Turnley asked if benefits would be improved. Professor Koopmann expressed doubt that such would be the case. Professor Wright asked for an enumeration of the various benefits that are set at the university level. Professors Koopmann and Garcia mentioned, *inter alia*, retirement benefits with a 2:1 match, health care benefits for retirees and spouses, prescription drugs, vision, dental, and legal insurance, but not dependent tuition.

Professor Smith inquired whether administrators were inclined to evaluate each item with an eye to improving UM benefits that are subpar. Professor Koopmann responded that improvement was achieved recently in the area of long term disability, but that it was the faculty who pressed for the improvement, not the administration. Professor Garcia suggested that transparent examination of the entire compensation package could make it possible for some benefits to be low if others are high. Professor Schloss suggested that a cafeteria approach might be helpful to allow some faculty to choose the benefits they want. Professor Garcia said those options already exist.

Professor Garcia moved to call the question (Professor Muehlberger seconded).
The procedural motion was approved unanimously with no abstentions of record.

ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY 092313-1

Attracting and retaining the best faculty and staff, essential to maintaining the University of Michigan's reputation and status as a top public university, requires that the University remain competitive in salary and benefits. In its review and modification of faculty and staff benefits, the University has, in recent years, tended to examine components of total benefits in isolation

and often under conditions of secrecy. In the interests of comprehensiveness and greater transparency, Senate Assembly urges that the University and the relevant HR committees consider benefit packages in their entirety and involve faculty in a more open and meaningful process.

Vote on the Active Motion:

The Action was approved by unanimous vote with no abstentions of record.

DESIRED PRESIDENTIAL TRAITS AND VALUES AND QUESTIONS FOR CANDIDATES

At 4:08 P.M. Chair Staller asked Professor Masten to introduce the next agenda item. Professor Masten reviewed the history of SACUA actions during the summer with respect to its efforts to include nominees from central faculty governance for the presidential search advisory committee. He noted that the advisory committee was subsequently constituted with no faculty governance representation. Chair Staller pointed out that students as well as faculty from UM-Flint and UM-Dearborn were similarly left out. Professor Holland suggested that faculty should attend presidential search forums. Professors Masten and Oey agreed, and Professor Oey pointed out that if faculty do not attend the forums they may be accused of disinterest.

Chair Staller resumed chairing the meeting and invited discussion as a Committee of the Whole. Professor Wright suggested this is an opportunity to use technology and he recommended inviting email responses from the entire Senate Assembly. He noted that there are competing presidential searches at Ohio State and Penn State, at least.

Professor Masten urged that the next president be an academic leader, not a businessman or politician. Professor Koopmann pointed out that many Fortune 500 corporate leaders have strong liberal arts backgrounds. Professor Hollingsworth expressed concern about leaning further toward a corporate model that has been increasingly the direction taken by the UM. Professor Oey said that research is integral to the UM and that the next president needs a firm grasp of academic thinking and research

Professor Danziger suggested that upcoming forums could be used to give committee members good ideas for questions that could be used in candidate interviews as well as the challenges we will face in the future. Professor Garcia remarked that some aspects of a corporate model can be beneficial if it provides additional revenue streams for the academic mission, but that the prime purpose of the institution is to educate students, followed by faculty research. Professor Schloss suggested that a university-wide SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) analysis complementary to the search would be helpful. Professor Smith said that it would be important that the new president be able to communicate well outside the institution, with legislators, etc.

Dr. Fraser suggested that the president should have an ability to deal with three campuses. Professor Winful urged that the president be one who embraces technology, its use to enhance education, and the opportunities offered by online platforms such as MOOCs (massive open online courses). Professor Mondro urged that the president evince a commitment to learning at all levels. Professor Holland said it would be nice to see improved recruitment of minorities in

both student and faculty ranks. Professor Garcia responded that achieving increased diversity was a difficult societal problem, too difficult to set as a goal for one individual.

Professor Masten commented that leadership is fine if you like the direction they are leading. He suggested that the next president should be responsive to faculty and student concerns. Professor Grosh suggested that the forums are an opportunity to provide questions for candidates to the search advisory committee. He noted that lots of good ideas have been suggested, and that if people cannot physically attend the forums, they should send email suggestions.

Chair Staller halted discussion by the Committee of the Whole at 4:53 P.M. in order to observe the order of the agenda.

PRIORITIZATION OF ISSUES

Chair Staller called attention to distributed item 3. She briefly characterized each topic listed and asked the members of the Assembly to rank order the priority of each topic and to provide the ballots to the Senate Office staff.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 P.M.

Respectfully submitted

John T. Lehman
Senate Secretary

University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents, Sec. 4.01:

The University Senate

The senate is authorized to consider any subject pertaining to the interests of the university, and to make recommendations to the Board of Regents in regard thereto. Decisions of the University Senate with respect to matters within its jurisdiction shall constitute the binding action of the university faculties.

University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents, Sec. 4.04:

The Senate Assembly

The Senate Assembly shall serve as the legislative arm of the senate.

The assembly shall have power to consider and advise regarding all matters within the jurisdiction of the University Senate which affect the functioning of the university as an institution of higher learning, which concern its obligations to the state and to the community at

large, and which relate to its internal organization insofar as such matters of internal organization involve general questions of educational policy.

Rules of the University Senate, the Senate Assembly and the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs: In all cases not covered by rules adopted by the Senate, the procedure in Robert's Rules of Order shall be followed.

Appendix

**Address to the Senate Assembly
State of Faculty Governance at the University of Michigan
Monday September 23, 2013**

**By Karen M. Staller, Chair
Senate Advisory Community on University Affairs (SACUA)**

Welcome and Overview

Good afternoon and welcome to the first meeting of the Senate Assembly for the 2013-14 academic year. My name is Karen Staller and I am the Chair of the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs, better known by its acronym, SACUA. I'll introduce you to the nine individuals who comprise this year's SACUA in a few minutes, but first I'd like to give you a bit of an overview of faculty governance at the University of Michigan, to fill you in on the work done by SACUA over this summer, to offer some suggestions about your responsibilities as Senate Assembly members, and to comment on the current state of faculty governance.

Overview of Faculty Governance

For those of you who are new to the Senate Assembly, welcome! For those of you who are old hands at this, welcome back! Together, we are over 74 members, or delegates, elected by our various schools and colleges, to serve on this central governing body known as the Senate Assembly. We have representatives from all three campuses Ann Arbor, Dearborn and Flint. The number of Assembly members from each school or college is based on a system of apportionment.

If we believe that, "shared governance is a cherished tradition of American universities" and that: "faculty participation in governance promotes and encourages diversity of ideas, a sense of shared responsibility, collaboration, collegiality, and institutional excellence" than certainly your presence here is critically important (Office of the Provost, AAUP).

For the benefit of the newer members, it might be worth taking a minute to distinguish the Senate Assembly from the University Senate. The University Senate (often called the Faculty Senate, or just The Senate), consists of all the professorial staff including executive officers, deans, and some members of the research and library staff at the University of Michigan. Of course, the University Senate is too large to meet conveniently or to serve as the "primary body for decision making" so "most decision-making is relegated to the representative Senate Assembly. (Steneck, 1991, p. 10). So we are the legislative arm of the University Senate. Any action taken by this Assembly has the effect of being an action of the entire University Senate unless or until it is revoked by the Senate. In short, we are a faculty-elected campus-wide body that exists for the presentation of the views of the whole faculty.

Of course, the ultimate governing authority for the University of Michigan rests in the hands of the Board of Regents, however, the authority for the University Senate, Senate Assembly, and SACUA, comes from Chapter 4 of the Bylaws of the Regents. Interestingly, the authority for

faculties and academic staff and of schools and units are contained in subsequent chapters (Specifically Chapters 5 and 6). This institutional arrangement suggests that those who initially drafted the Bylaws saw the role of our representative bodies, specifically the Senate Assembly and SACUA, as critical to university governance.

Under these Bylaws, we are “authorized to consider and advise on any subject pertaining to the interests of the University which affect the functioning of the University as an institution of higher learning, which concern its obligations to the state and to the community at large, and which relate to its internal organization insofar as such matters of internal organization involve general questions of educational policy. The President or President’s delegate may request the advice and counsel of SAUA or of the Senate Assembly on any topic of concern to the University.” The Senate Assembly may, “request information from any member of the University staff and may invite any such person to sit with it [us] for the purpose of consultation and advice.” and “Not less than once a year” we are required “to meet with the executive officers of the University” (Bylaws § 4.06)

Obviously, the Senate Assembly can’t do all the work of university governance by itself. Like any large legislative body, a great deal is delegated to committees. The Regent Bylaws note that the “assembly shall establish standing committees to advise and consult with the vice presidents of the University on matters within the areas of their respective responsibilities” (Bylaws § 4.06). There are 21 standing Senate Assembly Committees. Basically, they fall into two generic categories, those that are advisory to the Executive Officers of the University and those that are advisory on special issues (such as tenure and promotion, research). These “standing and special committees” report to the Senate Assembly for “study and transmittal” to the University Senate with such “recommendations for actions as the assembly shall deem proper” (Bylaws § 4.04).

In addition to these Assembly Committees, there is the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs, also known as SACUA. This small group of nine people, elected by you, the Senate Assembly, essentially serves as an executive committee for the Senate Assembly. I will introduce you to the individuals of this executive body in few minutes.

SACUA’s Summer

SACUA worked very hard over the summer. We meet almost weekly. Among other things we:

- Created a Special Task Force on Scholarship: Transmission and Ownership;
- Provided comments and offered an alternative draft of a proposed SPG on faculty “fitness for duty”;
- Reviewed and approved of proposed changes to the rules of the Police Oversight Committee relating to election of faculty members;
- In our capacity as faculty grievance monitor, we are monitoring 4 pending grievances that are currently at various stages of the process;
- Passed several resolutions including one expressing concern over the appearance of insensitivity to principles of academic freedom stemming from the dis-invitation of Alice Walker from a campus speaking engagement (she has since accepted an alternative invitation);
- Created a template for a semi-annual report on faculty governance to be distributed to the University Senate in (January and May);

- Reviewed and updated committee membership lists including committee chairs (which we will ask you to approve shortly);
- Individual members of SACUA met with President Mary Sue Coleman, Provost Martha Pollack, and General Counsel, Timothy Lynch;
- Perhaps most importantly, we generated a list of issues that we felt were crucial for faculty governance to consider during the upcoming academic year. We used this list of identified issues in several ways:
 - First, we decided which topics should be infused into committee work and added specific committee charges where appropriate;
 - Second, we are creating our SACUA meetings agendas according to these topics and priorities;
 - Finally, we created today's Senate Assembly agenda from these topics. Shortly, we will ask you to approve of our committee membership and chairs. We will ask you to debate a draft resolution that has been generated from SACUA's discussion on retirement benefits, we will ask you to deliberate over some questions associated with the presidential search, and finally, we will ask you to help guide us in setting some agendas for upcoming Senate Assembly meetings.

Senate Assembly Member Responsibilities

At the heart of many of SACUA's conversations this summer, were questions about how to increase participation in and communication between, and among, the various organs of faculty governance. If faculty governance is to be a vital part of campus life at the University of Michigan, effective and constructive, communication is critical. In light of all this, I'm offering a short list of actions you might take, as Senate Assembly members, to fulfill your role as representatives in this Assembly:

1. Participate in Senate Assembly meetings. Embrace your role serving on a deliberative body and arrive at Senate Assembly meetings prepared to discuss, debate, and take action on relevant issues.
2. Be proactive. Offer resolutions for debate here in the Assembly, draft short articles for the faculty Perspectives column that appears in the *University Record*, and bring issues to the attention of your colleagues.
3. Report back to your units. Make sure information from our meetings here gets disseminated within your own home schools and colleges.
4. Report to us from your units. As ideas, topics, or issues bubble up in your home schools and colleges that might impact faculty more broadly please bring them to the attention of the Assembly, of SACUA, or of relevant committees.
5. Talk with your colleagues in Senate Assembly and learn about the governing structures in other units. Be aware of the great differences in unit models and ask: Is faculty governance operating as effectively within my own school or college as elsewhere? Could it be improved? If so, then take action to do so.
6. Be aware of the work being done in the standing and special committees.
7. Participate in the upcoming presidential search advisory forums and recognize that your role at these forums is both as member of the University Senate, but also as an elected representative in the Senate Assembly.

State of Faculty Governance

While I would love to close this address by reporting to you that we have such a strong, vibrant, well-respected participatory faculty governance structure at the University of Michigan that there is nothing left to improve. But I fear that might be less than completely honest.

In 1991, now-Professor Emeritus of History, Nicholas H. Steneck, wrote a wonderful report entitled “Faculty governance at the University of Michigan: Principles, History and Practice. (We have copies should anyone want one and there is a link to the report on the SACUA website). In it Professor Steneck traces the evolution of faculty governance at the University of Michigan from its earliest roots in the fall of 1841 when the entire University consisted of 19 regents, two on-campus faculty, seven students and a single librarian.

Steneck points to “two principles” that “emerge” from the “early documents” that he argued still inform faculty governance today “advice and self-government.” He wrote: “As the ultimate governing body of the University, the Regents understood in the 1840s and accept today that they should undertake decision making with the advice, guidance, and sometimes, consent of the faculty” (Steneck, 1991, p. 4).

Steneck traces the evolution of governance from its humble origins to the one that exists today functioning a far larger, more complicated, University. In doing so, he also situates the University of Michigan within bigger national trends. He wrote:

“For the faculty, the growth of the new twentieth-century university meant a loss of sense of place and importance in the University’s governance structure. As the administration grew in size and complexity, the distance between the Regents and President, at one end, and the faculty, at the other, grew. Complex bureaucracies replaced open doors and personal contact. Executive and representative governance removed more and more faculty from direct contact with decision-making.” (Steneck, 1991, 7-8).

Steneck (1991) noted:

“Faculty do, of course, benefit from a university that is administered and governed by the administration rather than the faculty. Administration and governance are time-consuming activities. The less faculty have to engage in these activities, the more productive they can be in teaching, research and service. Universities run by larger and more efficient administrations will likely maximize productivity and service. However if this productivity is not grounded in action and an integral part of the university communities that foster it, there is a real danger that the qualities that make universities unique and special institutions will be lost.” (Steneck, 1991, 13).

Given this situation, there are, I suppose, two possible responses available to a faculty member. The first is to simply cede all decision-making authority to others. In my view, that would be regrettable. The second, is to recognize the importance of shared governance and of our role in advising administration and expressing our opinions. I like to believe that this second approach

is on display here. The ongoing and hard work of SACUA members over the summer, the eagerness with which faculty agreed to volunteer for standing committees and special assignments is heartening. So too is looking out at the group gathered in this room.

There are lots of exciting and pressing issues facing us this year, a search for a new president, continued conversations about college affordability and access, ongoing struggles to create an inclusive and diverse campus, new ideas about teaching, entrepreneurship, interdisciplinary, new modes of scholarship production and dissemination and new challenges on to how to evaluate it, to name a few. I know I speak for all of SACUA when I say we look forward to working with you, and among you, during this upcoming year.

References

Association of University Professors (2006). *AAUP Policy documents & reports. 10th Ed.* Washington: AAUP.

Chapter IV Bylaws of the Board of Regents. The University Senate.

Office of the Provost/University Senate Office. *Principles of faculty involvement in institutional & academic unit governance at the University of Michigan. 2nd Edition.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Steneck, 1991, <http://www.sacua.umich.edu/resources/faculty-governance.pdf>