

Minutes of the Senate Assembly Meeting of 28 October 1996
Approved 18 November 1996

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SENATE ASSEMBLY MEETING
MINUTES OF 28 OCTOBER 1996

Chair Dunn convened the meeting at 3:20 P.M.

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED

1. Agenda for 30 September 1996
2. SACUA and Senate Assembly Skeletal Agendas, Fall 1996
3. Minutes of the Senate Assembly meeting of 20 May 1996
4. Draft minutes of the Senate Assembly meeting of 30 September 1996
5. Minutes of the SACUA meeting of 1 July 1996
6. Minutes of the SACUA meeting of 29 July 1996
7. Minutes of the SACUA meeting of 26 August 1996
8. Minutes of the SACUA meeting of 9 September 1996
9. Minutes of the SACUA meeting of 16 September 1996
10. Minutes of the SACUA meeting of 23 September 1996
11. Minutes of the SACUA meeting of 7 October 1996
12. "What should we ask about intelligence", by R. J. Sternberg. *The American Scholar*, Spring 1996: 205-217.
13. "What do we know about intelligence", by L. S. Gottfredson. *The American Scholar*, Winter 1996: 15-30.
14. "Researchers try to understand why people are doing better on IQ tests", *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 27, 1996: A18
15. "Academic culture at Michigan, 1938-1988: the apotheosis of pluralism" by D. A. Hollinger.
16. "California regents criticized as hasty on affirmative action", *N.Y. Times*, 3 June 1996.
17. "On affirmative action", by H. W. Nickens and J. J. Cohen. *The Journal of the American Medical Association* 275: 572-574 (1996).
18. "A troubling defense of group preferences", by S. H. Balch and P. N. Warren. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 21 June 1996: A44.
19. "Why a diverse student body is so important", by N. L. Rudenstine. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 19 April 1996: B1.
20. "Affirmative action: A continuing discussion- a continuing commitment", by H. T. Shapiro, dated 16 October 1995.
21. "Keeping open an avenue whereby the deserving and exceptional may rise through their own efforts", by G. Casper, dated 4 October 1995.
22. Report of the AAUP Commission on Governance and Affirmative Action Policy, dated 29 May 1996.
23. Memorandum to CIC Colleagues from J. E. Girves, dated 8 July 1996, regarding advancing diversity/achieving excellence.

24. Senate Assembly Statement on Diversity, adopted by the Senate Assembly, 20 May 1996.
25. "Losing its preference: affirmative action fades as issue", The Washington Post, 18 September 1996.

CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF 30 SEPTEMBER 1996

The minutes of 30 September 1996 were approved as submitted.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Dunn announced that the last of four candidates nominated by the Presidential Search Advisory Committee was in the process of interviewing for the position of President of the University of Michigan. He asked that Senate Assembly members communicate their opinions regarding the candidates either directly to the Regents or to SACUA for subsequent transmittal. Professor Dunn said that copies of transcripts of the interviews would be available in the SACUA office the following day.

Chair Dunn next called attention to distributed items 12 to 25, and invited members to read them in anticipation of future Senate Assembly discussions about affirmative action.

REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE FACULTY (CESF)

Chair Dunn introduced Professor Lindsay, who delivered a progress report from the CESF. Professor Lindsay said that committee tasks for the year would be (1) to undertake a comparison of faculty compensation at the University of Michigan with that of other university faculties, and (2) to develop a guide for university compensation, which could be prepared in draft form by Spring 1997. He said that there were five additional issues: (a) establishment of a priority within the budget for faculty compensation, (b) periodic review of faculty inequities, (c) the practice of placing salary increases as percentages rather than absolute amounts, (d) market forces and the ranges of salary differentials across units, and (e) bonuses or "at risk pay", a particular practice in the Medical School.

Professor Freese said that she would like to see statistics on salary enhancements of male and female faculty. She said that in the Physics Department, 30% of salary increases are set by student evaluations, which she said can be gender-biased. Professor Bryant asked to see similar data presented by race. Professor Lindsay said that he agreed there were many problems. Professor M. Lomax said that good data on these queries were available from the Medical School.

VISIT BY PROVOST AND VICE-PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS MACHEN

Chair Dunn introduced Provost Machen, who read from a prepared text (Appendix A). He began his remarks by articulating his position on affirmative action, and its role in admissions policy at the University of Michigan. Subsequently, he

discussed Value Centered Management (VCM), undergraduate education and undergraduate research initiatives, and finally graduate education.

Professor Gobetti congratulated Provost Machen on his 14 months as Provost and then asked how Machen envisioned involving faculty governance in advising the new President. Provost Machen replied that he believed that if unit faculty executive committees could be integrated with the Senate Assembly the faculty will have a coordinated voice. Chair Dunn pointed out that there was a specific question about advice to the President. Professor Gobetti suggested that faculty should meet with the President at least once per month. Provost Machen replied that the point was a good one, because, in fact, there are advisory committees for the Provost, and for the vice-presidents for research and finance. He said that a president that is out of touch with the campus is in trouble.

Professor Hosford said that he detected poor lines of communication to the non-academic staff. Provost Machen replied that he had no good answer for the problem. Chair Dunn reminded Senate Assembly members that the chief financial officer is in charge of plant operations and that the vice president has a faculty advisory committee. Professor Hinman expressed concern that VCM will increase the level of conflict between units. Machen replied that decisions about matters of conflict should be made as much as possible by the faculty who are directly involved. He said that if that doesn't work, then the matters should be resolved dean to dean. He said that three faculty committees have been established to guide the process: (1) the VCM Oversight Committee, (2) the Advisory Committee on the University Budget, and (3) the Research Oversight Committee. Chair Dunn reminded the Senate Assembly that it had a representative on all three of the committees.

Professor Keyserling asked if additional funding for the tuition shortfall in Training Grants would be used to make the training grants more competitive. Provost Machen replied that the decisions would be made on a case by case basis, overseen by Dean Nancy Cantor. Professor Lucente said that funding for graduate students in the humanities was a particular problem. Provost Machen replied that if there is a specific problem in the humanities that he would like to follow up, and he said he would like to speak to Professor Lucente about it.

Professor Steneck said that we lose good minority candidates because we don't offer competitive financial aid packages. Provost Machen replied that the entire financial aid pool is needed to cover need-based awards, but that a merit-based program of Shipman Scholars had been initiated.

Professor Marich said that he was chair of the Student Relations Committee, and that he could report that students complain they often don't know who is in charge on important matters. Provost Machen replied that the communications problems of this campus are amazing to him. He said that he wanted to speak more about the concern. Professor Marich invited him to attend a committee meeting, and the Provost accepted.

Professor Hessler asked whether teaching would assume an increased role in tenure evaluation procedures. Provost Machen replied that his office turned back 4 or 5 portfolios this past year because of teaching, but that the research commitment was not going to be reduced.

Professor Lee asked how the Provost evaluates teaching. Machen replied that he favored the teaching portfolio model, which he characterized as comprehensive. He said that he thought that CRLT evaluations were being misused. Machen said that CRLT evaluations were designed to be feedback to the faculty. Professor Cowley, substitute for Professor Thornton, asked if Machen had considered using student performance as a criterion. Provost Machen replied that he was dubious of the approach for multiple reasons.

Professor Dunn thanked the Provost for his remarks, and invited Senate Assembly members to send additional comments to him at jbmachen@umich.edu.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMPENSATION

Professor Bryant moved that the Senate Assembly enter a Committee of the Whole discussion for 30 minutes (Professor Lee seconded). The motion was approved by voice vote.

Professor Gobetti said that the topic illustrated how important it was that a faculty panel advise the president, because the president did not bring the matter to either the faculty or the Regents before proceeding.

Professor DeCamp said that faculty on the branch campuses did not receive the letter from President Neal regarding the matter. Provost Machen said that on request from SACUA, the communication with branch campus faculty was recommended "up the line".

Professor D'Alecy said that everyone was uncomfortable about the compensation packages. Provost Machen replied that the situation is the result of unfortunate circumstances. He said that communication between the former president and the Regents had been poor. Machen said that a policy on executive officer compensation would be developed, but that he did not know if there would be any faculty input to it. He said that he had recommended that the policy not be applied to the deans. He said that the policy would have to be vetted in front of the faculty and everyone else.

Professor D'Alecy said that compensations were being used in a manipulative way by administration rather than as a reward for service to the enduring aspects of the institution. He characterized the approach as the corporate model. Provost Machen replied that we have a tradition here of merit-based compensation. He said that we could go to formula driven compensation. D'Alecy said that inherent in the provost's use of the term "merit" was the assumption that the administration is the arbitrator of merit. Machen replied that the way to evaluate merit is through peer review. Professor Deskins

noted that peer review can be only advisory, and sometimes amounts to a hollow exercise. Machen replied that at some point there should be a "buy-in to the system".

Professor Marich asked if deans retain their elevated salaries when they step down from their administrative positions. Provost Machen replied that there is no policy on the subject. Marich asked if the provost favored reviews of the deans. Machen said that he was centrist on the subject; he said he didn't think it was a very valid procedure because it was an anonymous chance to take a swipe at the dean. He explained feedback could be misdirected if it was made it evaluative. He added that feedback was important.

Professor MacAdam said that the university administration creates a story every time it keeps something secret. She said that far beyond the money expended was the loss of trust between regents and administration. She asked how SACUA and the Senate Assembly could contribute to restoration of trust. Provost Machen replied that, having lived through 14 months when there was not much trust between the executive officers and the Regents, he could attest that operations are not smooth. He said that the search for a new president was going well, and that the values of the faculty were the ones to abide. He said that the Regents ought to pick the candidate with whom they have the most trust. He said that henceforth we will have an activist group of Regents, a group that will be on campus all the time.

Professor Hessler said that the administration have been overvalued with respect to the faculty, and he asked the provost if Machen saw any way of redressing the inequity. The provost said that he saw the matter more clearly before he arrived at the Fleming administration building. Machen said that the faculty is the university, and that when that fact is forgotten, the university is compromised. He said that to the extent the faculty voices are united, its interests are advanced. Machen said that priorities had recently been set in place for which everyone will be paying for 20 to 30 years. He said that perhaps they were the wrong priorities. He added that administrators do undesirable work.

Professor Hessler observed that there seemed to be a professionalization of administration. Machen replied that the Information Technology Division of the UM alone was a \$100 million operation, a big business. He said that the university was a \$3 billion business, bigger than some states. Professor Steneck said that a case could be made that the faculty had given away some of its power and didn't do much to take it back.

Professor Baker expressed concern that some of the individual recipients of compensation packages had been harmed by the situation. Provost Machen replied that it didn't affect him, but that some people did feel hurt by it. Machen said that no one knew about the deals that were being engineered for others. Professor Maloy said that he was deeply disappointed felt a betrayal of trust. He said that the legacy of President Duderstadt should have been other than this. Maloy said that the routine taken made the packages appear non-defensible. Professor Burdi said that individuals were rewarded extravagantly for performing the jobs they were hired to do. He said that he did not

comprehend how people hired from business could be foisted irretrievably into the tenured faculty ranks without review of their scholarship.

Chair Dunn reported that complaints delivered to him included indignation that the compensation packages had been kept secret from the Regents, that the Regents did not adequately oversee the administration, and that the analogy with Fortune 500 companies was fundamentally misplaced in the academic arena. Dunn credited the president of Duke University with the suggestion that pretenders for Wall Street salaries should seek their fortunes on Wall Street.

Professor Burnstein said that the quantum leaps associated with administrator compensation packages mean that administrators live within a different culture from the faculty. He said that it appears the administrators are evaluated on the profit and loss of the universities, using the measures of business rather than traditions of the academy. Machen said that it was a bidding matter, and that there are many faculty and administrators that get a differential. He added that everything is accessible via the Freedom of Information Act if anyone wants to know how particular arrangements were made.

Chair Dunn declared that time had expired on the Committee-of-the-Whole discussion. He asked for motions from the floor. None were offered at the time.

OLD BUSINESS

No old business was presented.

NEW BUSINESS

No new business was presented.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

John T. Lehman
Senate Secretary