

Per your request
Faculty Senate Office

The minutes of the November 16 Senate Assembly meeting were approved on December 14.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 16, 1992

ATTENDANCE

Present: Angus, Beam, Birge, Blair, Blinder, Bord, Brewer, M. Brown, Cameron, Coward, D'Alecy, Danley, DeCamp, Didier, Douthit, Eklund, Ensminger, Frey, Friedman, Gidley, Greene, Griffin, Hayashi, Hook, Irani, E. Jensen, Kabamba, Kaplan, Katehi, Kaviany, Kelley, Koopmann, Kunkel, Larson, Lawson, Lopez, Lynch-Sauer, Marcelo, Montalvo, Mosher, Mukasa, Olson, Penchansky, Razzoog, Saunders, Scheppele, C. Smith, Tinkle, Toman, Warner, Watkins, W-J Yang; Thorson, Heskett.

Absent: Billi, A. Brown, Brusati, Chiego, Cole, Cowan, Cox, Crandall, Fellin, Gross, Gull, A. Jensen, Schwank, Semetko, Shirley, Silverstein, R. Smith, Stein, Stensones, Sutton, Thum, Tosney, Tremper, Veroff, Voss, Wheeler, Whitehouse, V. Yang.

Ejner Jensen, Chair, convened the meeting at 3:16 p.m.

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of October 19, 1992 were approved as submitted.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

John D'Arms will be speaking in the Presidential Lecture Series on December 8, 4:00-5:00 p.m., Rackham Amphitheatre. His address is entitled "Arduous, Pleasant and Hopeful Toil: Values in and beyond Graduate Education."

Jane Dutton will serve on the Advisory Committee on University Budgets replacing Rowena Matthews.

The appointment of Rebecca Eisenberg, Law, on the Research Polices Committee was approved. She will serve a two-year term replacing Richard Price, who resigned.

SACUA will be studying the changes in the rules regarding the publishing of dissertations and report back to Assembly.

EXPANSION OF THE SACUA CANDIDATE POOL

Jensen explained that presently SACUA candidates are selected from current Assembly members. Don Bord moved that "eligibility for candidacy for SACUA be expanded beyond those sitting members of the Senate Assembly and extended to individuals who have served on Senate Assembly during the last five years, and to individuals who have served as chairs of standing Senate Assembly committees for the last five years who have also served on Assembly." Bord proceeded to make a few remarks on the motion. Kaplan agreed with the motion saying that it is difficult to get candidates for SACUA and that expanding the pool will help get good representation. The motion passed unanimously.

JOHN KNOTT, CHAIR, TASK FORCE ON THE EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

Jensen announced that the recommendations of the Task Force on the Evaluation of Administrators were not intended to respond to unit-level grievances or distress over particular instances. He explained that today's discussion was preliminary; the report will be on the agenda in December for further discussion.

Knott introduced a member of the task force, Bradford Perkins (History), to help field questions. He then announced the other task force members: Kate Barald (Anatomy), Theodore St. Antoine (Law), and William Weissert (Public Health). He thanked all who cooperated with the committee. Knott began by saying the faculty are the

heart of the University and the administration must support faculty as its top priority. Many faculty perceive an unhealthy gap between faculty and administrators. Efforts to bridge the gap should be cooperative, not confrontational. The methods and process used to evaluate administrative offices must be supported by all. It would be possible to organize the first review by the end of next year.

Knott indicated that the task force met with the President, the Provost, members of the Board of Regents, various deans, and the Academic Affairs Committee. The task force reviewed documents on evaluation practices from other peer schools. He reviewed the task force's recommendations on the schedule of reviews, the selection and charge of an ad hoc committee, and the review process. The task force recommended that the reviews conclude with a confidential report to the President or the Provost and the office involved, with a summary to SACUA. He noted that the task force's job was to design model for administrative review; it will be up to Assembly to decide how they will proceed.

D'Alecy asked how the task force report responded to the March 16, 1992 resolution. Knott responded that the task force followed the charge that was provided by SACUA. Jensen explained that there are two points to the March resolution. The task force covered only one of these. The other point, about an annual report on the status of academic issues, has not been yet addressed.

Brewer was concerned that the report recommends including administrators on the ad hoc committees; Knott explained that that was inaccurate, that the committees are made up of faculty. Perkins explained that the President will select the members of the review committees from a list provided by SACUA.

Scheppele expressed some concerns that using separate committees to evaluate separate offices omits an evaluation of administrators in the aggregate; Knott agreed that such concerns would not be addressed if separate committees are used to review individual offices.

Kaplan suggested that committee members spend time in the offices being reviewed to find out the details of that office's work.

Knott pointed out that staff support for these committees was not covered in the report but he recognizes the need.

Coward asked if the reviews will be on-going. Knott replied that the process would be long-term. Reviews will be periodic. Northwestern does reviews every seven years and some other schools do them every five years. Perkins noted the task force tried not to overload the system and demand too much time commitment from committee members.

Coward asked about follow-ups. Knott indicated that a summary of the report will go to SACUA. He also mentioned that if the system works well, administrators will take it seriously.

C. Smith was concerned with the timeliness. What are the processes that could have shorter life cycles than five years? Knott indicated that the evaluations should not be rushed. Every year it will be decided which offices would be evaluated.

Penchansky indicated that many executive officers have faculty advisory committees. Knott responded that advisory committees should be used more.

Scheppele indicated that reviews of faculty use known criteria and serve to guide faculty members' work. Do we know what criteria and what goals administrative reviews would use? Knott responded that the Assembly could form a series of questions and indicated that the task force could have spelled out more, but each committee ought to respond to the goals of each office.

Koopmann asked about the time-line for implementation. Knott responded that is up to SACUA, the Assembly, and the Administration. Perkins indicated that each review would take at least a term.

Penchansky emphasized that Assembly must expand the model from the task force. One must remember that administrative offices often have a constant changing set of goals and objectives.

Jensen thanked Knott.

Bord moved that the report be received with thanks. The motion passed.

JAMES J. DUDERSTADT, PRESIDENT, "REDRAWING THE BOUNDARIES: DEVELOPING A STRUCTURE FOR THE NEW INTELLECTUAL REALITIES"

President Duderstadt began by focusing his remarks on an issue at the core of the modern University: How do we provide an environment on campus that supports new teaching and research, and how do we achieve a balance between the disciplines and interdisciplinary scholarship and teaching?

UM Traditions. Michigan has long been known as a national leader in interdisciplinary activities. Literally hundreds of institutes, centers, programs, etc. are in place, but the perception is that we're not doing enough.

Concerns from Within the University. Provost Whitaker, Dean D'Arms, and he have drawn together faculty from widely different parts of the campus to focus on the changing nature of scholarship. The rigidity of traditional disciplines is seen as a main barrier to current scholarship. He noted Paul Courant's belief that most programs stress "small think," not "big think." In a recent survey of faculty members with interests in environmental issues, 74% stated their belief that our present academic climate did not adequately encourage or support interdisciplinary efforts.

Concerns from Outside the Academy. Federal funding agencies are moving away from single discipline projects and instead are funding teams of investigators spanning several fields. The National Science Board formed a special federal commission to examine such issues, and its report will be submitted on November 20. Several conclusions and recommendations from the preliminary drafts: disciplines are merging, there is a convergence between science and technology, and NSF's incentives should encourage interdisciplinary work.

A Personal Perspective. His own background minimized rigid disciplinary limits.

Discussions with University Leaders. Among the concerns expressed by faculty are: 1) a faculty performance evaluation and reward system that encourages specialization, 2) the difficulty that administrators and faculty groups have in understanding and appreciating the quality of interdisciplinary teaching and scholarship, 3) the strong disciplinary control of resources, whether dollars, space, or faculty lines, and 4) even the psychological need we all have to belong to a discipline.

Some Particular Challenges. 1) Deification of the Disciplines: academic disciplines today tend to dominate the modern university; and there is a lost sense of community of university as a whole. 2) Faculty Reward Culture: emphasis on narrow area of research and quantity of publishing. 3) Tribal Pressures: The Need to Belong: clan instinct at work; most of us feel most comfortable belonging to a group, a tribe, a discipline. 4) The Impact on Teaching: specialized scholarship and other developments have placed an irreparable rift between graduate and undergraduate education. The predicament is that faculty are transmitting what they know--and love--with little awareness of what the student needs to learn.

The Zoology of Interdisciplinary Teaching and Research. There is a broad spectrum of interdisciplinary activities, ranging from the most traditional and focused of disciplines to activities which have no disciplinary roots whatsoever. Possible classifications: 1) The Traditional Disciplines: most of us have our base academic appointments in a given department or school, associated with a well-recognized scholarly area. 2) "Stapled Together" Interdisciplinary Activities: efforts to stimulate this activity are, in reality, just causing people to staple together unrelated projects into proposals so that they appear more interdisciplinary. 3) Interdisciplinary Teams: working with colleagues from other disciplines; each faculty member brings their particular disciplinary knowledge and skills to the team. 4) Simply doing, rather than belonging: these are explorers roaming across the various disciplines without regard to disciplinary boundaries. 5) Working on the Exponential Part of the Knowledge Curve: those extraordinary individuals who can work across disciplinary boundaries are greatly valued; they are frequently also the least understood and appreciated.

Some Opportunities: 1) UM Fact of Life #1: Counterflows of Resources: there is a considerable flow of resources across rather than through the disciplines. Resources for instruction flow down disciplinary lines, yet resources for research flow across disciplines. 2) UM Fact of Life #2: Funding the New at the Expense of the Old: new proposals

capture attention and dollars; the capacity to innovate is critical to all institutions, and such as General Fund and Extendable Restricted Fund particularly to universities. 3) Darwinian Strategies: we could allow the creation within the University of alternative intellectual structures that are "nondisciplinary" in nature; they would compete with the disciplines for budget resources. 4) Matrix Organizations: issues such as global change, K-12 education reform, rebuilding our national infrastructure require both a perspective and a set of resources spanning the University.

Other Ideas for Simulating Intellectual Change. 1) Faculty Appointments: We could seek endowment of chairs outside particular disciplines. 2) Sabbatical Leave: The fundamental purpose is intellectual renewal. An interesting alternative would be to encourage faculty to teach and conduct research in a different unit, intellectually far-removed from their home unit. 3) Faculty Roles: We tend to structure and evaluate faculty roles far too narrowly; as faculty members become more experienced, their greater breadth of knowledge gives them more capacity for integrative and applied scholarship. Ernest Boyer suggests that we should recognize this by developing what he calls "creativity contracts", arrangements by which faculty members define their professional goals for a multiple year period, possibly shifting from one scholarly focus to another. 4) Merging of Graduate Education Programs: Many universities are reorganizing their teaching and scholarship, particularly at the graduate level, to move away from specialization. 5) A Different Approach to Undergraduate Education: We could design a far broader undergraduate education that would prepare a graduate to move in almost any direction. Perhaps we could call this renaissance degree a "B.L.L.", a "bachelors of liberal learning".

Some Bolder Approaches. The "Collaboratory": Rapid advances in information technology will change the ways we do our work. Joshua Lederberg has envisioned a "collaboratory" as an advanced, distributed infrastructure that would use multimedia information technology to relax the constraints on distance and time, and would support and enhance intellectual teamwork in both research and teaching. The University within the University: A new unit could serve as a laboratory for the university of the future, this academic unit would have programs organized around overarching themes such as global change, social infrastructures, and economic transformation.

Concluding Remarks: The intellectual character of the university is dynamic. New ideas and concepts are exploding forth at ever-increasing rates. The capacity for intellectual change and renewal has become increasingly important to us as individuals and to our institutions. Our challenge is to create an environment in which such change is regarded as an exhilarating opportunity to conduct teaching and scholarship of even higher quality.

The following questions were asked by members of the Assembly.

Kaplan asked if there was a problem of geographical isolation, for example, north campus. Duderstadt responded that the University must address geographical separation, that connections through communication systems were not enough.

Duderstadt commented that faculty and administration must work together to initiate change without undermining what's already working. Changes are dependent on issues like faculty hiring and promotion.

Greene commented that he had been administering a multi-disciplinary center and finds himself at a growing distance from central administration.

Duderstadt responded that new units start, but are not expected to last forever. There should be a sunset at a stated time. More flexibility is needed.

Kelley asked about hiring and tenure in multi-disciplinary programs and the changing faculty culture. Duderstadt responded that the faculty needs to determine for itself which programs should be expanded. The large size of the University has the advantage of allowing experimentation and absorbing risk.

Larson asked if there was a mechanism for implementing these ideas. Duderstadt responded that it is up to the faculty.

Kabamba noted that faculty do not get reward for investing in inter-disciplinary activities for students and such projects that do exist are supported by industry sponsors.

The Assembly thanked President Duderstadt with a round of applause.

Jensen commented that the Assembly needs to address Larson's concern regarding ways to continue exploring these ideas.

OLD BUSINESS

Didier announced that the Committee on Communication will meeting today at 5:00 p.m.

NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathryn Beam
Senate Secretary, pro tempore

a/m/nov1692