

Minutes of 17 November 2003
First Circulated 8 December 2003
Approved 16 February 2004

**THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SENATE ASSEMBLY MEETING**

17 NOVEMBER 2003

ATTENDANCE

Present: Aklerlof, Berent, Bradley, Brown, Cebulski, Clarkson, Combi, Elenbogen, Ensminger, Giordani, Goldman, Green, Gull, G. R. Holland, M. Holland, Hutchinson, Keller-Cohen, Koopmann (Chair), Lehman, Mascoska, Meerkov, Mitani, Moran, Pedraza, Quint, Raisler, Remick, Riebesell, Rush, Schwendeman, Seabury, Sension, Shimp, Smith, Thornton, Watkins, Wechsler, Younker, Ziff, Zorn

Alternates: Cimprich (Nursing-Pohl) and Lubeck (Education-Carlisle)

Absent: Alfred, Andersen, Barsky, Bartlett, Ben-Shahar, Boyd, Byosiere, Cho, Colas, Fishman, Frier, Gould, Hall, Hu, Huntley, Jackson, Johnson, Kim, Lithgow-Bertelloni, Liu, Norris, Ohye, Orr, Page, Peters, Potter, Pritchard, Robertson, Ross, Ruffin, Sagher, Sahiner, Seyhun, Tropman, Whatley, Yeo

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED

1. Senate Assembly agenda
2. Draft minutes of the Senate Assembly meeting of 20 October 2003
3. SACUA/Senate Assembly Planning Schedule, updated 12 November 2003
4. Item for Action regarding September minutes.
5. Item for Action regarding Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics
6. The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), 30 October 2003
7. A framework for comprehensive athletics reform,

<http://www.math.umd.edu/~jmc/COIA/COIA-Home.html>

<http://www.math.umd.edu/~jmc/COIA/Framework-Sum.html>

<http://www.math.umd.edu/~jmc/COIA/Framework-Text.html>

8. Item for Action regarding Senate Assembly Apportionment

Chair Koopmann convened the meeting at 3:20 P.M. The proposed agenda was adopted.

CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF 20 OCTOBER 2003

The minutes of 20 October 2003 were amended and approved.

RE-CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF 29 SEPTEMBER 2003

Secretary Lehman reported that vice president Slottow has transmitted a message in response to the September minutes in which he stated "I do not remember linking the parking permit billing mechanics to VCM, but I certainly did mention that the parking permits are subsidized by departments and it is done through the financial system." The Assembly approved contraction of the report in the minutes to "Mr. Slottow remarked that each time a person buys a permit that person's department is charged \$112."

ANNOUNCEMENTS/UPDATES

Chair Koopmann announced:

1. The chair's address to the Regents is scheduled for Thursday afternoon.
2. The December meeting of Senate Assembly has been cancelled.

COALITION ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS (COIA)

The chair reviewed the background to SACUA's recommendation that the Senate Assembly support an Action Item (distributed item 5). Professor Brown pointed out that faculty members on the advisory committee for intercollegiate athletics, formerly known as the Board in Control of Intercollegiate Athletics, had traditionally needed allies in their deliberations with athletics administrators. He said that if the proposed alliance stands for basic principles it would be helpful. Professor Green added that if other universities are watching the U-M for leadership, then faculty here should act. He said that the local situation would be embarrassing if it were widely known that faculty have been removed from athletic department governance and that the athletic director has been able to pack the board. Chair Koopmann declared that the U-M situation is unique among the Big-10.

ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY 111703-1

Professor Rush moved (Smith seconded):

Whereas, on 10 November 2003 the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA) voted unanimously to seek Senate Assembly endorsement of the following:

Therefore, be it resolved, that Senate Assembly endorses, in principle and subject to local circumstances, the 2003 Framework for Comprehensive Athletics Reform document of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) and delegates to SACUA authority to appoint an on-going liaison to COIA.

The Action was approved with one dissenting vote. -----

SACUA NOMINATING COMMITTEE ELECTION

Ballots were distributed for election of members for the SACUA nominating committee. No results were announced at the meeting.

SENATE ASSEMBLY APPORTIONMENT: ACTION 111703-2

Assembly members considered a report from the Rules Committee proposing re-appointment of Assembly seats by unit according to the rules of the Assembly (distributed item 8). The recommendation was given unanimous approval.

VISIT OF PROVOST COURANT

The guest arrived at 3:45 P.M. Provost Courant presented prepared remarks with the unifying theme of “accountability.” He indicated that universities ought to be as business-like when appropriate, but that they should be evaluated on more than the financial bottom line. When his remarks were concluded, members of the Assembly offered comments and questions.

One member of the Assembly declared that as part of the orientation process incoming undergraduates should be informed carefully about the purpose of an education. The provost replied that it is incumbent on faculty to share their perspectives about education.

Professor Meerkov introduced the term “360 degree evaluation,” and suggested that it was an emerging concept in industry. He noted that students and faculty are evaluated from many directions, but that there is little opportunity for administrators to be accountable to the faculty. The provost replied that “360 degree evaluation” is viewed as a useful corporate tool. He said that faculty should be involved, and that he hears a lot from faculty about administration. Professor Meerkov inquired about the mechanisms used for “360 degree evaluation.” The provost replied that it is performed by a consultant who conducts interviews. This is necessary, he said, because an internal person can be easily compromised.

Professor Meerkov declared that faculty are evaluated by students, correctly. He asked if there is an evaluation of the educational experience of the students, different from individual performance evaluation. The provost replied that such evaluation is not as easy as it sounds. He referred to an existing literature on the assessment of learning. He said there is a danger of excessively simple measures that cause people to teach to the tests; he said that sensible and replicable methods are required.

Professor Brown declared that individual tests are often too narrow. He said that students don't necessarily show beneficial effects year by year. He talked about the need to measure longitudinal effects that include growth and development even beyond the university years.

Professor Meerkov suggested that it might be valuable to offer a questionnaire to all students seeking agreement or disagreement with such basic statements as “Overall my first year experience was excellent,” etc. The provost replied that the U-M participates in national assessment efforts roughly every other year. He said that the U-M scores reasonably well and that he could provide some of the data. Meerkov suggested that the data should be released publicly. The provost said that the data have been circulated in various ways, but maybe not as much as they should be.

A member of the Assembly remarked that the increasingly skewed distribution of wealth in the U.S. might have an impact on accessibility to college education. The provost responded that the majority of U-M undergraduate students graduate without any debt. He said there is less access with respect to non-residents because the U-M has been unable to match the financial deals that private universities make, and which amount to need-blind attendance. He characterized the trend in accessibility as disturbing.

Professor Rush referred to the Assembly’s action regarding COIA, cited above. He said that the organization was meant to provide an oversight function. He suggested that the Senate Assembly itself performed certain oversight functions, although it might not always think about them or exercise them. He noted that lack of oversight can breed abuses of the sort represented by Enron, and he asked the provost to comment. The provost rejected Enron as an analogy for the university. He said there are many opportunities for faculty to have profound influence on policy and practices of the institution. He said that although the U-M is formally the Regents, it is actually the behavior of thousands of people in dozens of units. He stated that oversight is not at the top of the list of things that need to be done.

Professor Giordani reported that some schools are considering time accounting as a means for accountability. He said that the provost should be aware that there is discussion regarding the “teaching hour” vs the “research hour” vs the “clinical hour.” He said this all begs the question: “What is the work week in hours?” Chair Koopmann added that he thought there was too little emphasis on the wellness of employees. He noted that the private sector places much emphasis on exercise during the work day, but that is not so at the U-M. The provost replied that it doesn’t make sense to apply oneself to the demands of academic work unless it is fulfilling. He said that work rules are something in which faculty should be deeply engaged. He said it is essential to have time and space for pure scholarship.

Professor Giordani declared that if faculty are told to count their hours, the response may be “OK, but that is all you get.” Professor Berent remarked that a budget crunch and reduced resources drives things toward structuring and scheduling. The provost declared that faculty should still define what the next important work should be.

Chair Koopmann expressed continuing concerns about the oversight role of faculty in undergraduate admissions, about loss of faculty oversight of athletics, about decisions within the health system to divert \$200 million to the Life Sciences Institute rather than other needs, and about the role of faculty regarding proposed revisions to the

Standard Practice Guide on matters that concern them. The provost responded that faculty are now engaged in the admissions process, that he did not know about the athletics situation, that he was not involved in the decisions about the Life Sciences, but that there is now improved faculty input, and that the SPG draft revisions would be shared soon.

Professor Riebesell noted that the provost had mentioned in his remarks that vestigial practices are sometimes retained for reasons that are not superficially obvious; he asked for specific examples. The provost replied that one example that came immediately to mind was the practice of maintaining both Academic Year and University Year appointments, with salary payments extended over 12 months for each.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

The meeting adjourned at 4:52 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

John T. Lehman
Senate Secretary

University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents, Sec. 5.02:
Governing Bodies in Schools and Colleges

In each school, college, or degree granting division of the University, including those at the University of Michigan-Dearborn and at the University of Michigan-Flint, the governing faculty shall be in charge of the affairs of the school, college, or division, except as delegated to the executive committee, if any, and except that in the School of Graduate Studies the governing board shall be the executive board, and in the Medical School shall be the executive faculty.
