

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

MINUTES OF 11 DECEMBER 1989

ATTENDANCE

Present: Montalvo, Borders, Bornstein, Brooks, Burdi, Cameron, Chudacoff, Croxton, Diana, Didier, Drabenstott, Dressman, Duell, Eggertsen, Floyd, Gilgenbach, Goepfinger, Greenwood, Harrison, Jenkins, Jensen, Jones, Loveland-Cherry, Kimeldorf, Lenaghan, Levy, M. Lomax, R. Lomax, Gidley, Marcelo, McDonald, McLaughlin, Meyerhoff, Miller, Morris, Mosher, Penchansky, Rosenthal, Senkevitch, G. Smith, P. Smith, L. Tentler, T. Tentler, Verhoff, Warner, Whitehouse, Winn, Woods, Wrobleski, Wulff, Ness; Kilham, Savory, Schessler.

Absent: Birdsall, Blane, Bord, Chesler, Connelly, Davies, Davis, Dirks, Dobbins, Foss, Friedman, Grosse, Gull, Hinton, Hollingsworth, Kelsey, McLeod, Mignolo, Morley, Owens, Pharmacy, Papalambros, Potter, Radine, Ross, Russell, Seligman, Turner.

Professor Gayl Ness convened the meeting at 3:22 p.m.

MINUTES

Quite a few names were inadvertently deleted from the attendance list; this will be corrected. The minutes were approved.

MATTERS ARISING

1. Medical Affairs Advisory Committee: A slate of nominees was presented to Senate Assembly. A motion to accept the slate was made by Rosenthal; seconded by Wulff. The motion carried.

2. University Council Resolution of Appreciation.

The following resolution was presented:

The Senate Assembly appreciates very much the efforts of the members of the University Council to reach agreement on a specific set of hearing procedures for resolving complaints of violations of the Policy on Freedom of Speech and Artistic Expression. We strongly endorse the principle of discussion and recommend that a mechanism be found to continue a formal and effective tripartite discussion.

A motion to accept the resolution was made by Wulff; seconded by Montalvo. The motion carried.

On behalf of the Senate Assembly, Ness expressed great appreciation to the faculty who worked so hard to support this effort.

3. Stopping the Tenure Clock for Dependent Care

A draft of the proposed policy from the Provost (11/20/89) was distributed, along with a document summarizing the major points and SACUA's position.

Carol Hollenshead, speaking on behalf of the President's Advisory Commission on Women's Issues, thanked the Senate Assembly for their support. The Commission has collected data on factors contributing to success of faculty and barriers to achieving this success. Maternity policy and dependent care were identified as a vital concern.

A two-part policy was deemed appropriate, with pregnancy and childbirth being an entitlement, and gender neutral dependent care having decanal discretion, with provision for review for uniformity across campus. They support SACUA's concern for oversight on this policy.

Winn: Why not an entitlement for general dependent care? Do we want to trust the deans?

Jones: What is the pattern on other campuses?

Hollenshead: These policies are just too new to judge their success. There has been some concern about overuse of such a policy. In a two-year period at Wisconsin, 31 faculty women at all ranks gave birth.

Penchansky: Why is the word 'additional' used in paragraph 1, and why is 'young' child stipulated?

Bornstein: I don't think the adjectives on child, partner or parent are necessary, but I am generally supportive.

Burdi: The definitions of these categories are too ambiguous, e.g., what is a partner exactly?

Professor Tom Moore, Chair of the Tenure Committee, distributed and read a statement from that committee on this policy.

Penchansky: What is the general University policy for extension because of medical problems?

Moore: It is adequate as far as we know. Our intention with this document is to respond to the general philosophy.

Penchansky: I suggest adding a third clause that covers general medical problems.

Moore: The question of leave is not addressed here, just stopping the tenure clock.

Ness: Back to Winn's question: SACUA has decided to accept the two-part provision because the President's Advisory Commission on Women's Issues feels strongly about the entitlement for pregnancy/childbirth, with the second part having decanal discretion with oversight.

Winn: I want to reiterate that individual deans are unlikely to be generally supportive of this second part. This is not really much of an improvement. We have the opportunity here to be out front on this issue.

L. Tentler: I am sympathetic toward a more general policy, but I am afraid that it might just disappear again if it isn't approved with the decanal discretion.

Winn: I have the feeling that most of us prefer the more general policy but would support the two-tiered policy if that is all we can get.

Ness: From my conversations with Provost Vest, I am convinced that the policy is not in jeopardy, but there are some reasons for more discretion.

Burdi: I think we should table this and reconsider the language.

Lenaghan: I think that we do want the best policy.

Jensen: A level playing field requires a policy without decanal discretion. Why not support the best policy?

Didier: What is the time frame on this?

Ness: The Provost would like to have this policy in place soon.

Rosenthal: I am strongly in favor of the original general proposal, but perhaps we should be pragmatic. Let us at least ask for a formal review procedure and movement toward the original proposal.

Bornstein: What are people afraid of. We should be bolder.

T. Tentler: How does the second part actually work?

Ness: Vest would convey his intentions to the deans stating that requests should generally be granted. All requests would be copied to him.

T. Tentler: I find myself leaning toward the two-tiered system because the second part does have some subjective components that need some review, while the first part is objectively based.

Didier: In the spirit of the Michigan Mandate, this policy is needed, and we should be the best right from the beginning.

Croxton: Maybe we should have two separate policies.

Jones: The intent of the Bylaws is to make us a better University. We should do everything we can to support promising faculty and give them an adequate chance to establish a record for judgment.

Ness: I think the sense of the meeting is that:

1. We are delighted to see the policy moving forward.
2. We prefer to have as broadly based and gender neutral a policy as possible.

The statement from the Tenure Committee will also be forwarded to the Provost.

ELECTION OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE FOR SACUA

Ballots were distributed and collected.

RULES COMMITTEE REAPPORTIONMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

A document detailing the recommendations was distributed. This contained a description of how the reapportionment was made. There is only a slight rearrangement, with two units each losing one member and two units each gaining one member.

Didier: I am concerned that the decrease in SILS means that 90 librarians would be represented by only one person, because the School has one for its members.

Ness: This is a matter for internal discussion within the unit.

R. Lomax: Is this set in stone?

Burdi: We did the best we could within the mandated constraints. There are only so many ways to cut the pie.

A motion to accept the reapportionment was made by Penchansky; seconded by Senkevitch. The motion carried.

ALPHA 7 PROPOSAL

SACUA has made a proposal to form seven relatively permanent groups (ALPHA 7) to facilitate discussion about particular issues.

Burdi: We should move ahead with this.

Penchansky: We are just adding another unnecessary group activity with little purpose.

Burdi: This seems an efficient way to generate break-out groups.

Ness: Our intention was to make a mechanical process easier.

A motion to accept the proposal was made by Senkevitch; seconded by Marcelo. The motion carried.

DRAFT STATEMENT OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF MEMBERSHIP IN THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

A draft statement was distributed for discussion. This is a statement of what we stand for. The original was drafted by Shirley Clarkson, assistant to the President, and revised by SACUA.

There are two questions to be addressed:

1. Is the language something we are happy with and can be proud of?
2. What should be done with such a document? How do we put life into it?

The Senate Assembly broke up into Alpha 7 groups for discussion.

Alpha 7: This is just a poor rewrite of the Harvard policy and differs largely by being more poorly written. We should have a statement that is only one page and written in elegant language.

Alpha 6: It is useful to have such a document, but it is badly written. It should be used by all members of the university community. We suggest that Senate Assembly should sponsor talks, orientations and other special activities to draw attention to the principles contained in the document.

Note: All of the groups agreed that it was badly written.

Alpha 5: A positive statement is a good idea. It might be included in packets for incoming people. Perhaps everyone should sign it, at least then it would be read by each person.

Alpha 4: Our discussion was concerned with the statement on the bottom of page 2, beginning "Refrain from actions...". There are many problems with that statement. We had no good ideas on how to use the document.

Alpha 3: We were concerned about the same paragraph. What does this say about a faculty that doesn't already operate by these principles? The value of diversity should be mentioned.

Alpha 2: The last paragraph should include the faculty. There was an old policy statement along these lines about 20 years ago. The primary purpose should include ethical conduct.

Alpha 1: Artistic expression should be included in the first paragraph. How do we coordinate with other policies?

Ness: This was intended to be a statement of principles, not policy, but something positive upon which policies can be built.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Drabenstott: The faculty in the School of Information and Library Studies would like to find out more about the pension cash-out and other investment options for retirement funds.

Ness: These issues are being considered by several taskforces already.

Whitehouse: It is essential that faculty have more information and input about this issue.

Penchansky responded with details about how various committees are presently dealing with these issues. It is too soon to expect reports.

2. There will be no Senate Assembly Meeting in January. Members are encouraged to take part in Martin Luther King Day activities.

3. The February Senate Assembly meeting will be followed at 3:45 p.m. by the annual meeting of the University Senate.

4. The AAUP proposal on reconciliation will be on the agenda in February.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan S. Kilham
Senate Secretary