

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN  
SENATE ASSEMBLY MEETING  
MINUTES OF 12 DECEMBER 1994

ATTENDANCE

Present: Akhoury, Beam, Bike, Blinder, Brewer, Christiansen, Coward, DeCamp, Deskins, Dunn, Eklund, Elta, Feld, Fox, Frey, Griffin, Gull, Halsted, Hardwick, Hinman, Hosford, Howell, Irani, Kaplan, Lee, Lohr, Lomax, Loup, Macnee, Maloy, Marich, McNamara, Meyers, Mizruchi, Montalvo, Nostrant, Oberman, Redman, Rodriguez-Hornedo, Rogers, Schteingart, Shirley, Sisson, C. Smith, R. Smith, Stockton, Taylor, Volakis, Wyszewianski, Zorn; Lehman, Heskett, Cressman.

Absent: Awkward, Alvarez, Brandle, Briggs, Brusati, Bryant, Canine, Coffin, Danly, Driscoll, Gobetti, Greene, Hessler, Kennedy, Levine, McClatchey, Moore, Mutschler, Myers, Nairn, Nowak, Potter, Princen, Rush, Todd, Tremper, Wahl, Woestehoff, Yohannes.

Loup convened the meeting at 3:20 p.m.

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED

1. Agenda
2. Draft minutes of the Senate Assembly meeting of 21 November 1994
3. Minutes of SACUA, 7 November 1994
4. Minutes of SACUA, 14 November 1994
5. Proposal to Senate Assembly for a change in the manner of electing and nominating the SACUA/Senate Assembly Chair
6. "The quality of the climate for minority faculty at the University of Michigan", report of the Multicultural Committee
7. Toward a definition of tenure document, dated 29 November 1994
8. Announcements
9. Remarks to Regents, dated 17 November 1994
10. SACUA statement to December 1994 Senate Assembly

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES OF 21 NOVEMBER 1994

The minutes were approved as distributed.

PROPOSAL TO SENATE ASSEMBLY FOR A CHANGE IN THE MANNER OF ELECTING AND NOMINATING THE SACUA/SENATE ASSEMBLY CHAIR

Professor Brewer presented a proposal he had drafted, which SACUA had voted at its 14 November 1994 to bring to the December Senate Assembly. The proposal involved a change in procedure whereby the Chair of SACUA, who also is Chair of the Senate Assembly, would be nominated and elected by the Senate Assembly acting as Committee of the Whole, rather than exclusively by the SACUA. Brewer expressed his belief that such a change would strengthen the position of the Chair, by making it evident that the incumbent had been selected by the entire Assembly. Brewer moved that the Senate Assembly approve the proposal, and the motion was seconded by Professor Hessler.

Professor Marich asked if the proposal would also entail Senate Assembly election of the SACUA vice-Chair. Professor Brewer replied that the proposal would leave election of its vice-Chair to SACUA. Professor Dunn added that a Senate Assembly vote for vice-Chair might likely have the effect of designating the next Chair, which would not necessarily be desirable in all situations.

Professor Coward expressed concerns about a potential departure of the proposed method from specifications in the Regents' Bylaws. Professor [Carr] from the Rules Committee referenced Regents' Bylaw 4.06, saying that the Bylaws state that SACUA shall choose its Chair, but the Bylaws do not tell SACUA how to do it. Professor Coward then asked if the change would be specific to the present SACUA only. Chair Loup replied that the change would stay in place until the method was altered. Professor Lomax said that the Rules Committee had discussed the options and concluded that SACUA could try the new method, and not lose anything in the process.

Professor Griffin raised the issue of lead time necessary to implement a change in the selection of the Chair. He stated that the Chair is a half-time appointment with release salary provided by the office of the Provost. He suggested that a Chair should be selected by February so that release time could be arranged. He said further that nominations should be completed by December to achieve the timetable, and he suggested charging the existing Nominating Committee with nomination of a new Chair. Professor Brewer responded that he favored keeping the selection process an act of the Committee of the Whole.

Professor Griffin moved to postpone further consideration of the active motion until the January Senate Assembly meeting, and Professor Maloy seconded the motion. The vote to postpone the main motion was approved by 22 to 13.

## THE QUALITY OF THE CLIMATE FOR MINORITY FACULTY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Loup introduced Professor Bashshur to present the Committee report and noted that the report had not been released to the Ann Arbor News by SACUA.

Professor Bashshur presented prepared remarks (appended) and provided an overview of the report illustrated with 35 text slides. He concluded with the recommendations printed on page 2 of the report, and invited discussion from the floor.

Professor Lee asked the size of the sample obtained for the part of the report dealing with attitudes of minority respondents. Professor Sashshur replied that questionnaires had been sent to 670 individuals, but that only 200 were returned. Professor Lee expressed her concern that a response rate of less than one-third was not representative of the whole sample. Professor Bashshur replied that the committee was careful in the report to note that the responses were not necessarily representative, and that findings on those issues could be consistently biased. Professor Hessler asked if there had been any follow-up efforts with subjects after the initial mailing. Professor Bashshur replied there had been no follow-up activity owing to limitations of time and resources for the faculty committee.

Professor Hardwick expressed concern about interpretation of the results, and noted that the study did not include a control group composed of faculty who do not hold minority status. Professor Bashshur replied that the recommendations did not rely strongly on the findings of the survey. Instead, the committee collected data from three

separate sources, including personnel files, the deans of individual units, and the questionnaire survey. He suggested that the survey should be taken in context, and he stated that he shared the concerns others had expressed.

Professor Marich moved that the report be accepted by the Senate Assembly, and Professor Macnee seconded the motion.

Professor McNamara expressed his concern that the recommendations of the report did not seem to flow directly from the data. He questioned the 29% response rate to the survey, noting that important recommendations regarding expenditure of time, energy and money were at stake, and that more respondents were needed. He also said that in a study of retention and climate, it would be necessary to learn why individuals left the university, rather than to theorize the reasons. He further noted that a lack of success in retention could not be necessarily equated with a lack of effort. He suggested a more quantitative analysis of some points within the report.

Professor Bashshur responded with further explanation about the recommendations of the report. He said that the committee wanted to acknowledge the success of the University in recruiting minority faculty, and that they thought now was the time to pay special attention to retention and climate issues. He said they believed the recommendations were not controversial and that his committee would be pleased to work from suggestions on textual changes to the document. In regard to the individual surveys, he noted that female faculty were very critical in their responses, but that inference from commentaries was difficult because written comments were limited to only 5 or 6 out of 200 replies.

The active motion, to accept the committee report, was approved by voice vote.

Professor Bashshur then moved for Senate Assembly approval of the recommendations of the report. Professor Montalvo seconded the motion.

Professor Feld said that the second recommendation of the report was similar to the Michigan Mandate, an administration initiative, and that it would be helpful if the faculty would take this position, as well. Professor Deskins said that the recommendations were not controversial, that they did not represent new policies, but rather were a reformulation of long-standing ones.

Professor Marich moved that the active motion be postponed until the January meeting of the Senate Assembly, with the specification that the committee edit the report to incorporate textual changes discussed at this meeting.

The motion to postpone was approved.

## TENURE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Barnard introduced the report of the Tenure Committee, noting that the committee had wanted to develop a definition of tenure. She stated that at present the only relevant document was Bylaw 5.09, which addressed the removal of tenure. He reported that the present statement before the Senate Assembly had been printed on the Faculty Perspectives page of the University Record last Spring, and that after some revisions it was now being presented to the Senate Assembly.

Professor Kaplan reported that a recent AAUP complaint had revealed a gap between provisions of the Regents' Bylaws and AAUP recommendations. The Bylaws presently contain no provisions regarding severe sanctions less than dismissal. He stated that AAUP maintained that for serious actions such as reduction of salary, procedures

like those of 5.09 should be imposed. Professor Syverud noted that upon approval of the report, a reduction of salary would be considered a demotion, and thereby trigger 5.09 procedures.

Professor Smith moved that the Senate Assembly endorse the Tenure Report.

Professor Obermann asked if the next step upon approval would be transmittal of the report to the Regents. Loup said that action would probably occur. Professor Syverud added that endorsement of the report could also be regarded as guidance to the Tenure Committee. That committee was created by Regental Bylaws to hear dismissal cases. Approval of the motion would send notice that salary reductions are also matters that should be heard. Professor Kaplan noted that there was a real case at present in which this mechanism could be used. Professor Feld stated that the main issue was not a debate over what were "adequate salary" and "adequate benefits", but rather that there should not be capricious reductions in salary. Professor Griffin noted that mechanisms were being developed whereby service over limited periods of time would be rewarded financially, but that the salary enhancements in those cases would be only short term. Professor Barnard replied that the committee report was not meant to include special contracts, and that the future existence of such compensatory mechanisms would not affect the committee statement.

The active motion was approved by voice vote.

#### OLD BUSINESS

No old business was proposed.

#### NEW BUSINESS

Chair Loup announced that Ms. Sandra Heskett had tendered her resignation, effective 6 January 1995, in favor of a position in the Medical School. Senate Assembly members saluted Ms. Heskett for her service on behalf of SACUA and the Senate Assembly with a round of applause and thanks.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John T. Lehman  
Secretary, pro tempore

Appendix: Remarks by Professor Bashshur