

Minutes of 13 December 2004
First Circulated 18 January 2005
Re-Circulated 21 February 2005
Approved 21 February 2005
Re-Considered 21 March 2005
Approved 21 March 2005

**THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SENATE ASSEMBLY MEETING
13 DECEMBER 2004**

Present: Abdo, Agrawal, Albers, Aller, Andersen, Annich, Ben-Shahar, Berent, Brown, Carlisle, Cebulski, Combi, Ensminger, Giordani, Goldman, Gull, M. Holland, Hollar, Hu, Hutchinson, Jackson, Kahn, Koopmann, LaChance, Lange, Lehman, Lemos, Luera, Matjias, Meerkov, Mitani, Moran, Ohye, Pedraza, Peters, Pohl, Pritchard, Prygoski, Quint, Schultz, Seabury, Senkevitch, Sension, Simpson, Smith, Smock, Thouless, Wechsler, Younker, Ziff, Zorn **Alternates:** Burant (for Sagher-Medicine) and Maddock (for Orr-LSA)

Requested Alternate but none identified/attended: Huntley/Eksioglu, Liu, Macoska, Benamou

Absent: Adriaens, Bartlett, Bhavnani, Chang, Colas, Fishman, Fricke, Green, G.R. Holland, Ludlow, Potter, Robertson, Ross, Rush, Sahiner, Schwendeman, Seerance, Seyhun, Tropman, Watkins, Whatley

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED

1. Proposed Agenda
2. Summary of the Senate Assembly meeting of 15 November 2004, lacking quorum
3. Draft minutes of the Senate Assembly meeting of 25 October 2004
4. Informational items for Senate Assembly Action Item regarding Rules Committee Proposal

Chair Berent convened the meeting at 3:17 P.M.

AEC UPDATE

Professor Lehman reported the status of activities by the Administration Evaluation Committee (AEC). He pointed out that about 20 percent of eligible Senate members had already participated in the on-line evaluation process. A member of the Assembly requested that the deadline for participation be extended to the end of the Fall Term. Professor Lehman asked for a show of hands from Assembly members to indicate the level of agreement that the deadline should be extended. Almost the full Assembly raised their hands.

Professor Lehman reminded the members that results would be posted to the AEC website (<http://aec.umich.edu>) in January.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Berent announced:

1. SACUA is looking into Institutional Review Board (IRB) practices owing to expressed concerns. The U-M is likely to invest resources to improve the system, with an overall aim of simplifying the application and approval process.
2. A search committee has been constituted for the position of vice president for research; SACUA recommended a candidate for membership.

CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF 25 OCTOBER 2004

The minutes of 25 October were approved as submitted.

SACUA NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Ballots for election of a SACUA nominating committee were distributed by the Senate Office staff. Chair Berent named Professor Brown, Professor Pedraza, and Mr. Schneider from the Faculty Senate office as tellers for the election.

The tellers subsequently reported that the following candidates had been elected to the 2005 SACUA Nominating Committee:

Professor Berent
Professor Pedraza

Professor Anderson
Professor Colas
Professor Goldman
Professor Orr

[N.B. The vote counts from 48 ballots deposited in the Faculty Senate Office were inconsistent with this outcome. This matter was the subject of a message from the Secretary to the Assembly on 18 January 2005, and subsequent action was taken by the Assembly at its January meeting.]

ITEM FOR ACTION- RULES COMMITTEE PROPOSAL

Professor Riebesell presented a report from the Rules Committee. He noted that there appears to be a discrepancy between Regents Bylaws and Senate Rules regarding eligibility for election to SACUA. His presentation paralleled distributed item 4 and was completed at 3:40 P.M. He pointed out that the proposed change in Rules would ensure that all SACUA members be elected from the Assembly.

Chair Berent reported that SACUA had polled itself with one member absent, and all present agreed that they opposed the proposed rules change. Chair Berent read the proposed rules change:

MAIN MOTION

Amend the first paragraph of Section III.4.(1) of the "Rules of the University Senate, the Senate Assembly, and the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs" to read:

"(1) Procedure. The Assembly shall organize for the ensuing year by choosing the Senate members to serve on SACUA. Eligibility for membership on SACUA shall be limited to voting members of the University Senate who are current members of the Senate Assembly."

Professor Zorn expressed his support for continuing current practice of including an expanded eligibility pool from which candidates could be elected to SACUA. Professor Thouless expressed his opinion that tension exists between the dual functions of SACUA as (1) an advisory committee to executive officers, and (2) the executive committee of the Senate Assembly. He suggested that the Assembly should charge the Rules Committee with re-thinking the structure and function of SACUA. Another member of the Assembly stated that if SACUA has become largely autonomous of the Assembly a larger pool of candidates makes sense. But, she said, clarification of the role of SACUA is necessary.

An Assembly member asked if the next step should be to petition the Regents to change their Bylaws to conform to Senate Assembly rules. Chair Berent replied that the Regents' Bylaws pertaining to faculty were driven by the faculty and were proposed by the faculty. He said that the Regents tend to accommodate faculty requests regarding their own rules. Another Assembly member stated that he did not think an expanded slate of candidates is permitted by current Regents' Bylaws.

VOTE ON THE ACTIVE MOTION (for a change in the Rules)

Number approving- 4

Number disapproving- 33

Number abstaining- 2

Chair Berent declared the motion to be defeated. He stated that he did not agree that SACUA is acting independently from the Assembly. He said that SACUA meetings are public, and that anyone is welcome to attend any time and observe.

MOTION TO PETITION REGENTS

Professor Ensminger moved that the present inconsistency between University Senate Rules and Regents' Bylaws be resolved by formally asking the Regents to change their Bylaws so that current chairs of Senate Assembly committees become eligible for election to SACUA provided they have been members of the Assembly at any time in the past. Professor Pedraza seconded.

Professor Giordani said that a package of proposed "housekeeping" changes to the Regents' Bylaws was currently being prepared within the administration. Professor Ensminger replied that his proposal could be part of that package.

Professor Lehman suggested that now would be the appropriate time to consider expansion of the eligibility pool to regular members of the Assembly committees, rather than to chairs alone. He noted that the chairs are not elected, but rather are effectively appointed by SACUA, and thus are of no different status than regular members. Chair Berent declared that the Assembly must address only the motion that was on the table. A member of the Assembly pointed out that by doing so, the Assembly would have to approach the Regents a second time to reform the rules.

MOTION TO TABLE THE MAIN MOTION

Several members moved and seconded a motion to place the Main Motion to the table until additional information was made available to the Assembly about a complete set of proposed changes to the Rules by the Rules Committee.

Vote on the motion to Place to Table

Number approving- 37

Number disapproving- 3

Number abstaining- 4

Professor Giordani asked if the Rules Committee would bring all of its proposed changes to the Assembly. Chair Berent said yes. Professor Riebesell said that the Rules Committee is considering a series of discrepancies within the Rules, and that its plate is quite full right now.

Professor Zorn remarked that universities are being asked by the Governor to expand the number of college graduates in the state. He asked if there was any interest in offering evening courses within LSA as one way of meeting the objective. A member of the Assembly responded that the subject could be fruitfully discussed. Another member said that many of the issues are out of the control of the faculty and are being discussed only within higher levels of university administration. A third member remarked that she came from a unit with many non traditional students who cannot come to campus in the middle of the day for one hour to take a required course. A fourth member stated that the regional campuses at Flint and Dearborn would welcome the non-traditional students.

Professor Ensminger recalled that the provost had indicated that community colleges would likely participate in the drive to expand the number of college graduates. Another member suggested that faculty might look to developments within CourseTools as an effective mechanism.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

A member asked about the status of the Childcare Taskforce report. Chair Berent said that he would be better prepared to answer that question at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:12 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.
