

The minutes of the December 13, 1993 Senate Assembly meeting were approved on January 24, 1994.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

MINUTES OF 13 DECEMBER 1993

ATTENDANCE

Present: Awkward, Beam, Birge, Blair, Brandle, Brewer, Brown, Brusati, Cameron, Canine, Cole, Coward, D'Alecy, Driscoll, Eklund, Elta, Ensminger, Frey, Gidley, Greene, Griffin, Gull, Howell (Alt for Raymond), Irani, Kaplan, Keener (Alt for Mukasa), Kelley, Kelly (Alt for DeCamp), Kennedy, Kunkel, T. Lee, V. Lee, Levine, Lomax, Loup, Lykes, Maloy, Marich, Moore, Mutschler, Nairn, Nostrant, Nowak, Princen, Rodriguez-Hornedo, Saunders, Schteingart, Shirley, Silverstein, Simms, Sisson, R. Smith, Stein, Stensones, Tinkle, Warner, Whitehouse, Williams, Woo, Yohannes; MacAdam, Olson, Thorson, Heskett.

Absent: Bike, Blinder, Bryant, Chiego, Christiansen, Cowan, Danly, Eggertsen, Fox, Katehi, McNamara, Myers, Rush, Scheppele, C. Smith, Tremper.

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES FROM NOVEMBER 15, 1993

The minutes were approved as submitted.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FACULTY SALARY INCREASES

Griffin called Assembly members' attention to the distributed documents containing salary data, and noted the article appearing in the University Record on December 13, 1993. At Griffin's request, John Tropman, Chair, Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, outlined CESF's considerations in preparing the annual report to the Regents. Griffin invited discussion from Assembly. In response to a question by Elta, Whitaker confirmed that the salary percentages reported were only on base salary. Lomax noted the discrepancy between the salary figures reported and those appearing in the Ann Arbor News based on a total of 28 administrators which suggested an average increase of 7.2% (rather than the University's officially reported 5.85%). Walt Harrison, Vice President for University Relations, replied that it was unclear how the Ann Arbor News had calculated the percentages, perhaps working from the salary list.

Brewer denounced the raises for top administrators as a mistake which sent the wrong signals to students and members of the community. He noted that comparisons of the distribution of salary increases favored administrators over faculty in every case, and warned that failure to provide adequate faculty increases would ultimately lead to mediocrity. Brewer offered the following motion:

"Senate Assembly notes with concern the extraordinary increases in salary among the top administrative leadership the past year, and further, that throughout the distribution of percent increase in salaries, comparisons favor administrators over faculty. Senate Assembly protests these inequities. We remind all that the intellectual strength and quality of a university is intimately tied to the quality of its faculty. In view of relatively low increases in faculty salaries this year following a

year of no increases, we expect at least a 10% increase in faculty salaries in the upcoming year."

Whitehouse emphasized the need to see salary data in terms of actual dollars rather than percentages. Nowak suggested that Assembly should hear the reasons from the administration for the increases and noted that the language of the motion was too harsh. V. Lee warned that the faculty salary figures would be skewed if they included increases for promotions. Lomax again cited the increases reported in the Ann Arbor News. Marich pointed out that there was a considerable inequity between a 5% increase on a salary of \$100,000 compared to the same percentage increase on a salary of \$25,000, and added that even slightly higher increases on top salaries would widen the salary gap over time. Brandle identified the problem as the few very high salary increases.

[Griffin postponed further discussion to a later point in the agenda.]

DAVID W. COHEN, DIRECTOR, INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE

Cohen outlined the background of the Institute, formally established in September of this year linking twelve pre-existing institutes and two affiliated units: Public Health and the Center for Afro-American Studies. He summarized several goals including helping the University forge a much stronger line to the rest of the world, and, in addition to providing an administrative umbrella, developing an intellectual agenda of its own around teaching and research. Cohen emphasized that he expected to continue playing a very strong role, but developing cross-national focus. He reported that, since one of the new Institute's main concerns is making its resources accessible, they expect to publish a guide to Institute resources within the next two months and then will issue a newspaper three times a year.

In response to a comment by Kaplan on the name of the Institute (which implied covering many nations), Cohen admitted there had been some discussion over a name, but that the Institute's mission was to build bridges between scholarship at the University and scholarship in other countries. Moore asked for elaboration on the suggestion that affiliated faculty might have tenure in more than one unit. Cohen replied that they were trying to use ingenuity in identifying people at the senior level capable of being tenured in two places.

Marich asked if there had been any discussion of adding a department or courses in geography. Cohen responded that there was some interesting work being done in this area, but with a multi-disciplinary focus. Griffin asked for clarification of the type of resources to which Cohen referred; Cohen reported that the Institute had \$450,000 a year as a foundation and hoped to solicit more and larger proposals for projects across the University. He further indicated that approximately \$700,000 in general funds went to the combined institutes, many of which had large endowments, and reported that he was working on hiring a development person.

Griffin thanked Cohen for his discussion with Assembly and called Assembly attention to the Assembly meeting on January 24, and the Senate Assembly/Executive Committee retreat scheduled for March 2.

NICHOLAS STENECK, CHAIR OF THE RESEARCH POLICIES COMMITTEE,
PRIMARY RESEARCH STAFF PROPOSAL

Steneck summarized the RPC process, including the work of a subcommittee charged with the assessment of the primary research track. RPC submitted a report to SACUA in May 1993, and the report was now before Senate Assembly following the review by SACUA.

In response to a question by Brewer, Steneck replied that there had been no real estimate of how many people in the research track (currently about 500) would be able to achieve research professor appointments. Kaplan read from an AAUP report which noted, "Those researchers as soon as you call them professors should have the same privileges as other faculty (e.g., should be granted tenure.)" Steneck responded that the committee's goal had been to include people in all phases of academic life, and he noted the first recommendation suggesting a clarification in appointments. To a question by Griffin on whether individuals in such tracks at other institutions were called professors, Steneck replied that he did not know. Shirley asked about consideration of the budgetary implications of the recommendations; Steneck responded that the committee had considered this but didn't calculate any amount.

T. Lee suggested that faculty currently were asked to take on many roles, but that researchers were not asked to do things other faculty did. Steneck called attention to the document outlining a new view of the professoriate, drawn up as background, and Loup expressed concern that several categories of faculty were omitted, including archivists, curators, and librarians. Steneck indicated that this was just an error of omission, not a deliberate attempt to exclude. Moore asked about the right to apply for sabbatical, and Steneck agreed that such questions would have to be answered. Simms recommended that the report be sent to the Rules Committee and Lomax reported that SACUA had a committee looking in to a review of the professoriate. Cole noted that the recommendations could be applied in principle to other staff, and Coward suggested that if people wanted to be treated equally, they needed the same responsibilities. Steneck agreed that responsibilities needed to be more clearly defined.

Griffin asked Assembly to consider whether they would be prepared to support the recommendations at the February 7 Assembly meeting and thanked Steneck for his visit.

EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES

Griffin reported that SACUA was in the process of nominating a list of individuals for the evaluation committee for the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs, and that the redrafted guidelines for the committee had been distributed to Assembly members for their review. Coward asked if the evaluation included only executive officers, not deans. Griffin replied that this was correct but reminded Assembly of the simultaneous process to evaluate deans; he asked Moore to report on this process.

EVALUATION OF DEANS

Moore reiterated the original Senate Assembly resolution, noting its basic point was to enhance and focus dialogue between faculty and administrators. The schools originally selected included Engineering, Pharmacy, Music, LS&A, and Business. Moore reported that a subcommittee of Academic Affairs was currently working on a basic survey questionnaire which should be distributed early in January.

D'Alecy stressed that the faculty evaluation is of the performance of the dean and the effects on the academic performance in that unit. Further, the committee was trying to create a standard evaluation instrument and a procedures document to help keep the procedure consistent, and the committee welcomed comments. Coward questioned why, as the faculty representative in Pharmacy, he had not been contacted. In response to D'Alecy's agreement on the importance of going through the Senate Assembly representative so that a dean could not say she/he did not want to be evaluated, Coward identified the main concern as one over confidentiality of the results. He indicated that Pharmacy faculty saw this process as a dialogue between faculty and the dean and saw no reason for the information to go out beyond Pharmacy. Moore responded that Academic Affairs Committee was addressing this issue, but Coward reiterated that the process was not helped by failing to work through the Senate Assembly representative.

Kennedy raised concerns over the validity of a common instrument used in very disparate schools, and Stein confirmed that the School of Music experience was that the original questions had to be so adapted that the evaluation group didn't know enough to design the right instrument. She suggested a simpler effort directed at finding out what faculty were happy or unhappy about in the running of the school. Moore and Brewer argued that this process was a learning experience and that it was possible to ask generic questions about leadership and communication. Coward suggested that Senate Assembly determine what had been learned about the process over the last six months, rather than continue the assumptions from last Spring.

In response to a question by Marich, D'Alecy noted that the committee was trying to get the units to work on drafting the unit-specific questions. Griffin summarized the general discussion, suggesting that Senate Assembly wished to hear more about what had been developed and that a subcommittee of Academic Affairs should have the instrument completed for Assembly review at the Senate Assembly meeting scheduled for January 24. At that time, Senate Assembly could approve or raise additional concerns. At Griffin's request, the great majority of Senate Assembly members indicated their availability for the Senate Assembly meeting on January 24. D'Alecy suggested that it would be foolish to have a group the size of Senate Assembly attempt to review the instrument or procedures in any meaningful way. Moore countered that unless something was largely wrong, the committee would proceed. Silverstein asked about the distribution of information received and D'Alecy said that this part of the process was under development. Coward reiterated that he had thought representatives of the unit would be working as part of this process. Simms expressed hope that everyone would learn from this and have a solid notion of how to cooperate rather than finger point.

Cole moved that Senate Assembly postpone further discussion until the January meeting. Senate Assembly approved the motion.

RESUMPTION OF DISCUSSION ON ADMINISTRATOR SALARIES

Brewer reread the proposed motion. Birge expressed difficulty in naming a specific 10% figure and asked Tropman if CESF had such a figure. Tropman responded that CESF had met and was not supporting a specific number, feeling that there was no justification of a particular figure. He added that CESF had been looking at comparable institutions and that, in recent years, CESF had not recommended a specific percentage. Tropman noted that this would require a target policy for faculty pay, with agreement on what CESF hoped

to achieve with a salary strategy and why. This would make it easier to state a specific number based on a compensation policy. Griffin displayed an overhead with comparisons between UM faculty salaries and those at peer public institutions. Noting the slight lag in full professor salaries, Griffin called attention to the leading position in terms of assistant and associate professor pay. A second graph showed Michigan in the middle of peer private institutions (again, except for full professor salaries which are in the bottom quartile).

Lykes suggested great inequity across UM schools and colleges in salary, and Levine expressed concern that the figures compared apples and oranges, noting that some of the peer institutions didn't have Law or Medical Schools, for example. Whitaker and Tropman indicated their confidence that the institutions were generally comparable and that the figures were not driven by Medical School salaries. Citing low increases in the Department of Mathematics, Stensones said she was pleased to hear it expressed that the quality of the institution depended on the quality of the faculty.

Cole offered an amendment to Brewer's motion: to eliminate the 10% figure and replace it with the word "equitable." The motion to amend was seconded. Cole added that he had concerns that the 10% figure smacked of elitism in tough financial times. Birge concurred and Brandle also expressed support for the amendment. Shirley noted that it appeared that Michigan was making a steady rise over the California institutions, probably due to their problems. He suggested the need to rethink expectations in these difficult times.

Senate Assembly voted to approve the amendment to the Brewer motion and voted to approve the following motion:

"Senate Assembly notes with concern the extraordinary increases in salary among the top administrative leadership the past year, and further, that throughout the distribution of percent increases in salaries, comparisons favor administrators over faculty. Senate Assembly protests these inequities. We remind all that the intellectual strength and quality of a university is intimately tied to the quality of its faculty. In view of relatively low increases in faculty salaries this year following a year of no increases, we recommend an equitable increase in faculty salaries in the upcoming year."

OLD AND NEW BUSINESS

There was no old or new business.

ADJOURNMENT

Senate Assembly adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara MacAdam
Senate Secretary