

Per your request  
Faculty Senate Office

The minutes of the December 14, 1992 Senate Assembly meeting were approved on February 1, 1993.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN  
SENATE ASSEMBLY  
MINUTES OF DECEMBER 14, 1992

ATTENDANCE

Present: Oleinick (alt M. Brown), Beam, Billi, Birge, Blair, Blinder, Bord, Brewer, Brusati, Cole, Cowan, Coward, D'Alecy, Dawson, DeCamp, Didier, Douthit, Eklund, Ensminger, Fellin, Frey, Gidley, Griffin, Gross, Hayashi, Hook, Irani, E. Jensen, Kaplan, Koopmann, Kunkel, Larson, Lawson, Lopez, Lynch-Sauer, Marcelo, Montalvo, Mosher, Penchansky, Saunders, Scheppele, Schwank, Shirley, Silverstein, C. Smith, R. Smith, Stein, Stenones, Tinkle, Toman, Veroff, Voss, Watkins, W.J. Yang; MacAdam, Thorson, Heskett.

Absent: Angus, A. Brown, Cameron, Chiego, Cox, Crandall, Danley, Friedman, Greene, Gull, A. Jensen, Kabamba, Katehi, Kaviany, Kelley, Mukasa Olson, Razzoog, Semetko, Sutton, Thum, Tremper, Warner, Wheeler, Whitehouse, V. Yang.

Ejner Jensen, Chair, convened the meeting at 3:15 p.m.

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of November 16, 1992 were approved as submitted.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Jensen announced that he would be available to meet with liaisons who so wished on the discriminatory harassment policy after today's Senate Assembly meeting. An open meeting to discuss the policy has been scheduled for January 15 at 12:00 noon, room 5 of the Michigan League.

Jensen and John Tropman, Chair of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, are scheduled to provide reports of SACUA's and CESF's activities to the Regents on December 17 at 1:00 p.m.

Ballots were distributed for the election of the SACUA Nominating Committee.

STEPHEN DARWALL, CHAIR OF THE AD HOC TASK FORCE ON THE  
REMOVAL OF MANDATORY RETIREMENT

Darwall opened with a review of the change in the mandatory retirement law, the committee membership, and the extent of the effort to seek input from faculty through various mechanisms, including the recent mailing of a questionnaire.

Darwall summarized what the task force had learned so far about the likely impact of the removal of mandatory retirement. The information is not conclusive, but based on a model developed at the University of Chicago, Michigan data suggest that by the year 2004, 8-14% of the faculty may be between 70 and 80 years of age. The committee's consensus is that if there is a justification for change in the process of tenure or post-tenure review, it would have to be on some independent rationale. Because of the change in the law, retirement will become more of a process with appropriate support on the part of the

institution, and an eye needs to be kept on the data. Darwall opened the discussion asking for questions and comments.

Kaplan noted that federal law says any upper limit in terms of incentives is illegal.

Stein asked what institutional mechanism might serve to monitor and assess the impact? Darwall suggested that it was probably a good idea to have such a mechanism and thanked Stein for reinforcing this point.

Penchansky noted the health plan cost savings involved in flexibility for faculty to have 49% appointments.

Jensen asked when a report could be completed. Darwall indicated that the Committee's report should be completed by mid to late February.

It was noted that all faculty over 55 did not receive the questionnaire.

In response to a question by Kaplan, Darwall indicated that he thought 3-4% of the faculty currently stayed after 70, though this varies among the schools and colleges.

Helling asked if a defined benefits plan made a difference in the incentive to retire or remain. Darwall responded that it appeared to have limited effect.

Penchansky asked if the committee discussed changes in the mandatory contribution to retirement funds. Darwall replied that there was consideration of this, but it was very complicated from a legal standpoint.

In response to a question on whether there had been discussion on how review of teaching competency of older faculty could be carried out equitably. Darwall responded that it probably was the case that units should be looking at the broader issue, but that evaluation of teaching competency was outside of the retirement issue.

Jensen thanked Darwall and other members of the task force for their work. Further questions and comments can be sent to Darwall on e-mail or campus mail.

#### SACUA NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Jensen announced the results of the nominating committee election: Ejner Jensen (SACUA-LSA), Roy Penchansky (SACUA-Public Health), Sam Gross (Law), Robert Hayashi (Medicine), Myra Larson (Art), and Chuck Olson (Natural Resources and Environment). The committee will meet in January to select candidates for election to SACUA.

#### ELAINE DIDIER, CHAIR OF THE FACULTY COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE

Didier announced that the other members of the committee were George Brewer (Medicine) and Bob Smith (Engineering). Didier reported that the committee had concluded that use of the University Record appeared to be the best option but warned about the costs of a faculty page in the Record. Didier is drafting a memo of understanding outlining a six-eight month trial period with a three-six member faculty advisory committee to encourage and solicit articles for the faculty page.

There were no questions from the Assembly and Didier encouraged further input.

#### DISCUSSION OF PRESIDENT DUDERSTADT'S NOVEMBER ADDRESS

Jensen introduced John Birge who announced that SACUA is organizing a luncheon with President Duderstadt on January 20. The luncheon will provide an opportunity to discuss the ideas about multidisciplinary efforts raised in the president's address at the November Senate Assembly meeting. Assembly members who are interested in attending are encouraged to contact Birge.

#### DISCUSSION OF THE REPORT ON THE TASK FORCE ON THE EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

Bord introduced the following motion: "It is resolved that the Senate Assembly adopt a system of periodic evaluation of executive offices by faculty committees appointed for this purpose in accordance with the recommendations articulated in the report of the Task Force on the Evaluation of Administrators and that Senate Assembly direct SACUA

to establish evaluation protocols, including timelines and general procedures for implementing such an evaluation system."

Griffin seconded the motion. Jensen asked for discussion of the motion.

Cowan asked for the definition of executive offices. Bord responded that these were offices above the level of Deans as described in the report of the Task Force on the Evaluation of Administrators.

Brewer asked for clarification and Jensen confirmed that the evaluation of offices implicitly resulted in an evaluation of the office incumbent.

Kaplan noted the importance of ensuring a real benefit from this process, and not engaging in a process that could be time-consuming and frustrating with no clear outcome. (A copy of an AAUP letter was distributed to the Assembly.)

Koopmann asked for clarification of the process regarding evaluating of Deans; Jensen described the process.

D'Alecy noted the wording of the earlier resolution which included the evaluation of Deans and officers.

At Senate Assembly's request, Bord re-read the motion.

Arnold asked whether the report would be confidential; Bord reported that there was consideration of this, FOIA was not reviewed relative to this, but needed to be addressed.

Smith asked how the President will appoint the committee. Bord replied that the committee of six would be selected by the President from a slate of nine or twelve selected by SACUA.

In response to a question by Didier, Bord clarified that the evaluation committees would be established expressly for the evaluation purpose.

Cole asked for the distinction between the current motion and the prior resolution. Jensen noted the design of an evaluation instrument and the inclusion of Deans as two components in the earlier Senate Assembly resolution that differed from the recommendations of the task force.

At Jensen's invitation, Knott outlined the rationale for emphasizing the evaluation of the office rather than the officer.

Senate Assembly approved the resolution.

Jensen opened discussion through a series of questions (document distributed).

1. What Offices are to be reviewed and in what order?

Coward suggested that because of the transition, the Office of the Vice President for Research might be a good choice.

D'Alecy questioned whether a discussion would be more productive after having time for review of the questions.

Cole suggested the Office of International Affairs be taken under consideration.

Silverstein suggested that a list of offices with some background information would be helpful. Jensen agreed.

2. When should the process of evaluation begin, and how many evaluations should we have initially?

Koopmann noted that several offices could be done simultaneously with strong committees.

Scheppele noted the interconnecting of many offices and suggested reviewing offices that were related, so connections weren't overlooked.

3. What should be the size and composition of the evaluation committees?

Penchansky reminded the Assembly that the recommendations called for six members to a committee.

Shirley asked when the process would begin. Jensen indicated that later this semester appeared to be a logical starting time.

Koopmann voiced a concern over the officer participating in the evaluation criteria and the President's right to pick the evaluation committee. Jensen asked for Knott's comments. Knott indicated that the committee felt the President had to be involved in setting the charge, but faculty would have to be insistent about the criteria they felt were important.

Jensen brought the discussion to a close, calling attention to question number seven. What will be the means of assessing the impact of the reports?

Jensen announced that he would review the January 25 Senate Assembly date because of a conflict with a scheduled presidential lecture series address.

### OLD BUSINESS

D'Alecy reviewed the Senate Assembly resolution approved at the March 16, 1992 meeting and introduced the following resolution: Whereas, at its meeting on March 16th, 1992 the Senate Assembly adopted the following resolution:

- "(I) To establish a standing committee to prepare and publish an annual evaluation of the academic status of the University and its faculty and,
- (II) That the committee design and establish an instrument for the evaluation, by the faculty, of all administrative personnel at the rank of Dean and above in order to facilitate faculty input into both the direction of the University and the appropriate faculty report on the status of academic affairs"

and whereas the report of the Task Force on the Evaluation of Administrators has not addressed this resolution, the Senate Assembly reaffirms the resolution and further resolves that:

- (I) an appropriate evaluation instrument be designed and put in place as soon as possible and that,
- (II) the above instrument be used both to evaluate senior University administrators (Deans and executive officers) and to contribute to the timely information flow from the faculty to the administrators on academic issues of vital interest to the faculty and that,
- (III) the implementation of the resolution be entrusted to the Academic Affairs Committee, which is the committee charged by Senate Assembly with monitoring the academic affairs of the University and that,
- (IV) it is further resolved that the details of the proposed instrument, and the procedures to be used in its implementation, be reported by the Academic Affairs Committee to the Senate Assembly prior to its April 1993 meeting.

D'Alecy opened the discussion by noting that this was an opportunity to bring the Deans and Executive Officers into the evaluation process.

Penchansky noted that a committee had given some sound recommendations and should be implemented and given the opportunity to work effectively. He also indicated that, despite his earlier concerns, he felt the evaluation of Deans was much improved and he suggested tabling the earlier motion.

Brewer argued for a mere timely review of officers and suggested the current motion was a simple and timely way to accomplish this.

Koopmann noted that faculty are evaluated on an ongoing basis.

Silverstein asked how the processes would be supported financially. Smith responded that the cost was about \$150 per evaluation for ISR instrument and analysis. Didier questioned the ISR involvement and Smith clarified that this was merely the estimate of such a process and ISR involvement was not assumed. Didier noted the distinction between faculty evaluation by students and what was proposed.

Watkins summarized the need for a cooperative process, and the key elements in the process: how the officer sees his/her role; question appropriate individuals at both the faculty and administrative levels; and to keep an interactive and interpersonal style.

Stein emphasized the importance of timeliness and the need to get open communication channels; a two or three year process would not be effective for this.

Jensen noted the negative potential of a poorly done evaluation going forward.

There were several suggestions of ways to establish evaluation forms to deal with some of the problems.

Griffin suggested that the Senate Assembly ask Academic Affairs Committee to design an instrument and bring it to the Assembly.

D'Alecy pointed out that it would be faculty evaluating their own Deans.

Penchansky suggested taking the resolution back to the schools and colleges. D'Alecy argued that this process was a responsibility of the faculty.

Shirley noted that the School of Music had already established such a process.

Cole raised an objection to the CRLT forms being used as a model.

Senate Assembly approved the resolution.

### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara MacAdam  
Senate Secretary, pro tempore

a/m/dec1492