

Minutes of 14 March 2005
Circulated 22 March 2005
Revised and Re-Circulated 25 March 2005
Approved 28 March 2005

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs

6048 Fleming Administration Building
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1340

Phone: (734) 764-0303

Fax: (734) 764-6564

www.sacua.umich.edu

Approved Minutes: www.sacua.umich.edu/sacua/sacua-minutes.html

MINUTES OF THE SACUA MEETING OF 14 MARCH 2004

PRESENT: Berent (Chair), Combi, Ensminger, Giordani, Gull, Lehman, Meerkov, Pedraza, Zorn; Leu, Loup, Schneider

ABSENT:

GUESTS: Provost Courant, K. Gibbons, R. Krasny

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED

1. Proposed agenda
2. Draft minutes of 7 February 2005 SACUA meeting
3. Draft minutes of 7 March 2005 SACUA meeting
4. *Principles of Faculty Involvement in Institutional & Academic Unit Governance at the University of Michigan* (1997)
5. Electronic mail message from T. Schneider to Provost Courant regarding questions for Monday's SACUA meeting
6. Electronic mail message from T. Schneider to S. Berent regarding AAAC discussion of grade change reporting.
7. Draft resolution for a proposed Childcare Implementation Committee.
8. Three draft letters addressed to President Coleman regarding the AEC evaluations.
9. Senate Assembly resolution establishing the Administration Evaluation Committee (Passed 25 October 2004)
10. Two revisions of the statement on faculty governance prepared by S. Berent.
11. *University Record*, March 14, 2005.
12. SACUA/Senate Assembly Planning Schedule updated 9 March 2005

Chair Berent called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of the SACUA meeting on 7 February 2005 were approved with one abstention. Approval of the minutes of the SACUA meeting on 7 March 2005 was postponed until the next meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENTS/UPDATES

1. Chair Berent distributed a new draft of the Faculty Governance document for discussion later in the meeting
2. Chair Berent reported that, in the private meeting he and Vice-Chair Pedraza had with the Provost earlier in the day, he had shared that SACUA had shifted the members of the Childcare Taskforce to an implementation committee. The Provost had responded that he would be happy to work with the group.

VISIT OF PROVOST COURANT

Provost Courant and Karen Gibbons arrived at 2:11 p.m.

Chair Berent introduced the list of questions for discussion, the first concerning the report of the Childcare Taskforce. Provost Courant indicated that Professor Yeo had visited with the Executive Officers to discuss the report. He and the President have expressed support and he has asked his staff to cooperate with the SACUA group.

Professor Lehman raised the concern about the Provost stepping down and expressed appreciation for his efforts on behalf of faculty governance. Professor Zorn indicated this is a huge loss. Professor Meerkov thanked the Provost for being kind after vigorous argument. The Provost indicated he much prefers vigorous, engaged argument to passive discussion. He emphasized that he will continue to work with SACUA.

Chair Berent thanked the Provost for his recent endorsement of the *Principles of Faculty Involvement in Institutional & Academic Unit Governance at the University of Michigan* and asked if he had any comments on the draft document, currently under consideration by SACUA, on faculty governance. The Provost indicated that he believes that progress can be made on operational aspects. He cautioned that the *Principles* were endorsed with a caveat, except where areas conflict with the *Regents' By-laws*. Professor Meerkov asked what happens if a dean refuses to involve faculty in budget matters. Professor Lehman indicated that it seemed odd that the General Counsel would see the *Principles* as conflicting with the *By-laws*. The other document takes off from the *Principles*, and conflict with the *By-laws* would be a problem. Professor Lehman also expressed his concern that there has been a move away from consulting with elected faculty groups toward consulting with selected groups. The Provost indicated he might disagree with the premise regarding elected vs. selected. He feels that it has always been this way, for example, search committees and ad hoc committees looking at specific issues. What is important to him is for a group to include the appropriate representation and expertise.

Professor Zorn expressed concern that need-based financial aid should be more tied to performance than it is now. Departments have virtually no control over need-based aid. He is concerned that the University is supporting some students who are not working hard enough. The Provost pointed out that those who receive need-based aid must make satisfactory progress, a minimum of a 2.0 grade point, nine credit hours per term and on target to graduate in six years. There are standards, though maybe not as stringent as faculty would like. It might be possible to look into coupling aid with academic counseling. He understands that schools and colleges prefer merit-based aid, but the University has a commitment to need-based aid to ensure

access. Professor Zorn suggested that it might be good to have a group talking about the issue to find out what is happening. The Provost pointed out that there is no question about the correlation between family income and performance in college. Need-based aid is intended to change this. It would be inappropriate if the University was failing to support students who can benefit from this place. We should want to do well for these students, too. Professor Zorn suggested that maybe case studies would be useful.

Responding to the request for an update on the Advance program, Provost Courant urged SACUA to invite the Advance leadership to provide a briefing. They have interesting stories to tell.

Professor Pedraza criticized the Cherry Commission report in that it seems to be misleading in portraying Michigan as ranking quite low in a number of categories, when, in fact, Michigan ranks at the national average in most categories. The Provost cautioned that what often happens in politics is that people will use the data for their own purposes. Broadly what the report does is 1) to present the correlation between prosperity and education, and 2) note that in the past people were able to do well without education, but that is not true now. He also said he would propose that the high-level research done here and other doctoral institutions drives prosperity. And, he said, "We do underfund education in this State." Professor Lehman expressed his concern that the University is doing a poor job of convincing the voting public that the advantages of a fine university accrues to the overall well-being of the State across society. Provost Courant pointed out that, at the state and national levels, there is pressure to keep tuition down, not from those who pay it, but for society in general. One subject he is interested in exploring is the question of what is going on between American higher education and the public that must support it.

Provost Courant indicated, in responding to the question regarding administrative growth, that administration is hard to measure. In the general fund, the rate of growth of the budget for academic units is higher than the growth in the budget of administrative units. He has no data on the growth of administrative activity within academic units. There are two trends: 1) a great deal of what the University does is not in the general fund, for example, sponsored research and the hospital; and 2) regulatory requirements continue to increase. The University is adding administrative personnel involved in compliance. We are not doing it for the fun of it. The Provost indicated that he is proud of having designed a budget system in which growth in academic unit budgets happens naturally. Chair Berent pointed out that the demands of administrative tasks often fall on faculty. The Provost responded that faculty used to be much more involved in admissions and other activities that have now been turned over to others. Professor Giordani indicated that faculty have different requirements now than they used to, grant-seeking, tenure, demands for more research. The Provost pointed out the increased demands for more avoidance of risk, i.e., human subjects. Individual faculty cannot set the level of risk. Professor Meerkov reported that Professor Smith, Chair of the Budget Study Committee, had met recently with SACUA. Their work shows administration growing at 10% per year. The number of faculty is not growing at that rate. Professor Lehman pointed out that this data comes from a study done by Professor Kaplan about ten years ago. It was a good report, though now dated. Professor Smith was suggesting that it is time to do it again. Professor Meerkov asked if the Provost would support a committee, appointed by the Provost, and charged with an objective examination of the growth of administration. The Provost asked what the purpose of such work

would be. It is not obvious how to encode what is administration and what is not administration. Professor Meerkov responded by suggesting that a count of those who teach and a count of the rest. The Provost asked if everyone who is not teaching is administration. He went on to say that he had a very good group, the Office of Budget and Planning, that works successfully with CESF and other groups. There is a lot of work involved and he is not willing to define that question loosely. There is a limited number of staff available.

Provost Courant and Ms. Gibbons left the meeting at 3:10 p.m.

VISIT OF AAAC CHAIR ROBERT KRASNY

Chair Berent introduced Professor Krasny, Chair of AAAC, and pointed out that SACUA was seeking feedback from all committees and AAAC is a key committee. Professor Krasny began by saying that AAAC had received a number of issues from SACUA and he planned to report on the current status of those issues.

Grade alteration: A subcommittee of AAAC studied the issue of grade alteration and whether faculty should be informed every time a grade change is made in the Registrar's Office and brought back several recommendations. The Committee passed a motion asking the Registrar to send an e-mail notice to faculty whenever a grade has been changed. Chair Berent responded that that should be an automatic process and indicated he would want to know about any grade change. Professor Krasny reported that the Committee had met with the Assistant Registrar, who thought initially this would be difficult. The Provost has suggested that they meet with Vice-Provost Monts. The goal is to have the e-mail sent automatically. With the University moving to an on-line system, this should be built into the system. Professor Pedraza asked if it would be better to say that no change could be made before consultation with faculty. Professor Zorn expressed concern about grade integrity, especially at the point when incompletes are resolved. Class lists from the past are not available. Professor Giordani pointed out that this results from the privacy laws. It is very hard to find a case of a grade changed without the faculty's permission.

ACTION OF SACUA 031405-1

Professor Meerkov moved that SACUA endorse the AAAC motion. Professor Combi seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion:

Approve: 8

Disapprove: 0

Abstain: 0

The motion passed.

Professor Giordani emphasized that the e-mails should be sent to the faculty, not to the GSIs. Who signs the grade sheets varies from department to department. In some, the GSIs sign the grade sheets, but faculty ought to sign. Professor Pedraza stated that the e-mail should go to the professor even if the GSI had signed the grade sheet. Professor Giordani pointed out that in the current system the e-mail will go to the GSI. The difficulty is that each unit is very

different. Chair Berent suggested that faculty be told that they should sign their grade sheets. Professor Lehman indicated he could see where the Registrar is blameless in grade changes. Who signs the request for a grade change? Can a GSI sign or a department chair? Professor Zorn pointed out that the Registrar does not check signatures.

Teaching evaluations: Professor Krasny reminded SACUA that the original intent of the teaching evaluations was to help instructors improve their teaching. Now they are being used in different ways. The Provost has acknowledged this, but says it is important data, though not the only measure that is used. He wants to see much more than scores, wants a portfolio with rich documentation. In the past five years teaching has been taken more seriously. The Provost has hinted that he was beginning to think a task force needs to be convened to look at teaching evaluations. Professor Krasny does not know if such a task force will be named. Professor Giordani agreed but said that the Provost certainly said the issue has been around for a long time and it may be important to look at the process. Professor Lehman asked if there was any mention of who owns the evaluations. Professor Krasny said no, and Professor Lehman suggested this question needs to be revisited. Professor Giordani pointed out that if there is a task force, faculty will be looking at all issues, including ownership. Chair Berent suggested this might be a good question for the General Counsel's Advisory Committee. Professor Zorn reemphasized that the evaluations started as feedback for faculty. Professor Meerkov pointed out that it is a useful instrument and he is not sure a task force is needed. Professor Giordani indicated that some faculty are very concerned. In some departments the results set raise levels. Some have also suggested the evaluations should be done more than once per term. Professor Krasny indicated there is a need to find out what the current practices are. He also pointed out that there is a test of an online evaluation system in progress which has raised questions about participation rates. The topic will continue to be on the AAAC agenda.

Institutional Review Boards: Professor Krasny pointed out that there is a new application system on the horizon which will change the application process. That will not change the need to examine the process. AAAC is not sure what it can add, but is willing to work with the Research Policies Committee. Professors Ensminger, Giordani, Koopmann, and Chair Berent are a sub-group of SACUA to meet with AAAC and RPC. Professor Giordani indicated that the IRBs also have difficulties dealing with regulations. Chair Berent asked if there were regulatory issues with non-human research. Professor Ensminger expressed concern about the time involved in providing information in the new system. Professor Giordani pointed out that the electronic system will get rid of some issues, but the question is still there as to what IRBs are to do. Chair Berent emphasized that the IRBs have always looked at the quality of the research.

Expanding the University Senate membership: Professor Krasny reported that AAAC has just begun to think about the question of Senate membership for clinical faculty and they see it as a huge issue. Chair Berent encouraged the Committee to continue looking at this. He is not sure what the nature of faculty governance will be, if the interests of clinical faculty are not considered. It is important to reach some consensus on this. Professor Lehman stated that tenure is being targeted. The ultimate goal is to create a body dominated by non-tenure-track faculty who then vote to eliminate tenure. Professor Pedraza pointed out that it seems that tenured faculty would have to vote on eliminating tenure, not non-tenure track. Professor Lehman reported this is a tactic being used across institutions. Chair Berent emphasized the need to find

out about clinical faculty and some way to incorporate them into faculty governance. Professor Giordani indicated that clinical faculty should not be set up in competition with tenured faculty, but rather they need to be included in the existing faculty governance.

Professor Krasny ended his report with an issue that the LS&A Student Government had raised, that of brackets in registration. The Committee has some sympathy for the students and will be talking with Vice-Provost Monts about this. Chair Berent thanked Professor Krasny for an informative report.

Professor Krasny left the meeting at 4:02 p.m.

UPDATE ON MARCH 21 AEC REPORT

Chair Berent requested an update on the AEC report from Professor Lehman, who responded that he is in the process of finalizing the report. The fourth draft is about to be shared with the Committee. Sizeable attention is being given to confidentiality and security. There will be a detailed explanation with proposals for the future. He expects SACUA to get the report soon. Professor Giordani indicated the Provost has expressed interest in there being an option for a signature and also some information about the unit the evaluator was from. Professor Lehman said that any individual can reveal their identity. AEC needs to consider the question of assigning written comments to a department. There is a problem if an individual is concerned about retaliation. Professor Giordani asked if it is possible to make it an option for the faculty member to make. Chair Berent added that it would be nice to provide a logoff icon. Professor Lehman indicated that the logoff question came up during the evaluation and it will be address for the next time.

CHILDCARE IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE PROPOSAL

The Chair pointed out that the draft resolution is in the packet of materials provided for the meeting.

ACTION OF SACUA 031405-2

Professor Pedraza moved that SACUA adopt the resolution creating a SACUA Child Care Implementation Committee, constituted with the SACUA Childcare Taskforce membership. Professor Giordani seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion:

Approve: 9

Disapprove: 0

Abstain: 0

The motion passed.

GOVERNANCE PRINCIPLES

Chair Berent distributed the new draft and asked for feedback. He will provide another draft for discussion at the next meeting.

NATURE OF AEC RESULTS COMMUNICATION

SACUA members worked on finalizing the letter to the President regarding the AEC results. Further discussion was postponed to the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Loup
SACUA Staff

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.