

Minutes of 12 June 2006
Circulated 14 June 2006
Approved 19 June 2006

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 12 JUNE 2006

Present: Combi, Frier, Giordani, MacAdam, Meerkov, Potter, Riles, Seabury, Smith (chair);
Lehman, Leu, Schneider

Absent: none

Guests: T. Sullivan, K. Gibbons, A. Stewart, D. Gershman, R. Krasny, S. Pedraza, R. Gull

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED:

1. Draft Agenda
2. Draft minutes of the SACUA meeting of 5 June 2006
3. Electronic mail message from K. Riles to J. Lehman, dated 7 June 2006, regarding draft minutes of 5 June 2006
4. ["Tell the U of M Regents to Vote for Inclusion,"](#) Triangle Foundation, dated 12 June 2006
5. ADVANCE at the University of Michigan (<http://sitemaker.umich.edu/advance>)
6. [Study of Student Academic Success at Michigan](#), Academic Affairs Advisory Committee
7. [Resolution from the Benefits Committee of the University of Michigan-Dearborn regarding Medicare B reimbursements for retirees](#), dated 17 May 2006
8. Electronic mail message from T. Schneider to T. Sullivan, dated 8 June 2006, regarding questions and topics for Monday's SACUA meeting
9. Recruiting Women Graduate Students into the Professoriate, by Teresa A. Sullivan, undated.
10. [Resolution by the Senate Assembly regarding proposed changes to Regental Bylaw 5.09](#), adopted 23 January 2006
11. [Assessing the Necessity of Extending the Maximum Probationary Period, by J. Lee and C. B. Smith](#), dated 22 May 2006
12. [Faculty Governance Update](#), June 2006
13. Faculty Governance Update, May 2006 (*following June Update*)
14. [Report of the subcommittee on faculty evaluation and development](#), Gender in Science and Engineering, dated March 2004
15. [Section 10.I SACUA Faculty Hearing Committee](#), Faculty Handbook
16. Rules Committee membership

17. Privacy Oversight Committee membership, dated 10 April 2006
18. SACUA/Senate Assembly Planning Schedule, updated 9 June 2006

Chair Smith convened the meeting at 2:30 P.M.; the draft agenda was approved.

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of 5 June 2006 were corrected and approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The chair announced:

1. The chair will meet with Regent Maynard on 10 July 2006; SACUA will meet with the Athletic Director that same day to discuss proposed stadium renovations.
2. The "Academic Bill of Rights" has been introduced into the federal budget proposal for the next year.
3. Corporatization of universities was identified as a major threat to the American university at the AAUP National meeting last week.

COMMITTEE LIAISON REPORTS

AAAC-

Professor Riles moved that SACUA endorses the AAAC study of student academic success proposed in distributed item 6 (Meerkov seconded).

Professors Seabury and Potter expressed concern about the use of the word "preference" in paragraph 2 of the Methodology section. They said the word is politically charged and potentially linked with affirmative action. Both said that they were nonetheless in favor of collecting the data and having the study going forward. Professor Riles replied that he did not know that "preference" is a charged word.

Professor Frier said that he was not sure that the study alone would be able to make recommendations without taking into account other political and policy considerations. Professor Meerkov pointed out that SACUA has seen many recommendations that are made without any data at all. He noted that the recommendations would not be binding, and that it was wrong to suppress people's opinions.

Professor Riles noted that IRB exemption had been granted based on the current wording of the document, and that altering its language at this stage could only cause fruitless delay. Professor Giordani said that he was reluctant to support putting SACUA's endorsement on the study on behalf of Senate Assembly because he felt that the data collection and analysis plan should be better formulated, particularly given the other concerns already noted by other SACUA members. Professor Riles replied that the full AAAC has endorsed the study. Professor Giordani said that he had no problem with the AAAC proceeding with it.

Professor Riles asked that the active motion be placed to the table. All members signaled approval of the motion to place to table.

PREPARATION FOR MEETING WITH PROVOST

SACUA members prepared for their agenda topics with the new provost.

VISIT OF PROVOST T. SULLIVAN

The provost and K. Gibbons arrived at 3:00 P.M. The provost reported that she had chaired her first meeting with the Academic Programs Group (APG) earlier in the day. Later this week she would experience her first meeting with the Board of Regents.

Chair Smith asked the provost to share three principles of administration that she had previously described to her staff. Provost Sullivan replied:

1. Never surprise an administrator. She said the rule had a corollary: Don't shoot the messenger who brings bad news.
2. Identify the resources and get control. The most valuable of university resources is time, particularly the time of faculty, because the reputation of the university rests with its faculty.
3. Don't leave anybody out who should be at the table.

Chair Smith asked whether this meant that a SACUA representative would again be welcome to attend meetings of the APG. The provost replied that she would approach that goal incrementally. She said there was a spirited discussion in APG this morning, and that she did not think the deans would have been as candid if a faculty representative was present. Still, she said, she would appreciate having a SACUA representative bring faculty governance perspectives and questions to the APG meetings from time to time. She said she planned to form a student advisory group and would like to bring a representative from that group to SACUA meetings from time to time.

Professor Frier asked whether the new provost plans to include faculty members in decision-making by the administration. Provost Sullivan said yes, but that faculty express themselves in very different ways. She added that she would consider SACUA to be a sounding board. She commented further that with the impending promotion season she wants to place all the guidelines for promotion procedures on the provost website so that there are no surprises about what is needed.

Academic Success Study-

Professor Riles explained that the AAAC has voted to conduct a study of possible predictors of undergraduate academic success at the U-M, working from existing data in the possession of undergraduate admissions and the registrar. Provost Sullivan commented that the topic was an area of her own interest and scholarship; she cautioned that it is very difficult to specify the model properly. She offered by way of example the fact that students are admitted to the School of Music based on auditions, but that there is no quantitative data available about each audition. She suggested that in such a case, multiple linear regressions specifying independent variables as the set of known quantitative data might produce statistically significant coefficients for spurious reasons. She added that ambiguities of interpretation were likely, as well. She cited differing opinion about the meaning of academic success at the University of Texas by students who graduated in the top 10% of their high school classes. She said that she

would be happy to discuss her experience and concerns with the subcommittee charged with conducting the study.

Professor Riles said that so far the subcommittee has asked for high school GPAs, class rank, the U-M's ranking of high school competitiveness, and ideally something about the high school curricula. He said that everyone involved agrees that the study should be approached without preconceptions. The provost pointed out that the holistic admission scheme used at the U-M for 3 years has elements that are not numerical, including essays and letters of recommendation. She added that most registrars purge data on students not admitted after a year, for privacy concerns, and so the only information available would likely be for students who accepted admission.

Professor Riles said that he understood the Office of General Counsel was drawing up a Memorandum of Understanding regarding the student data. He expressed concern that the intent was to restrict dissemination of the study results from the full faculty, who are charged under Regents' Bylaws with duties that include student admissions. The provost said that she understood the study was considered quality assessment rather than research, and that is why it has been given exemption from IRB review. Professor Riles replied that he did not view the study in the same way that he viewed his disciplinary research, and that he did not envision it being published in peer-reviewed national or international journals. But, he said, as a scientist he is accustomed to making hypotheses and testing them against data to learn new things. He said that not all members of the subcommittee share the same hypotheses, and that the study offered a chance to test alternative hypotheses about indicators of student academic success. Professor Potter added that the study will be a good opportunity to study the successes and failures of admissions practices; he said no one knows what they will find until they examine the data. Professor Giordani pointed out that too often there seems to be reticence to collect or look at program evaluation data at the University. The provost responded that she has no problem with data based decision making. Chair Smith added that there are many perceptions that are not necessarily supported by data.

Gender Identity and Expression-

Professor Frier called attention to distributed item 4 from the Triangle Foundation, which he identified as the largest politically active gay advocacy community in Michigan. He expressed concern that the organization is targeting the U-M undeservedly. He said that the last two provosts have been responsive, and that changing the Regents Bylaws is out of their hands. He expressed hope that recent successes would not unravel. Provost Sullivan replied that she has reviewed material provided by interim provost Gramlich to SACUA. She agreed that substantial effort has been made, but that evidently such is not considered news. Professor Frier suggested that an independent group conduct a study to document the status of implementation. The provost said that further steps could be taken, including an update on the provost's website.

Public Perceptions of the Professoriate-

Professor Smith reported that an AAUP study and report about public perceptions of the professoriate appears in the 16 June issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education. He said the study found that professors rank second in public esteem, below physicians, whereas politicians are at the bottom.

Women in Higher Education-

Chair Smith reported that the recent annual meeting of AAUP featured a panel discussion of women in higher education. He noted that the Chronicle of Higher Education also included an article about the tenure debate at the U-M. He noted that Sullivan has written an essay about tenure and women in the professoriate (distributed item 9). The provost stated that it might be useful to conduct an anonymous questionnaire asking recent recipients of tenure at the U-M whether they used the flexible policies already available to them. She cited anecdotal concern that women do not take advantage of existing flexibilities out of fear that it will be held against them by senior faculty. Chair Smith suggested that any real or imagined stigma could readily be eliminated by declaring it mandatory for women to be given leave if pregnant, unless they explicitly decline to do so. The provost asked whether male partners should share in the policy. The chair said that he assumed that would be fine, too.

The provost commented that in the life sciences there is virtual parity in production of Ph.D.s between males and females, but that only about 30% of the assistant professors hired are women. She said the reason was unknown, but there may be a perception that universities are not family friendly. She added that females with Ph.D.s are not dropping out of the work force. She suggested one approach could be to hire in tenured women who have been in national laboratories or industry.

Corporatization of the U-M-

Professor Meerkov remarked that over the last 20 years he has noticed that the university has been modeling itself more and more closely to private corporate businesses, in that decisions are handed down without consultation and faculty are expected not to question the decisions. The provost replied that universities are much more regulated now, with advent of IRBs, elaborate accounting on grants, state regulations, compliance issues, and student services which are now provided by non-faculty professional staff. She said that more and more university activity is being conducted by people without academic backgrounds. But, she said, there are still many ways in which universities are different from corporations: they have stakeholders rather than shareholders; and prestige is measured by the selectivity at which they confer degrees, not by larger numbers.

Professor Meerkov said that his concern is about decision making, including in the search and selection of administrators. He noted that unit executive committees are selected administratively, and that they are not necessarily composed of the people who earned the highest vote totals in unit "elections." To remedy these deficiencies, he said, faculty governance has brought forward two initiatives for shared governance, one at the unit level and one at the institutional level. Provost Sullivan responded that faculty differ a great deal in how much they want to be involved in governance, but that most interest is at the department and unit level. She said that she was reluctant to think that one size fits all. Professor Meerkov inquired about the provost's attitude toward faculty involvement in governance. The provost replied that she had no problem with the principle, but that the mechanism of such involvement could be problematic. Professor Meerkov said that he understood the faculty role to be advisory. The provost replied that she agreed, in general, but that there are some matters, such as hiring new faculty, where the role is much more than advisory.

The guests left the meeting at 3:57 P.M. A recess was declared.

VISIT OF ABIGAIL STEWART

The guest joined the meeting at 4:05 P.M. Members engaged in a round of introductions.

ADVANCE Project-

Professor Stewart reviewed the history of a 5 year NSF grant (distributed item 5) and said that the U-M has committed to a 5-year follow-on from internal funds. Professor Potter asked where women with Ph.D.s go if they choose not to enter academics. Professor Stewart replied that there was no single destination; she added that women tend to leave science in larger proportions than do men. Professor Potter asked if there were greater positive incentives outside of academe. Professor Stewart said there is no single factor, but that at national labs, for example, the career paths seem more clear. Professor MacAdam asked whether women pick different dissertation topics than do men. Professor Stewart replied that, while this is still a controversial issue among scholars, data suggest women are more likely to operate on the margins of their fields and to be interdisciplinary.

Professor Riles said that he had come to understand that money has been set aside in the provost's office for hiring women, and he asked to learn more. Professor Stewart replied that she has no such pool of funds, and that she was never aware of any pools in either the LSA dean's office or in the office of the provost. She said there is money to increase the diversity of the faculty, however. She said that none of the faculty hiring initiatives have anything to do with ADVANCE.

Professor Riles remarked that in nearly every example he knew, the U-M offer to a female candidate in Physics was topped elsewhere. He said it seems there is pipeline issue, mainly at the undergraduate level. Professor Stewart replied that it was true in physics, but was not the case in biology. There, she said, the problem is that two postdoctoral fellowships are generally needed before hiring. Professor Riles suggested that careful study and comprehension could prevent decisions from being misdirected.

Professor Meerkov asked what conclusions and recommendations have resulted from the \$4.75M NSF study. Professor Stewart replied that there are different remedies for different fields, but that there is a universal need to address climate issues. Professor Meerkov suggested that funding provided by the NSF suggests that science deserves a role in study outcomes, and he said that the most fundamental scientific principle at hand was the theory that there is existence of a solution. Professor Stewart replied that she believes solutions exist, and that climate can be changed.

Chair Smith asked about the effect of clinical track appointments in the Medical School for women in the professoriate. Professor Stewart responded that women may choose the clinical track if they think there is no hope whatsoever in the tenure track. She added that her climate surveys indicated that the climate is similar, but poor, in both tracks. Chair Smith asked whether the number of women in the tenure track would increase if the clinical track eliminated. Professor Stewart said "yes."

Professor Stewart explained that she was concerned with the rigidity of the tenure clock. She said that she is on the Weiss-McDonald flexible tenure committee, and that she strongly supports the recommendations of the committee. Many members of SACUA asked if she thought it was possible to change rigidity without changing the time of the probationary period. Professor Stewart replied "maybe," and that she could support such a proposal as long as it was completely transparent. Professor Potter pointed out that concentrating on the tenure clock does not address the fundamental issue. Professor Stewart acknowledged that most of the time it is the chair that is the obstacle, and that sometimes these problematic issues add up to more than 2 years of potential delay. She said she would favor stopping the clock for however long it takes.

Professor Stewart said that she believes the U-M is losing really qualified women who give up, but that it is losing less qualified men. Professor Potter suggested that if the provost's committee would take the tenure clock off the table and focus on climate, a more productive discussion could emerge. Professor Stewart replied that she understood, and saw the point.

Professor Riles said that SACUA understands that the Weiss-McDonald flexible tenure committee plans to stick by its original decision to change the tenure clock. He asked if the committee would record a vote. Professor Stewart replied that the committee has never voted, but that it could. She said that the committee has operated by consensus. Professor Riles asked what the committee considered to be the LSA opinion. Professor Stewart replied that opinion was variable across departments. Professor Riles pointed out that according to AEC responses, of 175 who responded, 54% strongly disapproved or disapproved of the Weiss-McDonald proposals, and that in the College of Engineering, 58% of responding faculty disapproved. Professor Stewart replied that the AEC responses will be reported and addressed in the Weiss-McDonald report. She added that the committee never saw itself as an implementation committee. She said that initially it saw its role as sponsoring enabling legislation that would permit others to respond further, but that its role has evolved. Professor Frier said that the committee should specify an array of situations with explanations of how its recommendations would work in each case. Professor Giordani added that the proposals seem to give increased power to the individual deans, but that there must be some central oversight and assurance of clarity, reasonableness, and fairness across units.

Professor Meerkov asked whether the ADVANCE research found evidence of discrimination against women. Professor Stewart replied "yes." Professor Meerkov suggested that it is much easier to create a system that eliminates discrimination than to change undefined "climate."

The guest left the meeting at 5:06 P.M.

REGENTS COMMUNICATION

SACUA members suggested that the chair write the draft of the July communication and circulate it to the body.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

There was no old or new business.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The meeting entered executive session at 5:08 P.M. The chair reported on his meeting with Regent Deitch. Committee nominations were also discussed. The meeting returned to open session at 5:15 P.M.

ACTION OF SACUA 061206-1 Professor Seabury moved endorsement of the resolution drafted by Dearborn joint benefits committee (distributed item 7). Professor Frier seconded. The action was approved by unanimous vote.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

John 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.