

Minutes of 12 September 2005
Circulated 13 September 2005
Re-Circulated 26 September 2005
Approved 3 October 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 12 SEPTEMBER 2005

Present: Combi, Giordani (Chair), Gull, Lehman, Meerkov, Seabury, Smith, Younker, Zorn;
Leu, Schneider

Absent: None

Guests: K. Bergquist, E. M. Gramlich, R. Krasny

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED

1. Proposed agenda
2. Draft minutes of the SACUA meeting of 27 June 2005
3. Draft minutes of the SACUA meeting of 29 August 2005
4. Electronic mail message from T. Schneider to E. M. Gramlich, dated 8 Sep 2005, regarding topics for Monday's SACUA meeting
5. Letter to S. Masten from S. M. Hollar and C. O. Frost, dated 7 Sep 2005, regarding possible membership for assistant librarians in the University Senate
6. Criteria based approach to shared university governance, approved by Senate Assembly 18 April 2005
7. Standard Practice Guide 201.65-1, 15 Jul 2005: Conflicts of Interest and Conflicts of Commitment
8. Model Policy for Conflict of Interest/Conflict of Commitment, Draft 1.0
9. Model Policy for Conflict of Interest/Conflict of Commitment, Draft 2.1
10. Model Policy for Conflict of Interest/Conflict of Commitment, Draft 3
11. Model Policy for Conflict of Interest/Conflict of Commitment, Draft 4
12. Report of the Committee to Consider a More Flexible Tenure Probationary Period, dated 30 June 2005
13. Principles of Faculty Involvement in Institutional & Academic Unit Governance at the University of Michigan

Chair Giordani convened the meeting at 2:06 P.M. The draft agenda was adopted.

ANNOUNCEMENTS/UPDATES

Chair Giordani announced:

1. The chair and vice chair met privately with both the president and the interim provost during scheduled monthly meetings.
2. Following SACUA's motion of September 5, 2005 to request to President Coleman, she has directed that action on the role of the Academic Performance Committee be removed from the Regents' agenda pending further review and deliberation by the APC.
3. The president is aware of the report advocating extension of the tenure probationary period (distributed item 12) and she anticipates faculty discussion during the coming weeks and months.
4. Concerns about features of the faculty grievance process were discussed with the provost, including the potential role of the provost in an upcoming appeal to that office.
5. Faculty concerns about Conflict of Interest/Conflict of Commitment policy (distributed item 7) were discussed.
6. Chair Giordani and Vice Chair Gull distributed a number of items to the provost as background to ongoing discussions in SACUA and Senate Assembly. These included:
 - a. Copies of AEC results and the AEC report
 - b. The criterion based university governance document (distributed item 6).
 - c. A copy of "Principles of Faculty Involvement..." (distributed item 13) Copies of APC documents associated with proposed Regent's bylaw changes

PREPARATION FOR GUESTS

SACUA members reviewed topics and background for discussion with the interim provost.

VISIT OF INTERIM PROVOST GRAMLICH

The interim provost and Karen Gibbons arrived at 2:28 P.M. SACUA members extended welcome to the provost and introduced themselves. Chair Giordani invited provost Gramlich to offer remarks and to respond to a list of topics developed by SACUA.

Background-

Interim provost Gramlich explained that he had been a faculty member, department chair, and director of the School of Public Policy (subsequently the Ford School of Public Policy) over a span of 20 years, and that he had subsequently served on the Federal Reserve for 8 years. He was contacted by both the president and former provost Courant regarding the possibility of returning to the U-M in the role of interim provost, and he agreed. While in Washington, D.C., he stayed in touch with university events by means of the *University Record*.

Perspective on Current Issues-

Interim provost Gramlich shared some initial thoughts. He noted that financial resources are constrained but that it seems possible to manage within those constraints and not lose vitality. The deans seem upbeat, and they project "can-do" attitudes. He pointed out that a Conflict of Interest statement has been promulgated in the form of an SPG (distributed item 7) and that all units are required to produce specific COI policies that are consistent with the central university policy.

Provost Gramlich explained that when he was a dean here in early 1990s it seemed that the tenure guidelines were rigid and that sometimes decisions had to be made before the time was right. He referred to distributed item 12 and asked SACUA to collate their response

regarding alteration of the probationary period, and to articulate a common position on each point.

The interim provost said that he has reviewed the results of the faculty evaluation of administrators (AEC results from 2004) and that some of the outcomes were not what he would have predicted. He said he was not yet sure exactly how the information would be used. He cited an analogy within his personal experience with the periodic appraisal of deans that occurred during his previous tenure in the School of Public Policy. He added that he has been on the job for a mere two weeks and that time has been consumed by a few specific issues.

Professor Meerkov asked the provost if he viewed the evaluations of administrators as a useful exercise. Provost Gramlich replied in the affirmative, and that he sees them as comparable to the 360-degree evaluation now common in industry. Professor Seabury remarked that higher response rates were desirable and the provost agreed. Professor Lehman suggested that participation would rise if the provost would urge the deans to encourage their own unit faculty to engage with the process. The provost indicated that he did not want to commit now to such a lobbying effort, but he said that he would encourage the deans, noting that the evaluations may help them to do their jobs.

Role of Central Faculty Governance-

The interim provost said that he was mindful of the distinctions between unit and central governance within the university. He said that he recognized the role of governance that extends across unit lines but that it was important not to infringe on unit prerogatives. Chair Giordani pointed to the COI/COC policy (distributed item 7) and observed that faculty have expressed the need to have an appeals process outside single units and that the existing grievance process may not be suitable for such an appeal. He noted that there is a basic time issue to many COI/COC issues. Chair Giordani also discussed the grievance process, in general, in terms of issues that have come to SACUA's attention. These include cases in which the Grievance Review Board (GRB) finds in favor of a faculty member, but the unit dean disputes the finding or does not act on it. Provost Gramlich replied that concerns about grievance procedures are not confined to the faculty; he said that people within the administration are likewise not entirely satisfied with the existing process. Professor Lehman inquired about the nature of the issues of concern to the administration, and specifically whether they concerned either fairness or control. The interim provost acknowledged that the concern was not that the administration lacked enough control.

Ongoing and Emerging Directions-

The interim provost said that a number of changes are evident to him about the campus today. For one thing, a great deal of construction is underway, which has many implications. Part of that construction is intended simply to keep up with the times. A lot of the activity is financed by private donations. He noted that private donations are playing a much larger role than in the past. One consequence, he said, is that a greater part of a dean's role involves raising money. He said that some may lament that reality, but if we do not pursue those funds, we risk falling behind. He asked that faculty recognize the new reality in their evaluations of the deans.

Provost Gramlich said that the campus is more diverse now than when he left, and that he supports the change. He added that it is hard for him to assess faculty morale, but based on conversations with faculty colleagues, he does not think that morale is worse, and that maybe it is better.

Professor Smith asked the provost to react to the premise that the Life Sciences Initiative was a gamble and that it is doubtful that the U-M won that gamble. He acknowledged that the LSI has been criticized. He said that he is hopeful it will be something to be proud of.

Professor Lehman cited a report by the Budget Study Committee which concluded that annual building upkeep costs average about 5% of the original construction cost each year, but that the upkeep costs have not routinely been factored into operating budgets. The interim provost replied that those costs should be factored in but that he did not know exactly how these costs have been handled. He said that he would look into it.

Health Care and Other Benefits-

The interim provost asked about the prevailing attitudes toward health benefits. Professor Smith pointed out that there have been two different surveys on the subject, one of them conducted by the PBM (Prescription Benefit Manager) Caremark and the other by the Senate Assembly. He cited flaws and bias in the Caremark survey, which was self-promoting. The Senate Assembly survey unearthed widespread dissatisfaction.

Chair Giordani described additional Senate Assembly efforts to improve the quality and accessibility of childcare, and that progress seems to be underway.

Tenure and the Non-Tenure Track-

Professor Zorn asked the interim provost if he imagined that the time to tenure should be different according to academic field. Provost Gramlich replied that it was hard to set different time expectations within LSA, for example. He said that each School will probably have a normal expectation, and have deviations from expectation for various reasons. He commented that in some disciplines, it seems to take longer to develop a reputation than in others. If there are good reasons for slowing the tenure clock for a particular candidate, then the option should be open. He added that nobody will try to standardize time to tenure between LSA and Medicine because they are in different markets.

Professor Smith asked the interim provost to comment about the growth of non-tenure track faculty. The provost acknowledged that the growth was a change from his past experience. Gramlich asked how faculty viewed the trend. Professor Smith observed that the lecturers have now unionized. He explained that clinical faculty, given the time-limited nature of their appointments and the need for re-appointment, do not see themselves as having the ability to disagree and argue strongly with administration. Professor Smith said that a fundamental academic freedom issue was at stake because non-tenure track instructors cannot speak out against unfair or unreasoned practices. Professor Lehman noted that the vitality of the institution was being eroded because given their short time horizons, the temporary instructors necessarily put less effort into long term curriculum development and department reputation than do those who expect to spend their careers in that environment. Chair Giordani added that clinical faculty,

given the nature of their appointments, may not hold the same allegiance to their positions, as do tenure track faculty, as clinical faculty can be more readily hired by other institutions. This issue of loyalty to the institution has been noted by AAUP.

Role of Faculty in Decision Making-

Chair Giordani pointed out that faculty want to feel a part of the decision process and that this has benefits to all sides. He noted that at times there seems to be a climate of expediency in decision making that may avoid the faculty. He cited the example of the Registrar who had attended a meeting for the AAAC to discuss the computerized grading system. At the end of the meeting, the Registrar remarked at how helpful and fruitful the experience had been. When asked if he had held similar faculty forums and discussions before the software had initially been developed, he remarked that he had only met with unit office and administrative personnel, but would now engage regularly with AAAC.

Professor Meerkov referred to the Shared University Governance Initiative and explained that it was not intended to infringe on administration rights, but rather was intended to produce better decisions. He noted that many decisions are made by faculty within units with faculty involvement, but that other decisions are made outside the units and that faculty involvement is vital there, as well. Several SACUA members pointed out to the provost that election to executive committee membership is not a clear process in all the schools. The interim provost asked if SACUA intends to make a systematic study of unit governance. Professor Meerkov replied affirmatively that such a taskforce has been proposed. The interim provost asked if SACUA intends to make a systematic study of unit governance. Professor Meerkov replied affirmatively. Chair Giordani raised the issue of hiring practices across the units. He noted that some faculty have pointed out that deans may not always be securing appropriate faculty input for tenure-track hires. Provost Gramlich responded that it would be helpful if SACUA conducted a study of current University hiring practices.

Response to Hurricane Katrina-

Professor Seabury pointed out that some units are interested in finding places for students displaced by the recent hurricane, and he suggested that these students be allowed to study here while paying tuition to their home institutions, which need the funds to rebuild. The interim provost replied that Regents' Bylaws require the U-M to charge tuition to all students, but that those expenses are being defrayed through grants and financial aid. He cited cases in which undergraduates are currently enrolled under NCFD (non candidate for degree) status, as well as the fact that two displaced faculty members have been hired and are teaching courses this term. He said that arrangements are even more diverse in the graduate school.

The provost explained that the U-M does not have a formal relationship with Tulane, so we cannot know what they will do. He added, however, that president Coleman wants it to be clear that the U-M is not trying to recruit students away from Tulane. Professor Smith asked if there was any federal money that could be used to help these academic efforts. The provost replied that the students can apply for federal aid if they are qualified for it.

Provost Gramlich pointed out that many additional efforts and initiatives are underway. For example, the School of Public Health is planning to incorporate public health

activities at the affected sites into the student curriculum. He said that the U-M put together a big effort in a short time, and that all should be proud of that fact. SACUA members expressed agreement. Professor Younker commented that the School of Music presented a benefit concert recently and that it had been well attended.

The guests left the meeting at 3:28 P.M.

VISIT OF AAAC CHAIR

Chair Giordani invited Professor Krasny to join SACUA discussions at 3:30 P.M. Giordani reviewed a list of potential agenda items that SACUA wished to place before the committee. These included:

- 1) Shared University Governance- perhaps a revision of distributed item 13 Student Course Evaluations, in coordination with the Student Relations Advisory Committee. This might be divided into two steps. One, directed by AAAC, would review the uses of Student Course Evaluations in such areas as promotion and merit salary, as well as other situations. The other approach, spearheaded by Student Relations would involve a review of the questions and the mechanics of how forms are collected and processed, as well as whether the on-line process seems reasonable;
- 2) Potential expansion of University Senate membership to include clinical faculty and assistant librarians;
- 3) Reaction to distributed item 12 regarding potential extension of the probationary tenure period. Feedback is required by January; the tenure report does not speak to the importance of tenure, for example;
- 4) IRB (Institutional Review Board) issues, mainly including concerns from faculty doing research involving human subjects, but some issues about animal research, too. This should be a joint effort with RPC (Research Policies Committee). This may be a good topic to engage with the new vice president for research.

Professor Krasny responded that the RPC is very far along on the IRB topic and they report the intention of concluding their work by December. He said that the AAAC cannot realistically expect to match that time frame. Instead, it seems that the initiative is coming from the School of Medicine, and that it should be possible to find a likely liaison from within AAAC who can work with RPC. Chair Giordani noted that LS&A faculty, including, for example, a faculty member in the psychology department have expressed significant concerns. Chair Giordani pointed out the importance of including AAAC input into this question, as it had been a charge to the committee last year by Provost Courant who was responding to LS&A faculty concerns. Also, as the RPC is advisory to OVPR that covers IRB, it may be important to broaden the review beyond that committee alone.

Professor Meerkov pointed out that SACUA was expecting to receive a report about Shared University Governance from AAAC by December, but that if the committee has too much on its plate a new plan will have to be constructed. Professor Krasny replied that with only two meetings per month to work with, setting a deadline of December for any of the proposed charges would be problematic. Professor Meerkov said that SACUA should perhaps, therefore, set up a taskforce for the governance charge. Chair Giordani pointed out that the AAAC had

originated the blue book some years ago and that it seemed that this committee was a likely place to this issue to be pursued. Professor Smith also noted this, pointing out that the process may take longer, as it may be an involved process to make changes and it had taken several years, originally to secure agreement from all sides, including administration. Professor Meerkov pointed out that SACUA had been in agreement to expect the report by December and this seemed reasonable. Professor Lehman pointed out that at its April meeting the Senate Assembly had charged SACUA with developing an implementation plan for Shared University Governance.

ACTION OF SACUA 091205-1 Professor Lehman moved that SACUA shall establish a task force consisting of members drawn from the AAAC, SACUA, and others as appropriate to fulfill the charge given by the Senate Assembly in April 2005 for implementing the Shared University Governance initiative. (Smith seconded)

Action on the Active Motion-

The motion was approved unanimously.

Professor Smith pointed out that a response to the tenure report could not be delayed. Chair Giordani asked whether SACUA members were willing to collate comments from various sources in response to the tenure report. All SACUA members expressed willingness to do so.

Chair Giordani said that the question of University Senate expansion will also be placed before the AAAC, Rules, and Tenure Committees. Professor Krasny said that the AAAC will consider all of the issues, but that the tenure report will be given highest priority. He explained further that AAAC members have a slate of continuing business items held over from the previous year, and that there is considerable interest in completing them.

Professor Krasny suggested that faculty morale is an important and critical faculty issue. He suggested that a faculty interest survey should perhaps become a regular feature of faculty governance activities. He cited the faculty satisfaction survey conducted within the School of Medicine as a possible model for the campus. Chair Giordani remarked that one issue with the Medicine survey is that it is owned by the administration and therefore the faculty may feel that information they receive is controlled by the administration. He noted that the AEC model may be a better one for such questions. Professor Smith commented that the AEC survey tells a lot about faculty morale, and that it can be modified to be even better. Professor Lehman said that if the AAAC designed a faculty satisfaction survey it could be implemented in the same manner as the AEC evaluations. Professor Seabury pointed out that the School of Social Work has had a climate survey mandated by faculty since the 1970s. However, he said, it was not conducted last year because the unit administration said it had a time limitation.

The guest left the meeting at 4:15 P.M.

SHARED UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE

SACUA members developed a list of candidates to populate the task force authorized by Action 091205-1. Professor Meerkov agreed to serve. Other candidates will be contacted after the meeting.

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

Consideration of the minutes of 27 June 2005 and 29 August 2005 was postponed.

ACTION OF SACUA 091205-2 Professor Smith moved that SACUA shall revert to traditional practice whereby the Senate Secretary shall keep the minutes of SACUA (Meerkov seconded). The action carried with 3 approving, 2 disapproving, and 3 abstaining.

Professor Zorn expressed interest in developing a proposal about digital recording and archival practices for SACUA meetings, but the proposal was placed to the table. SACUA members observed that Senate Assembly meetings are routinely recorded to facilitate accuracy in record keeping. Chair Giordani suggested that as a matter of course and to be clear to faculty, this should, most likely, be stated to the faculty at the Assembly meeting.

COI/COC MODEL POLICY

The agenda item was postponed for action at the next meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

Chair Giordani said that the Academic Performance Committee would be meeting later that day to consider the bylaw revision proposed by the administration.

In response to a letter from LEO expressing concern about hiring practices in the School of Art, Chair Giordani met with an Art School faculty member and ascertained that LEO's concerns may have been misplaced. The hiring process was unusual, but faculty had been involved. It appears that individuals who had been reviewed by faculty had been invited as visiting faculty and then subsequently offers may have been made to them as targets of opportunity.

Establishment of a task force to review unit governance practices was postponed for action until the next meeting.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The meeting entered Executive Session at 4:55 P.M. Members produced additional nominations for the Academic Freedom Lecture visiting professor selection committee, the Military Officer Education Committee, and selected a chair for the Committee for a Multicultural University.

The meeting adjourned at 5:09 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.

###