

Minutes of 14 November 2005  
Circulated 16 November 2005  
Re-Circulated 5 December 2005  
Approved 19 December 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](http://www.sacua.umich.edu)

Approved Minutes: [www.sacua.umich.edu/sacua/sacua-minutes.html](http://www.sacua.umich.edu/sacua/sacua-minutes.html)

**MINUTES OF THE SACUA MEETING OF 14 NOVEMBER 2005**

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

**Absent:** None

**Guests:** E. Gramlich, K. Gibbons, R. Krasny, K. Herold, I. Robinson, D. Winsor, C. DeLeon, J. Frumkin

**MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED:**

1. Draft Agenda
2. Draft Minutes of the SACUA meeting of 7 November 2005
3. Academic Programs Group Agenda, 10 November 2005
4. Electronic mail message from T. Schneider to E. M. Gramlich, dated 9 November 2005, regarding questions for SACUA meeting of 14 November 2005
5. Electronic mail message from J. Zorn to J. Lehman, dated 3 November 2005, regarding SACUA minutes of 31 October 2005
6. Report of the Committee to Consider a More Flexible Tenure Probationary Period, dated 30 June 2005
7. Letter to B. Giordani from J. E. Kurland, dated 15 September 2005, regarding initial AAUP response to U-M tenure proposals
8. Draft agenda for Senate Assembly meeting of 21 November 2005
9. SACUA/Senate Assembly Planning Schedule, updated 14 November 2005
10. SACUA Office Position Description, dated 1 September 2005
11. Memorandum dated 14 October 2005 regarding Position Opening- Faculty Senate Office (SACUA)
12. Job Posting No. T-048455-DW; 100229 Admin Coord/Project Coord; Department: SACUA; Post Begin/End Date: 11/02/2005//11/17/2005

Chair Giordani convened the meeting at 2:06 P.M.; the draft agenda was modified at request of Professor Lehman.

**STAFFING OF FACULTY SENATE OFFICE**

Professor Lehman said that he had come across item 12, a job posting for the Faculty Senate Office, with end date listed three days hence. He asked that SACUA reopen its discussion of the organization and staffing of the faculty senate office, postponed from March and April of the previous year pending budget notification. Chair Giordani said that he would provide the current budget at the next meeting, and that no staffing appointments would occur pending committee discussions.

#### CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

Action on the minutes of 7 November 2005 was postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS/UPDATES

The chair announced that he and the vice chair held a scheduled private meeting with interim provost Gramlich. The meeting focused mainly on proposed changes to tenure policy and the haste with which they are being pursued.

#### VISIT OF INTERIM PROVOST GRAMLICH

Tenure Policy-

The guest and K. Gibbons arrived at 2:30 P.M. Professor Smith thanked the provost for agreeing to meet with Professor R. O'Neil prior to the December meeting of the Senate Assembly, at which proposals from the provost's tenure committee would be discussed. Chair Giordani expressed the view that elected faculty representatives need the opportunity to respond to whatever final changes are proposed by the provost's committee and that the provost might plan to bring to the President and the Regents. He added that it would have been a better example of shared governance from the outset if the former provost had solicited formal faculty governance involvement at the committee formulation stage rather than seeking it after a report had been generated. Provost Gramlich said that he is not inherently opposed to changes proposed by the faculty. He added that if proposed changes are significant, he would not be averse to another round of comment and feedback, but he said that several months have already been expended in such consultation. SACUA members pointed out that the committee report had been issued on 30 June 2005, during the summer when most of faculty governance was in recess.

Professor Smith stated that central administration recommendations to the Regents ought to be submitted to the Senate Assembly for their consent. The provost expressed reticence at the word "consent," saying that it seemed to imply that the Assembly could exercise veto power over the administration. He said that he viewed the landscape as consisting of 20 units, being 19 colleges plus central faculty governance. He said that at the unit level, deans represent their faculty. Professor Smith replied that there are many examples in actuality where deans do not reflect the prevailing opinions of the unit faculty. Chair Giordani added that because the proposals affect more than one unit, they fall within the purview of the University Senate and Senate Assembly. He said that perspectives that span the units are needed. Professor Lehman cited Regents' Bylaws that authorize the Senate Assembly to make its recommendations directly to the Board of Regents. He said that a situation might arise in which the elected representatives of the faculty make their direct recommendation contrary to that of the administration. The provost agreed that such an eventuality would be awkward, but he acknowledged that he could not tell the Assembly not to take its positions to the Regents.

Professor Zorn predicted that if the tenure proposal goes forward now, discussion will be vigorous in January and February, but will not come to conclusion by the end of the Winter Term. He proposed that any changes be targeted for final action by Spring 2007. The provost responded that he would agree not to take any proposals changing tenure conditions to the Regents during the summer, but would rather wait until Fall 2006. He added that he would likely no longer be serving as interim provost by that time; he said that candidates for provost were being interviewed currently.

Professor Gull expressed support for Professor Zorn's proposal. He said that the provost's tenure committee plans to reconvene around 1 March 2006, and that he did not expect a revised report to go back to the faculty by the end of the academic year. The provost replied that the proposal did sound reasonable. He said that he and Karen Gibbons would consult and write something as a memorandum for reference. Professor Lehman said that many units actually have very reasonable policies for dealing with extensions to the tenure clock for well defined reasons. He suggested that adoption of these policies across units could resolve existing concerns without any need to amend Regents' Bylaw 5.09. The provost agreed that alternative resolutions were indeed conceivable.

Professor Seabury asked how the provost would proceed if there was no consensus in the feedback from multiple sources. Provost Gramlich replied that if it were still his decision to make, he would be inclined to seek additional advice. He added that it would be helpful if faculty governance comments were aggregated into one document. Professor Krasny asked if the provost has authority to grant exceptions to the 8 year maximum probationary period cited in Regents' Bylaw 5.09. The provost replied that he did not know because the subject has not come up during the two months he has been on the job. Ms. Gibbons responded that deans can petition to stop a clock under certain circumstances. Professor Smith pointed to explicit policy statements by the College of Engineering and LSA for extensions of the tenure clock. Chair Giordani said that he was told the Medical School has no parallel policy because they say they adhere to the Standard Practice Guide.

#### Provost Search-

Professor Meerkov asked what role the faculty is playing in the selection of a new provost and chief academic officer. Provost Gramlich replied that the matter is in the hands of the president. He said that he knew that a list of candidates had been transmitted to the president, and that he is meeting with candidates as they visit to interview; he added that he is not a candidate in the permanent search.

#### Business School Buildings-

Professor Meerkov asked what role the faculty had played in the decision to demolish two buildings used by the Business School. The provost replied that he would find out and provide the requested information. He added that he knew that faculty inside the School had been consulted and that most are strong supporters of the decision.

Chair Giordani asked where the money for these activities is coming from. The provost replied that Mr. Steve Ross has provided at least half of the funding, and that the rest comes from other private sources. He added that maintenance costs are also factored in, at about 10% per

year of construction cost; those costs are defrayed either through a pool of donations that is dedicated to continuing costs or by agreement to use a portion of future donations for that purpose.

#### University Physical Plant-

Professor Smith asked who owns the physical plant of the university. The provost replied that owing to the constitutional autonomy of the university, it owns its buildings, but that he was not prepared to describe the specific role of the Regents. Professor Seabury asked if it was true that the U-M has the largest footprint of any university in the U.S. The provost replied that yes, the U-M has the largest number of buildings. Professor Smith asked what proportion of its budget is applied to heating costs. The provost said that the amount is significant, such that one-third of the new money received from the State will have to be used for heating costs. He added that the amount budgeted for heating in 2006 was underestimated by \$5 million.

The guests left the meeting at 3:20 P.M.

#### VISIT OF LEO REPRESENTATIVES

Guests from the Lecturers' Employee Organization (LEO) arrived at 3:25 P.M. After a round of introductions, Chair Giordani asked whether LEO wishes to conduct an evaluation of university administrators using the on-line system developed by the AEC, as had been discussed at the last SACUA and Senate Assembly meetings. Dr. Robinson said that the LEO governing council has discussed the subject and sees the only potential drawback to be the amount of time required. Dr. Winsor said that the main thing needed from LEO is a current, accurate database of valid members. Professor Smith asked why the university administration could not supply the database. Dr. Herold replied that LEO has continuing members who may not be employed at the moment, and a rapidly changing membership. Dr. DeLeon said that LEO would have the best handle on its membership list by December, and that would be the idea time to conduct evaluations.

Dr. Robinson informed SACUA that LEO is working on a report aimed at improving undergraduate education, and that some of the proposals might require resources or changes in university policy. He said LEO would be working with student representatives about tuition issues and with national educational organizations, including the AFT, on state and national funding. He said that LEO was also trying to organize its members in response to the ballot initiative to eliminate affirmative action.

Dr. Herold said that both LEO and university administrators are still learning how to operate within the terms of the existing contract. She said that there were significant problems in particular with LSA stemming perhaps from the fact that there was no representation from the dean's office on the bargaining team. She said that the recent job-mapping initiative by Human Resources has caused great confusion. She explained that there are two Lecturer tracks, and that LSA is denying access to the Lecturer 3-4 track to people who are clearly doing more than strictly teaching classes. The issue is now in a grievance process, with 15 to 20 people grieving their classification. She said that binding arbitration would be the next step if resolution could not be achieved. She said a second issue of contention is that LSA wants to wait a year after the department completes its review of a lecturer before a raise is granted. Thirdly, she said, is the

LSA effort to 'harmonize' workloads. She said that what the effort amounts to in practice is that people previously paid on an overload basis are no longer being paid extra, but their workloads are not reduced.

Dr. Herold also described other developments across the campus that seem aimed at reducing protections afforded by the LEO contract. She said that the dean of the School of Art and Design is instituting programmatic change to eliminate the need for lecturers in that unit by using visiting artists and other groups. She said that Nursing and other units are attempting to move people from LEO into the clinical ranks by saying that they teach in the hospital. LEO is contesting the move because the lecturers have no role in patient care or clinical duties.

Professor Seabury asked what fraction of lecturers belong to LEO. Dr. DeLeon said that membership is 70% university-wide, but is variable across units.

The guests left the meeting at 4:00 P.M. A recess was declared until 4:05 P.M.

#### AEC EVALUATION PERIOD

---

##### ACTION OF SACUA 111405-1

Professor Meerkov moved that SACUA recommends to the AEC that it should extend the period for faculty evaluation of administrators until 23 November (Gull seconded).

Discussion of the Active Motion- SACUA members pointed out that the initial e-mailing of notice that evaluations were commencing had inadvertently omitted the subject line. Professor Lehman agreed, and acknowledged that numerous respondents had complained that the message was filtered out by e-mail software.

Number Approving - 6 Number Disapproving - 0 Number Abstaining - 1

---

EXECUTIVE SESSION The meeting entered executive session at 4:20 P.M. Topics included the Senate office budget, staffing, and office structure. The meeting interrupted executive session to entertain a motion.

---

##### ACTIVE MOTION OF SACUA

Professor Lehman moved that SACUA establishes a subcommittee to review the structure, staffing, and budget of the Faculty Senate office with the goal of making it an optimal support structure for faculty governance at the U-M. (Meerkov seconded).

Chair Giordani asked that the meeting re-enter executive session for further discussion of the Active Motion and personnel issues, which was agreed to by the SACUA membership.

---

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 P.M. by majority vote without action on the Active Motion.

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.

###