

Minutes of 22 November 2010
Circulated 24 November 2010
Re-circulated 29 November 2010
Approved 29 November 2010

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

Internet Address: <http://www.umich.edu/~sacua/>
Approved minutes: <http://www.umich.edu/~sacua/sacmin/sacuaminutes.html>

MINUTES OF THE SACUA MEETING OF 22 NOVEMBER 2010

Present: Professors Barald, Frost, Goldman, Kearfott, Lusmann, Navvab, Poe (vice chair), Rothman (chair); Fraser (Secretary); Carr, Schneider

Absent: Professor Lehman

Guests:

Martha Pollack, Vice Provost
Professor Larry Boxer, Chair of the Salary Task Force
Lester Monts, Senior Vice Provost
Katie Merx Sarver, Public Affairs
Jamie Iseler, *the Record* and *The Record Update*
Caitlin Huston, *The Michigan Daily*

Materials Distributed:

Draft Agenda for the 22 November SACUA meeting
Draft Minutes of the 8 November SACUA meeting
Faculty Salary Structure Task Force charge
Faculty Salary Structure Task Force report
Faculty Salary Component Definitions (Medical School)
Faculty Salary Structure Plan (Basic Science Departments)
Committee SACUA Liaison list

The regular meeting of the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs met on the 22nd day of November 2010 in the Regents Room of the Fleming Building, the chair being at the podium and the secretary being present, was convened at 3:15.

3:15 Call to Order/Approval of Agenda and Minutes

Professor Kearfott moved to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

Professor Lusmann moved to approve the minutes as modified. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

Professor Barald moved to approve the minutes of 22 October as they were revised by Provost Hanlon. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

3:16 Guest: Vice Provost Martha Pollack

Professor Pollack is in charge of budgetary affairs for the Provost's office. Her training is as a computer scientist and she has served both in the research and academic worlds. At this University, she started in the School of Engineering. She became Dean of the School of Information from where she was tapped to handle the budget, strategic assessments and space management in the Provost's office. Her research has been about natural language processing, natural image processing, automatic planning and constraint documentation, and the development of artificial technology for people with cognitive impairment.

We asked about issues concerning the expansion of our faculty. Where can we find space for the 150 new faculty members? The University has allocated the space for the 150. We have more classroom space than we need, with only a 46% utilization. We could repurpose some classrooms for laboratory or office space without losing needed capacity.

If the state support had followed the Detroit CPI since FY 2002, our current support would be \$430 million instead of \$316 million. The Detroit CPI is lower than the national CPI or the higher education CPI.

We asked about NCRC space / purpose utilization and the gap between some original announcements for interdisciplinary with outside entities spaces and the current reality. The space allocation for NCRC is under the authority of the medical school, but this is an area that is developing slowly.

The School of Music is constrained by a dearth of practice rooms for students. One plan suggested in previous years was to move faculty to Bates, but this facility has been kept for dormitory space. She had no knowledge of that discussion, but continues to work on space for practice rooms.

We asked about retraining for the mid-forty somethings who are shifting careers in mid life: couldn't we use the summer space in professional schools for non-traditional students? It is extremely difficult to develop even a "break-even" business model to do this. UM can't afford to divert funds from core education for programs that don't carry their own weight. A combination of personnel costs and lack of demand has so far thwarted certificate programs. However, the University is always looking for possibilities.

We questioned about where cuts in budget will take place as part of the cost containment efforts. The University is on track for FY 2010-2012 to reduce by \$100 million and another \$125 million between FY 2013 and 2017. Every dean is asked to cut some money each year, but there is no prioritization other than that the core mission is at the top.

Is the University tracking the total compensation package for faculty, both salary and non-salary? Not to her knowledge, but others may know.

Professor Pollack left at 3:44.

3:45 Guest: Salary Task Force Chair Professor Larry Boxer

Professor Boxer also chairs the Senate Assembly Medical Affairs Advisory Committee. The Salary Task Force found that there has never been any discussion about the correlation of demotion and reduction in salary. In the medical school there is always an expectation of research grant funding and a willingness to teach. If either is reduced, the compensation may be reduced. Faculty members near retirement may reduce their effort and their salary as well. For an issue of performance, chairs may reduce salary by 10-15% per annum. Over a few years, this could result in enough reduction to be the equivalent of the salary of a different rank; this is only for a faculty member who raises a decreasing amount of research funds and who also declines to teach more courses to make up the difference in income generated. In many of the basic science areas, a reduction in grant support was the only basis for reduction in salary. Those areas often have significant teaching loads but have no variable reimbursement for that teaching.

The salary structure plan has been in place in many areas in the medical school for a decade and in a few places for two decades. The offer letter spells out the components of salary but not the salary structure. Questions were raised about the lack of explicit language in the offer letters in describing the basis for a reduction in salary if research funds dry up. We discussed language that might be better.

If this is only a medical school phenomenon, it may not be part of the purview of SACUA. We deal with broader issues, not those that affect a single school.

Regarding a demotion as mentioned in Regents' Bylaw 5.09: individual reductions in salary may be a demotion. The task force looked at whether the reduction in salary could be considered as demotion under the bylaw and decided it was not. This plan has not been adopted by any of the basic science department, but has by all the clinical departments.

Anecdotal evidence arose of members of the faculty having the terms of their offer letter changed after they arrived. This was outside the charge of the committee, but worthy of future research by SACUA.

Professor Frost moved that SACUA thank Professor Boxer for the good work and report of the task force. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

4:19 Professor Boxer concluded his report and left the session.

SACUA decided by consensus to forward the report to Provost Hanlon and we will ask the Provost other questions when he meets with us next week. Professor Goldman moved that we discuss this further in executive session. It was seconded and approved unanimously.

4:23 Announcements

Regents Update due 3 December and 7 January

Professor Barald and Professor Rothman will meet with the President at 4:00 on 7 December.

Professor Kearfott and Professor Rothman will meet with the Provost at 2:00 on 9 December.

We discussed the article in AnnArbor.com regarding the faculty going to a bowl games. SACUA has never looked at the issue of the faculty members on the ABIA who form the Academic Performance Committee, although Senate Assembly has. The issue was proposed as a conflict of interest for the Senate Assembly. This is not a conflict of interest. The University does not pay for faculty to go to the bowl game. The Bowl committee pays for the players, the cheerleaders, the regents, members of the administration, and for faculty members to go to the

bowl game. The administration is not paying for faculty to go to the bowl game as a reward for ignoring academic problems with student athletes. This is not a conflict of interest.

The faculty members on APC see the grades of very few students. If students fall below the NCAA standard or the Big Ten standard, the faculty here don't vote about it. Only for those students who pass the Big Ten the UM higher standard. The APC decides a variety of issues for a handful of student athletes, such as whether student's faculty member has turned in grade late. That would prevent the student from enrolling in the next semester. The APC would find out from the faculty member what the issue is and act accordingly. There is absolutely no evidence that the members of the APC have waived low grades to make a student athlete eligible.

4:20 Committee Liaison Reports

Financial Affairs Advisory: Professor Barald was unable to attend because of a conflict, but will be meeting the chair 23 November.

Administration Advisory Committee: The committee has met regularly and developed survey questions for chairs, deans and faculty opinion with the counsel of several new committee members who are expert in survey construction. The survey went out earlier today (22 November).

Faculty Perspectives Page Editorial Advisory Board: No submissions have been received.

Rules Committee: Neither Senate Assembly or SACUA has asked the Rules Committee to look into any matter.

Communications Advisory: Professor Frost reported that it is taking the entire semester to set up a time to meet.

Development Advisory: Professor Frost reported a very interesting meeting about outside foundation support. This has been a weak area in support for the University.

Foundation money is looking far more accessible than dwindling Federal money.

General Counsel Advisory: Professor Goldman reported that this committee is meeting for the first time tomorrow (23 November).

Student Relations Advisory: Professor Goldman met with the committee on October 22. They are surveying students to find out what they would like changed. They discussed the Next Step program established for new students on campus. They have initiated a two-day event for exploration and experimentation. They have also talked about bullying on campus and plan to talk about this more.

Academic Affairs Advisory Committee: Professor Kearfott reported on three things: a question had come to the committee for the online survey (AEC) that was rather complex and was not included this year. The second issue raised the suggestion of a standard expanded syllabus; this research is moving forward. Third, an extended discussion has started about how to truly evaluate student learning.

Committee for a Multicultural University: Professor Kearfott reported that this has high participation from all three campuses and that the regional campuses brought a great deal to the plate. The committee is focusing on the report that came out three years ago and distilling it into clear recommendations about retention and promotion of minority faculty. Senior Vice Provost Monts reported that some of the data from the base report are suspect. He also pointed out that the committee is not advisory to him because many items are not actionable on his part. He advises that the Office of Budget and Planning be asked that the data be compiled; they have the access.

Budget Study Committee: Professor Lehman was absent.

Civil Liberties Board: Professor Lehman was absent.

Government Relations Advisory Committee: Professor Lusmann reported that they met 11 October (before the election). We have a 2.8% reduction in state funding. The next legislative session will handle (likely) legislation about handguns on campus and stem cell research. The committee has received reports on campus construction, including the Fuller Road multi-modal station, the central campus transfer center, and an 18-month closure of Stadium and South State for bridge reconstruction.

Tenure Committee: Has not met.

Research Policies Committee: Professor Navvab mentioned issues that are on the table: NCRC issues, research information infrastructure, the interdisciplinary cluster hires, and the responsible conduct of research.

Secretary of the University Advisory Committee: Professor Poe said that the committee has discussed bullying and where that should be enshrined in the University regulatory structure. They are trying to define what bullying means for the campus. Harassment is legally defined in state and federal laws, but not bullying.

University Undergraduate Scholarship Committee: Professor Poe reported that the committee has not met.

Medical Affairs Advisory: Professor Rothman mentioned this committee meets early in the day. The medical school is trying to broaden the educational experiences of students by finding other venues for them to practice.

5:06 Unfinished Business. None.

5:06 New Business. None.

The Chair reminded SACUA that no recordings are to be made in executive session. The members all agreed.

SACUA went into executive session at 5:06.

SACUA ended executive session at 5:33

5:33 Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

M. Robert Fraser
SACUA Secretary