

Minutes of 20 December 2004
Circulated 6 January 2005
Approved 10 January 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 20 DECEMBER 2004

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

ABSENT: Ensminger

GUESTS: D. Gershman

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED

1. Proposed agenda.
2. Portion of the draft minutes the 6 December 2004 SACUA meeting covering the visit of President Coleman with changes suggested by President Coleman
3. Draft minutes of the 6 December 2004 SACUA meeting circulated 14 December 2004, modified to include changes by Zorn and Coleman and re-circulated 17 December 2004
4. Electronic mail message from Paul Courant and William Gosling dated 14 December 2004 sent to Deans, Directors and Department Chairs regarding the announcement of University of Michigan's partnership with Google
5. Electronic mail message from Fawwaz Ulaby dated 8 December 2004 sent to Psychology faculty regarding when a class assignment requires IRB approval
6. Draft dated 15 December 2004 of SPG 201.93 Modified Duties: Relief from Teaching Assignments Based on Effects of Pregnancy, Childbirth, Related Medical Conditions, or Adoption
7. Draft with strike-outs and underscores to show changes dated 15 December 2004 of SPG 201.93 Modified Duties: Relief from Teaching Assignments Based on Effects of Pregnancy, Childbirth, Related Medical Conditions, or Adoption
8. Announcement of Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) Meeting in January 2005
9. Draft of "Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics: Principles, Proposed Rules, and Guidelines" to be finalized at the COIA meeting in January 2005
<http://www.math.umd.edu/~jmc/COIA/A.html>
10. Background information on COIA <http://www.math.umd.edu/~jmc/COIA/>
11. Electronic mail message from Jason S. Mironov dated 2 December 2004 sent to the President's Task Force on Ethics regarding dates for a Campus Forum
12. Shared governance memo to SACUA from Stan Berent dated 14 December 2004
13. Shared Government Initiative (SGI) Proposal by Professor Meerkov

14. Memo to SACUA Chair Stanley Berent from Rules Committee Chair Riebesell dated 22 November 2004 regarding SACUA Question to Rules Committee Regarding Possible 4th Year on SACUA for Chair
15. Memo to SACUA Chair Stanley Berent from Rules Committee Chair Riebesell dated 8 December 2004 regarding SACUA Apportionment
16. Memo to Stan Berent from Tom Schneider dated 13 December 2004 regarding SACUA Budget
17. SACUA Financial Activity Tables reporting General Fund Budget History and One-Time Transfers 1994-1995 to 2004-2005, Final Budget Allocation Report for 2004-2005, Report of One-Time Commitments 1999-2000 to 2003-2004, Sources & Uses Table for 2003-2004, Summary Table – Totals for 1999-2000 to 2003-2004, and Budgeted Facilities Costs and Actual Utilities and Rental Space for 2000-2001 to 2004-2005
18. Electronic mail messages from Professor Lehman to SACUA dated 17 December 2004 regarding request from faculty member and a memorandum to SACUA from the faculty member dated 15 December 2004 regarding course evaluations
19. Section 10.I SACUA Faculty Hearing Committee from the University of Michigan Faculty Handbook, Ann Arbor Campus, Fall 2004
20. Memo to Chair Berent from Provost Courant dated 1 December 2004 regarding Refreshed Cognate Panel
21. Research Policies Committee membership information
22. SACUA/Senate Assembly Planning Schedule updated 17 December 2004
23. Report provided by Human Resource Information Services - An Analysis of Salaries Paid to the University of Michigan Instructional Staff and Graduate Student Instructors 2004-2005

Chair Berent called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of the SACUA meeting on 6 December 2004 were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS/UPDATES

1. Chair Berent and Vice-Chair Pedraza reported on their meeting with President Coleman. She stated again that the three responsibilities of the faculty are curriculum development, hiring of new faculty, and promotion and tenure decisions only. On the recent announcement about Google digitizing the library collection, she said the decision involved input from James Hilton and it has a strong potential impact on faculty and their work. She also stated that the matter had received more world-wide press coverage than any other matter involving the University, including the affirmative-action decision. She suggested that SACUA could meet with James Hilton and John Wilkin from the Library. President Coleman reported that she has assigned the Child Care Task Force report to the Provost's office. She pointed out that her staff is not large and that projects get assigned to other Executive Officers. Chair Berent indicated that the topic of IRB had also been discussed. He thinks the complaints received have begun to stimulate action toward making the process more user-friendly. Professor Combi reported that, at the Research Policies Committee meeting last week, OVPR staff had presented a web-based tracking system, eResearch, which defines what each project needs up front. Chair

Berent emphasized the importance of talking with people and asking questions, actions which are quite powerful. He does not agree that SACUA has not done much and sees both the President and Provost as more sensitive to faculty concerns.

2. Chair Berent and Vice-Chair Pedraza met with the Provost on December 13th and reported on that meeting. The Provost shared a draft SPG, “Modified Duties: Relief from Teaching Assignments Based on Effects of Pregnancy, Childbirth, Related Medical Conditions, or Adoption,” and asked for feedback. The Provost also reported on a committee looking at the tenure clock and indicated that Professor Ken Adams, Chair of the Tenure Committee, is included on this committee. Chair Berent pointed out that faculty provide input into University governance in a number of levels, department, school, and executive committees as well as through SACUA and the Senate Assembly. There was also discussion of sabbaticals and the variance in granting them from school to school. In the Medical School it is very difficult to get a sabbatical. The Chair reminded SACUA members to provide topics for discussion with both the President and Provost, and, in particular, to send comments on the draft SPG to Tom Schneider who will draft a summary for review.
3. Chair Berent and Tom Schneider will be attending the meeting of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, to be held in Nashville, January 6-7. All of the major conferences are represented. The Chair would have liked a third person to go, someone who could go again next year, but was told by conference organizers that this is not possible. He asked anyone who might be interested to let him know.
4. Chair Berent commented that the graduation event on December 19th was very nice. He is always impressed with the respect people show for faculty. People see the faculty as the University.

COURSE EVALUATIONS

A professor from Engineering had earlier met with SACUA and reported an incident in which evaluations from a course appear to have been altered. Two positive evaluations were changed to negative ones with white-out, and extremely negative comments were written on the back, that could not have been there when the original evaluations were positive. Professor Pedraza reported that the Office of Examinations and Evaluations is already engaged in the process of moving towards a web-based system of evaluations, increasing the security against efforts to alter them. The Sociology Department will be participating in a pilot program that initially will involve only graduate-level courses in a few departments of LS&A. The department’s faculty had a long discussion about response rate and the staff from the *Office of Evaluation and Examination* responded to this concern. They have developed the web- based evaluation so that students who have not responded can be contacted with a reminder to do so. They are now getting a 75% response rate. Professor Zorn pointed out that course evaluations originally were intended to provide confidential feedback to help faculty improve their teaching and now the results are being transcribed and used in ways not intended earlier. Professor Lehman reminded SACUA members of a study by James Kulik that showed a correlation between the average score and the average grade. Professor Pedraza indicated the Sociology Department includes a question asking what grade the student expects. Professor Zorn suggested that professors need to know if students that get good grades give good scores and asked what input was provided by the faculty for moving the evaluations to the web. Chair Berent pointed out the importance of enhancing use of the Senate Assembly committees and assigning issues such as this to them.

ACTION OF SACUA 122004-1

Professor Pedraza moved that SACUA formally charge the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee to get together with the *Office of Evaluation and Examination* to discuss the process for course evaluations and look at implications of the new web-based evaluation system. Professor Meerkov seconded the motion.

Discussion of the motion included comments that it is important to look at implications for confidentiality, the possible link between grade and evaluation, and input from students.

Vote on the motion:

Approve: 5

Disapprove: 0

Abstain: 1

The motion passed.

Professor Lehman asked how much funding was going to this project.

Professor Lehman raised the specific concern shared by the professor in Engineering and pointed out this matter raises very serious concerns regarding the integrity of course evaluations. Chair Berent asked if the professor was requesting a review of his case only or a broader review of the integrity of evaluations. Professor Lehman responded that the professor was asking for a review of his specific case and emphasized that SACUA has the authority to do this. Chair Berent suggested the case would be appropriate for review by the Faculty Hearing Committee. Professor Lehman made the following motion which was seconded by Professor Meerkov.

ACTION OF SACUA 122004-2

Having heard the request from the professor to investigate his assertion that his course evaluations were tampered with, SACUA refers the matter to the Faculty Hearing Committee.

In discussion of the motion, Professor Zorn asked what would happen if the Faculty Hearing Committee finds egregious wrongs. Chair Berent indicated the Committee would bring the matter back to SACUA with recommendations for proposed action. Professor Pedraza pointed out that the professor had filed a grievance, but the respondent was the Dean. Professor Combi indicated the professor asked SACUA to fix the evaluation system and adopt measures that ensure integrity and confidentiality of evaluations. Chair Berent reminded SACUA members that this could become a lawsuit and, if so, members could be subpoenaed. He cautioned about the need for care in the process and record keeping. Professor Zorn expressed support for Professor Combi's suggestion, that SACUA look at the process and see where it went wrong.

The motion passed unanimously.

FACULTY HEARING COMMITTEE

See Section 10.1 of the *Faculty Handbook*. The Chair pointed out that the current members of the Faculty Hearing Committee are Chair Berent (2005) and Professor Gull (2006). After some discussion, Professor Meerkov (2007) agreed to serve on the Faculty Hearing Committee.

PLANNING FOR ETHICS FORUM

Chair Berent report that Jason Mironov, the President of MSA, really wants to join with SACUA to present the Ethics Forum, a panel modeled on the one for the Regents' candidates. Questions would be posed, panelists would each respond, and then there would be an open discussion, all lasting about an hour. MSA will also be sponsoring a separate session on ethics with a speaker, and SACUA could co-sponsor that as well. Professor Zorn expressed concern about what could be accomplished in only an hour and asked whether there was a framework for guiding the discussion. Chair Berent indicated that the Forum would be widely advertised with students, faculty and the public invited. One point which will be included is the lack of distinction in the usage of the terms morals and ethics. [Professor Giordani arrived at 3:38 p.m.]

ACTION OF SACUA 122004-3

Professor Meerkov moved that SACUA support this student effort. Professor Gull seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Berent suggested that a Monday would be the preferred day and with the Senate Assembly meeting on January 24th, a date suggested by MSA, there should be good attendance. The Chair will speak with Jason Mironov regarding the details.

SHARED GOVERNANCE CONTINUING DISCUSSIONS

Professor Meerkov indicated he was pleased with the outline prepared by Chair Berent on the criteria for faculty participation in University governance. Faculty should have some say in University decisions. Currently there is nothing that triggers faculty involvement. He would like a system that is more structured. Professor Lehman agreed and pointed out the instance of expanding the football schedule. The argument against faculty involvement in that decision was that it was a financial decision, not an academic matter. Professor Meerkov asked what system will allow faculty to carry out their responsibilities for decisions.

Chair Berent said that he had in mind for SACUA to develop a set of criteria that define where formal faculty governance should be involved. Then the groundwork would have been laid for a “contract” with the administration. Once this is worked out, there would still be tension, but SACUA would have the basis for the argument that SACUA should be involved. SACUA would be stronger. Professor Pedraza agreed that the list is a very good one, but wondered if the President and Provost would look at the list and say that they have involved faculty in such matters. In her view, the problem is that too often faculty are not involved at an early stage. She pointed out that last year SACUA received the new policy on faculty-student relationships when the policy was a *fait accompli*, as was the case this year when SACUA received the modified teaching duties upon the arrival of a child. SACUA needs a way to ensure involvement at the earliest stage.

Chair Berent indicated that the list is simply a tool toward getting involved. SACUA would have to make it happen. It is up to SACUA to fight with them intellectually and appeal to reason. Professor Zorn suggested SACUA should provide a mechanism to identify appropriate

times to involve faculty and to include faculty early on in committees or groups. The Chair emphasized the importance of the rationale, if the discussion is from a reasonable, mutually-accepted set of criteria. Professor Lehman expressed the need for some kind of stick, a public statement. Professor Giordani agreed the framework is good and agrees with Professor Zorn that a mechanism is needed.

Chair Berent emphasized that the distinction of faculty governance at various levels is important. He also pointed out that the administration is probably not going to sign a formal agreement. Professor Combi pointed out that if violations happen regularly, then SACUA would have a stick, a reason for a public statement. Chair Berent indicated that faculty could bring to bear a lot of pressure.

Chair Berent expressed his interest in having SACUA set down its expectations for the administration and then use diplomacy to come to some agreement. Over time it will become more and more documented. Professor Gull pointed out that the criteria could become the basis for faculty evaluation of administrators. Chair Berent stated it is important that this be an objective, criteria-based approach. Professor Giordani suggested it might evolve into a memo of understanding. Professor Lehman pointed out that the criteria should be linked to statements in the Regents' By-laws. Professor Giordani indicated at times he would not mind the administration doing the ground work and bringing a proposal to SACUA for discussion. At other times SACUA should be involved earlier. Professor Pedraza expressed a need for dialogue with President Coleman and Provost Courant on the issue of faculty involvement in decision-making before taking any statement to the Senate Assembly.

Chair Berent asked if there was general agreement that this is a good approach. He then suggested that each member take the list and add or amend it. Then the informal discussions with key people could begin. Professor Meerkov supported this suggestion. Professor Combi indicated part of the dialogue could be sharing examples of when faculty involvement had not happened. Chair Berent agreed but stated it is too easy to put all the blame on the administration. In psychotherapy the question, in what way do you contribute to your experiences, is asked.

RULES COMMITTEE PROPOSALS

This discussion was postponed to a subsequent meeting.

At 4:30 p.m. SACUA went into EXECUTIVE SESSION until 4:38 p.m. regarding nominations for the Cognate Panel for Faculty Grievance Review Boards and to appoint a replacement on the Research Policies Committee.

SACUA OFFICE BUDGET

Chair Berent explained the need to be reviewing past SACUA Office budgets in light of the budget request for 2005-2006. Tom Schneider shared two documents which included details of the budget and pointed out that the budget is largely salaries. Professor Meerkov asked what plans exist for filling the vacant position. Mr. Schneider indicated the position probably will not be filled right now. This has provided some needed flexibility for the budget. He plans to post a Secretary III position and pointed out the Office did not need two Research Associates. Clearly

the budget is tight. Professor Meerkov underlined the many Senate Assembly committees that require office support and stated that it seems reasonable to have another staff member as secretary. Mr. Schneider indicated that by hiring a secretary, the Office could generate some savings. They have had an agreement with the Provost since 1999 that the annual increases will be that of the average for all campus staff. Chair Berent pointed out that the budget request offers an opportunity to address these issues and others.

Professor Pedraza stated that only the Chair gets release time. All SACUA members make a significant time commitment. Chair Berent indicated he would like to argue for release time for the vice-chair and members of SACUA. Professor Pedraza pointed out that the University makes statements regarding what it values through money, i.e., release time and compensation. Professor Giordani pointed out that it looks like every year the Office goes into the budget year expecting to be in the red. It has a base allocation and salary and benefit commitments that leave less than \$1000 for all sorts of other expenses. Chair Berent indicated the Office funding is very stingy. The equipment is old. It is important to say the Office needs more funding. He summarized the needs as being the base office request, an equipment request, and release time for all.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

1. Professor Meerkov reported having attended a portion of the recent meeting of the Board of Regents, held in the College of Engineering. President Coleman asked members of the Board about their activities of the morning. Regent Maynard, *chair of the Personnel Committee*, mentioned the Committee discussed the process of evaluating executive officers and, with the Provost, the evaluation of Deans.
2. Professor Meerkov attended a recent meeting of the Rules Committee and raised there the question of the timing of the election of the chair and vice-chair of SACUA. Because the election occurs in January, the officers are selected by the old members, not the new committee. He thought the Rules Committee agreed. Professor Gull said the Committee discussed the matter, but he would not say the Committee agreed. Professor Meerkov proposed the election of officers follow the election of the new members of SACUA. Chair Berent indicated this is not a simple issue. It is a new issue and needs to be on the agenda. It would be good to benefit from the discussion in the Rules Committee. There are reasons on both sides. Professor Pedraza indicated there are other related issues that should be on the agenda, a possible fourth year for the Chair, the possibility of electing a vice-char/chair-elect to become Chair the following year, and the issue Professor Meerkov has raised. All three issues need to be addressed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Loup
SACUA Staff

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.