

Minutes 10 February 2020
Circulated 24 February 2020
Recirculated 28 February 2020
Approved 9 March 2020

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA)
Monday, February 10, 2019 3:15 pm
4006 Fleming Administration Building
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1340

Present: Ahbel-Rappe (phone), Beatty (chair), Conway, Dinov, Gallo, Malek, Manera, Marsh, Potter, Spencer, Banasik, Snyder

Absent:

Guests: Professor Swales; Members of the Press

3:15: Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

The agenda was approved; the minutes for 27 January were approved.

3:16: Announcements

Chair Beatty presented the agenda for the Senate Assembly meeting on February 17:

3:00 Call to order
3:05 Approval of Minutes and Announcements, SACUA nominating committee
3:10 E-voting Action for SACUA election; Committee Realignment Resolution
3:25 Civic Engagement (SRAC chair Professor Gina Cervetti; Ginsberg Center - Erin Byrnes and Mary Jo Callan)
3:45 Presidential Debate Planning—Catherine Carver
4:15 Campus Lighting Standards—Dark Skies—Professor Sally Oey
4:30 Adjournment

Dr. Banasik noted that Senate Assembly approved motion for e-voting in 2010 on a case-by-case basis, and this process will be used for the SACUA election occurring in March. Chair Beatty said that people wishing to participate in the SACUA election must be physically present at the meeting. The agenda for the February 17 Senate Assembly Meeting was approved.

3:25: UM Press Concerns, English Language Teaching Program – John Swales

Professor Swales introduced himself as the director of the English Language Institute (ELI; <https://lsa.umich.edu/eli>) from 1985-2001 and Professor of Linguistics emeritus; his area of expertise is academic discourse. He said his colleague, Professor Joan Morley, had published a number of books with the University of Michigan Press, especially in the area of listening comprehension, and had been promoted to Professor in the College of Literature, Science and the Arts (LSA) because of the high quality of her textbooks. Her publication program was a feature

of the ELI, which promoted methodology and pedagogy along with linguistics. Sales of Professor Morley's textbooks approached 200,000 copies a year which provided funds to support the scholarly publishing program at the University of Michigan Press.

Professor Swales attributed the success of the ELI's publishing program to the University of Michigan Press's English Language Teaching (ELT) commissioning editor Kelly Sippell (<https://www.lib.umich.edu/users/ksippell>), who allowed authors to develop projects as they saw fit, something that is not the case at other publishing houses. He also drew attention to books designed to help graduate students with their professional development (https://www.press.umich.edu/search/dissertation?imprint=english_language_teaching). And his book, with Christine Freak, *Academic Writing for Graduate Students* (https://www.press.umich.edu/2173936/academic_writing_for_graduate_students_3rd_edition), was a commercial and critical success, with sales of around 150,000 copies. He noted that the current Director of the University of Michigan Press (Charles Watkinson) has disregarded the scholarly aspect of ELT publications. He was annoyed by Mr. Watkinson's article in the *Connector*, which gave no credence to scholarly quality and no credit to Kelly Sippell's work (https://quod.lib.umich.edu/c/connector/14770791_2020.007/--university-of-michigan-press-is-on-a-mission?rgn=main;view=fulltext). He noted that the University of Michigan Press is the only press publishing ELT materials in the United States.

Chair Beatty asked if the treatment of the ELT program at the Press is a recent development. Professor Swales replied that no director has been fully appreciative of the efforts of the ELT division. Professor Conway asked how SACUA could support Professor Swale's concerns. Professor Swales said that he read the minutes of SACUA's meeting with Dean of Libraries Hilton, and that he had sympathy for the concern about low sales of scholarly monographs, especially as the tenure system prioritizes specialized monographs that often do not have a large market. He feels that market success comes easier for authors with more established track records, and that the pressures on assistant professors to publish books creates a misalignment. Professor Dinov asked Professor Swales what metrics should be used to determine success of a monograph? Professor Swales said a monograph will a few hundred copies, while textbooks, which once sold about 20,000 copies a year, still sell around 10,000 (the decline is due to piracy).

Librarian Spencer asked if open access was the wave of the future, and if it would affect sales of his book. Professor Swales replied that the University of Michigan Press has divided itself in two parts, telling the editors of the ESL and Regional lists that they are on their own financially, and leaving the scholarly side to do the best they can, which he understands will include open access distribution. Professor Manera asked if there was a constructive message that could be sent to departments which require books for tenure. Professor Swales, drawing upon his experience as a member of the Humanities Divisional Committee, which reviews tenure cases in LSA, suggested reconsidering tenure requirements in the Humanities, to place more stress on articles. A longer track record of articles could enable authors to build reputations that would enhance sales of a book. Chair Beatty noted that a book contact is currently a standard requirement for tenure. Professor Manera asked how selective a university press can be. Professor Swales replied that presses like the Oxford University Press and the Cambridge University Press could be more selective because their marketing was better. Professor Ahbel-Rappe pointed out that the rules for tenure are set in LSA by the Humanities division, not by the department, with the result that a department has to make sure that the College Executive Committee will accept the criteria it has used. Tenure cannot be given to a person who does not fit the profile. A better-known person might be more likely to produce a book that sells, but, for tenure, the theory is that the book makes a new and important intervention, that it will move the field in a new direction. Sales may not be the primary goal of such work. Professor Potter concurred.

Professor Marsh asked if Professor Swales could articulate a solution for the issues he sees in University Press publication. Professor Swales said he needed to know more about the finances of a press, but felt that the university publishing world should put some pressure, nationally, on the expectations of publication for tenure. Professor Ahbel-Rappe said there can be books in the Humanities that do what no other books do, but are in a very small field. Professor Potter noted that new areas of study can be built by successful publication of seemingly opaque material. Professor Marsh asked if Professor Swales' argument was that the requirement for assistant professors to publish books for tenure corrupts university press publication. Professor Swales said that university presses could do better if they published books by better known authors. Professor Marsh asked, if, in the Humanities, there are equivalents to people who are turned down for tenure and get a Nobel prize. Professor Swales said a person with a steady record of article publication had a better chance to produce a more successful book. Professor Manera agreed that there is something to be said that people begin with articles to develop a reputation that will make a book more accessible.

Chair Beatty said that SACUA will have to consider its approach to the issue. Professor Malek suggested increasing start-up packages for Assistant Professors to help meet publication costs. Professor Potter said that LSA does offer start up packages for Assistant Professors and has additional funds that faculty can apply for, but the immediate, as opposed to long-term, impact of a publication often depends upon attention in major review journals, which enables a book to be part of a more general public discussion.

Professor Conway asked if the Press budget was a problem because the press is under the library. Chair Beatty said that SACUA needed to consider its response, which might include appointing a committee.

4:00: Committee Realignment Resolution

The resolution passed with one abstention.

4:28 Executive Session

[Regarding a recent meeting with General Counsel Lynch attended by Beatty, Potter, & Banasik]

[Regarding a recent lunch meeting with Regent Illich attended by Beatty, Conway, Potter, & Banasik]

5:01 Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,
David S. Potter
Senate Secretary

Appendix: SACUA Resolution 2-10-2020

WHEREAS, Senate Assembly committees provide an avenue for faculty to address issues and concerns;

WHEREAS, Senate Assembly may create standing and special committees to assist it with its work;

WHEREAS, the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA), on behalf of Senate Assembly, shall serve as an instrument for effecting the actions of the Faculty Senate and Senate Assembly;

WHEREAS, issues that arise or demand attention change from time to time requiring realignment of Senate Assembly committees to address current goals and needs.

BE IT RESOLVED, A new committee is established with a charge to address issues related to the Office of Institutional Equity, the grievance process and implementation of sanctions. This committee shall be named the Committee on Oversight of Administrative Action (COAA).

BE IT RESOLVED, Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (CESF) is revised with an expanded charge to encompass topics such as campus climate and social well-being, while also serving in an advisory capacity to Academic Human Resources pertaining to faculty-life issues. CESF's name shall be revised to *Committee on the Economic and Social Well-Being of the Faculty* (CESWF).

BE IT RESOLVED, Committee on Civil Rights and Liberties (CCRL), Committee for an Inclusive University (CIU), and Tri-Campus Committee (TCC) are merged and consolidated into one committee, the *Committee for Fairness, Equality, and Inclusivity* (CFEI). CFEI's initial specific charge is to address issues of inclusion for all populations on the three campuses including Ann Arbor, Dearborn, and Flint.

BE IT RESOLVED, Financial Affairs Advisory Committee (FAAC) and Building, Facilities, and Infrastructure (BFIC), are merged into one committee, FAAC, addressing issues related to both financial affairs and building, facilities, and infrastructure.

BE IT RESOLVED, Rules, Practices, and Policies Committee (RPP) is designated as an **ad hoc** committee. Committee members shall serve for one-year terms when assigned as specific needs arise.

University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents, Sec. 5.02:
Governing Bodies in Schools and Colleges

Sec. 4.01 The University Senate

"...[t]he Senate is authorized to consider any subject pertaining to the interests of the university, and to make recommendations to the Board of Regents in regard thereto. Decisions of the University Senate with respect to matters within its jurisdiction shall constitute the binding action of the university faculties. Jurisdiction over academic policies shall reside in the faculties of the various schools and colleges, but insofar as actions by the several faculties affect university policy as a whole, or schools and colleges other than the one in which they originate, they shall be brought before the University Senate."

Rules of the University Senate, the Senate Assembly and the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs:
Senate: "In all cases not covered by rules adopted by the Senate, the procedure in Robert's Rules of Order shall be followed."

Assembly: "The Assembly may adopt rules for the transaction of its business. In appropriate cases not covered by rules of the Assembly, the rules of the University Senate shall apply."

SACUA: "The committee may adopt rules for the transaction of its business."