

Minutes 2 December 2019  
Circulated 9 December 2019  
Approved 9 December 2019

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN  
Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA)  
Monday, 2 December 2019 3:15 pm  
4006 Fleming Administration Building  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1340

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

Absent: Potter

Guests: Members of the press

3:15: Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

The agenda was approved; three sets of minutes for September 30, October 28, and November 11, 2019 were approved.

3:20: Announcements

Chair Beatty announced that the Senate Assembly meeting on December 16 is the last meeting of the term. There will not be a SACUA meeting on December 23. There is not currently a meeting scheduled for January 6, which is before the start of the term.

Chair Beatty indicated that Professor Potter and Professor Ahbel-Rappe have prepared a response letter to Associate Provost James Hilton's visit to SACUA on November 11. Chair Beatty distributed the text for review. Chair Beatty stated that the point of the letter was to respond to the SACUA visit seeking further points of clarification. Professor Ahbel-Rappe explained that this has to do with Associate Provost Hilton's talk being a recognition that university presses are no longer profitable without addressing possible other ways of generating revenue. She described the back presses, which are downloadable for free, which will subvert revenue for authors. Ahbel-Rappe questioned whether there is an atmosphere where successful authors are encouraged with revenue generating manuscripts. Chair Beatty acknowledged that Professor Potter has written many books and understands the processes at the Press. Chair Beatty noted that if SACUA agrees on the contents of the letter, then the letter will be sent to Associate Provost Hilton requesting a written response. SACUA members were asked to think about what type of response is needed. Some of the statements were described as nuanced, and they were difficult to understand without rewording some of the content. It was acknowledged that the letter was very detailed and included expressions that are not fully understandable by everyone. Professor Ahbel-Rappe indicated that the tone is a little harsh, and Professor Gallo agreed.

Professor Conway asked whether Associate Provost Hilton stated that people could not sell their books. Professor Ahbel-Rappe clarified that the issue has to do with advertising, and e-books, curtailing profitability in certain circumstances. Professor Ahbel-Rappe advocated for a more general letter with questions about open access and the place open access has. Conway stated that open access is a suggested topic for the Senate Assembly meeting on December 16<sup>th</sup>. Chair Beatty clarified whether specific questions were being followed up derived from the

minutes of the original meeting, or whether a broader strategy was being addressed in the letter. Professor Ahbel-Rappe agreed to compare the letter to the SACUA minutes from the meeting to see where the two may diverge, and to send a document describing her findings. Chair Beatty encouraged that the appropriate tone of the letter be confirmed.

Professor Dinov expressed support for the University Press and described it as an incredible resource. He stated that the University Press should work with faculty who are interested in open access as well as with those who are interested in publishing books with royalties, and that this should be simple. Professor Gallo stated that the large majority of people who publish may not make money on their books, but they still need to have the opportunity to publish. Chair Beatty put the discussion on hold to receive a visitor for Executive Session who is not named in the minutes.

3:35-4:18: Visitor – faculty grievance processes [Executive Session]

4:18: Debriefing information from visitor – Time was not available for debrief, so Chair Beatty indicated that this would be brought back at a future meeting.

4:21: Senate Assembly Planning and Agenda

Chair Beatty indicated that the Senate Assembly meeting is coming up on December 16. Chair Beatty stated that she and Vice Chair Conway met last week to plan. For the next meeting, they would like an agenda that encourages participation. There will be a vote on the CCRL Resolution that was presented by CCRL Chair Barry Belmont at the Faculty Senate meeting on November 18, and several topics that will be used for group discussions. Four possible topics are:

1. Faculty Life
2. Senate Assembly Connections to Units
3. OIE/Grievances
4. Open Access

Chair Beatty solicited opinions about different topics or a proposed different number of groups. Chair Beatty indicated that she would like to send the agenda out soon so that people can plan for the new Senate Assembly meeting time, which will be from 3:00 to 4:30 instead of from 3:15 to 5:00. As part of the communication, Chair Beatty suggested including a reminder emphasizing the importance of coming to the meeting. Chair Beatty also questioned whether the lack of attendance should be addressed, given the lack of quorum at the recent Faculty Senate meeting. The list of members who have not attended Senate Assembly meetings will be distributed next week.

There was some concern that the OIE/grievance topic would be difficult to discuss because faculty may not want to reveal their personal grievance experiences in an open forum. Chair Beatty indicated that it would be difficult to identify issues to improve if the issues cannot be identified and discussed. She mentioned that question prompts could be a way to frame the table discussion and set ground rules. People will also be able to share stories they have heard from their colleagues.

Professor Gallo indicated that some people may not have specific information to share on the OIE/Grievances topic because some people have not experienced these issues. Professor Malek stated that people may feel embarrassed to discuss an issue, even if they were exonerated because of perceptions that negative information may “stick” to one’s reputation. Professor Conway indicated that in her school, she hears people discussing these issues in the hallways, such as

student to student cases. Professor Malek indicated that the Medical School has a different climate. Librarian Spencer mentioned the recording of the meeting as another potential inhibitor.

Chair Beatty questioned why and whether people are keeping things confidential. She acknowledged that SACUA may need to collect information in other ways. It was suggested to provide a link on the Faculty Senate Office website where people could send more private information. Professor Conway suggested focusing on the process and not on the facts of specific instances such as asking what someone knows about grievances, who do you contact, and what do you know about the ombuds. Professor Ahbel-Rappe agreed that finding out about faculty knowledge of grievances and procedures would be beneficial.

SACUA members discussed which members of the group would facilitate various topics. Professor Conway indicated that some Senate Assembly members have expressed that there have been too many things on the agenda which doesn't allow enough time for discussion. She suggested choosing two items and saving the other two for a future meeting. Chair Beatty stated that it would make sense to have at least a twenty-minute discussion period and ten minutes for reporting. Professor Malek acknowledged that the topics are broad, and Professor Manera also proposed splitting topics over multiple meetings. Professor Conway suggested covering topics that have been recently covered in Senate Assembly meetings. Professor Ahbel-Rappe indicated that the umbrella policy may be on people's minds which would be relevant to the OIE/Grievances discussion. Professor Ahbel-Rappe also indicated the Faculty Life is also an important topic. Chair Beatty suggested having a presentation on this topic first at Senate Assembly prior to discussing it so that people will understand the topic better. Chair Beatty gave an example of bringing in a speaker from Michigan State or from the Center for Educating Women at U-M who handles some issues related to this topic.

OIE/Grievances and Open Access were identified as the first two topics for table groups at Senate Assembly. There will be conversation about who will lead in which areas next week.

Chair Beatty indicated that the CCRL resolution will go first followed by the table reports on the agenda. She confirmed that the meeting will be 15 minutes shorter than previous Senate Assembly meetings due to the change in the start and ending times.

#### 4:42: Jago Survey Proposal

Chair Beatty indicated that Professor Jago needs to know by the end of fall semester if we wish to participate in the faculty governance study. If we wish to move forward, we need to identify how the process will work. Chair Beatty prepared a summary of the survey instrument which ask about faculty attitudes about faculty governance. Chair Beatty explained that UM would receive reports back for its own benefit indicating what U-M senators think about faculty senate. Results would be anonymized to compare with other institutions, state public schools. We would not know the identities of the other schools. We would have access to survey comments, and they would be anonymized. Professor Jago stated in his request that he can get better response rates if he has email addresses for followup of non-responders. Chair Beatty indicated that she does not believe that we can give out university email addresses. Chair Beatty believes surveys would be sent from Professor Jago's servers. Ms. Snyder confirmed that email addresses are public and are available on U-M's website.

Professor Dinov inquired about why U-M could not run its own survey. He also expressed concern about response bias. He asked whether this survey is being done well.

Chair Beatty indicated that Professor Jago is an established management professor. Professor Dinov stated further that there could be self-selection biases, but there are ways to statistically manage this. Professor Manera stated that because Professor Jago wishes to be able to contact potential participants as many times as needed, so providing a weblink may be a better option. Professor Ahbel-Rappe expressed agreement that the link can be distributed to an email list.

Professor Dinov asked if anyone has seen the survey, and Chair Beatty responded that the survey is established. She suggested that a link go out to random sample. Professor Manera asked why we should do this work for Professor Jago. Professor Abhel-Rappe stated that we would benefit from having the data about faculty governance at U-M. Professor Marsh expressed agreement with participating in the survey, but he expressed concerns about participation. He also acknowledged that Senate Assembly members' email addresses are public. Chair Beatty clarified that one survey is intended for the small group, and the other is for the full senate. Professor Jago may have a challenge with calculating the response rate if the survey link is sent to all senators instead of a specific random sample. Chair Beatty stated that she will write to Professor Jago and ask about whether posting to the website will be adequate, and to inquire about how many people need to be included in the random sample. Ms. Snyder stated that access to the full senate will not be available. Chair Beatty confirmed that in general SACUA is okay with doing the survey. Professor Malek indicated that there are larger issues at play that need the group's energy and focus. Professor Marsh suggested that SACUA offer some participation to be good representatives of faculty governance, but that requesting full senate participation would be too broad.

Chair Beatty presented Motion 1:

Motion 1: Approve Professor Jago's survey for the small group, which is Senate Assembly.

Professor Manera seconded the motion. Chair Beatty called a vote. All present approved with the exception of Professor Dinov, who opposed. Motion 1 passed.

Chair Beatty presented Motion 2:

Motion 2: Approve Professor Jago's survey for the whole senate to be sent via a web survey link.

Professor Conway seconded the motion. Chair Beatty called a vote. Six SACUA members approved, one opposed (Professor Dinov) and two abstained (Professors Abhel-Rappe and Gallo). Motion 2 passed.

4:57: Matters Arising

Chair Beatty indicated that next week SACUA will discuss grievance procedures and an overview of 5.09 review expectations. The proposed letter in response to Associate Provost Hilton's visit will be covered next week. Meetings with the provost and the president should also be addressed at the next meeting. Plans for the first Senate Assembly meeting after the winter break will also be addressed.

4:59 Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,  
MaryJo Banasik  
Director, Faculty Senate Office

Appendix 1: Draft Letter to Associate Provost James Hilton

Dear Associate Provost Hilton,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with SACUA about the difficult issues confronting scholarly communication now and in the future. As we reflect on the discussion, we continue to have questions about the library's publication program and would hope that you can provide further clarification on several points:

1. The relationship between your views of appropriate publicity and those of peer institutions. You stated you would advertise in the *New York Review of Books* if you thought it would improve sales. The implication was that you did not feel this would be the case. Yet many of the peer/competing presses mentioned by Mr. Watkinson (such as Cambridge and Routledge) do regularly advertise in the *New York Review of Books*, so they seem to see merit in advertising. Can you give additional details on the University Press' approach to advertising and why we are not following others in the publishing community?
2. Sales to individuals. Michigan's competing presses count on extensive sales to individuals at academic conferences, which makes it hard to understand why Michigan does not see sales to individuals as an important potential source of revenue. The Press seems to be using the lack of individual sales as a way to justify low prints runs, which increase unit costs.
3. Stress on e-books. These typically account for only 10% of the sales of a title, hence we are surprised by the stress on e-books as the future in Michigan's program. We note that "Publishers of books in all formats made almost \$26 billion in revenue last year in the U.S., with print making up \$22.6 billion and e-books taking \$2.04 billion, according to the Association of American Publishers' annual report 2019" (<https://www.cnbc.com/2019/09/19/physical-books-still-outright-e-books-and-heres-why.html>). Again, we are curious why Michigan's program appears to be outside the professional mainstream.
4. The University of Michigan Press is advertising a Michigan Press Ebook collection for which promotional material states that "[a]ll titles in the University of Michigan Press Ebook Collection (UMP EBC) are available for download in EPUB and PDF formats" (<https://www.fulcrum.org/accessibility/#content>). Sites such as Academia have accustomed scholars accessing free downloadable pdfs of works, and can be used in ways e-books cannot (e.g. be distributed for free to colleagues and students) meaning that once a single pdf copy has been downloaded it can be distributed at will and therefore cannibalizes future sales. Is there data on the impact of your program on frontlist sales?
5. A large portion of the University of Michigan Press backlist is also available and downloadable for free through services such as the Hathi Trust. We wonder if there is data that would show the sales effects of free distribution of titles otherwise for sale. Perhaps data should be obtained on relative frontlist versus backlist sales from UM's self-identified rival presses to enable an assessment of this issue.
6. There is growing awareness of the consequences of the "Open Access Movement" which include the creation of new tasks and costs, and of "geowalls" in place of "paywalls." Critics note that since the beginning, a hallmark of the OA movement has been a seemingly willful ignorance of the potential for unintended consequences (see here: <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2019/11/25/the-tyranny-of-unintended-consequences-richard-poynder-on-open-access-and-the-open-access-movement/>). More consultation with faculty across disciplines can ensure that Michigan is at the cutting edge of developments.

Appendix 2: Summary of Jago Faculty Senate Survey Proposal

## Summary of Faculty Senate Survey Proposal

- Dr. Art Jago is proposing to launch **two** studies in April/May 2020, focused on faculty governance at AAU public universities. The goal is to look at the current state of faculty governance at leading public universities and the role that faculty senate has in higher education decision making.
  - Study 1 is for Senate Assembly members
  - Study 2 is for a random selection of Senate members
  - He says: “Data collection must take place as close to the end of the Spring ’20 semester as possible. This will ensure that senators can reflect on their academic year experiences (before some of them rotate off the body and others replace them) and faculty can respond before their summer activities put the ’19-’20 year well behind them.”
  - He needs institutional agreement by the **end of the Fall semester**.
- Study is approved by University of Missouri IRB
- The questions have been determined by Jago’s team; we could add questions if we wanted to.
  - The survey has 21 questions – many are sets of likert questions, so there are actually 34 questions.
- Dr. Jago’s team will collect the quantitative data, analyze the results, and generate a report which includes statistical inferences. No recommendations will be made. See the next page for the table of contents from their study which shows the key concepts studied.
  - Our survey question responses will be compiled and anonymously compared with other AAU public universities
  - We will have our own results and access to comparisons (other schools identified only by a code), and we will not know which specific schools have participated
  - Similarly, no other schools can identify our program results (institutional anonymity)
- Qualitative data (written responses to open-ended survey questions) will also be shared with us.
  - In these qualitative data, specific references to named individuals is redacted, and schools can only see their own open-ended survey questions.
- What is needed from us? [Joy says: I don’t think we can share umich emails]
  - Email addresses for Senate Assembly members
  - Email addresses for a random sample of a minimum of 600 ranked faculty (assistant, associate, and full), including tenured/tenure track and non-tenure track appointments.
  - If his team is allowed to have the email addresses, they can follow up with non-responders which dramatically improves the response rate
  - If his team is not allowed to have the email addresses, he can give a web address for the survey that we send out (without the follow-up for non-responders)



**FACULTY GOVERNANCE SURVEY:  
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI CAMPUSES**

Dr. Arthur G. Jago  
Professor Emeritus of Management  
Trulaske College of Business  
University of Missouri

**Table of Contents** (click on any section or scroll through)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
INTRODUCTION .....	5
SURVEY METHOD .....	7
SENATOR BELIEFS AND ATTITUDES.....	9
Senator Involvement .....	9
Self-Perception of the Senate and its Effectiveness.....	10
Identified Areas in Which Faculty Have Substantial Influence.....	15
Senate Leaders versus Senate Members .....	18
FACULTY BELIEFS AND ATTITUDES.....	19
Awareness of the Senate.....	19
Perceptions of the Senate and its Effectiveness .....	20
Identified Areas in Which Faculty Have Substantial Influence.....	23
Proportional Differences in the Perception of Influence: Senators vs Faculty .....	26
Differences Within Ranked Faculty.....	27
Ranked Faculty versus Other Faculty .....	29
CLOSING CAVEATS.....	30
APPENDIX A: EMAIL INVITATIONS	
APPENDIX B: SENATE/COUNCIL MEMBER SURVEY	
APPENDIX C: FACULTY SURVEY	
SUPPLEMENT (separate volume)	

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 polices 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."