

Minutes: February 7, 2022
Circulated DATE March 3, 2022
Approved DATE

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs
Monday, February 7, 2022, 3:15
The meeting was held virtually

In Attendance: Chair Allen Liu, Vice Chair Caitlin Finlayson, Professor Sara Ahbel-Rappe, Professor Michael Atzmon, Professor Colleen Conway, Professor Donald Freeman, Professor Elena Gallo, Professor Durga Singer, Professor Kentaro Toyama, Faculty Senate Office Director MaryJo Banasik, Faculty Governance Coordinator Elizabeth Devlin, Secretary Deirdre Spencer

Guests:

Jeff Bleiler *University Record*
Rachel Lynn Mintz *Michigan Daily*
Professor David Potter Chair, Sexual and Gender Based Misconduct Working Group

3:15 Call to Order – The meeting was called to order at 3:19 pm. Requested revisions to the minutes from 1/10/22 and 1/31/22 SACUA meetings were applied. The minutes from those two meetings were approved.

3:20 Faculty Senate Office Updates – Faculty Senate Office Director MaryJo Banasik announced that President Mary Sue Coleman will give the opening remarks at the DMN lecture.

Four interviews were conducted last week for the new part-time Faculty Governance coordinator position, and interviews are scheduled for this week as well.

3:25 SACUA Chair Updates – Chair Allen Liu announced that Vice Chair Finlayson is stepping down from her SACUA position for a full year research leave. As a result of Finlayson's departure, Dearborn faculty will now be eligible to run for a seat on SACUA. The provost remains firm regarding the lack of flexibility on the issue of childcare, a position which likely reflects that of the Regents. Chair Liu said the letter from the College of Engineering did not mention risk to students or other high-risk people. Professor Donald Freeman said that flexibility was at the discretion of individual units.

3:30 Senate Assembly Agenda -- The Committee on Equity Fairness and Inclusion (CFEI) recommended changing the diversity language from 'campus' to 'university'. Professor Freeman suggested that the Flint speakers submit a brief video clip in advance of the Senate Assembly meeting. Professor Singer suggested swapping the meeting order of Regent Acker and Flint faculty representatives.

Vote – Voted to approve the Senate Assembly Agenda

3:40 Endorsement Handling SOP – SACUA discussed Standard Operating Procedures regarding endorsement requests from outside groups. Professor Singer said if SACUA wanted to endorse a petition, SACUA should issue a statement. Points under

discussion included 1. Does SACUA agree with the statement presented? 2. Does SACUA want to have its own independent statement on the issue presented? 3. Does SACUA want to co-endorse a statement with another group? 4. There was discussion regarding the length of the statements, but ultimately a statement as brief as one sentence would be acceptable. 5. Approval would require a 2/3rds majority. 6. SACUA can choose not to endorse a petition.

Vote -- SACUA Voted unanimously to pass the SOP, and to issue a simple statement of endorsement.

3:55 Flint Post-Tenure Review Resolution -- Vice Chair Finlayson drafted a new resolution, different from what Flint had put forward which came from Flint's College of Arts and Sciences. The Faculty Council made its own statement as well but due to limited consultation, many faculty were unaware of this change. In December the Flint provost recommended a work policy shift and a post-tenure review. This proved to be unpopular, particularly the post-tenure review. The document was renamed and re-introduced.

The workload document raised many issues such as the percentage division of teaching, research and service, that was not truly reflective of what faculty in some departments or disciplines actually do. Many Associate professors need to achieve full professorship. If one adheres to the 3-3 course load but is deemed insufficiently productive, the course load will increase to 4-4 or 5-5. An increased teaching load does not incentivize research because it reduces the time to devote to research. This changes the nature of one's contract post-tenure and could result in having to achieve tenure repeatedly throughout one's career.

UM Flint hired a firm to write a document by people who don't teach. The firm thought that teaching only took place between certain dates and there was no prep time or research time figured in. Another problem with the report was their model schools were state research universities which prioritized research. It did not take into consideration that regional campuses are more undergraduate teaching focused, and the balance of percentages are different. The comparisons are apples and oranges.

At research institutions the teaching loads are more like 2-2. This sets up unrealistic expectations for faculty at regional campuses.

Post tenure, the contract could be changed because a dean doesn't deem a faculty productive enough. This can be challenging to academic freedom because it forces a faculty to produce a certain number of publications. Projects with uncertain outcomes can be stifled because if a faculty is following a path of research that may or may not result in the desired outcome, they would be penalized for following a path of inquiry that did not bear fruit in the form of high numbers of publications. This compromises academic freedom. If you are publishing in other areas such as Op-Eds in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, or serving on journal editorial boards, these don't seem to factor into the workload.

There are also gender implications because women tend to take on more service roles. 10% service was an unrealistic representation. It devalues service and devalues faculty governance. If you take on administrative posts, but don't get your research done, you will get more teaching. Service does not count and is being devalued.

The document does not incentivize moving from associate to full professor. The Flint document was written with an eye toward Flint's procedural issues. Vice Chair Finlayson

wrote from a broader perspective for all three campuses. Contractual changes on one campus could impact another campus.

Professor Ahbel-Rappe asked about legal protection against violation of contracts. One signs a contract regarding course load. How can it be considered non-binding? The administration is trying to discover a means to break the contracts.

Vote – SACUA voted unanimously to accept Vice Chair Finlayson’s resolution concerning post-tenure review and teaching load.

4:10 Presidential Search Position Paper – Professor Toyama led the discussion on the Presidential Search Position Paper, which was a two-page document on what they would like to see in the search process. According to Professor Toyama, Regent Acker said the search committee was reasonably inclusive. The makeup consisted of an undergraduate student, a graduate student, a LEO member representing unions, and faculty from multiple disciplines etc.

Professor Toyama said universities are moving increasingly toward the secret approach to conducting high level searches in order to shield candidates’ identity and not jeopardize their future job prospects. He recalled a previous University of Michigan presidential search that was open, and seemingly did not hurt the candidates who were not selected, as they all advanced in their careers to university presidents and chancellors.

Professor Toyama would like for SACUA to co-sponsor with AAUP in support of a more public search, and not one that is totally confidential. A search committee is a small group sworn to secrecy. One undergraduate student really doesn’t represent all undergraduates. Professor Conway asked about the practices of other schools and colleges in their search for top positions. She said that in STMD, deans were interviewed at the airport, and department chair interviews were confidential.

Professor Toyama said the School of Information had candidates present to the entire department. Professor Atzmon said that the College of Engineering’s last search was open. Professor Freeman said the School of Education conducted open searches. It would strengthen our request if we made clear there was a national practice for open searches. (The University of Wisconsin was an example). Professor Freeman said that with the low level of trust on campus, people might prefer an open search, but on the other hand Chair Liu said put yourselves in the candidate’s shoes. They would prefer a closed search. Professor Freeman mentioned that in the case of an internal candidate, an open search weakens the process. Professor Toyama suggested that the search be private until the short list of candidates has been established. People should be able to interact with those on short list.

Professor Toyama said what is desired in a candidate is someone who listens to stakeholders. Professor Singer agreed that we should conduct open searches in the future, and that we look at the more recent searches of peer institutions.

Professor Toyama provided background information by saying open searches were the requirement until President Mary Sue Coleman and her cohort wanted confidentiality to be maintained. The Michigan State Supreme Court wanted searches to have the option of being confidential.

Professor Ahbel-Rappe asked about the wording of the supreme court decision and the request for confidentiality. Once the finalist is picked people can do their homework and prepare follow-up.

Professor Toyama said that upon researching information about President Schlissel,

once he was Michigan's chosen candidate, he discovered where Brown students had complained that he didn't take misconduct seriously.

Chair Liu will work on a polling system for next week. The Regents will probably announce the search committee next week. We will discuss the possibility of an open search with Regent Acker at our meeting next week.

4:30 Executive Session -- Professor David Potter Chair, Sexual and Gender Based Misconduct Working Group Update.

5:00 Adjourn – The meeting was adjourned at 5:02pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Deirdre D. Spencer
Secretary

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."