

Minutes 24 January 2011
Circulated 2 March 2011
Approved 21 March 2011

**UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SENATE ASSEMBLY
24 JANUARY 2011**

Present: Ahbel-Rappe, Armitage, Aronoff, Atkins, Barald, Barber, Booth, Borer, Boxer, Brown, Davis, Dorsey, Folger, Fraser, Friese, Gumucio, Hirshorn, Holland, Jagadish, Jenckes, Johnson, Jones, Kearfott, Koopman, Koopmann, Larsen, Lehman, Lenk, Lusmann, Miller, Millunchick, Navvab, Norton, Ortega, Panda Zayas, Pipe, Poe, Prygoski, Rothman (chair), Schriber, Sharma, Sheets, Shore, Silverman, Smith, Soellner, Staller, Sun, Thornton, Westlake, Williams, Wolfe, Zemgulys

Requested Alternate, None Available: Adlerstein-Gonzalez (SNRE), Andre (LSA), Ferris (Kinesiology), Goldman (Engineering), Nassauer (SNRE), Yang (Medicine)

Alternates: Bedi (Bielinska-Medicine), Bitar (Giordani-Medicine), Christman (Yang-Medicine), Kumar (Bergin-LSA), Shedden (Carson-LSA), Talsma (McCullagh-Nursing), Williams (Mars-Flint)

Absent: Beck, Crane, Frost, Green, Hardin, McCullagh, Najita, Salesa, Sohn, Trandafirescu

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED:

1. Draft Senate Assembly Agenda
2. Draft minutes of the Senate Assembly meeting of 13 December 2010
3. [“Productivity and the Value of the Faculty”](#)
4. [Action of Senate Assembly 23 January 2006](#) regarding extending tenure
5. [AAUP white paper of January 2010](#) regarding the proposal to extend the tenure probationary period
6. [“2010 Summary Proposal for a Flexible 10-year Tenure probationary Period”](#) from Provost Hanlon
7. [“Memorandum”](#) to Provost Terry Sullivan, 21 September 2006 regarding the report from the committee to consider a more flexible tenure probationary period
8. [“Toward a definition of tenure”](#) written by the SACUA standing committee on tenure and approved by Senate Assembly 12 December 1994.
9. [“Guidelines regarding University of Michigan policies that govern time to tenure review”](#) from the Office of the Provost, 20 April 2005.
10. AAUP, [“1940 Statement on principles on academic freedom and tenure with 1970 interpretive comments.”](#)

11. Regents of the University of Michigan, Bylaw 5.09: "[Procedures in cases of dismissal, demotion, or terminal appointment \(revised November 1993\)](#)"

The regular monthly meeting of the University of Michigan Faculty Senate Assembly was held on 24 January 2011 at 3:19 pm in the Forum Hall of Palmer Commons, the Chair being at the podium and the Secretary being present.

3:19 Call to Order/Approval of Agenda and Minutes. Both were approved unanimously.

3:20 Announcements

Increased productivity of the faculty over the past decade
Coalition On Intercollegiate Athletics meeting
SACUA election in March

3:23 SACUA Nominating Committee Election

3:27 Guest: Provost Philip Hanlon

The Provost sat at the front for a more informal discussion time.

1. Who am I? Mathematics professor here at UM almost 25 years. Undergrad of Dartmouth and from a mining village in New York state. Doctorate at Cal Tech. Taught at MIT for two years, back to Cal Tech and then to UM. Committed to public service and to our education mission. Education takes place in many venues, inside and outside the classroom. For the last decade he has been involved in administrative work, but still taught last semester.
2. Visioning. It is an important time for higher education with tremendous forces such as global engagement, information technology for communication and pedagogy, intellectual property and the funding model for higher education. This last is unsustainable on the current model. Public university costs has increased 5-7% a year and private universities have a greater rate of increase. A lot of the cost driver is technology. We must invest in technology but we get no bottom line benefit from it. No sense that the costs of compliance with federal regulations will be allowed to funding proposals. Should there be national laboratories or a national library, for example.

Given these pressures, what should we do to vision? Have started a group led by Bob Dolan to initiate the process. We need to consider how to shape our investment decisions. How do we distinguish ourselves from other top schools? We obviously have a great intellectual breadth – LS&A with many top-ranked schools on all sides, cover the intellectual map. This is our niche. The breadth of activities that happens here is also awesome – second largest research enterprise, hospital, long & well developed service work; we are engaged in a broad range of activities. How do we take these

distinctive features and make them distinctive benefits. We are uniquely positioned to take on some of the world's great problems. The challenge is to decide what complex world problem to take on.

Student learning is part ivory tower – intellectual skills – and experiential learning. Service learning or performance or starting a company.

The professions take intellectual skills and apply them to world problems. Where are we advantaged against our competitors? Not in the classroom (15:1 to 6:1). But we excel at experiential learning and the professions more so than any other university he knows. Making the world citizens of the next generation.

We have increased financial aid in double-digit percentages in five of the last six years. We have an increase in the under \$60k and the over \$100k family income student. We are starting to look at the \$60k-100k family income range.

Portfolios may be very useful to those graduating into the job market.

We cannot target matriculants by minority status because of proposition two. The percentage of minority students accepted increased this year after two lower years. We do everything we lawfully can.

Assessing learning outcomes with non-classroom experiences is challenging. We should start to look how to do this better.

We need to grow the faculty because the faculty members are all going “flat out” and can't make additional effort. We need more faculty members on the ground for some of these new initiatives. We added 50 new faculty lines this year in addition to the 100 lines of five years ago. We reduced cost of operations by \$135,000,000 between 2003 and 2009. That reduction in expenditures paid for the 100 new faculty lines for multidisciplinary enterprises. By 2012 we expect to cut another \$100,000,000 from expenditures and are paying for the 50 new faculty lines with this and with gifts from alumni and others. These fifty were allocated to identified departmental needs.

The issue of faculty retention was raised. Often a preemptive offer for retention is made at the last minute. This is a failure, but also the issue is often not money. Often the issue is respect or recognition. Even the sky boxes have been used to give strokes to faculty members identified by deans as “at risk.” We compete with Harvard, Berkeley and Stanford (the top three) and have retained 60% of those these try to snatch away.

Question of dependent tuition support for retaining faculty. We do benchmark salary and benefits against that group. We adjust for cost of living to these places. We will continue to look at a dependent tuition benefit.

A question was raised about retiree effort in the ongoing educational enterprise. The Provost directed attention to Ed Rothman

as a person who has been thinking creatively about this and it is a matter for ongoing consideration.

As we look to professional school involvement in undergraduate education we will have to be more flexible in the classroom structure.

3. Faculty matters. Funding is being applied to incite faculty newly tenured to continue research productivity; challenge of a natural let down after tenure is achieved. Also, consideration once again is ongoing about shifting the tenure clock from eight years to ten.
4. The budget. We have done well against our competitors because of a variety of efforts. The educational core has not suffered. Next year we will likely see a substantial reduction in state appropriation for Universities. To continue our reduction in expenditures, we are undergoing IT rationalization (IT costs \$315,000,000 UM-AA a year) to deliver the same service at much lower cost. The current state gap is 13% without any change in the business tax; if that tax follows the governor's proposal to reduce it to 3% across the board, the gap would be about 25%.

4:27 **Extending Tenure Probationary Period**

Action Item 012411-1:

Resolved, that at the University of Michigan only tenure track faculty as a body are eligible to make final decisions of the faculty in matters involving tenure including, but not limited to, the tenure process as described in Regents Bylaw 5.09 and its procedures, as well as individual decisions to grant tenure.

For: 56

Abstention of record: 1

Against: 0

Action Item 012411-2:

Resolved, that the [January 23, 2006](#) Action of the Senate Assembly (No.012306-1 attached) expressing significant reservations about any changes to the existing Regents Bylaws governing tenure is hereby re-affirmed.

For: 54

Abstention of record: 1

Against: 1

5:01 Adjournment