

Minutes of 17 November 2014 Senate Assembly Meeting
Circulated 18 November 2014
Re-circulated 26 January 2015
Approved 26 January 2015

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
UNIVERSITY SENATE MEETING
SENATE ASSEMBLY MEETING
17 NOVEMBER 2014

Present: Adler, Adlerstein Gonzalez, Battacharrya, Baker, Beck, Bertacco, Broglio, Cervetti, Chen, Cohn, Custer, Danziger, Fagerlin, Fiore, Grosh, Hayes, Holland, Jacobsen, Jones, Keshamouni, Kileny, Lavoie Smith, Lehman, Liu, Malek, Masten, Mondro, Oey, Princen, Raphael, Rothman, Schloss, Schultz, Silveira, Smith, Wang, Weineck, Winful, Young

Alternate Requested: Adunbi, Biteen, Burrow, Campbell, Casida, Gocek, Hershovitz, Lim, Zeisberg

Alternates: Herbert, Hopkins, Kao, Wright

Absent: Atchade, Barolo, Brown, Bradley, Campbell, Cotera, Dolins, Ellis, Fraser, Friesen, Garcia, Johnson, Katapodi, Kee, Krishner, Mitchell, Nielsen, Pandey, Primus, Ro, Ryan, Shaefer, Swain, Turnley, Veatch, Ziff

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED

1. Agenda for Senate Assembly
2. Draft Minutes of the 22 September 2014 Senate Assembly and University Senate meeting
3. Draft Minutes of the 20 October 2014 Senate Assembly meeting
4. Advisory Board on Intercollegiate Athletics, Confidentiality Policy Statement, dated 12 May 2010.
5. Advisory Board on Intercollegiate Athletics, Confidentiality Policy Statement (SACUA draft, 31 October 2014).
6. Faculty Senates and Athletics Governance. Steering Committee, Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), September 2014.
7. University of Michigan Board of Regents Bylaws Sec. 11.54, Sec. 11.55, 11.56, 11.58, 11.59, 11.60, 11.61, and 11.62 regarding the Athletic Department and the ABIA.
8. Big 10 2011-12 Handbook, excerpted pages.
9. Academic Performance Committee. Annual Report to the Faculty Senate, 17 November 2014.

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Chair Masten convened the meeting of the Senate Assembly at 3:19 P.M. The proposed agenda was approved.

MINUTES

The draft minutes of 22 September 2014 and 20 October 2014 were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The next meeting of the Senate Assembly is scheduled for 15 December 2014.

INFORMATION-ONLY REQUEST FROM PROVOST REGARDING STUDENT COURSE EVALUATIONS

Professor Lehman read the following from the draft minutes of the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee (AAAC):

AAAC next introduced a request transmitted by Mr. Muchhal from Central Student Governance that course evaluations be made available for student review. The provost reported that the office of general counsel offered the opinion that the numerical ranking in the evaluation belong to the university but that legal ownership of the comments is more complex, and may belong to the writer.

Discussion about the merits of the request touched on factors including low response rates and the limits on interpretation of the scores. The scores may represent an index of student satisfaction with their experience rather than a metric of their learning. Student satisfaction was not seen to be irrelevant or unimportant, but it is incomplete. Everyone agreed that use and misuse of the evaluation results was a recurring topic. The provost said that the issue had been discussed in the Academic Programs Group (APG) and that some deans pointed out that there was some statistical evidence suggesting bias in responses associated with race, gender, age, and ethnicity, although the evidence is mixed. The provost asked AAAC members to canvass their colleagues and to report faculty sentiment about publically releasing numerical scores for four questions:

- 1. Overall, this was an excellent course.*
- 2. Overall, the instructor was an excellent teacher.*
- 3. I learned a great deal from this course.*
- 4. I had a strong desire to take this course.*

Professor Lehman asked that Assembly members express their support of the proposal to release those numerical scores to student governance in a non-binding straw poll, without formal motion or discussion. Members expressed their sentiment by show of hands.

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE REPORT ON STUDENT-ATHLETE PERFORMANCE AND POLICIES

Chair Masten introduced Professors Barbara Brush (chair of the Academic Performance Committee, APC) and Anne Curzan (Faculty Athletics Representative, FAR) at 3:27 P.M. He pointed out that the visitors had been scheduled to meet with the Assembly since last summer. Professor Brush noted that their appearance was timely, given the publicity accorded remarks made by the president to SACUA one week earlier. She expressed interest in making a presentation to the Assembly every year. She stated that the APC is a faculty subset of the Advisory Board on Intercollegiate Athletics (ABIA), and that the APC hears petitions from student athletes who have achieved the NCAA grade point requirements for eligibility, but who have not achieved the UM requirement of a 2.0 GPA.

Professor Curzan explained that as FAR she reports directly to the president. She is in the second year of a 3-year renewable appointment. She represents the UM to the NCAA and on campus she is a liaison between the Athletic Department and the president. She said her appointment has been an eye-opening experience. One of the things she learned is that across the full range of sports, student athletes feel they are stereotyped in unflattering ways by faculty and peers.

The two guests reviewed the statistics presented in distributed item 9. Professor Oey asked whether missed class days were monitored. FAR Curzan explained that class days refer to all days during a semester when classes are held on campus. She added that the missed class day policy does not apply to post-season competition.

Professor Curzan reported that the Big 10 has recently issued a requirement to show that faculty oversight of student athlete academic performance is authentic. She said that she monitors course enrollment data to identify any courses in which student athletes comprise more than 20% of enrollees. Professor Smith asked if there have been a study to learn whether whether athletes would be admitted if they were not athletes. The FAR responded that the holistic admissions process would preclude such a study. Professor Smith said that there is a there is a perception that there are courses that athletes gravitate to because it is easy to get a high grade. The FAR replied that that is true of all universities, and that it is not restricted to athletes.

Professor Beck remarked that less than half of the students taking the paper courses at the University of North Carolina were athletes. He asked if there is a way to track such behavior. Professor Curzan replied affirmatively and said that is why she works with the Registrar's Office to track enrollments.

The guests concluded their presentation at 4:10.

FACULTY ROLES IN ATHLETICS DEPARTMENT GOVERNANCE

At 4:10 P.M. Chair Masten introduced Professor Yago Colas, the UM representative to COIA (distributed item 6). Professor Colas said that he was a recent appointee to his position, and that he was still learning in his role as liaison between faculty groups and COIA. He reviewed the history of COIA and the issues with which it engages. Recent attention has focused on athletics and faculty governance.

He identified an area of personal concern involving tension between athletic departments and those identified as stewards of institutional academic integrity, including the faculty. He said that COIA did not seem to pay enough attention to meeting the needs of student athletes for individual growth and well-being.

Professor Colas then called attention to Rule 3.01 of the Big 10 Handbook (distributed item 8), which calls for full and complete faculty control of intercollegiate athletic programs. He said that he did not know if such control exists at the UM. He concluded his remarks at 4:25 P.M.

Chair Masten called attention to Regents' Bylaws pertaining to the ABIA (distributed item 7). Professor Schultz asked how many members of the ABIA are nominated by the

governing faculty as opposed to other groups. Chair Masten replied that there are 6 faculty-nominated members, plus the SACUA chair, thus constituting a majority.

Professor Custer asked if COIA has any authority or enforcement capability. Professor Colas replied that it did not. Professor Raphael asked whether the guests believed that the UM is providing a full educational opportunity to student athletes. Professor Curzan outlined the support system for student athletes, including sharing of information between academic advisors in LSA and athletics counselors. Professor Oey stated that she believed the information sharing was uneven.

Professor Malek asked for the mean and standard deviation of GPAs for student athletes compared to the general student population. The FAR replied that she could provide those data. She added that there are many reasons why student athletes leave the UM before graduation. She said that exit interviews are conducted with each athlete who leaves, but that the information has not been compiled in a systematic way.

Professor Smith asked how a course in the culture of basketball currently offered by Professor Colas contributes to the full educational experience at the UM. Members responded that the matter is within the province of the Curriculum Committee of the relevant unit. Professor Curzan replied that the current LSA Theme Semester is Sport and the University. She said there is no conflict between sports and academics.

ADVISORY BOARD ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT

At 4:45 P.M. Chair Masten called attention to distributed items 4 and 5. He stated that the confidentiality agreement promoted by the Athletics Department (item 4) and required of all ABIA members precludes discussion of any information outside the ABIA. He then pointed to distributed item 7 and quoted sections that require the ABIA to report to the University Senate and SACUA. He said the office of general counsel asserts there is no conflict between confidentiality agreement item 4 and the Regents' Bylaws, but that SACUA regards the agreement as too restrictive. He said that SACUA developed an alternative agreement (item 5) that conforms with the way elected faculty governance conducts its own business, recognizing as confidential those matters that laws such as FERPA mandate as such. SACUA sent its proposal to the office of general counsel on 31 October 2014. He acknowledged that neither document addresses enforcement of confidentiality. He said the topic will be brought before the Assembly for greater deliberation if the office of general counsel rejects SACUA's draft.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 P.M.

Respectfully submitted

John T. Lehman
Senate Secretary Pro Tempore

University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents, Sec. 4.01:

The University Senate

The 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.

University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents, Sec. 4.04:

The Senate Assembly

The Senate Assembly shall serve as the legislative arm of the senate.

The assembly shall have power to consider and advise regarding all matters within the jurisdiction of the University Senate which affect the functioning of the university as an institution of higher learning, which concern its obligations to the state and to the community at large, and which relate to its internal organization insofar as such matters of internal organization involve general questions of educational policy.

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