

Minutes of 8 February 2016 SACUA  
Circulated 12 February 2016  
Approved 7 March 2016

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN  
Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA)  
February 8, 2016  
Monday, 3:15 pm  
Fleming Building, Regents Room

Present: Lehman, Mondro, Schultz, Szymanski, Weineck (chair), Wright, Ziff, Potter

Absent: Smith,

Guests: President Schlissel; Erika Hrabec; reporters for the *Michigan Daily* and the *University Record*

3:15 Call to Order/Approval of Agenda and Minutes/Announcements

3:20 Status Reports

Campus IT

There was considerable discussion of the problem with the migration of course sites to CANVAS, Laura Patterson and Sean will be speaking to Senate Assembly about the move to CANVAS from C-Tools. Professors Potter, Mondro and Wright commented on the impact on faculty productivity. Professor Schultz observed that this was an example of a committee that had been hand-picked to submit a report that would be supportive of a policy change. The CANVAS committee was staffed with “early adopters” of new technologies meaning that the committee did not have a realistic picture of the difficulties that the average faculty member might encounter in making the shift. Professor Szymanski said that the experience of Kinesiology was positive.

Office for Institutional Equity  
Professional Standards SPG

Regents Faculty Governance Update

3:30 Guest: President Schlissel

Chair Weineck called President Schlissel’s attention to the Bylaws governing the selection of a new Faculty Athletic representative (FAR). President Schlissel said we need a new person starting in the next academic year. He said that he would pass on the job description to SACUA. President Schlissel said that it would be good to discuss the priorities for the athletic program with the arrival of the new Athletic Director. He invited SACUA’s thoughts for the priorities for the Athletic Director. The new Athletic Director will be making a visit or two before he starts and discussions will be held about the expectations for the future. Professor Szymanski suggested that the role of Advisory Board for Intercollegiate Athletics (ABIA) should be explored. He said that the committee has no obvious purpose. President Schlissel said that

this should be discussed with the new Athletic Director. Professor Potter discussed the working of the ABIA in the past, noting that under Bill Martin the Planning Committee and the Academic performance Committee (APC) filled a significant role in discussing academic issues. Chair Weineck said that SACUA would send an e-mail greeting the new Athletic Director, and President Schlissel agreed that he should be welcome at Senate Assembly. President Schlissel noted Warde Manuel's background at Michigan as well as his excellent credentials had made him the top candidate even before his excellent interview.

Chair Weineck introduced the discussion of the committee structure. President Schlissel said that he would share the SACUA recommendations with the executive officers. Chair Weineck asked that the SACUA Chair, who came twice a year to a meeting of the Academic Programs Group (APG), might also come to a meeting of the Executive Officers. President Schlissel said this would be welcome when a specific issue was identified.

Professor Schultz asked about the confidentiality of administration formed committees, including the Provost's committee to review casebooks. President Schlissel said that he only enters the process at the very end, reviewing all files for tenure level hires, and promotions to tenure. In his review, he sees a memo from the college, giving the reasons for the decision, and the Provost's office with an evaluation of the case from two associate provosts. President Schlissel said that he does not have details of the group that advises the Provost on promotion cases. Prof. Schultz said that at the department level there is great transparency, at the college level everyone knows who is on the executive committee. President Schlissel said that the proportion of cases altered at the Provost's level is very small (1-3%). President Schlissel himself asked for more detailed justifications for some cases. He does not recall that there has been a case for which he asked for further information in which he has reversed the decision, but he stressed the importance of participants feeling that their decision process is carefully scrutinized. Chair Weineck said that she thought there was a feeling that SACUA would always support tenure cases, while SACUA was in fact concerned with the rigor of the review process. President Schlissel said that he felt that SACUA's issue was the preservation of the integrity of the unit review.

President Schlissel said he was looking to see what he could do to make Michigan better, he is looking to build up the scholarly infrastructure and making sure that there were resources to hire and retain the best people. He said that he would focus on the breadth of the University. He feels that the number and quality of the schools and colleges is a great strength. His interest is in seeing how he can tap into the breadth on a strategic level, promoting collaboration between schools. He believes that faculty do not care if a colleague works in the same school, but faculty members need ways of locating potential collaborators (he noted that M-Cubed is very well designed to promote such collaboration between individuals). He would like to stimulate long-term collaboration between schools. He gave the example of collaboration between the Medical School, Pharmacy Engineering and LSA Life Sciences. In the interest of capturing the potential of collaboration between schools, he asked schools with a social science orientation to identify a common problem, gathering representatives Business, Law, Public Policy, Social Work, Education and LSA. A number of common themes emerged from the meeting. He would like to develop a small number of themes that cut across administrative boundaries and would resonate with interests outside the academy. He values scholarship that the public can understand, scholarship that reinforces the value of what the University does in public consciousness.

President Schlissel feels that it is his role to approach issues at the meta-level. Schools are cognizant of issues that have interests that extend beyond their boundaries, but are less good at developing models of interaction with other units. Professor Ziff said that current budget models encourage parochialism. President Schlissel replied that when the right incentives are present, things will happen; he feels that progress will not be made by taking things away from units. Progress could be made by using incremental resources from central funds to reward successful initiatives that arise at unit levels. Professor Lehman said that it is important to improve the public perception of the academy as a public rather than private good. President Schlissel agreed that the public is seeing Higher Education as a private good.

President Schlissel said that diversity is a crucial aspect of the university's identity—it is an institutional value, it has to have accountability to the center. The part he is most worried about is the inclusivity of the academy as a whole and the campus in particular. He has met with many student identity groups whose members have made it plain that minority students do not experience the campus the way that majority students do. He would like to foster a climate in which students can talk about difficult things; he feels that only a minority of students are engaged in discussing identity and diversity.

President Schlissel said that he favored processes where ideas emerged from the bottom up, that centrally designed initiatives tended to look like other universities' initiatives. This did not necessarily play to the strength of the University of Michigan. Prof. Schultz noted that President Coleman had initiated interdisciplinary cluster hires to promote new initiatives wondered whether there had been a critical evaluation of cluster hiring since there was criticism of the initiative at the time. President Schlissel believes that the coincidence of interest of faculty will enable Michigan to move ahead in an original way—that the central administration should add resources to organically arising areas of strength. Chair Weineck said that we should follow up with concrete suggestions on committees and on tenure and promotion.

#### 4:05 Approval of February Senate Assembly Agenda

The question arose as to whether SACUA wanted to make a recommendation to Senate Assembly about how to resolve the question of election procedure. Chair Weineck said that a structured discussion would be more fruitful, and would be promoted by having a proposal on the floor. Professor Wright said that SACUA should say what was meant by “the remainder of the term,” in the proposed motion. Chair Weineck asked whether a term consisted 3 academic years, not necessarily served consecutively, or 3 consecutive years from point of election. Professor Wright said if SACUA adopted the second definition of a term, this would create more elections. Professor Lehman noted that an increase in the number of elections would make things seem too ad hoc. Professor Lehman said that Senate Assembly should have a remedy for a SACUA member being away, but that the member should not serve beyond the original 3 academic years from initial election. Chair Weineck said that SACUA needed a policy for the future. She wanted to ensure that decisions not be ad hoc. Professor Ziff said that he supported a fixed term of 3 years from point of election. Professor Lehman said that SACUA never had a problem in the past because the SACUA position went to the next highest vote giver and that the person who took the term would be eligible for reelection since the person will not have filled a full term. It was pointed out that this would not work if the position became vacant a year, or even a term, after the election.

SACUA agreed that there should be two motions for the Senate Assembly. Professor Wright proposed that the motions should be:

Whereas, it is not uncommon for SACUA members to be awarded a leave of absence during their SACUA term of office due to a sabbatical, a fellowship, duty off campus or similar circumstances such as medical leaves and

Whereas, it is of benefit to the University that the faculty participate in these leaves and

Whereas, it most closely matches the intent of the original elections, therefore be it

Resolved, that it is permissible and at the option of the SACUA member offered the leave to defer for up to one year the remainder of his/her term.

Or:

Whereas, it is not uncommon for SACUA members to be awarded a leave of absence during their SACUA term of office due to a sabbatical, a fellowship, duty off campus or similar circumstances such as medical leaves and

Whereas, it is of benefit to the University that the faculty participate in these leaves and

Whereas, it most closely matches the intent of the original elections, therefore be it

Resolved, that it is permissible and at the option of the SACUA member offered the leave to return to SACUA after the leave is completed to serve until the original scheduled date of the end of the term.

Chair Weineck and Professor Ziff said that there should be clear policies for replacement members. Professor Wright suggested that the policy for replacement will be that:

“SACUA will recommend a to the assembly the means by which the vacated position will be filled or left open.”

Professor Lehman suggested that the matter be brought to the rules committee within the next 3 days. Professor Ziff seconded the motion. The proposal is that Professor Frier will consult the rules committee electronically, if practical, to return an opinion by Thursday. The question for the Rules Committee will be whether there is a formal problem to SACUA’s proposal’s for dealing with vacancy.

A motion to approve the following Senate Assembly Agenda was passed unanimously:

3:15 call to Order/Approval of Agenda and Minutes

3:20 Announcements

3:30 Replacement Procedures for SACUA members who are going on leave

Whereas, it is not uncommon for SACUA members to be awarded a leave of absence during their SACUA term of office due to a sabbatical, a fellowship, duty off campus or similar circumstances such as medical leaves and

Whereas, it is of benefit to the University that the faculty participate in these leaves and

Whereas, it most closely matches the intent of the original elections, therefore be it

Resolved, that it is permissible and at the option of the SACUA member offered the leave to defer for up to one year the remainder of his/her term.

Or:

Whereas, it is not uncommon for SACUA members to be awarded a leave of absence during their SACUA term of office due to a sabbatical, a fellowship, duty off campus or similar circumstances such as medical leaves and

Whereas, it is of benefit to the University that the faculty participate in these leaves and

Whereas, it most closely matches the intent of the original elections, therefore be it Resolved, that it is permissible and at the option of the SACUA member offered the leave to return to SACUA after the leave is completed to serve until the original scheduled date of the end of the term.

#### 3:45 SACUA Election Procedures for Replacements

Proposal: “SACUA will recommend to the assembly the means by which the vacated position will be filled or left open.”

4:15 Academic Affairs Advisory Committee (AAAC) chair John Lehman

4:30 Student Relations Advisory Committee (SRAC) chair David Potter

4:55 Unfinished Business/Matter Arising

5:00 Adjournment

#### 4:15 March Faculty Governance Conference Planning

Professor Lehman asked if we had a list of people who will be attending the meeting.

Chair Weineck suggested circulating a questionnaire to find out faculty governance work at other schools. She noted that other schools have a mechanism for the past, current and future chairs work together for greater continuity.

Chair Weineck asked if there should be a campus announcement of the Kipnis lecture and Should the sessions be open to the public? She said that there will be an open reception after the lecture; RSVPs will be requested for the reception as alcohol will be served. Undergraduates will be welcome to the lecture.

The current attendees are as follows:

Gary Miller and Joseph Rosenblatt—University of Illinois

Colin Campbell and Jigna Desai—University of Minnesota

John Powell and Martin Crimp—Michigan State University

John Bender and John Woodman—University of Nebraska, Lincoln

Joe Garofalo—University of Virginia

Ben Hermalin—University of California, Berkeley

Christina Bohannon—University of Iowa

Amy Wendt—University of Wisconsin, Madison

Nina Solenski—University of Virginia

Joel Aberbach—University of California at Los Angeles

Edward Hughes—Northwestern

#### 4:30 SACUA Nominations

Professor Mondro reported that there are five nominations so far.

#### 4:55 Executive Session

Minutes of 8 February 2016 SACUA

Circulated 12 February 2016

Approved 7 March 2016

Discussion of potential SACUA nominees

5:05 Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

David S. Potter  
Senate Secretary

Next SACUA meeting: February 15, 2016  
Next Senate Assembly meeting: February 22, 2016

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."