

## **Senate Assembly Resolutions 2005-2006 through 2018-2019**

### **ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY 021819-1**

#### **Davis, Markert, Nickerson Lecture Committee**

Be it resolved that a permanent DMN Academic Freedom Lecture Committee of the Senate Assembly be established with a charge to select the annual speaker for the DMN lecture and coordinate the programming elements.

### **ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY 021819-2**

#### **Resolution on Governance at all levels**

Whereas the principles of faculty governance apply to all three campuses across the University of Michigan as an institution;

Whereas the Principles for Faculty Participation in Institutional Governance state that “Faculty members are encouraged to use these principles as a basis for ensuring their effective participation in governance at all levels; [...] Agencies for faculty participation in the government of the college/school or university shall be established at each level where faculty responsibility is to be met. A faculty-elected campus-wide body shall exist for the presentation of the views of the whole faculty. The agencies may consist of meetings of all faculty members of a department, school, college, division, or university system, or they may take the form of faculty-elected executive committees in departments and colleges/schools, and a faculty-elected body for larger divisions or for the institution as a whole (Part A.5).”

Whereas faculty serve in a variety of roles, including through governance within committees, programs, departments, schools, colleges, institutes, divisions, and assemblies;

Whereas the governance structures of the institution vary in number and type by campus;

Whereas an instructional unit is most often a school or college, all Regentally established academic structures (i.e., disciplines, institutes, programs, departments, etc.) also function as types of units and are meant to be subject to the same principles of faculty governance;

Be it resolved that the U of M Senate Assembly acknowledges the importance of faculty participation in institutional shared governance at every level of academic responsibility on all U of M campuses. This includes the faculty at the departmental and academic program or Discipline (Dearborn) levels. Faculty have the right and duty to develop and ratify internal procedures in accordance with the SPG ‘Hierarchy of Legal and Policy Requirements,’ and to establish mechanisms for their participation at those levels. Those best informed by disciplinary academic expertise should be able to

make decisions according to the standards of governance established in the Regents Bylaws and Principles of Governance.

### **ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY 021819-3**

[TriCampus Committee Resolution on Due Process](#)(pdf)

### **ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY 091718**

Be it resolved that a permanent Tri-Campus Committee of the Senate Assembly shall be established with a charge to consider points of interest delegated to it by SACUA such as those that relate to the relationship between the three campuses or policies across the institution.

The resolution was carried with one negative vote and one abstention

### **2016-2017**

### **ACTIONS OF SENATE ASSEMBLY**

RESOLUTION [032017-1](#)

The resolution was amended to read:

The University faculty governance supports a policy that allows all members and visitors to our campus to use bathrooms consistent with their gender identity.

The amended measure was unanimously approved.

RESOLUTION 032017-2

**Final resolution:** Any such alternates so provided shall be elected or appointed from Senate members of the same unit by the replaced Assembly member at least 24 hours prior to the Assembly meeting by notifying [facultysenateoffice@umich.edu](mailto:facultysenateoffice@umich.edu).

The measure was passed unanimously passed.

### **ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY 012317**

The Senate Assembly, in its capacity as the legislative arm of the University Senate (University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents, Sec. 4.04), hereby declares that any reduction to an individual faculty member's base academic salary constitutes a demotion and entitles the affected faculty members to all of the due process provisions of Regental Bylaw 5.09.

The vote in favor of the motion was 33 with one abstention.

### **ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [102416](#)**

The following resolution passed unanimously:

WHEREAS, a large number of Senate members from UM-Flint and UM-Dearborn have requested SACUA to create a Senate Assembly task force to undertake an assessment of and to make recommendations about tri-campus campus faculty governance relationships at U-M, UM-Dearborn, and UM-Flint, and WHEREAS, creating such a task force received the highest number of votes in the Senate Assembly initial poll at the September 19, 2016 Senate Assembly meeting, then THEREFORE, be it resolved that Senate Assembly hereby creates such a tri-campus task force to work with any existing local stakeholder, and be it further resolved that Senate Assembly hereby gives SACUA in collaboration with local campus faculty governance the authority to populate and charge a six-member task force subject to final approval of Senate Assembly, and be it further resolved that the task force will report back to Senate Assembly at the April 17,

WHEREAS, creating such a task force received the highest number of votes in the Senate Assembly initial poll at the September 19, 2016 Senate Assembly meeting, then THEREFORE, be it resolved that Senate Assembly hereby creates such a tri-campus task force to work with any existing local stakeholder, and be it further resolved that Senate Assembly hereby gives SACUA in collaboration with local campus faculty governance the authority to populate and charge a six-member task force subject to final approval of Senate Assembly, and be it further resolved that the task force will report back to Senate Assembly at the April 17,

THEREFORE, be it resolved that Senate Assembly hereby creates such a tri-campus task force to work with any existing local stakeholder, and be it further resolved that Senate Assembly hereby gives SACUA in collaboration with local campus faculty governance the authority to populate and charge a six-member task force subject to final approval of Senate Assembly, and be it further resolved that the task force will report back to Senate Assembly at the April 17, 2017 Senate Assembly meeting.

WHEREAS, creating such a task force received the highest number of votes in the Senate Assembly initial poll at the September 19, 2016 Senate Assembly meeting, then THEREFORE, be it resolved that Senate Assembly hereby creates such a tri-campus task force to work with any existing local stakeholder, and be it further resolved that Senate Assembly hereby gives SACUA in collaboration with local campus faculty governance the authority to populate and charge a six-member task force subject to final approval of Senate Assembly, and be it further resolved that the task force will report back to Senate Assembly at the April 17, 2017 Senate Assembly meeting.

THEREFORE, be it resolved that Senate Assembly hereby creates such a tri-campus task force to work with any existing local stakeholder, and be it further resolved that Senate Assembly hereby gives SACUA in collaboration with local campus faculty governance the authority to populate and charge a six-member task force subject to final approval of Senate Assembly, and be it further resolved that the task force will report back to Senate Assembly at the April 17, 2017 Senate Assembly meeting.

**2015-2016**

**ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY 041816**

The following resolution passed unanimously:

Whereas students who are either complainants or respondents in investigations conducted by the Office of Institutional Equity (OIE) can appeal both OIS's findings and sanctions imposed as a consequence of OIE findings and

WHEREAS faculty must be entitled to the same due process protections as other members of the university community, and

WHEREAS fair investigations of charges of misconduct against faculty benefit from and at times require peer evaluation,

RESOLVED that the Senate Assembly requests that the University institute a policy a. by which all OIE findings in which faculty are the complainants or the respondents be reviewed at the faculty's request by a body of their faculty peers which will be empowered to recommend reconsideration of the findings b. by which both OIE findings and sanctions against faculty can be appealed to the same body of their faculty peers or an appointed body at least half of whom will be members of the UM faculty senate.

**ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY 022216**

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

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

WHEREAS, it is of benefit to the University Senate, Senate Assembly and SACUA to have SACUA members with experience in faculty governance who might assume leadership roles, and

WHEREAS, it most closely matches the intent of the original election,

therefore, be it

RESOLVED, a SACUA member who goes on leave within his or her scheduled term in office may return to SACUA after the leave is completed to serve until the original scheduled date of the end of the term.

Approved by a majority vote

**ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY 012516**

In light of the recent wave of anti-Islamic rhetoric in public discourse, the University of Michigan's Senate Assembly hereby affirms its support for the Muslim members of the

University community. Our collective commitment to equity, inclusion, and mutual respect extends to all members of the community regardless of religious affiliation. We call on all members of the University of Michigan to unequivocally oppose and condemn all attempts to discriminate against, marginalize, or denigrate students, faculty, and staff on the basis of religious faith, national origin or ethnic belonging.

Vote on the Active Motion: Approved by a majority vote.

#### **ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY 111615**

**WHEREAS**, The University has a long-established procedure for determining whether a certain set of investments is appropriate for the University to hold in its endowment; **AND**

**WHEREAS**, that procedure begins with the formation of an Ad Hoc Committee comprised of students, alumni, faculty, and administrators assembled in order to gather information and formulate recommendations for the Regents' consideration; **AND**

**WHEREAS**, the University has an established standard for forming such a Committee which – as summarized by the Office of the CFO – requires that (1) the concern to be explored must express the broadly and consistently held position of the campus community over time; (2) there must be reason to believe that the behavior or action in question may be antithetical to the core mission and values of the University; and (3) there must be reason to believe that the organization, industry, or entity to be singled out may be uniquely responsible for the problems identified; **AND**

**WHEREAS**, the University has twice before determined that a set of investments meet this standard – first with companies doing business in apartheid South Africa, and second with tobacco companies; **AND**

**WHEREAS**, a consensus on campus regarding climate change is demonstrated by statistical data from the Graham Sustainability Institute, the academic and extracurricular pursuits of the student body, the research and teachings of the faculty, and the administration, operation, course offerings of the University, and the passage of a resolution by the Central Student Government; **AND**

**WHEREAS**, sustainability is a core value of the University, as evidenced by its inclusion in the University's vision statement, the academic and extracurricular pursuits of the student body, the research and teachings of the faculty, the administration, operation, and course offerings of the University, and the three working groups around sustainability created by President Schlissel; **AND**

**WHEREAS**, the core mission of the University includes preserving and applying academic values; **AND**

**WHEREAS** there is reason to believe that the nature of oil and coal – as the most greenhouse gas intensive forms of energy on the planet – is fundamentally antithetical the University’s core value of sustainability, and that the actions of the oil and coal industries – in undermining the scientifically proven link between greenhouse gas emissions and global warming for the purpose of economic gain – is antithetical to the University’s core academic mission; **AND**

**WHEREAS** there is reason to believe that the oil and coal industries are uniquely responsible for climate change due both to the inherent nature of their products and to their decades-long campaign to prevent action on addressing climate change in order to perpetuate reliance on their products; **THEREFORE BE IT**

**RESOLVED**, that the Senate Assembly believes that the University’s standard for forming a Committee to gather information and formulate recommendations about whether a certain set of investments is appropriate for the University to hold has been met as to the oil and coal industries; **AND BE IT FURTHER**

**RESOLVED**, that the Senate Assembly believes that because the University’s long-established standard has been met, the Regents should form such a Committee; **AND BE IT FURTHER**

**RESOLVED**, that the Senate Assembly believes that the Committee should not be charged with considering divestment from diversified commingled funds (such as mutual funds) that aren’t specific to the oil and coal industries; **AND BE IT FURTHER**

**RESOLVED**, that because it is the role of the Committee to come to the conclusion of whether the University should ultimately divest, this resolution does not address that question; **AND BE IT FINALLY**

**RESOLVED**, that the Senate Assembly believes that the composition of the Committee should be similar to the Committee on Tobacco Investments, which included four professors, one undergraduate student, one graduate student, one administrator, and one alumnus.

Vote for the student’s proposal to form the committee with small changes above was endorsed by a large majority of the faculty present.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

## **ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY** [102615](#)

Research strongly suggests that Friday morning classes considerably reduce heavy student drinking and the adverse events associated with it. In an effort to contribute to the University’s goals to reduce alcohol abuse, on September 28th, 2015, SACUA (the Senate Assembly’s executive committee) approved the following resolution for consideration by the Assembly:

WHEREAS the faculty of the University of Michigan is committed to providing the University's students with a world-class education, it recognizes the need to provide that education in a safe and healthy environment. And

WHEREAS the faculty of the University of Michigan recognizes that providing regular instruction for First and Second years students five days a week promotes a better and more secure learning environment, and recognizes that Friday classes, especially Friday morning classes, reduce the incidence of alcohol abuse in university communities,

THEREFORE The Senate Assembly strongly urges the Provost to promote and incentivize the regular teaching of 100 and 200 level large enrollment courses (defined as courses having ten or more sections) with a Friday meeting. It recommends that in cases where such classes have a lecture component, those classes will regularly schedule a lecture on Friday.

Vote on the Active Motion: Approved by a majority vote.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

## **ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [092115](#)**

The Senate Assembly endorsed the following motion brought forward by the AAAC:

The Academic Affairs Advisory Committee (AAAC) has been apprised by both student governance representatives and by the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs that students have expressed concern about the widespread practice of scheduling course assessments or examinations during the final week of classes each semester. Although the AAAC recognizes and strongly supports the primacy of faculty judgment about pedagogical methods and assessment tools in their individual courses, it also recognizes that an incidental consequence to students of such practice may be the scheduling of multiple assessments in a single day, resulting in fatigue and hardship. Consequently, the AAAC encourages faculty not to schedule comprehensive final examinations at times other than during the prescribed final examination period. The AAAC also asks faculty to weigh carefully the possible cumulative effects of scheduling course assessments during the final week of classes as they decide individually how best to conduct their instruction and evaluation of students.

Vote on the Active Motion: Endorsed by a majority vote.

## **2014-2015**

## **ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [021615-1](#)**

Resolution on the Structure of Senate Assembly Committees

Pursuant to the authority of the Senate Assembly to establish standing committees and to define their duties and obligations under Regents Bylaw 4.06 and Article II, Section 4, Paragraph 3 of the Rules of the University Senate, the Senate Assembly and the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs, the Senate Assembly hereby enacts the following changes to the standing committees of the Assembly, effective September 1, 2015, and authorizes the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs to propose new or modified committee charges as necessary to effect such changes for consideration and approval of the Senate Assembly at its September, 2015, meeting:

1. Eliminate the Provost's Advisory Committee on Budgetary Affairs (PACBA) and the Budget Study Committee (inactive) and expand the charge of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (CESF) to include advising the Assembly on budgetary issues.
2. Eliminate the Faculty Perspectives Editorial Board (FPEB) and expand the charge of the University Secretary Advisory Committee, acting without the Secretary of the University, to receive and review submissions for the University Record Faculty Perspectives page.
3. Eliminate the University Undergraduate Scholarship Committee (UUSC) and expand the charge of the Committee for an Inclusive University to include the solicitation of donations and the award of need-based support to outstanding U-M applicants (from all three campuses).
4. Eliminate the Committee on University Values.
5. Change the name of the Committee on Civil Liberties (CCL) to the Committee on Civil Rights and Liberties (CCRL) and expand its charge to include advising the Assembly on civil rights as well as civil liberties.
6. Change the name of the Rules Committee to the Rules, Practices, and Policies Committee (RPP) and expand its charge to include advising the Assembly on formal policies and procedures of the University that affect faculty.
7. Establish an Information Technology Committee (ITC).
8. Establish a Building, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee (BFIC).

Vote on the Active Motion:

Number approving- 36 Number disapproving- none

Number disapproving- none

Abstentions of record- none

Chair Masten declared the vote to be unanimous

ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY 021615-2

On a motion from the floor, the Assembly took up the following motion:

Pursuant to the authority of the Senate Assembly to establish standing committees and to define their duties and obligations under Regents Bylaw 4.06 and Article II, Section 4, Paragraph 3 of the Rules of the University Senate, the Senate Assembly and the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs, the Senate Assembly hereby enacts the following change to the standing committees of the Assembly, effective September 1, 2015, and authorizes the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs to propose new or modified committee charges as necessary to effect such changes for consideration and approval of the Senate Assembly at its September, 2015, meeting:

Eliminate the Communications Advisory Committee (CAC), the Development Advisory Committee (DAC), and the Government Relations Advisory Committee (GRAC) and create a Communications & External Relations Advisory Committee (CERAC) with responsibility for advising the Vice President for Communications, the Vice President for Development, and the Vice President for Government Relations.

Vote on the Active Motion:

A majority having voted in favor of the motion, the resolution was adopted.

SENATE ASSEMBLY ACTION [012615-1](#)

### **Resolution: Guidance on Confidentiality Agreements for University Senate Members**

As part of the shared governance of the University, Senate members may from time to time be called to serve on committees or advisory boards that develop and review policies and procedures or that render professional judgments. Although certain sensitive matters, such as personnel decisions and other personal matters, are appropriately (and in some case may legally only be) discussed in confidence, confidentiality should, in the interest of transparency and full deliberation, be invoked only for compelling reasons after deliberation by and the approval of the committee members and not as a means to avoid debate or accountability.

Therefore, the Senate Assembly advises Senate members that

1. whereas executive session deliberations are appropriate only for certain limited matters, members are discouraged from signing agreements or agreeing orally not to disclose committee activities as a whole;
2. when asked to accept broad confidentiality restrictions as condition for serving on committees or advisory boards, members are asked to disclose such requests and

their rationales to SACUA through the Faculty Senate Office so that the extent of such activities can be documented for review on request by members of the University Senate.

Vote on the Active Motion (012615-1):

Number approving- 35

Number disapproving- 1

Abstentions of record- 1

Chair Masten declared that the motion had been passed.

---

SENATE ASSEMBLY ACTION [012615-2](#)

### **Administration Evaluation Committee Resolution**

The Senate Assembly authorizes the Administration Evaluation Committee to amend the evaluation question set for unit deans with one or more questions about each associate dean in the unit.

Vote on the Active Motion (012615-2):

Number approving- 37

Number disapproving- 0

Abstentions of record- 0

Chair Masten declared the vote to be unanimous.

### **2013-2014**

SENATE ASSEMBLY ACTION [120913-1](#)

### **AST Process**

WHEREAS, we join with the University of Michigan Board of Regents and Central Administration in seeking to deliver excellent education at affordable cost in an era of sharply diminished state appropriations;

WHEREAS, the administration of financial and human resources at the University exists to further the mission of the University by serving its faculty and students;

WHEREAS, the design and development of the Administrative Services Transformation program was performed by external consulting firms and financial office employees without the meaningful participation of and evaluation by the faculty, resulting in inadequate consideration of the consequences and costs of the program;

BE IT RESOLVED that Senate Assembly endorses suspension of the implementation of AST until its impact on the educational and teaching missions of the university can be fully considered and properly evaluated in light of the diverse and often specialized needs of various academic disciplines and units across campus, and that such deliberations include representatives of central faculty governance.

Vote on the Active Motion (120913-1):

Number approving- 41

Number disapproving- 0

Abstentions of record- 0

Professor Olsen declared that the motion had been passed unanimously.

---

SENATE ASSEMBLY ACTION [120913-2](#)

### **Consulting Firms**

WHEREAS, The University of Michigan retained outside consulting firms to develop and implement the Administrative Services Transformation (AST) of finance and human resources, the IT Rationalization plan, and the Retirement Benefits review, all of which resulted in deeply flawed planning processes, damaging the confidence of the faculty in the Administration; and

WHEREAS, The University has spent tens of millions of dollars on these consulting firms; and

WHEREAS, The University is a preeminent institution, employing faculty with international expertise, in fields including business, finance, information technologies, organizations, and education; and

WHEREAS, The University's top academic leadership includes some of the most prominent, experienced, and talented Administrators in the nation, most of whom have been faculty members themselves; and therefore be it

RESOLVED, Senate Assembly advises that any continued and future retention of external consulting firms be contingent on supplemental and meaningful consultation, participation, and evaluation by faculty with content expertise in the targeted initiatives. Vote on the Active Motion (120913-2):

Number approving- 36

Number disapproving- 3

Abstentions of record- 1

Professor Olsen declared that the motion had been passed by majority vote.

---

SENATE ASSEMBLY ACTION [111813-1](#)

BENEFITS RESOLUTION

[View full resolution text.](#)

---

SENATE ASSEMBLY ACTION [092313-1](#)

Attracting and retaining the best faculty and staff, essential to maintaining the University of Michigan's reputation and status as a top public university, requires that the University remain competitive in salary and benefits. In its review and modification of faculty and staff benefits, the University has, in recent years, tended to examine components of total benefits in isolation and often under conditions of secrecy. In the interests of comprehensiveness and greater transparency, Senate Assembly urges that the University and the relevant HR committees consider benefit packages in their entirety and involve faculty in a more open and meaningful process.

Vote on the Active Motion:

The Action was approved by unanimous vote with no abstentions of record.

---

## SENATE ASSEMBLY ACTION [041513-1](#)

The University of Michigan is a great public institution. It is imperative that the University continue to work strenuously to create a learning community that reflects its aspirations to be a leader for public education in our increasingly diverse twenty-first century society. Therefore, it is resolved that we request the administration to:

- 1) seek to determine the cause(s) of the now decades-long lack of progress in improving campus diversity;
- 2) redirect University resources and strengthen leadership where necessary to achieve this goal of a more diverse and inclusive campus, supplementing any existing institutionalized programs with new creative approaches;
- 3) broaden the scope of efforts to include modern definitions of diversity (not only race, color, and national origin, but also age, marital status, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, disability, religion, veteran status, and economic class);

and

- 4) support initiatives such as the UM Alumni Association Leadership, Excellence, Achievement, Diversity (LEAD) scholarship program for out-of-state under-represented minority students, including, to the extent possible, making such programs a high priority in the next University capital campaign, within the limits defined by the state and federal Constitutions.

Vote on the Active Motion:

Number approving- 27

Number disapproving- 9

Number abstaining- 1

## 2012-2013

## SENATE ASSEMBLY ACTION [031813-1](#)

Multiple members moved and seconded a motion to approve the proposed reapportionment as follows:

|     | School/College | Seats |
|-----|----------------|-------|
| LSA |                | 15    |

|                                 |                |
|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Medicine                        | 15             |
| Engineering                     | 6              |
| UM-Dearborn                     | 5 (formerly 4) |
| UM-Flint                        | 3              |
| Architecture & Urban Planning   | 2              |
| Art & Design                    | 2              |
| Business                        | 2              |
| Dentistry                       | 2              |
| Education                       | 2              |
| School of Information           | 2 (formerly 3) |
| Kinesiology                     | 2              |
| Law                             | 2              |
| Music, Theatre & Dance          | 2              |
| Natural Resources & Environment | 2              |
| Nursing                         | 2              |
| Pharmacy                        | 2              |
| Public Health                   | 2              |
| Public Policy                   | 2              |
| Social Work                     | 2              |

Vote on the active motion:

Approving- All

Disapproving- None

Abstentions of Record- None

The Senate Secretary declared that the motion had been approved by unanimous consent.

---

#### SENATE ASSEMBLY ACTION [111912-1](#)

Resolved

Whereas the Senate Assembly and Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs constitute the official representative bodies of the Faculty Senate, and

Whereas the Senate is authorized by the Regents Bylaws to consider any subject pertaining to the interests of the University, and to make recommendations to the Board of Regents in regard thereto, and

Whereas the selection and appointment of executive officers of the University is of critical importance to the functioning and progress of the University,

We urge that search committees for executive officers and, particularly, the search committee for the University's next president, include representatives of the Faculty Senate chosen from a list of names selected by SACUA and approved by Senate Assembly.

## **2011-2012**

### SENATE ASSEMBLY ACTION [021312-1](#)

Professor Kearfott moved that the Senate Assembly strongly supports President-Emeritus Duderstadt's vision of the University of Michigan's bicentennial celebration, in particular that a broadly defined academic core dominate (Rothman seconded).

The Action was approved by a show of hands.

---

### SENATE ASSEMBLY ACTION [021312-2](#)

We, the Senate Assembly of the faculty at the University of Michigan, support the creation of an environment at the University of Michigan where all students, staff, and faculty members feel comfortable to take a stance (either for or against) GSRA Unionization.

In particular, we oppose intimidation or retaliation against individuals supporting or opposing GSRA unionization. In doing so we respond positively to calls from union activists that individual faculty members endorse this principle. In short, we affirm the commitment of University faculty to uphold federal and state law in this and all other matters. We also call on all parties to put forward only claims that can be documented with reasonable evidence in order that a dignified exchange of ideas be encouraged.

Vote on the Active Motion-

Number approving- 36

Number disapproving- 0

Number abstaining- 0

---

#### SENATE ASSEMBLY ACTION [021312-3](#)

Chair Barald introduced an action item calling on the University to carefully consider the recommendations of Senate Assembly resolution 012312-1 on reporting criminal activity. She noted that hospital security, NCRC security, and housing security do not report to DPS.

There was no discussion.

Vote on the Active Motion-

Number approving- 40

Number disapproving- 0

Number abstaining- 0

---

#### SENATE ASSEMBLY ACTION [012312-1](#)

The Senate Assembly voted without dissent to ratify the resolution regarding peaceful protest that had been introduced at the December 2011 Assembly meeting in absence of a quorum.

Assembly members had been polled electronically and strongly endorsed it.

---

#### SENATE ASSEMBLY ACTION [012312-2](#)

The Senate Assembly voted without dissent to ratify the resolution regarding reporting crime that had been introduced at the December 2011 Assembly meeting in absence of a quorum.

Assembly members had been polled electronically and strongly endorsed it.

---

#### SENATE ASSEMBLY ACTION [012312-3](#)

Professor Armitage moved to collate a list of all Senate Assembly members who have been asked to maintain secrecy in policy advisory committees and forward it to office

of provost (multiple seconds). The motion was modified through friendly amendment to collate a list of committees rather than Assembly members.

The action was approved without dissent by show of hands.

---

#### SENATE ASSEMBLY ACTION [012312-4](#)

Professor Hirshorn placed on the floor the [Resolution on Open Governance](#) offered by the Budget Study Committee.

After brief discussion suggesting that the resolution might offer guidance to faculty on advisory committees who are faced with gag orders, the Action was adopted.

Vote on the Active Motion-

Number approving- 24

Number disapproving- 0

Number abstaining- 9

---

#### SENATE ASSEMBLY ACTION 122311-1 RIGHT OF STUDENTS AND FACULTY TO PROTEST PEACEFULLY ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

Revised and Approved electronically by Senate Assembly. [View full resolution text.](#)

Vote on the Active Motion-

Number approving- 54

Number disapproving- 1

Number abstaining- 1

---

#### SENATE ASSEMBLY ACTION 122311-2 REPORTING CRIMINAL ACTIVITY ON CAMPUS

Revised and Approved electronically by Senate Assembly. [View full resolution text.](#)

Vote on the Active Motion-

Number approving- 55

Number disapproving- 0

Number abstaining- 1

---

SENATE ASSEMBLY ACTION [112111-1](#)  
HEALTH INCENTIVES TASK FORCE REPORT

Chair Barald called attention to distributed item 3. She asked for Senate Assembly approval of the revised report.

Approval was expressed by unanimous vote.

---

SENATE ASSEMBLY ACTION [112111-2](#)  
STUDENT RIGHTS AND  
RESPONSIBILITIES APPEAL BOARD

Professor Kearfott moved (Rothman seconded) that Senate Assembly approves the appointment of the Chair of the Civil Liberties Board as ex officio member of the Student Affairs Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities Appeal Board.

The action was approved by unanimous vote.

---

SENATE ASSEMBLY ACTION [112111-3](#)  
Chair Barald proposed for action of the Assembly:

Resolved- Senate Assembly hereby 1) affirms the already existing one-year term limitation of the SACUA Chair, and now extends it to the SACUA Vice Chair and 2) affirms the already existing three-year term limits of SACUA and Senate Assembly members, and now extends that to the Senate Secretary

Vote on the Active Motion-

Number approving- 31

Number disapproving- 0

Number abstaining- 1

---

#### SENATE ASSEMBLY ACTION [112111-4](#)

Chair Barald proposed for action of the Assembly:

Resolved- To expand the range of faculty engagement in central faculty governance and to more fully represent faculty opinions on such matters, Senate Assembly hereby adopts the concept of electronic voting for the action items of the University Senate and the Senate Assembly.

Amended Action Item

The Senate Assembly hereby adopts the concept of electronic voting for selected action items of the University Senate as approved on a case by case basis by the Senate Assembly. All such votes shall be cast anonymously.

Vote on the Active Motion as Amended-

Number approving- 34

Number disapproving- 0

Number abstaining- 0

---

#### SENATE ASSEMBLY ACTION [SA102411-1](#)

HB 4770 and 4771 seek to prohibit any government entity in the State, including universities and city governments, from providing public employee domestic partner benefits (medical or other fringe). We support the current practice of the University of Michigan of offering benefits to those who meet the criteria of Other Qualifying Adult. This practice is fair and offers equitable benefits for those performing the same jobs.

Recognizing the integrity in self governance of the University of Michigan, we support current policy that provides these benefits at the University of Michigan. To do otherwise would significantly hamper the University of Michigan in its efforts to recruit

and to retain the best faculty and staff. In addition, the health of the University Community, including the dependent children of qualified adults, would be put in jeopardy.

Vote on the Active Motion

Number approving- 47

Number disapproving- one

Abstentions of record- none

The Action Item was approved.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [SA102411-2](#)

Professor Giordani moved (Kearfott seconded) that the Assembly accepts the report as amended (see Appendix) and instructs SACUA to develop an effective implementation plan after considering the discussion at the current meeting.

Vote on the Active Motion

Number approving- 44

Number opposing- 4

Abstentions of record-none

The Action Item was approved.

#### **2010-2011**

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [042511-1](#)

The Budget Study Committee and the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty introduced the following action item:

1. WHEREAS, the Budget Study Committee and the Committee on the Economic Status of the faculty have repeatedly requested that the University administration release to them total annual compensation data (W-2 date) for all members of the university community, itemized by individual but not linked to names, in order to permit

the committees to conduct analyses sanctioned by the Senate Assembly in the areas of faculty compensation, health benefits, and retirement benefits, and

2. WHEREAS the information is necessary for developing advice to executive officers and the Board of Regents about the functioning of the university, and

3. WHEREAS, the administration has repeatedly and persistently refused to comply with these legitimate requests, and

4. WHEREAS the Senate Assembly is authorized to request information from any member of the university staff,

5. THEREFORE, the Senate Assembly, acting in its authority under Regental Bylaw Sec. 4.04, asks the University President and the Provost to release the compensation data specified in paragraph 1 to the respective committees within two months of this action.

Chair Rothman asked Vice-Chair Poe to preside temporarily so that he could speak from the floor. He said that release of salary information could paint an unfair picture about faculty compensation because it would include compensation from other than General Fund sources that were not tied directly to teaching effort. He added that the compensation figures might invite criticism from members of the general public who are not so well compensated. Professor Barald pointed out that she and others received large portions of their salaries from sponsored projects rather than from General Fund sources. Professor Peters said that the Assembly committees were unable to conduct meaningful analyses about cuts in retiree and health benefits without adequate data across the entire university staff population.

Vote on the Active Motion:

Number approving- 19

Number disapproving- 14

Abstentions of record- 1

Chair Rothman questioned whether a quorum existed, and made a quorum call. Thirty-six members of the Assembly voted their presence, and the presence of a quorum was established.

The Action Item was approved.

---

## ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [042511-2](#)

Assembly members Lehman and Smith introduced the following Action Item:

### RESOLUTION ON SACUA COMPENSATION POLICY

WHEREAS, the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA) serves as an instrument for effecting the actions of the Senate and the Assembly;

WHEREAS, the SACUA Chair and Vice Chair as well as the Secretary of the Senate are officers of the Assembly; and

WHEREAS, the members of SACUA are members of the Senate Assembly;

THEREFORE, the Senate Assembly ratifies and approves the recent practice of providing discretionary funds from central administration sources to the Vice Chair, Secretary, and SACUA members in consideration for their service commitments to central faculty governance.

Chair Rothman explained that for the previous two years, the vice-chair has received additional annual funding of \$5,000 and regular members of SACUA have been offered \$3,000. Professor Smith asked what funds had been given to the interim secretary last year. The chair replied that it was \$5,000.

Vote on the Active Motion:

Number approving- 27

Number disapproving- 2

Abstentions of record- 7

The Action Item was approved.

---

## ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [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

The Action Item was approved.

---

ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [012411-2](#)

Resolved, that the January 23, 2006 Action of the Senate Assembly (No.012306-1) 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

The Action Item was approved.

---

ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [111511-1](#)

Approval of Committee Charge Template.

Professor Frost moved approval. Seconded.

The Action Item was approved unanimously.

---

ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [102510-1](#)

Professor Lehman moved that the Senate assembly express their appreciation to the candidates for their contributions. Seconded.

The Action Item was approved unanimously.

---

ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [092010-1](#)

Professor Poe moved the Approval of Committee Member Replacements. The motion was adopted unanimously.

At 4:05, Chair Rothman proposed the Creation of an Advisory Task Force on Faculty Involvement in Health Plan Incentives with the Possible Charge:

1) To identify principles to guide the University's use of incentives in the management of health costs, and 2) to develop examples and possible options for the implementation of these incentives.

The Chair asked that nominees be sent to Tom Schneider. Concern was raised about the lack of openness of the Human Resource committee set up to assess initiative for healthy behavior. Professor Poe moved to form the task force.

The Action Item was approved.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [092010-2](#)

Professor Lehman moved for the assembly to reserve to itself the right to issue its report in early 2011 and that, prior to the release of that report, it calls upon the administrative committee to release all material used in its deliberations to the task force. Further, it calls upon the administration to make no decisions until the deliberations of the task force have been concluded.

The Action Item was approved.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [092010-3](#)

Professor Lehman moved the continuous enrollment action from the May meeting (051710-1).

The Action Item was approved.

#### **2009-2010**

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [051710-1](#)

Based on the discussion regarding the proposed committee to study all aspects of continuous enrollment formulated by the Senate, John Carson proposed the following resolution:

We resolve that the Dean of the Rackham Graduate School be requested to provide all nonconfidential information collected from the university's various schools, departments, and programs evaluating and responding to Rackham's continuous enrollment proposal. We also request a summary of Rackham's own deliberations over the continuous enrollment proposal.

Vote on the Active Motion-

Number Approving – 30

Number Disapproving – 0

Abstentions – 0

The Action Item was approved.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [042610-1](#)

Chair Thouless called attention to distributed [item 3](#).

He pointed out that SACUA negotiated several amendments to the proposed policy with the office of the provost, and that item 3 includes those amendments. He said that SACUA endorses the present policy proposal and transmits it to the Assembly with recommendation for approval. Professor Abdoo expressed dissatisfaction with the insufficient information and discussion provided by SACUA about the recent revisions to the document. She pointed out that there was no easy way to see what changes had been made, and that there has been no opportunity for discussion of these changes within her unit. Her concern was echoed by other members of the Assembly. Professor Frost suggested that in the future the SACUA leadership should provide Assembly members with a marked-up document that shows additions, deletions, and amendments. Other members pointed out that SACUA had been insufficiently forthcoming and engaging with the Assembly this year that had been customary.

Vote on the Active Motion (approval of proposed policy item 3):

Number approving- 33

Number disapproving- none

The chair did not call for abstentions of record.

The Action Item was approved.

---

## ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [042610-2](#)

Professors Hirshorn and Prygoski introduced the following resolution:

Whereas the University administration has constituted several university-wide committees charged with health benefits and retirement benefits issues, and whereas the deliberations of these committees are often secret or poorly communicated to the University community, and

Whereas the members of these committees are selected by the administration rather than by peers, and may fail to represent the diverse interests of the several groups that constitute the University employees, and

Whereas a University thrives on open communications and works best when contributions and ideas from all segments of the University community are welcomed,

Therefore the Senate Assembly urges (1) that appointments to these committees be made upon the recommendations of the respective segments of the University community, and (2) that these committees function in an open style that promotes dialogue and communication, and encourages outside inputs.

### Discussion

Professors Poe and Frost asked the proposers to define “respective segments.” Professor Brown asked whether it includes retirees, for example. Professor Stark said that the resolution was not a detailed policy statement, but rather that it was a statement of principle.

Professor Mansfield asked whether the resolution would have any teeth. Professor Abdoo asked whether the committee meetings were subject to the Open Meetings Act. Chair Thouless replied that the meetings were not subject to the Act. A member of the Assembly declared that openness is a fundamental issue, and that salaries are being reduced each year by benefits take-backs conducted without transparent deliberation. Professor Giordani suggested that the resolution be amended to reduce its inflammatory language, but acknowledged that there are too many committees operating in secrecy.

Several members of the Assembly declared that the Assembly ought to communicate its strong objection to secrecy, and asked for the rationale for such secrecy. Professor

Rothman stated that he was appointed by the provost to a committee charged with changing retiree benefits, but that he could not discuss the deliberations of the committee because he was sworn to secrecy. He said that the rationale offered for the secrecy was that preliminary proposals under consideration might engender strong opposition. He added that he supported the resolution, nonetheless.

Professor Goldman suggested that the resolution be amended to say that a draft form of any proposed policy should be shared openly and remain open for public comment for a prescribed period. Professor Frost moved that the Active Motion be postponed until May (Smith seconded), but the motion to postpone failed.

Vote on the Active Motion

Number Approving- 30

Number Disapproving- 4

The chair did not call for abstentions of record.

The Action Item was approved.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [012510-1](#)

RESOLVED, that Senate Assembly, on behalf of the University of Michigan Faculty Senate, adopts the distributed [statement on academic freedom](#).

The action was passed by unanimous vote, with no objections and 4 abstentions of record.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [102609-1](#)

Senate Assembly approves a change in the charge to the Senate Assembly Committee for a Multicultural University.

The new charge is:

“to communicate regularly with and provide input from a faculty perspective to the Senate Assembly and SACUA.”

The action received unanimous approval.

---

## ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [102609-2](#)

Senate Assembly deliberated an action item proposed by SACUA regarding quorum count approves the action approved by SACUA:

If a member of the Assembly is absent from 3 consecutive Assembly meetings without requesting an alternate, the seat shall be declared vacant and shall not count against quorum.

Discussion of the main motion

Professor Smith suggested that the motion could have the effect of disenfranchising a unit because of the actions of individuals. Professor Abdoo said that a unit may not know that their representatives are absent from meetings. A motion from the floor, properly seconded, proposed removing the phrase "shall be declared vacant and."

Vote on the amended motion:

Number approving- 35

Number disapproving- 2

The active motion became: If a member of the Assembly is absent from 3 consecutive Assembly meetings without requesting an alternate, the seat shall not count against quorum.

Vote on the active motion:

Number approving- 47

Number disapproving- 1

Number abstaining- 1

The Action Item was approved.

**2008-2009**

## ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [031609-1](#)

Chair Potter reported that Regental action changing Kinesiology from a Division to a School has consequences for Senate Assembly apportionment. As a Division,

Kinesiology was entitled to one seat on the Assembly but as a School it is entitled to two seats. Because the size of the Assembly is presently limited to 73 seats, a re-apportionment would be required and most likely either LSA or Medicine would lose a seat.

Dr. Fraser moved that the Assembly asks the Board of Regents to increase the size of the Senate Assembly to 74 seats (multiple seconds).

The action was declared unanimous on the basis of a voice vote.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [SA012609-1](#)

Amend the Rules to read:

*“Eligibility for membership on SACUA shall be limited to voting members of the University Senate who are currently or were previously members (including alternates) of the Senate Assembly or its standing committees.”*

Vote on the Active Motion

Number approving- unanimous approval, with no abstentions of record.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [SA012609-2](#)

Chair Potter asked vice chair Thouless to chair the discussion. Chair Thouless declared the motion introduced by Professor Rothman at the December meeting to be the Active Motion.

Professor Eagle proposed a friendly amendment to the language of Rothman’s motion, and the amendment was accepted. The Active Motion then was:

A student-athlete shall be in good academic standing as determined by the academic authorities who determine the meaning of such phrases for all students of the institution. The academic authorities who make these determinations are located in the academic advising units of the schools and colleges where the students are enrolled; these academic advising units will make recommendations about a student athlete’s eligibility to the provost.

Adjustments in the timing of recommendations should be made to meet NCAA requirements. In order to accommodate the timing requirements of determining eligibility each semester, the academic advising units should set timelines for approving academic plans and recommending certification of eligibility by the Provost by the first day of classes each semester.

#### Discussion of the Active Motion-

A member of the Assembly asked for clarification of the role of the Academic Performance Committee (APC). Professor Potter explained that the APC spends most of its time looking into the academic experiences of student athletes, and that eligibility issues take up a relatively small fraction of its time.

Vote on the Active Motion:

Number Approving- 29

Number Opposing- 1

Number Abstaining- 1

The Action Item was approved.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [SA012609-3](#)

Professor Riles moved (multiple seconds):

Whereas members of the Academic Performance Committee (APC) are offered reimbursement for bowl game attendance and travel expenses, including game tickets, airfare, hotel accommodations, and meal per diem, and

Whereas the University Audits Office has found this reimbursement to pose an apparent conflict of interest for APC members in carrying out their advisory responsibilities on academic performance,

The Senate Assembly urges the President to end the practice of reimbursing APC members for any expenses associated with attending bowl games.

Derivative Motion-

Professor Eagle moved to postpone further deliberation on the Active Motion until September 2009.

Vote on the Motion to Postpone Further Debate:

The Derivative Motion was disapproved by majority vote. The Active Motion reverted to the primary motion introduced by Professor Riles.

Discussion of the Active Motion-

Professor Abdoo asked about the source of money for the perks. Professor Riles said that he understands that the money is generated by athletic revenues. Professor Poe asked about the full range of conflicts of interest that Professor Riles was concerned about. Professor Riles said that the athletes, and the football athletes in particular, are responsible for the \$90M in revenue that pay the coaches and staff of the Athletics Department as well as the APC perks. Professor Smith said that he attended two Bowl games while chair of SACUA and that there was a lot of functions involved, including meeting with alumni, prospective students, and representing the faculty of the university.

Vote on the Active Motion:

Number approving- 19

Number disapproving- 11

Abstentions were not called for or recorded.

---

ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [120808-1](#)

The revised [Standard Practice Guide 201.89 Sexual Harassment](#) was introduced. There were no comments.

Motion to accept the revised SPG section as written was given and seconded.

The Action was approved by unanimous vote.

---

ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [120808-2](#)

The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics Bylaws written November 2008 were introduced.

There were no comments.

Motion to accept the bylaws as written was given and seconded.

The Action was approved by unanimous vote.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [120808-3](#)

Motion to revise Article 1, Section 1, Paragraph 3 of the [Rules of the University Senate, The Senate Assembly, and the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs](#) to read, “Librarians of any rank who have full-time appointments as regular staff members shall be designated as members of the University Senate.”

Motion to accept the revision as written was given and seconded.

The Action was approved by unanimous vote.

#### **2007-2008**

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [042108-1](#)

The Senate Assembly accepts the [report of the Committee for a Multicultural University](#) and endorses its recommendations.

Vote on the Active Motion:

The motion was approved by unanimous vote with one abstention of record.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [042108-2](#)

The Senate Assembly endorses Action 040908-2 of AAAC:

NCAA Division I student-athletes whose mandatory practice or competition commitments to University sponsored activities limit their opportunities to participate fully in the complete range of classes because of scheduling conflicts should be accorded the highest level of priority registration for terms when conflicts arise.

Eligibility for such priority registration should be overseen by the Academic Performance Committee (APC) of the Advisory Board on Intercollegiate Athletics in consultation with the Office of the Registrar. The purpose of this priority registration is to enable access by student-athletes to classes they need to complete their degrees in a timely fashion.

Moreover, the AAAC shall oversee an annual evaluation in consultation with the APC and the Office of the Registrar to ascertain the implementation and effects of this policy.

#### Discussion of the Active Motion

Professor Ketefian expressed concern that practice and competition schedules conflict with the academic needs of athletes, and stated that they are students first. Professor Koopmann replied that competition schedules are determined by the NCAA and the Big-10, not the U-M. He expressed support for the Motion. Professor Frost pointed out that many students must work to pay their tuition, and that perhaps they deserve special consideration, as well. Professor Lehman replied that the AAAC had specifically asked the Michigan Student Assembly (MSA) to consider the issue because it wanted the students themselves to evaluate its fairness. In fact, it was the MSA that proposed that priority registration be restricted to Division I athletes. Professor Eagle commented that this Action would be a precedent that could be used by other groups who self-identify and subsequently petition for accommodation.

Vote on the Active Motion:

The action was approved unanimously with 4 abstentions of record.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [042108-3](#)

#### STATEMENT ON ADMINISTRATION CONSULTATION WITH FACULTY

SACUA member Fraser introduced the following resolution:

The Senate Assembly and the Provost have recently approved [Principles of Faculty Involvement in Institutional and Academic Unit Governance at the University of Michigan, 2d ed.](#) We believe this document is a substantial improvement over its predecessor, and hope that it will provide a framework for faculty participation in university governance and for further discussion of the respective roles of faculty and administration. We thank the Provost for her patient and constructive role in bringing this project to completion. The product is a result of many months of diligent

negotiation, with give and take on both sides, and is the first principles document that includes and describes the role of central faculty governance at the University of Michigan.

One issue eludes a fully satisfactory solution. SACUA wanted more explicit assurance that the administration would be proactive in communicating and consulting with faculty governance (SACUA and Senate Assembly) about significant issues that are of interest to the faculty but were not of an academic nature. The response of the administration was largely twofold. First, in an institution the size of the University of Michigan, some issues cannot be revealed prematurely without endangering negotiations. Second, with the complexity and variety of issues involved, the administration cannot commit itself to knowing which issues the faculty will find of interest. We recognize these considerations, and believe that they can be accommodated in a provision that nevertheless assures that administrators will ordinarily feel obliged to consult on significant matters with representatives chosen by the faculty.

The administration has invited us to question it on any issue that draws our interest. We accept that responsibility. We encourage the administration to be transparent and consultative in its dealing with faculty governance. We hand on to our successors the challenge that when the principles document is next reviewed, language detailing a more explicit and proactive assurance and consultation should be negotiated and approved.

## Discussion

Professor Riles spoke in support of the resolution, stating that he would support an even stronger statement, but that the existing language was acceptable to him. Professor Ketefian pointed out that the academic business conducted by the faculty is essential to the mission of the university, and that SACUA must be alert to developments and bring them before the committee structure of the Assembly. She said that the administration has a responsibility to inform, facilitate, and support the essential mission performed by the faculty.

Professor Poe moved that the Senate Assembly endorses the resolution as offered (multiple seconds).

Vote on the Active Motion:

Number approving- 36

Number disapproving- 1

Number abstaining- 2

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [042108-4](#)

Professor Poe moved that the Senate Assembly thanks Chair Smith for his service as faculty chair and commends him for the progress made during the past two years (multiple seconds).

The action was approved by acclamation.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [031708-1](#)

Chair Smith introduced a proposed Action Item placed before the Assembly by SACUA. Chair Smith introduced the document, [Principles of Faculty Involvement in Institutional and Academic Unit Governance at the University of Michigan, 2d ed](#), to be considered for approval.

The document is an update to the earlier draft reviewed by Senate Assembly during the fall. Revision to the document was suggested by Senate Assembly membership, as concerns about faculty notification and consultation for matters of institutional significance, as opposed to academic issues exclusively. SACUA worked with the Provost and other administrators during the past months to develop a statement of clarification on the issue. Chair Smith read the text of the addition, which is found on page 5, paragraph 7:

“Issues that might be of significant concern to faculty may occasionally arise from outside the realm of the traditional faculty interests, as outlined in paragraph 6. As appropriate, and when circumstance permit, administrators will make a good faith effort to inform and seek the input of faculty representatives, with the understanding that what constitutes a significant concern is a matter in which reasonable minds may differ.”

#### Discussion of Active Motion-

Professor Friedman spoke about the development of this revision to the document. He said that the most important limitations to the text are the weakness of commitment to “inform and seek the input” of faculty, and the fact that the term “faculty representatives” is not clearly defined. Although the final product is disappointing, he encouraged Senate Assembly approval, as it is a strong document overall.

Professor Eagle suggested that the document be approved with the new paragraph 7 omitted, as the language is so qualified that it is meaningless. He recommended that further discussion and negotiation be attempted before approval of a relatively meaningless statement.

Professor Friedman said that he doubted that further negotiation would yield a better result. And, he said, although the language is very weak, it does represent an important move forward on the part of the administration about its responsibility to consult with faculty on significant non-academic issues. He agreed that the result is disappointing.

Professor Thouless said that it is important that at least some statement reflecting the need for consultation with faculty is an important step. He also noted that this issue is addressed in Regents' Bylaws.

Professor Frier reported that SACUA considered rejection of the entire document about this issue. He noted that the stadium renovation is not what is central to the issue; instead, it is about the commitment on the part of the administration to consider and value the voice of faculty.

Vote on the Active Motion-

Number approving- 27

Number disapproving- 2

Abstentions of record- 2

The motion was approved.

---

## ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [031708-2](#)

Professor Friedman moved that the Senate Assembly charge SACUA with drafting a resolution expressing disappointment about the nature of the added item 7, to be considered by Senate Assembly for the April meeting.

Discussion of Active Motion-

Professor Fraser said that negotiations have been very thorough, and the administration is already aware of faculty disappointment about the product of the past months' negotiations.

Professor Friedman argued that although the administration recognizes the dissatisfaction of a few SACUA members, it might be useful for the administration to realize that Senate Assembly is disappointed, if that is the case.

Vote on the Active Motion-

Number Approving- 19

Number Disapproving- 6

Abstentions of record- 2

The motion was approved.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [121707-1](#)

Chair Smith read a resolution submitted by SACMU:

Whereas, the President has indicated that 100 new faculty will be hired at the assistant professor level, the SACMU recommends that diversity be an integral component in the recruitment, hiring and retention processes.

Professor Primus expressed concern that owing to its origin from SACMU, the resolution might be construed to indicate that race be used hiring decisions, in contradiction to the Michigan Constitution. Professor Eagle responded that it was not possible to assess the motivations of the proposing committee, and that the resolution speaks for itself.

Vote on the Active Motion

Number approving- 28

Number disapproving- 4

Number abstaining- 2

The motion was approved.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [121707-2](#)

Professor Freidman moved (Koopmann seconded):

The Assembly rescinds Action 121707-1 and replaces it with:

Whereas, the President has indicated that 100 new faculty will be hired at the assistant professor level, the Senate Assembly recommends that, consistent with governing law, diversity be an integral component in the recruitment, hiring and retention processes.

Vote on the Active Motion

Number approving- 23

Number disapproving- 8

Number abstaining- 1

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [102207-1](#)

Professor Potter introduced a proposed Action Item placed before the Assembly by SACUA:

COIA Proposal on Reforms in Intercollegiate Athletics

*Whereas the Senate Assembly of the University of Michigan finds that the proposals of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics are generally in accord with the values of the University of Michigan, it hereby endorses the goals of these proposals.*

Discussion of the Active Motion-

A member of the Assembly expressed reservations about a provision in the COIA proposals that he said might adversely affect educational opportunity for African-American student athletes. Professor Potter replied that there was no intention to create adverse effects. Professor Ketefian asked how much faculty oversight there was at the UM campus about academic performance of student athletes. Professor Potter described the operation of the Academic Performance Committee of the Advisory Board on Intercollegiate Athletics. He said that the APC operates with votes cast exclusively by faculty.

A member of the Assembly expressed concern that there was no mechanism for enforcement of the proposals. Professor Potter acknowledged that it was a weakness, but that Division I athletics were extremely complex and subject to external pressures.

Vote on the Active Motion:

Number approving- all but one

Number disapproving- one

Number abstaining- none

---

## ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [102207-2](#)

Professor MacAdam introduced a proposed Action Item placed before the Assembly by SACUA.

### Resolution on Copyright Policy

*Recognizing how important it is that the University of Michigan maintain a copyright policy that serves the best interests of both the University and its faculty authors, Senate Assembly endorses in principle the “Addendum to Publication Agreements for CIC Authors” and the University Library’s additional efforts on behalf of University authors’ rights in the Library’s negotiations with publishers. At the same time, Senate Assembly further recommends that the University’s current copyright policy be reviewed and rewritten in order to clarify and strengthen the ownership rights of faculty in the instructional and scholarly works that they create. To that end the Senate Assembly endorses the establishment of a joint faculty and administration committee to draft a new policy.*

### Discussion of Active Motion-

Professor Ketefian asked what support will be available to faculty as they negotiate with large publishing firm. Professor MacAdam said that there were people in the Intellectual Properties office and the Office of General Counsel who can be consulted. GC Bernard explained that the OGC could not represent individual faculty in their own negotiations. He said he wishes the faculty could have the same legal services that students enjoy.

Professor Riles asked whether a list could be constructed by the OGC of publishers whose practices already conform to the ideal. GC Bernard replied that Riles’ suggestion was a good one.

### Vote on the Active Motion-

The Action won unanimous approval.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [102207-3](#)

Professor Riles moved that the Senate Assembly urges the President and Board of Regents to reconsider the Stadium Renovation project in light of arguments presented by Professor Goldstein and the serious concerns raised by more than 600 faculty and staff through their petition (two seconds).

Vote on the Active Motion-

Number approving- 18

Number disapproving- 7

Abstentions of record- 3

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [092407-1](#)

Chair Smith invited a motion to approve the slate of candidates nominated for membership on Senate Assembly committees.

The Action won unanimous approval.

#### **2006-2007**

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [SA041607-1](#)

Professor MacAdam moved that the Senate Assembly suspends its rule prohibiting a chair from serving two consecutive terms for the year 2007-2008 (multiple seconds).

The Action was approved by unanimous vote with no abstentions of record.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [SA041607-2](#)

Professor Lehman asked for action on the [policy statement regarding final examination scheduling](#) that had been presented to the Assembly for vote. The Assembly discussed

the statement as Committee of the Whole and amended it prior to vote. The final statement was as follows:

Policies for Final Exams with Registrar-sanctioned dates

Endorsed by AAAC [11 April 2007](#)

Amended and Endorsed by SACUA [16 April 2007](#)

Amended, Approved, and Endorsed by Senate Assembly 16 April 2007

1. Information about the registrar-sanctioned dates for final exams should be made more accessible for instructors and students. The information should be an integral part of the class-rosters for instructors and class schedules for students.
2. Changes from these dates should only be made with the agreement of the registrar and the instructor teaching the course. The class-rosters and class schedules should be updated by the registrar's office with this new information. The changes must accommodate all students in a class, with a suitable alternative being provided for students who have a compelling reason for being unable to take the exam on the new date. The original registrar-sanctioned date provides a default, if no other mutually satisfactory date can be found.
3. The dates of final exams must be finalized by the instructor, approved by the registrar, if they need to be changed, and published by the end of the first week of classes. Students must notify the instructor of any conflict with the date of an exam by the Drop/Add deadline for each semester.
4. Exams outside of the class period cannot be given in the last week of classes.
5. Final projects or take-home exams for undergraduate classes that have a due date during the last week of classes or during the finals period must be given to students at least one week in advance of the due date. This policy would allow students to accommodate the possibility of multiple deadlines in a short period of time. The policy should also be encouraged for graduate classes.
6. Students should not be allowed to enroll in courses that have final exams formally scheduled at the same date and time without permission of instructors in the affected courses.

Vote on the Active Motion:

The Action was approved by unanimous vote with one abstention of record.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [021907-1](#)

Senate Assembly hereby creates the UM Faculty Undergraduate Fellowship Selection and Oversight Committee to 1) select Fellowship recipients and 2) oversee the solicitation of funds to support the Fellowship. The Committee consists of not fewer than three members chosen, as are all Senate Assembly standing committees, through nomination by SACUA and election by Senate Assembly. The Committee creates and distributes the application, reviews completed applications, selects applicants for interviews, conducts interviews and selects recipients of the Fellowship.

Professor Ketefian expressed concern about what appeared to be a mushrooming workload for the fledgling committee. She suggested that the duties of committee members would be onerous without significant staff support. Chair Smith pointed out that the Development Office would provide adequate staff support. Professor Meerkov pointed out that a list of eligible students would be prepared by the Financial Aid office.

Ms. D’Allura, Director of Development for the Alumni Association, said that the list would likely contain the names of 20 to 50 students.

The Action was approved by unanimous vote.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [012207-1](#)

Chair Smith announced that a vote would be taken on the “Revision in the University of Michigan Grievance Procedures”.

Vote on the Active Motion: The Action was approved by unanimous vote.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [012207-2](#)

Chair Smith reminded the Assembly that SACUA had placed an Action Item about diversity before the Assembly at its [December meeting](#). He invited Professor Ortega to speak in favor of the Action Item. Professor Ortega pointed out that the “Senate Assembly Resolution on Diversity” was a forward-moving resolution precipitated by recent developments. Professor Ortega stated the Senate Assembly should recommit to diversity by endorsing the resolution.

An audience suggestion was made that the figure “14,000” in the first whereas should be changed to “thousands” so that the resolution does not become dated.

Vote on the Active Motion: The Action was approved with only one negative vote.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [121806-1](#)

Chair Smith reminded the Assembly that SACUA had placed an Action Item about registration brackets before the Assembly at its [November meeting](#). The Chair invited Professor Riles to speak in support of the resolution. Professor Riles reported that the resolution was drafted by AAAC in response to requests from student groups, and that it has been endorsed unanimously by both AAAC and SACUA.

Whereas the existing system and rules for student registration date back to a time when students were required to report in person for registration interviews, and the system has been made obsolete by modern technology, the faculty calls for changes to the antiquated system which:

- (1) remove an existing constraint which prevents students from being granted permission to register according to their credit hour standing if they are registered for a course that meets at that same time, and
- (2) enact provisions of a resolution passed by MSA that calls for implementation of registration brackets that are scaled to 5 credit hour increments.

Vote on the Active Motion: The Action was approved by unanimous vote.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [121806-2](#)

Chair Smith reminded the Assembly that SACUA had placed an Action Item about undergraduate scholarships before the Assembly at its [November meeting](#). He invited Professor Meerkov to speak in favor of the Action Item. Professor Meerkov pointed out that the action was particularly timely because the president has announced a matching challenge dollar for dollar with donations. Professor Thouless remarked that it was a pity that the president did not establish a matching fund for graduate student scholarships. Professor Meerkov replied that both the President and the Vice President for Development stated to him that there is much greater need for undergraduate scholarships than for graduate scholarships. Professor Abdoo asked about the criteria for judging financial need. Professor Meerkov replied that there is an existing but

complex algorithm that varies by county, etc. He explained that the intention is to use established definitions and rules.

A member of the Assembly suggested that the fund be named for all U-M faculty rather than for the Faculty Senate alone. Chair Smith polled the members of SACUA and then accepted the proposal as a friendly amendment on their behalf. The resolution then read:

*Whereas the faculty governance recognizes need based fellowships as an important tool for attracting students from low income families to the University of Michigan;*

Whereas the University announced a 50% matching fund program for all donations towards undergraduate need based fellowships;

Therefore, the Senate Assembly resolves to actively support this program by encouraging faculty to contribute to a special account in support of these fellowships. The resulting fellowships will be allocated with the participation of the elected faculty governance and will be referred to as the UM Faculty Undergraduate Fellowships.

Vote on the Active Motion: The Action was approved unanimously.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [112706-1](#)

SACUA placed the following resolution before the Senate Assembly for vote:

*Whereas the University of Michigan has made and is expected to make significant changes in the benefits that it offers its currently active and retired faculty, and*

Whereas the members of the University Faculty Senate and their elected representatives on the University Senate Assembly and its executive committee, the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA), have either not been consulted or have been inadequately consulted prior to the announcement of such changes in benefits,

Be It Resolved That:

The University of Michigan establish a Faculty Benefits Oversight Committee with representation on that committee by faculty members selected by SACUA and confirmed by the Senate Assembly.

The Action was approved by unanimous vote.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [091806-1](#)

The chair invited ratification of committee appointments proposed by SACUA. Several members moved for ratification.

Vote on the Active Motion:

The action was approved by unanimous vote.

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [091806-2](#)

Professor Maddock moved (multiple seconds) that the Senate Assembly encourages all faculty to inform their students that support systems exist to accommodate students with disabilities.

Further, the Assembly recognizes that the specific nature of such communication may vary across units according to policies already in existence. Therefore, in a spirit of encouragement, the Assembly offers the following language as a potential model, which individual faculty are invited to modify at will:

“If you think you need an accommodation for a disability, please let me know at your earliest convenience. As soon as you make me aware of your needs, we can work with the [Office of Services for Students with Disabilities \(SSD\)](#) to help determine appropriate accommodations. SSD typically recommends accommodations through a Verified Individualized Services and Accommodations (VISA) form. I will treat any information you provide as private and confidential.”

The Active Motion was approved with 1 dissenting vote and 2 abstentions of record.

#### **2005-2006**

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [041706-1](#)

Chair Gull called on Professor Seabury at 3:17 P.M. and invited him to introduce a [resolution](#) that was being placed before the Assembly by vote of SACUA. Professor Seabury said that he had agreed to draft the resolution, with help from Professor Frier, in response to appeals to SACUA by representatives from the Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Task Force. He pointed out that the resolution called for changes to the

language of Regents Bylaw 14.06 as well as Standard Practice Guides (SPG) 201.35 and 601.6. He concluded his presentation at 3:20 P.M. Professor Gull invited discussion from the floor.

Professor Frier stated that the current situation is one in which transgender individuals have been extended protection from discrimination within the university by virtue of a communication from the provost, but that there has not been effective follow through. He said the core of the issue was an absence of leadership from the top, and that the resolution was intended to solicit effective enforcement. He noted that committees appointed by former provost Courant made two important recommendations: (1) that there be more education about the salient issues within the university community, and (2) that transgender individuals be allowed to change their names within the university record system. He said that both points are advertised on the provost's website but neither project has been funded as yet. He explained that if the Regents' Bylaw were changed, then all other university policy would automatically be forced to conform to the higher policy.

Professor Seabury said that gender is a psycho-social phenomenon, and that conceptually there are more than 2 distinct categories. A member of the Assembly asked if the Regents have expressed a reason for opposing what seemed a relatively benign antidiscrimination clause. Professor Frier replied that nothing has been expressed by the Regents as a group. Again, he cited an absence of leadership from the top. He noted that the university already differs from State law in that the U-M extends antidiscrimination protection to sexual orientation.

A member of the Assembly declared that he believed no one should be discriminated against for anything but job performance. But he questioned the nuances of definitions implied by the proposed language of the resolution. Professor Frier replied that the categories listed in the motion are not obscure, but that there perhaps has not been enough education about them.

Chair Gull assessed the readiness of the Assembly for a vote on the Active Motion.

Vote on the Active Motion:

Number Approving- 27

Number Disapproving- 3

Number Abstaining- 4

---

## ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [022006-1](#)

Chair Giordani called attention to distributed item 8. He explained that SACUA recommends that the Assembly endorse a cover letter to university faculty asking them to honor student requests for excused absence from class if the students must travel to represent the university in official activities. He declared SACUA's recommendation to be an Active Motion before the Assembly.

A member of the Assembly asked whether there was any overview group looking at the amount of commitment students are expected to make to activities outside the classroom. Chair Giordani replied that the Academic Performance Committee of Advisory Board on Intercollegiate Athletics assumes that function for student athletes.

Professor Koopmann added that students are expected to provide ample notice to their professors, and added further that the athletics program would provide assistance to faculty in mitigating disruptions of academic progress.

Vote on the Active Motion:

Number approving- 32

Number disapproving- 0

Abstentions of record- 3

---

## ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [022006-2](#)

Professor Kimball proposed a substitute motion to the proposed action offered by SACUA. He moved that Senate Assembly delegates to SACUA authority to respond to requests from additional bodies for inclusion in the on-line evaluation process. Professor Lehman expressed acceptance of the substitute motion on behalf of SACUA.

Vote on the Active Motion

The action was approved by unanimous vote (39) with none opposing and no abstentions of record.

---

## ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [022006-3](#)

Professor Kimball moved that the Senate Assembly reaffirms its vote on model F1 whereby the name of the eligible candidate with the largest number of votes is to be submitted to the Provost for subsequent Regental approval (multiple seconds).

Vote on the Active Motion:

Number approving- 26

Number disapproving- 6

Number abstaining- 5

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [022006-4](#)

Chair Giordani announced that SACUA has endorsed the following Action Item and offers it to the Assembly for clarification of the eligibility of Assembly alternates:

The Assembly declares that eligibility for membership on SACUA shall include voting members of the University Senate who have been elected as alternates on Senate Assembly during any of the previous five years.

Discussion- One member said that there was no controversy about the action, particularly under the current situation. Professor Maddock said that it would be nice if an alternate had actually served at an Assembly meeting. Professor Lange said that she supported the idea of saying that all alternates are eligible, and that it makes sense to open up eligibility.

Vote on the Active Motion:

Number approving- 34

Number disapproving- 2

Number abstaining- 3

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [012306-1](#)

Chair Giordani called attention to the Active Motion placed before the Assembly at its December meeting:

WHEREAS the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs appointed a committee to review existing tenure policies at the University of Michigan, and

WHEREAS that committee has proposed a change to Section 5.09 of the Bylaws of the Board of Regents that would increase the maximum probationary period for tenure, and

WHEREAS the Senate Assembly together with its various committees including SACUA, AAAC, and Tenure has studied the proposals and has sought additional opinions from peers and the national AAUP;

THEREFORE, it is resolved that

1. The Senate Assembly has significant reservations about any changes to the existing Regental By-laws governing tenure.

2. The Senate Assembly asks faculty in all units to enunciate tenure policies that are fair, consistent, and that address the issues raised by the provost's committee in its report, within the framework of existing Regents' By-laws.

3. The Senate Assembly recommends that the following policies be features of the tenure policies of all units:

(i) The expected probationary period should be limited to no more than six years in all units. Units should ensure that their methods and criteria for evaluating the excellence of candidates for tenure are consistent with a six-year probationary clock under any evolving conditions within the appropriate discipline.

(ii) With the concurrence of the candidate, a unit should grant an extension of up to two years to the expected probationary period for the following reasons:

(a) Time taken for dependent care associated with the birth or adoption of a child by the faculty member or/and partner

(b) Time taken for care of a partner, dependent or parent associated with extraordinary circumstances or medical needs.

(c) Research time lost because of a serious chronic illness.

(d) Research time lost because of professional circumstances beyond the candidate's control.

(iii) If the issues described in Section (ii) are of such extraordinary magnitude that an exceptional further delay in the tenure clock is merited, then with the concurrence of the candidate and the unit, and under clearly defined terms and conditions, the Provost should be asked to make a temporary appointment that will stop the tenure clock for a clearly defined period of one or more years.

(iv) The requirements for tenure delayed for any of the reasons stated in Sections (ii) or (iii) should be the same as the requirements for tenure after the typical expected period.

(v) Policies for achieving tenure before the expected period should be clearly articulated.

(vi) A terminal appointment of one year at equivalent rank off the “tenure-track” should be provided for any candidate who does not obtain tenure.

4. The Senate Assembly recommends that a properly representative faculty committee be appointed jointly by SACUA and the Provost’s Office to make uniform recommendations about policies for joint appointments, so that faculty in joint appointments are not disadvantaged by their position. This committee should be charged to look at all issues associated with joint appointments, including, but not limited to, tenure, and to make policy recommendations to the provost and the units.

5. The Senate Assembly recommends that a properly representative faculty committee be appointed jointly by SACUA and the Provost’s Office to consider the merits and implications of “part-time” tenure.

#### Discussion of the Active Motion-

Professor Abdoo reported that the School of Nursing faculty held discussions and concluded that there were great differences among units with respect to tenure processes, but that existing policy seems to provide adequate flexibility. A member of the Assembly asked whether adherence to the proposed resolution would force the Medical School and perhaps other units to reduce the effective probationary period from current practice. Professor Smith responded that SACUA’s study and report about time to tenure demonstrates that most people are having a decision made within 6 years at the present time.

Professor Koopmann remarked that he spoke with Medical School associate dean David Bloom, and that Bloom acknowledged the veracity of the SACUA analysis, but explained that more people are opting to enter the clinical track because of the perceived difficulty of achieving tenure. Koopmann said that the demands on medical school faculty to perform clinical duties leaves them less time to obtain grants and write papers. He said that the administration should tell the Assembly if the changing

expectations can be handled under the current system, and that faculty deserve an answer.

Professor Smith responded that people transfer to the clinical track in medical school because they are encouraged to leave the tenure track. Professor Koopmann added that the decision about which track will be pursued typically has to be made within the first two or three years of an appointment. Professor Thouless remarked that by awarding tenure a faculty acknowledges that the tenured members have established that they are performing at the level that is expected for long term membership in the unit. He suggested that what needs closer inspection is the expectations and criteria being used by the tenure and promotion committees.

Professor Abdoo stated that Nursing faces a similar dilemma. She said that even if the unit recognizes clinical duties as part of the promotion packet, there have been instances where the cases were turned down at the provost level because of perceived deficiencies in research and publications. Professor Zorn suggested that different rules may be needed for the medical school. Professor Koopmann said that the Tenure Committee offered a practical solution some years ago. The committee recommended that the chair and unit put in writing what the expectations are for the faculty member at the time of hire. Any subsequent changes to those expectations should also be in writing.

Vote on the Active Motion:

Number Approving- 39

Number Disapproving- 1

Number Abstaining- 1

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [012306-2](#)

Professor Stark introduced the following resolution, seconded by Professor Meerkov:

WHEREAS the Senate Assembly commends the Unit Shared Governance Task Force (USGTF) for its thoughtful work;

WHEREAS the Senate Assembly wishes to strengthen the role of faculty governance;

THEREFORE, the Senate Assembly resolves:

The Senate Assembly adopts the recommendations of the [USGTF Report](#) with the following modifications:

1. Instead of model F2, the Assembly adopts model F1 of unit Executive Committee formation, which reads: "The names of the eligible candidate with the largest number of votes is to be submitted to the Provost for subsequent Regental approval."
2. Amend model I2 of the unit Executive Committees issues of involvement as indicated below in bold:

Differentiate the depth in the issues of Executive Committee participation, as follows:

-Tenure and promotion: Maintain the existing practice, i.e., ECs must vote and decide for or against each particular case.

-Administrative **and other** appointments: EC should give its consent for all **academic** administrative appointments in the units, **composition of search committees leading to these appointments, and to chair professorship nominations.**

-Budget: EC should be given all necessary information to provide oversight of the budget, including merit raises.

Discussion of the Active Motion-

Professor Koopmann voiced support for the resolution. He said that faculty deserve to be heard, and that democratic principles need to be observed. Professor Riles said that he favored the resolution, as well. He said that if faculty want to place a check on a dean's power, they should have that ability. He added that if the main argument in support of the "Rule of Two" was that the administration would ignore recommendations from faculty governance, that in itself was a commentary on the state of faculty governance. Professor Stark remarked that the administration has plenty of say in unit management, but that this is one place where faculty can have a voice. Professor Thouless commented that it was ironic that if a unit decides not to have an executive committee, the collective faculty are entitled to have a say on all matters specified by Regents' Bylaw 5.06, but oddly, if a unit has an executive committee, the faculty lose their authority. Professor Schultz said that he had been a member of the USGTF. He said that executive committee authority comes through administrative channels. He said he recognizes a disparity in the fact that executive committee members are nominated by the administration but they are supposed to represent the faculty. Nonetheless, he said, the word "executive" implies there is power given to it. He said that the "Rule of Two" with summary reporting of the selection process seemed like a reasonable compromise. He added that he approved

of faculty having a voice in the nomination of candidates. He predicted that the proposed resolution favoring F1 would be ignored by the administration. Professor Younker stated that she supported Professor Schultz's comments. She said that in some units, nominations do come from the faculty. Professor Abdoo reported that in the School of Nursing, the names of the two top vote-getters are passed to the provost. She said that there has been a problem with people running for office who are planning to go on sabbatical. Professor Meerkov responded that such eventualities were addressed in the resolution through language stating that the candidates must be eligible to serve in office. A member of the Assembly asked whether requests under the Freedom of Information Act would truly be blocked if the "Rule of Two" were codified. Professor Stark replied that experience has shown that the reasons for selection of a candidate under the existing practices will not be released by the administration through FOIA without court action. Professor Peters declared that she came from a country with strong democratic traditions, and that she finds it astounding that the proposed resolution would not be supported. Why weaken ourselves from the beginning, she asked. Professor Powell stated that he served on the USGTF and had supported the "Rule of Two" because he had polled members of his faculty and learned that they favored it as a way to assure diversity on executive committees. He averred that hearing the debate he was now persuaded that F1 is the correct choice, and that he supports the resolution.

Vote on the Active Motion:

Number Approving- 35

Number Disapproving- 5

Number Abstaining- 2

---

#### ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [112105-1](#)

The chair invited the motion: The secretary of the Assembly shall send the model COI/COC policy adopted on 31 October 2005 to the unit executive committees on behalf of the unit assembly representatives. (Multiple members signaled support.)

Vote on the Active Motion-

The action was adopted by unanimous vote.

---

## ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [103105-1](#)

Chair Giordani called attention to Distributed Item 5, an Active Motion introduced at the September meeting. He explained that the item is a resolution endorsed unanimously by SACUA that describes a Model COI/COC policy. If adopted at the unit level, it could remedy some of the deficiencies in the central policy.

### Discussion of the Active Motion

Professor Smith pointed out that other universities have determinative committees composed of faculty, and it would be proper for the U-M to follow that model.

Vote on the Active Motion-

Approving – all but 2

Disapproving – 0

Abstaining – 2

---

## ACTION OF SENATE ASSEMBLY [103105-2](#)

Chair Giordani introduced distributed item 7 as an Active Motion brought forward by unanimous vote of SACUA. He explained that the Motion asks the Assembly representatives from all units to authorize the Assembly to distribute through its secretary a list of questions to unit executive committees about the proposed changes to tenure policy. Professor Lehman reminded Assembly members that Regents' Bylaws grant the Senate Assembly the right to give its advice to the Regents directly.

By engaging in fact-finding the Assembly would be in a position to deliberate and adopt resolutions about the proposals.

Vote on the Active Motion:

Number approving – all but one

Number opposing – 0

Number abstaining – 1