

Minutes of 2 February 2009
Circulated: 6 February 2009
Recirculated: 10 February 2009
Approved: 30 March 2009

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs

6048 Fleming Administration Building

Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1340

Phone: (734) 764-0303

Fax: (734) 764-6564

Internet Address: <http://www.umich.edu/~sacua/>

Approved minutes: <http://www.umich.edu/~sacua/sacmin/sacuminutes.html>

MINUTES OF THE SACUA MEETING OF 2 FEBRUARY 2009

Present: Fraser, Frier, Navvab, Poe, Potter (Chair), Riles, Stark, Thouless; Carr, Schneider

Absent: Frost; Lehman

Guests: Diann Brei (Member, Rackham Executive Board), Kevin Brown (University Record), Mary Jo Frank (UM Media Relations), Alec Gallimore (Associate Dean for Academic Program and Initiatives, Rackham Graduate School), Phil Hanlon (Vice Provost for Academic and Budgetary Affairs), Sioban Harlow (Member, Rackham Executive Board), Marilyn Knepp (Policy Advisor to the Dean, Rackham School of Graduate Studies), Jeff Lee (Executive Director, AAUP-Michigan), Frances Mueller (Project Manager, UM Space Utilization Initiative), Janet Weiss (Dean of Rackham)

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED

1. Draft agenda
2. Draft minutes of 12 January 2009
3. Draft minutes of 16 January 2009
4. [“Policy Approved by Rackham Executive Board” from the Rackham School of Graduate Studies website.](#)
5. [“December 2008 update letter to Graduate Programs” from the Rackham School of Graduate Studies website.](#)
6. [“December 2008 update letter to Students” from the Rackham School of Graduate Studies website.](#)
7. [“Downturn Threatens the Faculty’s Role in Running Colleges,” by Robin Wilson, Chronicle of Higher Education, 02/06/09.](#)

Chair Potter convened the meeting at 3:19 PM. The proposed agenda was approved.

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of 12 January and 16 January 2009 were approved.

Capital Projects Process:

Phil Hanlon and Frances Mueller were introduced. The new process for choosing capital projects (buildings, major renovations) was explained. A new process was needed because the old process was unorganized and lacked transparency. The new process is more structured, clearly focused on academic needs and gives the units a basis of judgments made. The process requires consistent information from each unit with a set deadline for all. The proposals are prioritized and, depending upon available funds, the top projects are funded. Any project that will cost more than \$5M requires the provost's approval. Projects costing \$2-5M need the input of the Provost's office because of potential overdrafts. When a unit is submitting a proposal, the proposal needs to focus on need, not on solution. The use of space planners and architects prior to approval is strongly discouraged.

The Provost's Office Review Team (including a member of SACUA) assesses the proposals for the entire Ann Arbor campus. The committee may decide to combine a number of projects if needed.

The first round of proposals was completed in the Fall of 2008. Four proposals were approved in 2008, but not all were funded. The feedback of the proposal status was given to the units. The areas chosen were in the Health/Medical, Residents, Athletics and Parking.

Even though the new process coordinates the proposals annually, it is hard to do 20-year plan for academics because of changing needs of students. The planning of housing needs is difficult because it's dependent on enrollment figures and they are hard to predict. Recently external businesses are getting into the University's housing market.

Since the Capital Projects proposals are approved in November, Chair Potter asked if Phil Hanlon could meet with SACUA in October regarding submissions and campus space planning in general.

The purchase of the Pfizer property was discussed relative to opening space on central campus for other units. The plan is for central campus medical units to move to the Pfizer "campus", leaving space for back-fill by other central campus units. The EVPMA, the Provost, and the CFO will determine who moves to Pfizer. The property was purchased from central administration funds. The buildings were purchased with Hospital and Medical School reserves. It is not known if units moving to the Pfizer property will pay for upkeep and possibly part of purchase. There is currently no model in mind.

Answering what the next space utilization need is for the university, P. Hanlon believes we don't use our space efficiently. The Provost's priorities for space needs are 1) Mechanical Engineering, 2) Cellular and Molecular Biology, and 3) the School of Nursing., but not necessarily in that order. Cellular & Molecular Biology has many undergrads, so it's not feasible to move the unit to the Pfizer property. The unit will probably be put on the current medical campus.

Some discussion of budget occurred. One of the Provost's highest priorities is cost containment (<http://www.provost.umich.edu/budgeting/CostContain-2008.pdf>).

Phil Hanlon and Frances Mueller left the meeting.

Rackham Continuous Enrollment Policy:

Introductions were made between SACUA and the guests discussing Rackham's policy of continuous enrollment. The new policy was recently approved by the Rackham Executive Board with three conditions to be satisfied before the policy can be implemented: 1) plans in each school and college for University resources to cover the anticipated increased terms of registration arising from the policy change; 2) Regental approval of a restructuring of the candidacy tuition rate proportional to the expected change in enrollment so that the aggregate tuition cost remains constant; and 3) achievement of the consistent provision of the University services to Ph.D. students throughout the duration of their programs of study.

Janet Weiss gave a presentation. Originally the analysis estimated that enrollment would increase by 900 Ph.D. candidates. With updated data, the new estimate is an increase of 2,200 to 2,800 Ph.D. candidates. The Executive Board believes that the University should pay for the increased number of terms needed to graduate under the new policy, not students.

The following questions were asked by SACUA members and answered by Janet Weiss:

1. How will program be monitored to make sure that the new program works over time?

Answer: A monitoring process is being developed.

2. Will resources from other units be shifted to social science units? Resources are not being shifted from one unit to another. Some individual units will experience a reduced cost. GSI appointments are costing less, leaving money for tuition fellowships. Lower tuition frees up money for tuition fellowships. Full support may not be offered for candidates taking longer to complete Ph.D.

3. There is some concern among faculty that the support for students will come on the backs of faculty by using contracts and grants. What if research funding is for three years and student takes five years to complete Ph.D. Where will the funding come from for the two additional years?

Answer: Deans are working to come up with the means. All schools need an internal culture of support.

4. In architecture, faculty only receives teaching credit for the term of graduation. Are students supported properly? Do they have benefits? Pre-candidates use up more time of faculty, but areas explored are different from candidates.

5. The analysis used is static for 13% and assumes everyone's behavior will remain the same with new policy. But, in fact, faculty will probably hire more post-docs instead of graduate students because of new policy. If a faculty's funding is in question, it's easier to hire a post-doc, i.e. one-year funding, than to take on a five-year commitment needed for a graduate student. Faculty will change behavior based on new policy.

Answer: The budget model will adjust with enrollment.

6. Will money stay in pot for student support? Or will money be viewed by school as a new pot of money to be spent on something else? One of the SACUA members responded that if research dollars were freed up, the money would be spent on equipment. And added that equipment doesn't produce Indirect Cost Recovery money that was used in the calculation by Rackham as one of the areas that would produce revenue.

7. Under the new policy, students must take an official leave of absence to be excused from registering. It's paternalistic of Rackham to determine the "accepted" reasons for a leave, rather than allowing a student to determine the valid reason to take term(s) off.

8. According to the presentation, there are currently 340 students who are supporting themselves. What are these students' situations that they are not registered now?

Answer: 340 different stories.

Janet Weiss and Marilyn Knepp leave at 5:11 pm.

Discussion continues with one of the members of the Rackham Executive Board regarding Rackham's ability to make sure that the schools and colleges meet the goals outlined in the conditions and the fact that the new policy would not be rolled out if schools and colleges don't meet the requirements. Rackham will need to see actual plans and plans will need to be viewed within one year. As long as there's flexibility in the policy, there's more time for implementation.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. There as a recent private meeting with President Coleman, Chair Potter and Bruce Frier.
2. February's Faculty Governance Update to the Regents will be concerned with the Regents 5.09 Bylaw.
3. The SACUA Officers election will be held in March instead of April this year.

NEW BUSINESS:

The Senate Assembly Committee for a Multicultural University (CMU) and the Tenure Committee need new chairs. It was decided that, with his acceptance, Rex Holland will become the chair of CMU. The Tenure Committee will be polled and SACUA will decide next week.

LIAISON REPORTS:

Financial Affairs – Medical School will be making decisions regarding the use of space in the new Pfizer property.

Medical Affairs – reiterated the discussion in Financial Affairs.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Carr
SACUA Support

University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents, Sec. 5.02:

Governing Bodies in Schools and Colleges

In each school, college, or degree granting division of the University, including those at the University of Michigan-Dearborn and at the University of Michigan-Flint, the governing faculty shall be in charge of the affairs of the school, college, or division, except as delegated to the executive committee, if any, and except that in the School of Graduate Studies the governing board shall be the executive board, and in the Medical School shall be the executive faculty.
