

Minutes of the AAAC meeting of 27 April 2017

Approved:

Present: Armstrong, Lehman (chair), Marsh, Meerkov, Quidachay-Swan, Sanok, Toyama

Absent: Brewster, Epureanu, Kearfott, Mashour, Ortega, Piper, Qian

Attending: Interim Provost P. Courant

The meeting was convened at 8:45 A.M.

#### CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of 30 March 2017 were approved.

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS

Meeting dates for AY 2017-2018 will have to be scheduled after a new provost is appointed.

Returning members are Kearfott, Meerkov, Piper, Quidachay-Swan, Sanok, and Toyama.

The interim provost arrived at 9:00 A.M.

AAAC members asked Provost Courant for suggestions about how the AAAC could be most effective in its advisory function to the new provost when the incumbent arrives. He replied that the AAAC should arrange to be placed on the list of introductory meetings scheduled with the new provost. Members should characterize the role of the AAAC as that of informed faculty with ears to the ground. There will be a brief period during which AAAC gets to define its role. It will be important to avoid an adversarial stance.

AAAC members reiterated their interest in working with UM administration to develop an appeal process for OIE (Office of Institutional Equity) investigations. They asked how they could be most effective in such policy development. The interim provost said that there were technical issues surrounding an appeals process, but that he would be willing to help. The appeal process can not be parallel to that of students because of the employment relationship of faculty and staff. The AAAC should try to develop a rough outline of design criteria for appeals. Ask first what a good system would consist of and accomplish. He suggested working with the Office of General Counsel and with the faculty affairs people in the provost's office. The onus for initiating the process is on the faculty. The also suggested meeting with the new leadership of OIE.

Professor Sanok called attention to a recent article in the Chronicle of Higher Education that highlighted salary disparities by gender at the UM. She asked if and how such statistics are compiled and tracked at the UM. The interim provost responded that provosts have attended to this topic over periods of more than a decade. Great differences exist between the Medical School and the rest of the university. Salary predictions based on multifactor models are good enough to spot anomalies. He said that this area of study used to be his field. Human Resources produces a report, but does not engage in or report the results of modeling. In his recollection, analyses conducted by the provost's office left only a two to four percent difference between male and female faculty unexplained.

He said a related question is whether promotion rates are similar. The question was examined only once in his recollection, but he was not involved. Both types of analyses should typically be conducted every 4 or 5 years. AAAC should press on the new provost for these analyses. The last one was done in 2012. He said that both Wisconsin and Berkeley have done excellent studies on this study; he complimented Berkeley in particular. The study showed systematic small differences by field and school. He said the necessary data are available.

AAAC members asked how helpful the data produced by AEC (Administration Evaluation Committee) are to the provost presently. The interim provost replied that the data are useful if the response rates are high. They would be more helpful if response rates were higher.

Interim Provost Courant pointedly thanked Professor Armstrong for the excellent job she has done representing academic interests of student athletes.

The interim provost left the meeting at 9:35 A.M.

Professor Armstrong told committee members that she would continue to draft best practices for student athlete academics in collaboration with Mr. Quidachay-Swan, and that they will prepare a report and recommendations for AAAC consideration. The approach will be analogous to that developed for students with disabilities. She said that there was a need for a centralized proctoring resource as part of the overall plan. She suggested that the elements of the plan could be subsumed in a revised version of the letter to faculty from the provost that goes out in August.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 A.M.