

Draft Minutes 7 June 2021
Circulated 14 June 2021
Approved 21 June 2021

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA)
Monday, 7 June 3:15 pm
The meeting was held via Zoom because of the COVID-19 Shutdown

Present: Liu (Chair), Ahbel-Rappe, Atzmon, Conway, Finlayson, Freeman, Partridge, Potter, Singer, Toyama, Banasik, Devlin

Absent: Gallo

Guests: Professor Weineck; Nadir Nazar Al-Saidi, *The Michigan Daily*; Ann Zaniewski, *The University Record*

3:16: Call to order 5/24/21 Minutes/Announcements

Chair Liu called the meeting to order. The minutes for May 24 were approved. Chair Liu said President Schlissel is willing to issue an apology for Administrator Evaluation Committee survey question 14 so there is no need for a further SACUA resolution. Professor Finlayson requested that discussion of the One University movement be held in executive session.

3:20 Faculty Senate Office Updates

Dr. Banasik said that the Faculty Senate Office is sending notifications to Senate Assembly committee volunteers who have been placed on committees. She said that nominations for the Library Council will be sent out shortly by the Provost's Office to the Deans.

3:25: SACUA Chair Updates

Chair Liu congratulated Professor Partridge for promotion to professor. He said that he, along with Professors Potter and Conway met with Robert Roach and Larry Plutko from Guidepost Solutions about the proposed compliance position on May 27. One further issue with respect to proposed changes in response to the WilmerHale report is that the University does not have a code of conduct, which means that members of the University Community cannot be sanctioned for behavior that is harmful, but does not explicitly violate an SPG. He said that the SACUA WilmerHale Task Force report has been sent to all the regents, Guidepost Solutions and the executive officers. Professor Potter noted, that one aspect of the establishment of the Compliance office is a change in the reporting line for Office for Institutional Equity (OIE) to the President and, through the President and the Compliance Office, to the Board of Regents. In most universities the Title IX office reports to the President rather than to the Provost, which is not currently the case at the University.

Chair Liu said that the COVID council has been dissolved over the summer, but that President Schlissel said that, if there is community interest in the continuation of the council in the Fall Semester, SACUA can help populate it.

Chair Liu said that the Lecturers' Employee Union (LEO) has informed him that a remote working agreement for faculty is being formulated at the University and that he will find out about the terms of the agreement when they are clarified and share with SACUA.

Chair Liu said he had meet with Provost Collins and shared the recommendations of the Committee for Fairness, Equity and Inclusion (CFEI) with respect to the promotion process. He said that Provost Collins will send a message to faculty on the Ann Arbor campus about the promotion and tenure recommendations. Provost Collins asked about the reception of COVID impact statement in promotion files. Provost Collins told Chair Liu that in some units the statements are optional and in others they are not well-received. Provost Collins also discussed the decision by the Ann Arbor School District to cancel after-school programs in the Fall. She said that the University has approached the district to try to find a solution that will alleviate the difficulty this decision will cause members of the University community.

Chair Liu said that Professor Finlayson and Dr. Banasik had attended a meeting of a consortium of faculty governance leaders. The consortium was established in the spring of 2019 when faculty chairs from eight universities met at Yale for a half-day meeting to discuss common issues. The consortium has grown to include 19 institutions that have been meeting virtually on a regular basis. Professor Finlayson said the principal topics of the meeting were faculty governance roles and training for those roles. She said some universities hand-select faculty leaders, while others are more like the University of Michigan in having an elective process. There was general agreement amongst those in attendance that there is need for faculty committee chairs to be trained.

Professor Finlayson said some schools had more substantial programs for onboarding Senate Assembling members, outlining ways that issues can be brought to a Senate Assembly for units and how responses to those issues can be communicated to those units. Another issue is publicizing the accomplishments of faculty governance. One proposal was the composition of newsletters to promote faculty governance, another is to highlight faculty service on Senate Assembly committees to deans and chairs as a way of validating service. There is real variation in the way this service is valued from unit to unit. Chair Liu agreed that it is important for there to be recognition of work in faculty governance.

3:34: Resolution Against President Schlissel's AEC Survey Question 14

Professor Weineck joined the meeting. Chair Liu drew attention to his email concerning President Schlissel's apology for the wording of AEC question 14, and said that, in his view, there is no need for a SACUA resolution on the subject since President Schlissel is already doing what SACUA would like him to do.

Professor Toyama agreed that President Schlissel's message represented a good outcome, but said he remained concerned at the way President Schlissel had framed the question as a conflict between Ann Arbor faculty salaries and support for undergraduates at UM-Dearborn and UM-Flint. Chair Liu said President Schlissel had made it clear in his twenty-minute telephone conversation that he thinks a great deal about financial issues—and said that the One University movement is about funding regional campuses with money from the Ann Arbor campus. President Schlissel said that investment in UM-Flint and UM-Dearborn is a bad investment given the low rate of degree completion on those campuses, that salaries are a university's biggest expenditure, and the money to pay those salaries comes from tuition, making it very difficult to tell parents who are paying tuition to the Ann Arbor campus that their tuition dollars will be used to fund activities at UM-Dearborn and UM-Flint. Professor Freeman said the issue is deeper than the President's word choice in question 14, and that it is important for SACUA to go on the record to express its opposition to the sentiment expressed by President Schlissel. Professor Atzmon said he agreed with Professor Freeman that the damage is substantial when President Schlissel equates an effort to promote excellence on the branch campuses with damage to excellence on the Ann Arbor campus. Professor Finlayson agreed that linking the One University

issue with salary is problematic. The issues raised by the One University movement are about equity, and by framing the question the way that he did, President Schlissel misses the movement's core values. Professor Partridge agreed with the need for a statement to consider funding across the whole university.

Professor Ahbel-Rappe said that apologizing for the question's wording does not mitigate the intention of the statement, that President Schlissel is not trying to remedy the situation whereby minority students in the branch campuses are underfunded and consequently drop out. She noted that Harvard is currently defending a case, which may ultimately be decided by the Supreme Court, that diversity promotes student excellence by pointing to research showing that diverse law review editorial boards perform better than non-diverse boards (<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/05/31/us/supreme-court-diversity-harvard.html>). She said President Schlissel needs to understand that the faculty are arguing for excellence through diversity.

Professor Singer said she supports issuing a statement, adding she would like clarification that support for minority students can enhance completion be added to such a statement. Professor Finlayson noted that both UM-Dearborn and UM-Flint have issues with completion rates, that 56% of Dearborn students receive a Pell Grant, and that lack of funding is an impediment to completion. Students who are forced to lose a semester for financial reasons have trouble getting back into the flow of the university. She added that statistical comparison with Ann Arbor is problematic because students are struggling with different issues; the university needs to decide if it is an agent of social change and mobility or not. If the University does not do a better job supporting students at the regional campuses it is just supporting privilege.

Professor Conway said SACUA will need to issue a response, and should go to executive session to discuss the issue. Professor Ahbel-Rappe said that it made no sense to deny financial support to students on the ground that they cannot finish, and drew attention to State Bill 4400 ([http://www.legislature.mi.gov/\(S\(3cskf42w12dau0y43asafhzp\)\)/mileg.aspx?page=GetObject&objectname=2021-HB-4400](http://www.legislature.mi.gov/(S(3cskf42w12dau0y43asafhzp))/mileg.aspx?page=GetObject&objectname=2021-HB-4400)) through which the House has proposed redistributing money away from the Ann Arbor campus to equalize funding across all campuses. By resisting the bill, the University is failing to make allies across the state. Professor Finlayson said the redistribution of funds is about equity for in-state students, that UM-Dearborn receives a third of the per-student funding that the Ann Arbor campus receives. The redistribution of funds is about creating an equitable playing field for in-state students at all Michigan universities. Chair Liu said President Schlissel was clear that he values Diversity, Equity and Inclusion.

3:54 Executive Session

One University

Faculty Awards

College of Engineering Faculty

5:02: Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

David S. Potter

Senate Secretary

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

Governing Bodies in Schools and Colleges

Sec. 4.01 The University Senate

"...[t]he Senate is authorized to consider any subject pertaining to the interests of the university, and to make recommendations to the Board of Regents in regard thereto. Decisions of the University Senate with respect to matters within its jurisdiction shall constitute the binding action of the university faculties. Jurisdiction over academic polices shall reside in the faculties of the various schools and colleges, but insofar as actions by the several faculties affect university policy as a whole, or schools and colleges other than the one in which they originate, they shall be brought before the University Senate."

Rules of the University Senate, the Senate Assembly and the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs:

Senate: "In all cases not covered by rules adopted by the Senate, the procedure in Robert's Rules of Order shall be followed."

Assembly: "The Assembly may adopt rules for the transaction of its business. In appropriate cases not covered by rules of the Assembly, the rules of the University Senate shall apply."

SACUA: "The committee may adopt rules for the transaction of its business."