

Draft Minutes 2 August 2021

Circulated 11 August 2021

Approved 16 August 2021

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA)
Monday, 2 August 3:15 pm
The meeting was held via Zoom because of the COVID-19 Shutdown

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

Absent: Finlayson, Toyama, Banasik

Guests: Ann Zaniwski, *The University Record*, Teagan Stebbins, *Michigan Daily*

3:15: Call to order 7/19/21 Minutes/Announcements

Chair Liu reviewed the agenda. The minutes for July 19, 2021 were approved.

3:20 SACUA Chair Updates

Chair Liu said Ms. Devlin will add the SACUA meetings to the fall calendar.

Chair Liu said that Al Blixt (<https://www.linkedin.com/in/alblixt>), a professional facilitator, will facilitate the SACUA retreat, and asked that SACUA members schedule time with him before the retreat. He said that there is a possibility that the retreat will go from 12:00-5:00 pm on August 25.

Chair Liu said that chairs have been appointed to all Senate Assembly Committees with the exception the Administration Evaluation Committee (AEC) and the Government Relations Advisory Committee (GRAC). All people who have been asked to chair these committees have so far declined.

Chair Liu said that he has emailed all the deans asking permission for Senate Assembly members to use their “all faculty” email addresses so they can communicate the Senate Assembly newsletter to their faculty. Four deans have already responded affirmatively. He noted that there is already capacity at UM-Dearborn and UM-Flint for faculty to write the whole faculty. He will appoint a Senate Assembly member from each unit as a “communication point person.”

Chair Liu said he has completed his meetings with Senate Assembly members and has a list of possible topics for Senate Assembly meetings in the coming year. He will ask Senate Assembly to pick three of these topics. He is also looking for feedback on the use of the chat function at Senate Assembly meetings.

Chair Liu said the revised library report is again available on the Faculty Senate page (<https://faculty senate.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/5-25-2021-SACUA-Library-Ad-Hoc-Subcommittee-Final-Report.pdf>). He said that he and Dr. Banasik met with Associate Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs and Senior Director, Academic Human Resources Matish (<https://hr.umich.edu/about-uhr/service-areas-offices/academic-human-resources>) two weeks ago about proposed remote-work rules. They are continuing to follow up with Associate Vice Provost Matish on the topic.

3:26: Rules Committee Working Group

Chair Liu thanked Professor Freeman for drafting the two-phase process for selecting a committee to consider the incorporation of clinical faculty into the Faculty Senate (see appendix 1)

The first phase of the process will be to create a reference group to gather data about the function of clinical faculty (there are 1500 clinical faculty on the Ann Arbor campus, and additional clinical faculty at UM-Dearborn and UM-Flint) using this form:
<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSecqcvGJbNottqtegiTOUmcAV4woeGYnx9tH1yhDn1zZG9wg/viewform>.

Professor Freeman said that engagement with all units employing clinical faculty in a timely fashion is an issue. To this end the working group will assemble answers to the following questions in order to identify patterns of employment:

1. How the position of ‘clinical’ faculty member is variously defined across the 19 units in the university that now employ the title?
2. How these positions are differentiated, if it is, from that of tenure-line instructional faculty in those units?
3. How the workload of these clinical positions is defined?
4. What the process of appointment and re-appointment for clinical faculty is in these units?

Chair Liu has drafted an email to clinical faculty asking them for information about their employment.

Professor Singer said it will be important to title the message in a way that clinical faculty, who are not used to getting emails from the chair of SACUA, will answer it. Professor Ahbel-Rappe said it could be problematic for members of an unprivileged group to answer a message from a member of a privileged group about the terms of their employment. Professor Singer suggested that the note open with a statement along these lines:

“as you can see the faculty senate is interested in hearing your voice (from the last two votes where you were asked your opinion), now would like to formalize the process further.”

Professor Singer asked how faculty who are “clinical” but not “clinical professors”—e.g. clinical instructors and clinical lecturers in the Medical School—will be approached, and how data about the differing titles will be collected. Professor Partridge said a question that can be framed in the subject line of an email message is “how the voice of the clinical faculty can best be heard.”

Chair Liu said the reference group to study the issue of clinical faculty should be functional and did not need to be large.

Professor Atzmon said that faculty governance and union membership are not the same thing, meaning that the inclusion of clinical instructors in the Faculty Senate while excluding members of the lecturers will increase inequity.

Professor Conway asked about the timing of the email message. Chair Liu said he would like to have the working and reference group formed by the end of August, and to form the rules committee at the same time. The report from the working group could be completed by the end of October. Professor Conway suggested delaying the email inquiry until late August given that many people might not be paying attention to University emails in mid-August. Chair Liu said he will send the survey in the third week of August.

Professor Atzmon said that SACUA will need to articulate a reason for not including lecturers. Professor Freeman replied that SACUA is working with a group that does not have a voice, while lecturers have a voice through the Lecturers Employee Organization (LEO). Chair Liu added that SACUA is assembling data for the working group, and that adding lecturers would be adding another group. For the time being the working group will look at clinical faculty only. Professor Partridge said that it makes sense to think about the way the university defines different

categories of clinical faculty. Professor Freeman said that once the working group has the data, it can think about other constituencies.

Chair Liu said the working group will have six members. Two will be from the Medical School, one each from UM-Flint and UM-Dearborn, and two from the rest of campus.

3:53: Recruitment for Rules Committee

Chair Liu said the Rules Committee will need to be formed so that its charge can be confirmed by Senate Assembly. He said that membership should consist primarily of faculty senate members with some clinical faculty (perhaps one from the working group).

Chair Liu said an emeritus faculty member wanted to be included in the AEC, and said that emeritus faculty participation in the AEC Survey could also be considered. Professor Singer said the Rules Committee should consider the size of the Senate Assembly if the size of the Faculty Senate is increased, noting that archivists and curators want to be included since librarians are.

Professor Freeman said that SACUA needs to formalize the process through which it can reach out to the whole university community on issues of general university concern and noted that reporting the results of surveys with a breakdown of different groups can enhance impact as it reveals thinking across constituencies. He noted that faculty from UM-Dearborn and UM-Flint have said they want separate surveys to press a vaccine mandate on their campuses. Chair Liu said that part of the charge for the rules committee should be to look at what other Big Ten schools are doing with these issues, and that Dr. Banasik has already done some work on clinical faculties in other medical schools.

4:00: DEI Committee Update

Professor Partridge said that he, Professor Ahbel-Rappe, Professor Singer and Professor Finlayson have been looking at forming a task force to look at DEI issues, and have identified the following key issues (see also appendix 2):

- Pay equity - Determining process and cadence for evaluation.
- Why do BIPoC faculty leave?
- How can we retain BIPoC faculty?
 - Recommendations on “stay” interviews to identify factors enhancing or reducing satisfaction and academic experience.
 - How do we more meaningfully support the BIPoC faculty already here? How do we improve the campus climate?
 - What programs or policies can be put in place to create and sustain a more inclusive campus for BIPoC faculty?
 - Creating more structural, consistent mentorship of BIPoC tenure-track and research faculty.
- What programs and policies within the University are working (and can we roll these out more widely)? How are peer-institutions creating successful inclusion and support of BIPoC faculty?
- What resources, programs or supports are missing on the Ann Arbor Campus? What is missing on the regional campuses? How do we redress these absences?

Professor Singer said there is a lot of information that needs to be collected, and that, if the faculty manages these issues correctly, their work will have an impact on all members of the institution. She said the group should report to SACUA and the president.

Professor Ahbel-Rappe said that the task force proposal offered a model for proactive communication from the faculty, noting that it arose from discussion of the GoBlue Guarantee at

UM-Dearborn and UM-Flint. Professor Partridge said the difficulty of finding a person to take on Professor Sellers' position as Vice Provost for Equity and Inclusion, Chief Diversity Officer (<https://record.umich.edu/articles/sellers-announces-end-of-tenure-as-chief-diversity-officer/>) invited bottom up communication. Professor Gallo said that SACUA should not to repeat studies that have already been done, noting that the College of Literature, Science and the Arts (LSA) had commissioned an anti-racism task force, and that the dean had shared the report with LSA faculty (<https://lsa.umich.edu/lsa/dei/anti-racism-and-racial-equality.html>). She drew attention to some similarities between the SACUA document and the LSA task force report.

Professor Partridge said there are inequities on the Ann Arbor campus that are resulting in faculty departures. Professor Ahbel-Rappe said the anti-racism committee's engagement with stories about faculty struggling for support, is a way for faculty governance to say that it is listening to faculty who need support. She suggested that this work should be extended to students, and that listening is a way of shaping a new climate. Professor Gallo said SACUA should be clear that it is targeting areas that have so far been insufficiently dealt with without devaluing the work that others have done.

Professor Conway asked for clarification of the relationship between the Anti-Racism Committee and the Committee for Fairness, Equity and Inclusion (CFEI). Professor Partridge said that the Anti-Racism Committee will have representation from CFEI, that the Anti-Racism Committee is taking what has been learned by other groups and is bringing that data to bear on shaping policy.

Professor Singer said that the charge for the Anti-Racism Committee could be refined with the requirement that it discover what is already being done at the University, and that its recommendations be shared with other groups working on anti-racism.

Professor Ahbel-Rappe noted that inclusivity is different from diversity—inclusivity means that people of diverse backgrounds are being treated the same way—that everyone has a place in the community. Professor Singer agreed that talking about inclusivity is different from talking about diversity. Professor Ahbel-Rappe said that inclusivity is a qualitative rather than a quantitative issue. Professor Atzmon agreed with Professor Ahbel-Rappe, noting that one question such as Professor Schlissel's question about extending the GoBlue Guarantee on the AEC survey did more damage than many well-meaning efforts to improve campus climate could repair. Professor Liu said that because the work of the Anti-Racism Committee is time limited, it is different from the work of standing Senate Assembly committees. Professor Singer asked SACUA members to review the document and respond to the questions indicated by herself and Professor Partridge (https://docs.google.com/document/d/1nMc2OVY6HxkN8ICPQ1MMq_i9OQXO2w5Od_eqmyBkO08/edit).

4:28: Protection of Faculty/Academic Freedom and Social Media

Chair Liu said social media attacks can be very disturbing to faculty. Professor Potter said that he recalled the visit by Charles Murray to the University in 2017, which he attended at the request of the administration in his role as Chair of the Student Relations Advisory Committee (<https://www.michigandaily.com/government/students-attempt-shut-down-speech-controversial-social-scientist-charles-murray/>). He recalled that the event was set up by right-wing activists as a way of provoking an incident at which protestors would be arrested (the organizers were disappointed in their aspiration), and recalled an event sponsored by the Department of Classical Studies in conjunction with Martin Luther King Day at which a self-identified right-wing activist was taking a video of the event (he and a colleague had arranged for the Department of Public Safety [DPS] to intercept the activist, and DPS had confiscated the recording), which had not been authorized. He drew attention to an article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*

(<https://www.chronicle.com/article/the-culture-war-has-come-for-higher-ed>) which discussed the increasing politicization of college campuses and partisan interference in routine academic procedures. The article notes that public universities are frequently painted by conservative media outlets as “breeding grounds” for “leftist ideology,” and that public universities in Florida and Georgia face legislation that aims to limit academic freedom.

Professor Freeman said SACUA should check what other Big Ten institutions are doing and that the University, at present, does not appear to have a good mechanism with which to react to threats. Professor Singer agreed that SACUA should look at these measures, and ask the Provost if there is some planning around the possibility of politically charged attacks on members of the University community. Professor Conway agreed that the timing of such inquiries is appropriate as the Office for Institutional Equity (OIE) advisory group has recently met, and will meet again in late September. Professor Gallo drew attention to the University’s policy on political speech (<https://publicaffairs.vpcomm.umich.edu/key-issues/guidelines-for-political-campaigns-and-ballot-initiatives/frequently-asked-questions/>) and noted that the issue will be prominent in the context of the forthcoming midterm elections. Chair Liu drew attention to Penn State University policy on Social Media Support for faculty (https://sites.psu.edu/academicaffairs/files/2020/09/Social-Media-Support-and-Resources-for-Penn-State-Faculty_09-17-20.pdf).

4:45: Fall Planning Discussion
Executive Session

4:55: Matters Arising

5:07: Adjournment

Appendix 1: Draft Process for Examining the Incorporation of Clinical Faculty into University Senate

PREAMBLE

SACUA has been asked to examine the incorporation of clinical faculty into university senate. The question was examined most recently by the Rules Committee report in May 2006, resulting in the Extension of Membership in the University Senate to Clinical Faculty and Assistant Librarians report. The issue continues to be a complex one given, among other issues, the definitions of who constitute ‘clinical faculty’ in different units, the variety of unit-level policies about their participation in unit-level decision-making, how their workloads are determined and how they are contracted with the university.

Accordingly, SACUA has organized a two-stage approach to the question. In the first stage, a *Working Group on Clinical Faculty Representation* will examine the charge below and will report to SACUA by DATE. After reviewing it, SACUA will send the report, along with any comments, to the Rules Committee with a specific charge. The Rules Committee will consider the report, given the specific charge, and may decide to gather additional information before sending their recommendation to SACUA.

This two-stage approach acknowledges the important role of clinical faculty in describing the contours of their work across the various university units that employ them. It further places the decision-making process within the broader framework of the present review of rules governing participation within the voting faculty that is now being undertaken by the Rules Committee.

FORMATION OF THE WORKING GROUP

The SACUA Chair will solicit names and designate a Chair for the Working Group. He will also solicit interest among clinical faculty across the university to serve on the Group. Depending on the response, the membership of the core group may be limited to six people in order to facilitate meeting. A larger Reference Group will be created from among the interested respondents that represent a wider representation of clinical faculty across units and campuses. As needed, the Working Group Chair, working with the SACUA Chair, may solicit/identify a liaison from each unit that has clinical faculty.

CHARGE TO THE WORKING GROUP

The Working Group of/on? Clinical Faculty is directed to assemble the following information:

1. How the position of ‘clinical’ faculty member is variously defined across the 19 units in the university that now employ the title?
2. How these positions are differentiated, if it is, from that of tenure-line instructional faculty in those units?
3. How the workload of these clinical positions is defined?
4. What the process of appointment and re-appointment for clinical faculty is in these units?

The Working Group is asking to then review information to identify

- A) what is consistent across the units that employ clinical faculty
- B) what is specific to or unique in particular units

and to comment on any concerns or issues that these patterns may raise particularly with regard to potentially incorporating clinical faculty into the voting membership of university faculty. The Working Group is invited to include any additional information that they believe bears on the potential decision.

SACUA would appreciate receiving the Working Group’s report by DATE.

Appendix 2 : Draft Faculty Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Task Force

The University of Michigan’s focus on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) has created several initial steps towards increasing diversity including targeted hires, the GoBlue guarantee, and DEI strategic plans. This work has emphasized current gaps including retention, pay equity, academic promotion, satisfaction and wellbeing. However, this strategic plan has not necessarily implemented next steps to truly attain equity and inclusivity on all 3 campuses. We propose the creation of a Faculty DEI Task Force to outline the next steps for this work.

The Faculty DEI Task Force will be comprised of approximately 16 faculty from the Ann Arbor, Dearborn and Flint campuses, selected by SACUA via an open call for volunteers, including:

- Diversity of ranks
- Diversity of disciplines
- Faculty with knowledge of and experience in addressing issues of equity, exclusion, and racism
- A liaison from Committee for Fairness, Equity and Inclusion (CFEI)
- A liaison from the Committee on Anti-Racism

- Faculty representation from the Dearborn and Flint campuses

Throughout the 2021-22 academic year, the Faculty DEI Task Force will meet regularly to address issues of culture, climate, and inclusivity (as detailed below) across the three campuses and to investigate models both within the University and at peer-institutions for successful inclusion and support of BIPOC faculty. As noted by the CFEI final report ‘inclusivity’ is a key facet of DEI that is lacking. Thus, the committee will ultimately provide a set of concrete strategies for transforming the academic environment for BIPOC faculty across the three campuses.

In addition, as the recent extension of the GoBlue Guarantee to Flint and Dearborn highlights, creating and maintaining equitable resources and support for the regional campuses and their diverse, non-traditional student body represents a key component of meaningful DEI. The committee, therefore, will consider how more effective DEI initiatives can be supported across *all* three campuses and how to promote policies that recognize that supporting the regional campuses is a fundamental aspect of true inclusion, diversity, and equality at the University.

The Faculty DEI Task Force will meet with SACUA and then the President to bring forward ideas and specific strategies to continue the University’s efforts to transform the climate; in consultation with SACUA the committee will also meet with key administrative sponsors (such as the Chief Diversity Officer) to discuss DEI issues and to address strategies for promoting inclusivity and equity across the three campuses for BIPOC and underrepresented faculty (as well as BIPOC and non-traditional students).

The Faculty DEI Task Force will also have liaisons from both the Committee on Anti-Racism and CFEI to facilitate the advancements of these three committees related goals, while mitigating potential redundancies.

The Committee will address DEI issues including:

- Pay equity - Determining process and cadence for evaluation.
- Why do BIPOC faculty leave?
- How can we retain BIPOC faculty?
 - Recommendations on “stay” interviews to identify factors enhancing or reducing satisfaction and academic experience.
 - How do we more meaningfully support the BIPOC faculty already here? How do we improve the campus climate?
- What programs or policies can be put in place to create and sustain a more inclusive campus for BIPOC faculty?
 - Creating more structural, consistent mentorship of BIPOC tenure-track and research faculty.
- What programs and policies within the University are working (and can we roll these out more widely)? How are peer-institutions creating successful inclusion and support of BIPOC faculty?
- What resources, programs or supports are missing on the Ann Arbor Campus? What is missing on the regional campuses? How do we redress these absences?

In addition to issues focused on promoting BIPOC faculty inclusivity, the Task Force will also consider these issues as they relate to the differing student bodies on the three campuses:

- How do we reframe the narrative surrounding DEI to acknowledge the importance of Flint and Dearborn to the University's overall diversity?
- How do we pragmatically support the diverse, non-traditional student bodies on the regional campuses as part of a more inclusive, tri-campus approach to DEI?
- What are the specific causes of the high attrition rates on the Flint and Dearborn campuses? What would allow students to finish their degrees on the regional campuses? How do we support non-traditional students on the regional campuses to facilitate the completion of degrees?
- What programs or policies can be put in place (or replicated between the campuses) to create greater inclusivity and promote a more positive climate for BIPOC and non-traditional students across the three campuses?

Communication:

- Outreach to CFEI, the Committee on Anti-Racism, and SACUA prior to finalizing or communicating the charge as part of co-creation process
- Announcement in the Record, including the call for self-nominations
- Inclusion in President's weekly message
- Post on Maize and Blueprint and Provost's website
- Direct communication with the President, the Chief DEI Officer, and other relevant administrators
- Periodic updates on the Committee's work will be shared with the President, SACUA, and the University community

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 policies shall reside in the faculties of the various schools and colleges, but insofar as actions by the several faculties affect university policy as a whole, or schools and colleges other than the one in which they originate, they shall be brought before the University Senate."

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

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

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

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