

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SENATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

Monday, 10 May, 2021 3:15

The meeting was held by zoom

Present: Abir, Ahbel-Rappe (by virtue), Ali, Barzilai, Bridwell-Rabb, Burzo, Byon, Castilho, Caulfield, Conway (by virtue), Dal Cin, DiFeo, Dinov, Dolins, Evrard, Fabiilli, Finlayson (by virtue), Fontana, Gallo (by virtue), Gnedin, Guzdial, Huang, Hughes, Hyde, Jenkins, Junghans, Kahn, Kazerooni, Ketefian, Knoblauch, Kolmanovsky, Lagisetty, Lampe, Laurence, Lepri, Liang, Liu, MacLatchy, Madathilparambil, Maitra, Maxim, Mesa, Modrak, Nelson, Okwudire, Ostling, Pal, Partridge, Pinto, Potter, Ramaswamy, Sales, Singer, Snyder, Toyama (by virtue), Wang, Wright

Absent: Andrias, Bawardi, Butt, Conjeevaram, Friese, Garner, Hertz, Kattari, Kessentini, Lahiri, Manera (by virtue), Mansfield, Mendlow, Morgan, Papaleontiou, Passey, Smith, Spencer (by virtue), Subramanian, Trumpey, Van Berkel

3:16: Call to Order/ Welcome/Agenda/ Announcements

Chair Liu called the meeting to order. He said the purpose of the meeting is to review the accomplishments of the 17 Senate Assembly committees during the 2020/2021 academic year, and to vote on the proposed changes to the rules governing meetings of the University Senate and Senate Assembly. He said Senate Assembly can amend the agenda to move the vote on the proposed rules to the Fall 2021 Semester. He noted that the time allotted for discussion on the present agenda conforms with the time allotted for other action items. He said Ms. Develin will assist Senate Assembly members with access issues if they should arise, and that Professor Finlayson will manage the chat.

The Senate Assembly tested access to Simply Voting.

Professor Atzmon introduced the following motion:

Allocating all of ten minutes to voting on major rules changes, the most consequential item on the proposed agenda, undermines the deliberative process the Senate Assembly is supposed to follow. I move to approve the agenda with the following modification: For the 4:30 item titled “electronic rules,” delete the word “vote” and replace it with information and discussion.

Professor Dolins seconded the motion. Professor Mesa asked if Professor Atzmon’s proposal would delay the vote on the proposed rules change until September. Chair Liu replied that this would only happen if SACUA decided to add the proposed rules change to the agenda in September. Professor Dal Cin asked if this would be true for all the proposed changes. Professor Liu replied that would be the case. Professor Wright observed that postponement of the vote would exclude current Senate Assembly members who are rolling off of Senate Assembly.

Professor Finlayson noted that changing the agenda would eliminate the possibility of a vote. Professor Ahbel-Rappe asked what advantage would accrue from postponement. Professor Atzmon replied that the rules change is a big issue and that rushing a vote on something that should be deliberated for an hour is not appropriate. Professor Ahbel-Rappe disagreed. Chair Liu reminded the Senate Assembly that a motion to change the agenda required a two thirds majority to carry.

3:20: Faculty Senate Office Updates

Dr. Banasik said the assignment of volunteers to the Senate Assembly committees for 2021/22 will be completed within the next two weeks.

3:25 SACUA updates

Chair Liu said SACUA met with President Schlissel on April 17th in executive session, and with Provost Collins and the team that is working on the University's new policy on relationships.

Chair Liu responded to the email that Professor Atzmon had sent to the Senate Assembly (see appendix 2). He pointed out that only the first point in that email (restriction of voting to those who are present at a meeting of the faculty senate) was relevant to the work of the rules committee, and that the information Professor Atzmon provided was misleading because the Senate Assembly and Faculty Senate meet differently. Other than in elections for SACUA, Senate Assembly votes in a meeting, and members of the public have not made requests to attend Senate Assembly meetings. SACUA's business is typically conducted with the press in attendance; all SACUA minutes are available; and the majority of SACUA votes are conducted in the public by raised hands. SACUA has used Simply Voting twice, in both cases when it was not possible to finish a vote during a meeting.

Chair Liu said the issue concerning the reliability of Simply Voting (Professor Atzmon's point 3) is misleading. Simply Voting (<https://www.simplyvoting.com>) is used by 3000 groups. It is not a "broken voting system;" only eligible people can cast votes through the system; and it is problematic to question a dedicated voting software system with no supporting evidence. He noted that SACUA had sent the statement about Regent Weiser's conduct to all faculty, and over 1800 faculty members had voted (<https://facultysenate.umich.edu/sacua-issues-statement-condemning-recent-statements-by-regent-weiser-receives-strong-faculty-support/>; <https://www.freep.com/story/news/politics/2021/04/01/u-m-faculty-weiser-comments/4839234001/>).

Chair Liu said the ad hoc Rules Committee had been convened with a specific charge, approved by Senate Assembly at its March meeting (<https://facultysenate.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Approved-Minutes-of-15-March-2021-Senate-Assembly.pdf>). The committee has proposed changes in accordance with its charge, SACUA endorsed the recommendations with five votes in favor and none against. The reason SACUA voted after the meeting was that the text of the proposed rules change had been revised at the meeting; the vote was open for 60 hours after the corrected rules were posted.

The vote on Professor Atzmon's motion to amend the agenda was 30 opposed; 15 in favor; 2- abstentions. The motion failed.

3:30: Committee Reports

Dr. Banasik presented the committee reports. The slides for this presentation are available at: <https://facultysenate.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/ALL-Final-Senate-Assembly-Committee-Report.pdf>.

Academic Affairs Advisory Committee (AAAC):

1. The committee met 9 times, focusing on impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on the faculty and student experience; the impact of the pandemic on the tenure and promotion process; communication on anti-racism efforts; and unit responses to the pandemic. The committee also discussed administrative leadership evaluations and offered feedback on Office of Institutional Equity (OIE), the proposed umbrella policy on relationships, and ways to share information about such policies with the University community.
2. Accomplishments included support for SACUA's WilmerHale Task force, and interaction with the consultants from Guidepost Solutions; collaborative work with the Committee on the Social and Economic Welfare of the Faculty (CESWF) and the Committee on Oversight of Administrative Action (COAA).



3. Anticipated issues for the future include trust and equity in the selection and evaluation of University leaders; further work on recommendations from Guidepost Solutions; continued exploration of the pandemic's impact on the promotion and tenure process and OIE processes, including the way hearings are conducted (whether with an attorney or an advisor), an appeal process for faculty and staff.

Communications Advisory Committee (CAC):

1. The committee met 4 times, focusing on increasing trust and transparency through reliable and accessible communications about the COVID-19 pandemic; anti-racism, sexual harassment, and increasing faculty engagement.
2. Accomplishments included assistance in establishing President Schlissel's weekly COVID-19 briefings, and enhancing trust in the relationship of faculty and staff with the administration.
3. Anticipated needs for the future include the continued need for clear, accessible, open communication from University administration to stakeholders, while proving a commitment to an inclusive workplace, free of discrimination, harassment, and hostility.

Development Advisory Committee (DAC):

1. The Committee met 5 times, focusing on facilitating a knowledge exchange between the Office of University Development (OUD) and DAC members so as to broaden faculty knowledge of OUD activities and for OUD to hear faculty priorities and input, and to utilize DAC members for their area expertise and insights on how to help shape long-term development planning.
2. Accomplishments included focus on the impact of COVID-19 on University faculty, students, staff and highlighting to donors the work accomplished during this time as well as focus on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) at the University, how the University has embraced proactivity in this area and how it applies to development.
3. Anticipated work for next year includes exploration of how to best engage faculty in the next campaign, how to connect all three University campuses in development work, and a focus on units/centers/institutes without alumni or patients for fundraising.

Financial Affairs Advisory Committee (FAAC):

1. The committee met 4 times, focusing on understanding how University investments were doing, and providing a sounding board for the Chief Financial Officer in areas where he thought faculty feedback would be helpful. The Vice-President was particularly interested in the committee's views of appropriate responses to the WilmerHale report, especially the issue of how the University can do a better job of vetting people for high-level staff positions. A second Human Resources (HR)-related area was what features of pandemic-induced work patterns could be carried over into future operations. For example, can some staff work from home and others not? Can this increase job satisfaction? Can a strategy in this area mitigate parking problems and traffic congestion? What services need to be physically proximate to faculty they support?
2. Accomplishments included the development of a good working relationship with the many units that report to the CFO's office.
3. Anticipated work for the future will include understanding the University's implementation of Carbon Neutrality. Is the University's investment strategy going to support Carbon Neutrality? What will implementing geothermal power cost? Given that there will likely be a new Executive Vice President/Chief Financial Officer (EVP/CFO) by the Fall of 2021, the committee will provide much of his/her introduction to the faculty and try to be helpful and responsive to the new EVP/CFO's concerns and needs.

1. The Committee met 4 times, focusing on advising/informing the General Counsel's office on current faculty opinions, viewpoints and attitudes. The committee touched on the following issues: Supervisor-Supervisee Relationships Policy; the University's Sexual Misconduct Policy, and approaches to vaccination policy.
2. The Committee's most important accomplishment was a timely and very important discussion regarding possible framework of institutional vaccination policies.
3. Anticipated work includes defining vaccination strategies on campus for the next academic year.

Committee chairs were available to answer questions (Professor Atzmon stood in for Professor Avram, chair of GCAC). Professor Mesa asked about the advantage of having multiple committees deal with the consultants from Guidepost Solutions. Professor Richstone said the FAAC was involved because staff and Human Resources report to Chief Financial Officer on a separate line from that for faculty, which goes through the Provost's office. Professor Singer said that each committee provides different feedback, and that AAAC had nominated one member of the SACUA's WilmerHale ad hoc committee. Professor Mesa asked who was responsible for making sure the recommendations are followed. Professor Conway said she would address this issue at the end of the meeting. Professor Preston asked if the University community is receiving enough information about recommendations stemming from the WilmerHale Report and Guidepost Solutions consultants so that they would not drop from community consciousness. Professor Pal asked if concrete action had been taken to alleviate the effect of COVID for faculty in the promotion and tenure process. Professor Singer said that the AAAC did not have an actionable outcome but was told that the issue was presented to chairs and deans for unit-specific action.

Dr. Banasik introduced next group of committee reports as follows:

Government Relations Advisory Committee (GRAC):

1. The committee met 6 times, focusing on its charge, to discuss strategies to advance the civic engagement of UM faculty, students, and staff; review current and projected state budgetary priorities, especially relevant to higher education, identifying their impact on the University; and to analyze and summarize community issues relevant to campus and to the University community.
2. An accomplishment for the year was to shift the committee's focus to advise on COVID 19 implications for campus and community.
3. Anticipated work for next year includes continuing to assess and provide input concerning the University's response to COVID 19 as it relates to campus and the broader community; analyzing and advising on the University's impact on local community issues such as affordable housing, and community infrastructure; assessing federal and state budget implications for the University and Higher Education more generally.

Information Technology Committee (ITC):

1. The committee met 6 times. The committee focused on DEI issues in terms of service delivery and technical assistance, and providing best practices for delivering Information Technology resources and their effective use for new project development among diverse populations on campus; on evaluating the effectiveness of virtual meetings to inform future business practices post COVID-19; and assessing new technologies that may facilitate work in teaching, research, and service to stay current on the most current technological innovations.
2. An accomplishment was implementing effective virtual meeting platforms to handle large interactive meetings, including making online meetings accessible to all, especially those with hearing or visual impairments.

3. Anticipated work for next year includes continuing to consider DEI issues in terms of service delivery and technical assistance and provide best practices for IT resources and their effective use for new project development among diverse populations on campus; and improving support for data management, including storage (support the migration from Box to Dropbox).

Medical Affairs Advisory Committee (MAAC):

1. The committee met 5 times. Its charge was to explore changes in healthcare and their implications for curricular innovations (e.g. COVID-19, telehealth initiatives, use of simulation training, and the financial impact of changes in health care); to explore national and global health care issues with a focus on anti-racism and the role of the University; to assess the impact of interprofessional education and training initiatives within the University and nationally.
2. Accomplishments included the exploration of the COVID-19 pandemic's overarching influence including the health system's financial future, vaccination campaigns, DEI in creating community within the health system, interprofessional learning and role of the simulation center in supporting just in time training. The Committee is turning to clinical faculty roles in faculty governance as the beginning of a larger discussion related to promotion and progression across appointment types.
3. Anticipated work for next year includes expanding focus on DEI work that addresses both the work environment for faculty within Michigan Medicine and considering how this influences or is influenced by patient-care experiences

Research Policies Committee (RPC):

1. The committee met 8 times. The focus of the committee's activity was providing input on continuing plans for research operations in the COVID-19 environment by examining the impact of reduced research operations and reduced research opportunities on research practices and outcomes; discussing ways to support the development and implementation of recommendations for DEI-informed policies and practices in research in partnership with other organizations on the University's campuses to address disparities, particularly as exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic.
2. Achievements included achieving a more contemporaneous scope for the committee geared towards advising and making recommendations about research practices and increasing dialogue with the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) (hence proposed name change to Research Advisory Committee); exploration of contextual factors related to research inequities and suggestions for additional analytic issues to examine; examination of the current depth of action items pertaining to research activities in the University's DEI plans across the 50 units.
3. Continued consideration of inequities in research at the University, in particular, those created by COVID-19 and potential solutions; facilitating a higher proportion of action items pertaining to research activities in the University's DEI plans in DEI 2.0; engaging with internal university structures that support research across all three campuses to address challenges.

Secretary Advisory Committee (SAC):

1. The committee typically met after each Regents' meeting. The committee's points of emphasis included discussing the impact of the pandemic; preparedness across campus; and issues pertaining to workplace climate and reporting mechanisms.
2. The main accomplishment this year was ongoing support of Vice President Churchill's engagement with the WilmerHale Report and the issue of workplace climate.
3. Anticipated topics for the coming year include Carbon Neutrality; further work on workplace climate and shared workplace values; and next-steps in DEI engagement across the campus.

1. The committee met 8 times. The committee's focus was on many issues related to student wellbeing arising from the COVID crisis such as mental health, safety, and maintenance of social connection.
2. Although the committee was largely in consultation mode this year, it did complete an addendum to the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities.
3. Future issues will be connected with the resumption of in-person teaching and residual impacts on health, wellbeing, and campus culture as well as a comprehensive plan for mental health and wellbeing.

Committee chairs were present to answer questions (Professor Hodge stood in for Professor Rivera, chair of GRAC). Librarian Kahn asked about clinical faculty participation in faculty governance in the Medical School. Professor Low (MAAC committee chair), said it was time to open the conversation because MAAC includes units with a large proportion of clinical faculty, the subject had come up in earlier conversations about participation in voting, and will be a topic for next year. Chair Liu said SACUA will have a rules committee looking at the issue of clinical faculty participation in faculty governance. Professor Mesa noted that many committees had considered the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and asked if there would be continuing focus on the topic. Professor Aplan expressed the hope that there would be continued exploration of the way the pandemic effected the three campuses. Professor Finlayson pointed out that CESWF had sent a survey to all three campuses, broken down by colleges and schools, and is studying the results.

Dr. Banasik introduced the standing committees:

Administration Evaluation Committee (AEC)

1. The committee focused on the preparation of the administrator survey, while an ad hoc AEC committee met three times to identify how the survey should be continued in 2022 and beyond in light of a renewed interest in the survey data including how data may be best utilized, as well as the desire of current AEC leadership to step down.
2. Achievements included an agreement from President Schlissel to send an email reminder to faculty as in years past, confirming that the survey will receive increased attention and resources.
3. Issues for next year include the anticipated commitment of central resources for future implementation of the survey, and the implementation of a sustainable solution so that the survey will rely less on the expertise of two individuals but will be carried forward independently.

Committee on Anti-Racism (CAR):

1. The committee met 6 times. The committee's focus was responding to its charge, the establishment of groundwork for what anti-racism work means on the three campuses, designing its website, collecting the relevant data, and establishing the broader strategy for outreach and engagement with faculty.
2. The development of the committee website is an accomplishment for the year (<https://faculty senate.umich.edu/committees/committee-on-anti-racism-car/>).
3. Anticipated work for next year includes ensuring that the committee begins to collect systematic data on salary, retention and exit surveys that include breakdowns along racial lines and makes sure to respond to the current data that shows a particularly negative climate for Black and LatinX faculty.

Committee on the Economic and Social Wellbeing of the Faculty (CESWF):



1. The committee met 11 times. The committee's points of emphasis were understanding the faculty's overall social well-being in light of the challenges of COVID; discovering what departments have done well to support their faculty, and discovering what more needs to be done to help support faculty. The results of these inquiries are to be included in a final report that offers recommendations on how to better support our faculty's social well-being.
2. An accomplishment is the committee's survey which covered all three campuses, included all tenured faculty, librarians and lecturers, and had a 39% return rate. The committee found that many departments have done many things well, but that there is much more work to be done.
3. It is anticipated that completion of the final report, based on the survey, will take place in the summer of 2021 and that the committee will continue the focus on both the financial and the social well-being of the University's faculty as the pandemic continues to interrupt teaching, service and research.

Committee for Fairness, Equity and Inclusions (CFEI)

1. The committee met 8 times, the committee's primary points of emphasis were discussing and defining measures of inclusivity; supporting the "One University" campaign and DEI initiatives to include all three campuses; considering the impact of the pandemic on issues around fairness, equity and inclusion.
2. Accomplishments included the adoption of the "Resolution in Support of One University Campaign"; and "Recommendations on mitigating the effect of ongoing pandemic on the UM faculty across all three campuses."
3. Anticipated work for next year includes Inclusivity and its measurable outcomes for all three campuses and impact of the pandemic on non-tenure track teaching faculty and Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs).

Committee on Oversight of Administrative Action (COAA)

1. The committee met 8 times, the focuses of the committee's activity were: creating an identity and operational plan for the future; OIE; the faculty grievance process and administrative assessment.
2. This was the committee's inaugural year.
3. Anticipated topics for the coming year include defining the committee's role and scope; defining how OIE processes and the grievance process relate to UM-Dearborn and UM-Flint; investigating and collecting information on evaluation processes at Big Ten and other peer institutions; administrative assessment; clarification of 5.09 and 5.10 procedures and their implications for faculty.

Davis, Markert, Nickerson Academic Freedom Lecture Committee (DMN)

1. The committee met 3 times, its primary focus was organizing the panel discussion held on 2/16/2021 and planning for future lectures.
2. The committee's accomplishment was the panel discussion on 2/16/2021 with around 140 participants.
3. Future activity involves the selection of future topics and lecturers.

Professor Modrak asked what is meant by "increased attention and resources" for administrative evaluation. Professor Pasquale (chair of COAA) said that one of the most important issues for COAA is the way administrative assessment data is used. COAA found that it was not used and is looking for a way for this data to be used effectively. Professor Riles said that more resources were needed to collect data and engage with it. He added that the President's office has agreed to provide funding for this process. Professor Conway confirmed that this was the case. Professor Pasquale thanked Professor Riles for his work with the AEC. Professor Riles said the AEC has collected a great deal of data, and that any Senate Assembly committee should use that data as it sees fit. He expressed the hope that the fiasco over the mishandling of

comments about former Provost Philbert's personal conduct will prod administrators to take account of the surveys.

Professor Mesa asked about the purpose of the One University campaign. Professor Aristarkhova (CFEI chair) replied that the resolution has to do with extending the Go-Blue Guarantee to students on all three campuses, and the provision of DEI funding to all three campuses. Professor Okwudire said it is important to provide more feedback to committees during the academic year.

Professor Sales noted that a common theme in many of the committee reports is campus climate and that many issues are persistent beyond those connected with COVID-19. She asked how progress could be made in addressing those issues. Professor Partridge said that faculty governance did not currently have the necessary data to make the sort of push that is needed for change. Professor Pasquale suggested that, from an efficiency perspective, it would be good if committee chairs could meet with each other. Professor Singer agreed and said that Senate Assembly could be polled for topics that committees could bring to the administrators they are advising. Professor Markel suggested that committee chairs should consider joint committee meetings. Professor Richstone noted that such meetings had taken place in the past. Professor Okwudire asked how Senate Assembly members can be ambassadors to their units. Professor Cervetti said it is important for faculty to consider serving on SRAC, noting that it has been difficult to recruit faculty for this very important committee, to which the Vice President for Student Life pays genuine attention. Professor Finlayson said she would like committee chairs next year, and going forward, to consider virtual options so that more people from UM-Dearborn and UM-Flint can participate in committee work.

4:34: Research Policies Committee Name Update – Natalie Colabianchi, Chair

Professor Colabianchi said the general charge of the committee is to advise, hence the committee should be known as the Research Advisory Committee which better reflects the work the committee does. Professor Singer moved acceptance of the proposal; Professor Pal seconded the motion. The motion carried: 39-2-1

4:30: Electronic Rules

Chair Liu said that highlights of the proposed rules change are connected with electronic participation (Faculty Senate voting would be open for 72 hours after a meeting, and Senate Assembly meetings will be in-person with electronic participation), and the addition of a parliamentarian, which would bring the University's practice into line with the majority of Big Ten institutions. Professor Finlayson moved acceptance of the proposal; Professor Pal seconded the motion.

Professor Sales asked if the name of the Faculty Senate Office had changed? Chair Liu replied that the Faculty Senate Office works with the University Senate, and that the name has not changed.

Dr. Banasik said that the proposed rules changes will align the rules with current practice. Professor Mesa asked what is meant by the statement in section 5 that "that Senate Assembly meetings will be hybrid meetings by default with priority given to in-person participation." Chair Liu replied that Senate Assembly meetings will meet in person with provision for people to dial in. Professor Conway said the president and other guests would come to a physical meeting with Senate Assembly, and that the people who are in attendance will have priority in raising issues with the guests, but that technology will make it possible for other faculty to be included in the conversation.

Professor Dal Chin asked how Senate Assembly alternates are selected. Chair Liu replied that Senate Assembly members can select their alternate, otherwise, in some units, alternates are elected. Dr. Banasik said that not all units are currently electing alternates, and this has been problematic. Chair Liu said that the issue can be considered by the rules committee in the fall.

Professor Atzmon said that this Senate Assembly meeting should have been open to the public and denied that he is in favor of discriminating against faculty from UM-Dearborn and UM-Flint or opposed to their voting. Professor Atzmon said there is notion of a bias if people who don't participate in a discussion are allowed to vote. He said this allowed for the manipulation of the vote and said that the difference between votes cast by faculty who attended the Senate meeting in the fall, and those who did not, showed that

SACUA had manipulated the vote. Professor Modrak said she approved of that the existing guidelines in section 6 call for people who want to vote to be present.

Professor Atzmon introduced a motion to postpone the vote on the proposed rules changes. Professor Ali seconded the motion. Professor Gallo said that tabling the proposed rules changes amounted to voter suppression. Professor Mesa noted that Senate Assembly could revisit the revised rules in the Fall 2021 Semester. Professor Ahbel-Rappe noted that the Assembly had already voted about voting, and that without rules for electronic meetings, the Senate Assembly would be disenfranchising the regional campuses. Professor Ali said that major changes in many units require two meetings, which is why he favored tabling the motion.

The vote on Professor Atzmon's motion was 23 opposed; 18 in favor. The motion failed. Dr. Banasik said the proposed rules, if adopted, will stand until they are validated by an in-person vote.

The vote on the proposed rules change was 29 in favor, 11 opposed. The rules change passed.

4:40: Outgoing Chair Report

Professor Conway reviewed accomplishments of faculty governance for the year. She noted the vast increase in participation, which was in accord with SACUA's goal to involve as many people as possible. There had been more than 600 faculty at the town hall SACUA had sponsored in July 2020, and 875 responses to the survey SACUA had circulated on fall reopening plans; that there had been 2200 faculty at the faculty senate meeting in September 2020, and that sentiment ballots had been received from 49.5% of Faculty Senate members as well as 34% of clinical faculty. In response to the request for support of SACUA's statement condemning Regent Weiser's comments on the state's democratic leadership, 1837 faculty members had voted, 1800 of them supporting the statement (<https://www.mlive.com/news/ann-arbor/2021/04/1800-university-of-michigan-faculty-members-publicly-condemn-ron-weisers-comments.html>). Senate Assembly had participated in discussions with president Schlissel, provost Collins, several regents, Vice President Harmon, Vice President Cunningham and Vice President/Chief Financial Officer Hegarty, UM-Dearborn Vice Chancellor Dadey and UM-Flint Vice Chancellor Hague and had passed resolutions concerning a syllabus statement for students with disabilities, electronic meetings and a vaccination mandate. SACUA had met 26 times during the year. President Schlissel had attended 5 meetings. Provost Collins had attended 4 meetings, there had been two meetings with regents and 6 meetings with other members of the administration (General Counsel Lynch, UM-Flint Chancellor Dutta, Vice President Harmon, Vice President Kolb, Athletic Director Manuel and Dean of Libraries, Hilton).

In addition to its statement condemning Regent Weiser's comments, and proposals for electronic voting and in favor of a vaccination mandate, SACUA had issued statements affirming faculty input in the development of the new 5.09 process, supporting the Black Lives Matter Movement, and the One University movement. SACUA had created two new committees, CAR and COAA, restored the annual visit of the SACUA chair to the Academic Programs Group, created a task force to evaluate the University's response to the WilmerHale Report on former Provost Philbert, created the President's COVID Council, and increased communication with the Regents. She noted that all Senate Assembly seats will be filled in 2021/2 (7 were unfilled in 2020/2021). Issues that will still be open are the implementation of recommendations by the WilmerHale Task Force and Guidepost Solutions for administrative restructuring, preparation of grievance and judicial hearing boards; increasing communication between Senate Assembly, Senate Assembly Committees, and the Faculty Senate; increasing communication from Senate Assembly Representatives across their schools and colleges; and consideration of representation of clinical faculty in Faculty Senate. She concluded by saying the biggest challenge faculty governance will face in the coming year will be to make the most of what has been learned in 2020/21.

5:16: Adjournment

Appendix: Draft Rules Changes

SACUA Ad Hoc Rules Committee

Proposed Changes to University Senate Rules

Article I. The University Senate

Section 3. Officers and Parliamentarian

Reference to electronic ballots is added.

Proposed Text: It shall be the responsibility of the Secretary to . . .conduct mail or electronic ballots.

Senate office is changed to Faculty Senate Office, and office is capitalized.

Proposed Text: Execution of some of these responsibilities may be delegated to the staff of the Faculty Senate Office, with the approval of SACUA.

The requirement to elect a Parliamentarian is added to the Rules. The Parliamentarian is not proposed to be an officer. Officers are designated in the Regents Bylaws and a change to the Regents Bylaws would be necessary to add another officer.

Proposed Text: (3) Parliamentarian. The University Senate shall elect a Parliamentarian from current or retired Senate members. The Parliamentarian shall serve for a term of three years. A Parliamentarian who has served a full three-year term is eligible to serve consecutive terms if elected.

Section 4. Meetings

Clarification is added that members participating through electronic means or in person are both counted to meet quorum.

Proposed Text: (3) Quorum. One hundred members of the University Senate shall constitute a quorum. Members of the University Senate shall be counted as present if present through electronic means or in person.

A section (4) is added to allow for electronic meetings. The added language provides for a hybrid format with a priority on electronic participation.

Proposed Text: (4) Place of Meetings. Any meeting (whether regular or special) of the University Senate may be held in person or by telephone conference, electronic video screen communication or other electronic communication; provided all members participating in the meeting are able to concurrently communicate with the other members. Meetings of the University Senate shall be held in an electronic format allowing participation electronically in-person or remotely. SACUA may adopt policies and procedures for the conduct of University Senate meetings with Senate Assembly approval.

Section 5. Agenda; Motions and Resolutions

Text is added to allow for electronic distribution of materials.

Proposed Text: (3) Time of Submission and Distribution. All motions or resolutions, in order to be included on the agenda, must be submitted to the Secretary of the Senate, at least fourteen days before the meeting at which they are to be introduced. They must be delivered electronically by the Secretary to the ~~Campus Mail Room~~ Faculty Senate Office for distribution to all members of the Senate at least ten days before they are to be voted on.

Section 6. Voting

Text is added to allow for electronic voting. Text also provides for a timeframe of 72 hours within which voting shall be completed. Text has been added to confirm that University Senate meetings will not be recorded, but they will be livestreamed. Added text provides for recorded video statements on both sides of an issue as requested and approved by SACUA. Text is removed that would require a voice vote, a vote by secret written ballot, or a vote by mail.

Proposed Text: (2) Form of Vote. Unless otherwise specifically provided for in these rules or in the Regental Bylaws, all questions put to the University Senate shall be decided by majority vote of those voting. Voting shall ordinarily be by ~~voice but a standing vote shall be ordered by the chair if requested by any member of the Senate. A vote by secret written ballot may be called for by a concurring vote of any twenty-five members. A mail vote by Senate members on any issue on which the Senate is competent to act may be authorized at any Senate meeting by a majority vote of those voting. Any such mail votes shall be conducted in such manner as to ensure secrecy and shall be administered by the Secretary of the Senate.~~ electronic means approved by SACUA. Electronic voting shall be completed within 72 hours following the end of a University Senate meeting during which the matter being considered for a vote was discussed. By default, University Senate meetings will not be recorded, but meetings will be livestreamed. SACUA may request statements presenting multiple perspectives on an issue and make them available to members of the University Senate within twenty-four hours after the end of the meeting.

Section 7. Nominations and Elections

Text is added to include the interim appointment of a Parliamentarian.

Proposed Text: (4) Interim Appointments. SACUA may make an interim appointment to fill any vacancy in the office of the Secretary or any other officer or position elected by the Senate, including Parliamentarian. Such appointment shall continue until a successor is elected at a regular meeting of the Senate.

Article II. The Senate Assembly

Section 3. Election of Members and Alternates

The text is revised to remove the requirement that alternates be elected but explicitly requires that alternates be members of Senate.

Proposed Text: Any such alternates so provided shall be ~~elected~~ members of Senate. Any alternate attending a meeting of the Assembly shall inform the Secretary prior to the meeting. Such alternate may vote during the meeting and participate in the meeting to the same extent as any regular member. In the event that a vote is held after a Senate Assembly meeting, ordinarily Senate Assembly members shall be the electors.

Section 4. Organization

Text is added to clarify the inclusion of remote and in-person participants to reach quorum. Text is also added to include a procedure adopted by Senate Assembly in 2009 to exclude seats of Senate Assembly members

who have missed three consecutive meetings without requesting an alternate. Because the purpose of this Ad Hoc Rules Committee was to recommend rules for electronic meetings, current rules for quorum were considered to be outside the scope of the Committee's charge and were left unchanged.

Proposed Text: (1) (second paragraph) A majority of the members of the Assembly shall constitute a quorum. Members of Senate Assembly and Alternates as described in Section 3 shall be counted as present if present through electronic means or in person. If a member of the Assembly is absent from 3 consecutive Assembly meetings without requesting an alternate, the seat shall not count against quorum.

Section 5. Convocation of Meetings

Text is revised to provide for notice via email rather than by campus mail. Text is added requiring that connection details for remote participation be provided in the notice of meetings.

Proposed Text: (2) Notice of Meetings. Each meeting shall be announced by a notice in writing addressed to each member and ~~deposited in the campus mail~~ transmitted via email not more than thirty days and not less than ten days before the day of the meeting. The notice need not state the business of the meeting, except for emergency meetings, but shall state the hour and the place and the connection details for remote participation.

Text is added to allow for electronic meetings. Added language clarifies that Senate Assembly meetings will be hybrid meetings by default with priority given to in-person participation.

Proposed Text: (3) Place of Meetings. Meetings may be called to meet on the central or north campus at Ann Arbor, or at any other reasonable location, including the Flint or Dearborn campus. Any meeting (whether regular or special) of Senate Assembly may be held by telephone conference, electronic video screen communication or other electronic communication; provided all members participating in the meeting are able to concurrently communicate with the other members. Meetings of the Assembly shall be held in a format allowing both electronic and in-person participation with in-person participation receiving priority. Senate Assembly may adopt policies and procedures for the conduct of meetings.

Article III. The Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs

Section 3. Powers and Responsibilities

The reference to a poll *by mail* is removed.

Proposed Text: SACUA may, by a two-thirds vote of its members, authorize a poll ~~by mail~~ of Senate members for any purpose relevant to the exercise of the Committee's authority.

Section 5. Meetings

A section (3) is added to allow for electronic meetings.

Proposed Text: (3) Place of Meetings. Any meeting may be held in person or by telephone conference, electronic video screen communication or other electronic communication; provided all members participating in the meeting are able to concurrently communicate with the other members. SACUA may adopt policies and procedures for the conduct of meetings.

Appendix 2: Atzmon email

Dear Colleagues,

My apologies for cluttering your inbox on the weekend, but I don't know of any other way of addressing the serious issue at hand. For Monday, all of ten minutes have been allocated to discussing and voting on the most consequential agenda item: proposed changes in voting rules. Such a short discussion is woefully inadequate, and cannot begin to do justice to the topic. This problem is further aggravated by disturbing opacity and what appears to be a broken voting system. I therefore feel compelled to make you aware of the issues ahead of the meeting. If you are only skimming through this message, **point #3** may be the most worrisome of the following list:

1) As to the substance of the proposed rules change, currently, in order to ensure that voters are well informed, Senate voting is restricted to those in attendance. The U.S. Congress does the same. Any change would merit an in-depth discussion, which cannot be conducted, followed by a vote, in ten minutes. The proposal, which would allow voting by those who don't participate, includes language supposedly meant for their benefit: "*SACUA may request statements presenting multiple perspectives on an issue and make them available to members of the University Senate...*" In other words, SACUA would have the discretion to control what aspects, if any, of the discussion are brought to the attention of those not present.

2) The Faculty Senate Office has been conducting business in an opaque fashion.

a) SA meetings have to be, but haven't been, open to the public. Before and after the March meeting, Colleen Conway and MaryJo Banasik, when informed about it, defended a link, labeled "[Zoom](#)," that traps you in an infinite clicking loop. It is still there, and the public cannot access the meeting. There are standard ways of guarding against Zoom bombing, if that is a concern.

b) SACUA votes not held during meetings have been held in secrecy, this includes the recent vote on the proposed voting rule changes. The need to communicate remotely is not an adequate excuse for this lack of transparency, especially since there are at most nine votes to count.

(Allen Liu has expressed willingness to look at these issues, but he has not yet had a chance to do so. I hope we can look forward to a more transparent future)

3) The seemingly broken voting system is most disturbing: looking up my Senate [voting record](#), I appear as having voted on the SACUA Weiser statement (image enclosed). Not only didn't I vote, but I was neither a SACUA nor a SA member at the time, and therefore ineligible to vote. With such an unreliable system, how can the vote counting be trusted??

I urge you not to consent to ramming through of hasty voting rules changes. See you at the meeting.

Respectfully submitted

David Potter
Senate Secretary

University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents, Sec. 4.01:

The University Senate

The 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.

University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents, Sec. 4.04:

The Senate Assembly

The Senate Assembly shall serve as the legislative arm of the senate.



The assembly shall have power to consider and advice regarding all matters within the jurisdiction of the University Senate which affect the functioning of the university as an institution of higher learning, which concern its obligations to the state and to the community at large, and which relate to its internal organization insofar as such matters of internal organization involve general questions of educational policy.

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

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