

Draft Minutes 25 October 2021

Circulated 29 October 2021

Approved 1 November 2021

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN  
Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA)  
Monday, 25 October 3:15 pm  
The meeting was held via Zoom

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

Absent: Freeman

Guests: Ann Zaniewski, *The University Record*, Riley Hodder *The Michigan Daily*

3:16: Call to order/Announcements

Chair Liu noted that this is Professor Potter's last meeting as Senate Secretary.

3:18 Faculty Senate Office Updates

Dr. Banasik said she has worked with Michigan Creative (<https://creative.umich.edu/>) to develop a new Faculty Senate Office template, which is now available.

3:18: SACUA Chair remarks

Chair Liu said that he, Professor Conway, Professor Singer and Dr. Banasik met with Special Advisor to the President and Executive Director, Equity, Civil Rights and Title IX (ECRT) Strickman. They discussed the issue of appeals against findings of misconduct other than sexual misconduct, which are not currently allowed. Executive Director Strickman said that she would explore the issue. Another issue that they discussed was the designation of individuals as Individuals with Reporting Obligations (<https://oie.umich.edu/information-for-responsible-employees/>). Executive Director Strickman said that ECRT was developing a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) to help people know if they are IROs. Executive Director Strickman said that she did not agree with the recommendation in Motion 4 passed at the October 4, 2021 Faculty Senate meeting that the university "require and retain a written statement/certification from each committee member that they disclosed all known or suspected details of any allegations of sexual misconduct with all other members of the committee" from faculty serving on search committees for academic or administrative positions. She said that she did not think this was practical.

Chair Liu said he had met with Provost Collins, at which time he had discussed consequences for faculty and staff who had not been vaccinated against COVID-19. According to the policy, non-compliant faculty will be placed on thirty-day administrative leave at the end of the Fall Semester. If they are unvaccinated at the end of that thirty-day period, they will be subject to applicable dismissal measures (<https://record.umich.edu/articles/sanctions-set-for-employees-not-complying-with-vaccine-policy/>). The Provost said that there were three tenure-track faculty members, two of them untenured (out of thirty overall), who were not compliant.

Professor Potter pointed out that the SACUA Wilmer Hale group had recommended that only faculty members on search committees at the dean level be required to disclose all known conflicts of interest (<https://facultysenate.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/SACUA->

[WilmerHale-Task-Force-Final-Report.pdf](#)). Professor Singer said that Executive Director Strickman discussed that there were too many nuances for a flat requirement to disclose conflicts to be practical. Chair Liu asked faculty for topics for discussion at his meeting with Provost Collins, on October 29, 2021.

### 3:25: Committee on Anti-Racism

Chair Liu said that he and Professor Partridge had requested assistance from the Provost in gathering data about faculty salaries, but had not received help.

Professor Partridge said that when he was chairing the Committee on Anti-Racism (<https://facultysenate.umich.edu/committees/committee-on-anti-racism-car/>), the issue of pay equity came up, and that the committee discovered that there was disparity between faculty members, and that in one department, all the Black faculty were the lowest paid.

Chair Liu said the Provost's office was worried that disclosing salary data would violate confidentiality. Professor Partridge said that if pay equity is a factor in retention of minority faculty, then data is necessary. Professor Gallo agreed with proceeding with the collection of data about compensation and asked how the data could be concealed given that the University of Michigan is a public university and information about compensation is public information. She noted that salary data was also an issue connected with gender equity.

Chair Liu said that issue is whether to push the Provost for the data or for SACUA to do the work itself. Professor Singer drew attention to salary reviews done by previous provosts, and that a claim by the current Provost that the data could not be released because of an ongoing lawsuit was likely now moot as we believe the suit had been resolved. She also noted that published data does not reflect total compensation—that compensation such as administrative differentials were not part of that data. Professor Toyama said that the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee AAAC (<https://facultysenate.umich.edu/committees/academic-affairs-advisory-committee/>) had asked the Provost to commission a salary study since 2017. In 2017 the Provost declined to commission the study because there was “something happening at the university” that would be resolved in a year or two but he was not allowed to reveal what that was. Professor Toyama said he felt that the University should pay some faculty to do such a survey which would ensure that race and gender issues were accounted for, and drew attention to two previous surveys:

<https://www.provost.umich.edu/reports/Faculty%20Salary%20Study%20Report.pdf> and  
<https://www.provost.umich.edu/reports/Faculty%20Salary%20Study%20Report%202012.pdf>.

Professor Finlayson said that, in response to the campus-wide salary review, a salary survey in her department at UM-Dearborn had resulted in an equity adjustment as well as a review of start-up packages to make sure people were being treated equitably. She noted that it can be difficult to look at additional payments (e.g. research bonuses), but that it is still useful to have a base number.

Professor Conway said that, in her view, it is the University's job to do the salary survey. She said that the result of a salary survey in the School of Music, Theater and Dance was to provide an additional salary-increase for some faculty. This was done by placing all salaries, anonymously, into a pool, and increasing those that were below average at rank.

Professor Finlayson said there could be differences, but faculty at the same rank should be within the same band. She noted that a long-term salary issue will occur when a starting salary is well above that of other starting salaries, and that a campus-wide salary review years ago had revealed that UM-Dearborn consistently paid female hires less than males across ranks and colleges to varying degrees.

Professor Partridge agreed that the point about differential access to research money is a significant one. Chair Liu said that SACUA will want to contribute to the research design of a salary review and noted that Human Resources (HR) does not always have good data.

Professor Partridge also noted the comment of a person serving on the search committee for a new chief Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Officer that confidentiality could be impossible when there are few faculty of color. Professor Gallo said that data can be aggregated to combine small groups to preserve anonymity. Chair Liu said he will bring the issue of the survey up with the Provost at their meeting on October 29. Professor Singer said that faculty might be willing to self-report their race/ethnicity if they thought it would help with an equity compensation review.

Professor Conway asked if it would be possible to ask HR for data instead of the Provost. Chair Liu said that he suspected that all pathways would lead back to the Provost. Dr. Banasik confirmed that requests to HR were transmitted by HR to the Provost.

Professor Partridge said the relationship between the new DEI officer and the Provost is unknowable at the present, so it is impossible to know if a new DEI officer will be helpful in pushing this issue.

### 3:51: Motions Update

For the texts of the motion see <https://facultysenate.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/10-4-21-Faculty-Senate-Motions-with-Voting-Results.pdf>

Chair Liu said that he has presented a plan—along with Dr. Banasik—to form a group to meet with the President and Provost about the issues with Work Connections (<https://www.workconnections.umich.edu/>) that were raised in Motion 1. He said that President Schlissel had said, in the week of October 11, that he and representatives of Work Connections, Richard Holcomb (<https://record.umich.edu/articles/richard-holcomb-appointed-avp-human-resources/>) and Karen Schmidt (<https://hr.umich.edu/benefits-wellness/health-well-being/mhealthy/more-mhealthy/about-mhealthy/meet-mhealthy-team>) would meet the faculty group.

Chair Liu said he had asked Professor Braun, as chair of the Committee on Administrative Action (COAA) (<https://facultysenate.umich.edu/committees/coaa/>) to look at responses to both Motions 1 and 2. Professor Atzmon said that Work Connections has been overruling medical decisions, made mostly by Physicians at Michigan Medicine, relying on physicians external to the University. He noted that Work Connections report to Risk Management, part of UM Finance.

Chair Liu expressed, in connection with Motion 2, his disappointment that President Schlissel plans only to hold monthly meetings with the COVID Council. He said he will urge President Schlissel to hold meetings with the COVID Council more frequently. He added that while discussion of the motions was on the agenda for his last meeting with the president, the meeting ended before they could have that discussion. Professor Gallo asked how the agendas for these meetings are set and how they can be diluted. Chair Liu said that the President and Provost control the meetings. He added that President Schlissel had said, at the beginning of the term that he would hold two bi-weekly meetings with the COVID council and meetings thereafter would be monthly. Professor Conway said that before eliminating the COVID Council as a vehicle for enacting Motions 1 and 2, SACUA should try to convince President Schlissel to make proper use of the group.

Chair Liu said that he will discuss Motion 3 when he meets with the Academic Programs Group (APG). Provost Collins said that she did not think there would be much uptake of the points in Motion 3 by the APG. Chair Liu said that Professor Goldman is also putting Motion 3 on the October 29 agenda for the AAAC.

Chair Liu said that one aspect of implementation of Motion 4 was the conversation with Executive Director Strickman that he had reported on at the beginning of the meeting. He said that he will follow up with concerns about the Dean Reappointment Document that the Provost had shared (<https://www.provost.umich.edu/programs/Process%20for%20Dean%20Review-October%202020%202021.pdf>). Professor Potter said there was much missing in the document (e.g. any metrics governing reappointment). Professor Conway said the reappointment issue is crucial to solving issues that were raised in connection with the WilmerHale report. Chair Liu said that he will bring the reappointment issue up with the Provost, along with the pay equity survey.

Chair Liu said he had contacted Professor McCall, the chair of the Committee on the Social and Economic Wellbeing of the Faculty (CESWF) (<https://facultysenate.umich.edu/committees/committee-on-the-economic-status-of-the-faculty/>), with respect to Motion 5. Professor McCall said that his committee will take up the issues raised by Motion 5 and, in conjunction with COAA, will invite motion sponsors to their meetings.

Professor Ahbel-Rappe asked if the compensation issues was part of the current climate survey (<https://diversity.umich.edu/data-reports/climate-survey/>)—and wondered if that would provide an opportunity to discuss the salary issue as an objective measure of climate. Chair Liu agreed that this was the case.

Professor Ahbel-Rappe asked what points the administration is likely to embrace from the recommendations in Motion 4 so that faculty could know how much change is viable. Chair Liu said that there is much more work to be done. Chair Conway said that it will be important to interact with the consultants from Guidepost Solutions as a first step, because the Provost's office can prevent anything from happening.

4:11: Executive Session

LEO Faculty Senate Representation

The proposal was approved unanimously

VPEI-CDO Listening Session

Handling of SMTD Faculty Classroom Incident

5:12: Adjourn

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.”