Chair Goldman called the meeting to order and welcomed the guest speakers who attended to give an overview of the umbrella policy on sexual and gender-based misconduct. 


Strickman gave an overview of the new Equity, Civil Rights and Title IX Office (ECRT) that will replace the university’s Office for Institutional Equity (OIE) and the progress that has been made.

Strickman communicated prevention and outreach efforts and highlighted the creation of a new position, Equity Specialist. The Equity Specialist will be the first of the important pieces of feedback for parties to connect with other than investigators. The Equity Specialist will discuss options with the complainant, which will not be an actual interview. The Equity Specialist will answer questions and help parties understand the process during the investigatory process.

Committee members asked questions regarding the job descriptions for these new positions that have been created. Tami will provide the job descriptions to the committee for the Equity Specialist.

Petrowski gave an overview on the substance and how the policy has evolved and who is identified as Individuals with Reporting Obligations (IRO’s).

This policy applies to students, faculty and staff. The committee members asked questions about how the policies would influence and change behaviors. Committee members asked what the ramifications are for an IRO’s failure to report. Patricia Petrowski indicated that the University will be doing mandatory training on this issue with everyone and will speak to discipline within the training itself.
Petrowski indicated that a toolkit will be sent to faculty and staff, and she requested that committee members submit questions and suggestions to the provost’s office.

**Next steps:**
Provost Susan Collins suggested an Anti-Racism update as a future meeting topic.

Provost Collins, Christine Gerdes and the guests left the meeting.

Chair Goldman will collect the questions from the committee members to submit to the provost’s office.

**Questions from the committee to be submitted to the provost.**

1. Where does information that results from a review go? When no action is taken, does that information remain in the faculty member’s folder in their unit? What happens to the reports that are created whether negative or positive? Do all reports go into the faculty formal file and/or are they sent to the dean and placed in a deans’ office file?

2. What is the scope of an evaluation/investigation? In the past, if OIE opened an investigation and pursued other aspects of prohibitive behavior, if they found something unrelated to the question at hand, they were permitted to report it to the dean.

3. Why are there two separate categories for IRO’s? Why not make all faculty and staff have the reporting obligation?

4. Clarity was requested on the responsibilities for faculty that are mentoring and supervising students.
   a. Committee members would like more information on who is included as a supervisor. Is this the academic environment or is this in the context of job scope?

Chair Goldman asked for the committee’s feedback on what they would like to add to AAAC agendas throughout the year.

Committee listed a few areas they would like to discuss in upcoming meetings including the following:

1. Administrator Evaluations, how administrators are evaluated and specific criteria for the reappointment of administrators and hiring. Are academic administrators required to read comments and feedback?

2. Anti-retaliation SPG

3. Issues of Anti-Racism – Equity issues of BIPOC faculty in pay and retention. The committee would like to understand if more is being done to retain BIPOC faculty, such as mentoring. ADVANCE recently released a report, which the committee may want to review.

4. Invite Committee on Oversight of Administrative Action (COAA) to a future meeting
to present on the Faculty Senate motion regarding Work Connections.

5. Work Connections, understanding their role in evaluating faculty and determining their teaching modality.
   Confusion on who is making the final decisions, the provost, chair, president or deans?
   Are they hiring Independent Medical Examiners (IME) to review faculty submissions? Could these submissions be reviewed by UM faculty and not IME's?
   There is a lack of transparency in making these decisions.
   Chair Goldman will bring the IME issues to the Covid Council.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00am.

Respectfully submitted by,
Elizabeth Devlin
Faculty Governance Coordinator