

Minutes DATE 10, January 2022
Circulated DATE 3, February 2022
Approved DATE 7, February 2022

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs
Monday, 10, January 2022, 3:00 PM
The hybrid meeting was held
4006 Fleming Building

Remote attendees via ZOOM: Vice Chair Caitlin Finlayson, Professor Sara Ahbel-Rappe, Professor Michael Atzmon, Professor Donald Freeman, Professor Durga Singer, Professor Kentaro Toyama

In-person attendees: Chair Allen Liu, Secretary Deirdre Spencer, Professor Colleen Conway, Faculty Senate Director MaryJo Banasik, Faculty Governance Coordinator Elizabeth Devlin,

Absent: Professor Elena Gallo

In person guests: Ann Zaniewski from the *University Record*

Remote guests via ZOOM: Isabella Kassa, *Michigan Daily*; Professor June Howard, Vice President of the Ann Arbor Chapter of the American Association of University Professors; Professor Mark Allison, Chair of the Committee for Fairness Equity and Inclusion (CEFI)

3:00 Executive Session – Handling of petitions received by SACUA

3:22 The meeting was called to order at 3:22pm. The minutes of the 12/6/21 meeting were approved pending the inclusion of two corrections by Vice Chair Finlayson. SACUA must consider a temporary replacement for Professor Partridge who is on leave for the coming year. The procedure in the past for replacing members was to recommend the person who received the next highest number of votes in the previous election.

3:24 Faculty Senate Updates - Faculty Senate Office Director MaryJo Banasik said the DMN lecture will take place in Forum Hall. The last day that the Faculty Senate Office will be housed in the Fleming Building is January 21, 2022. Dr. Banasik toured the new facilities at the Ruthven Building and heartily approved of them. The final SACUA meeting to be held at the Fleming Administration building is January 24, 2022. The first SACUA meeting to be held in the Ruthven Building is January 31, 2022.

3:25 SACUA Chair Updates - Chair Liu was contacted by Dr. Marie Ting of the National Center for Institutional Diversity (NCID). NCID would like to co-sponsor a panel discussion with SACUA on academic freedom as the theme. There would be no financial commitment on the part of SACUA. We would simply help to advertise the event and have SACUA representation. It would not interfere with our DMN lecture. Professor Toyama has agreed to serve in the role of SACUA representative. The event would take place in February or March. Professor Atzmon asserted that it should be an

independent faculty event, and in no way associated with the administration. According to Chair Liu, Dr. Ting said most of the participants would be faculty, but there would be a few staff represented.

SACUA needs to find a temporary replacement for Professor Damani Partridge who is currently on leave. According to the University Senate Rules, the method used to fill the vacancy must be approved by Senate Assembly. We should look at the runner up from the last election.

The Equity, Civil Rights, and Title IX office (ECRT) seeks recommendations from SACUA for interviewing finalists for the director position of the Prevention, Education Assistance and Resources (PEAR) department.

3:30 American Association of University Professors, University of Michigan Ann Arbor Chapter Report - Professor Kentaro Toyama serves as chapter president and Professor June Howard serves as chapter vice president of the newly revived University of Michigan Ann Arbor Chapter of the AAUP. The parent organization of AAUP was founded in 1915 (<https://www.aaup.org/about-aaup>). The University of Michigan Ann Arbor chapter was active from 1915 until 2009 or 2010 but has always been engaged with the national office. As of September, Professor Valerie Traub serves as Secretary, and Lecturer Robert Sulewski serves as Treasurer. Professor Howard researched the history of UM's involvement in the university archives. Professor Howard, who recently retired as of Dec. 31, 2021 from the College of LSA, Departments of English and Women Studies, provided historical context. AAUP fought the State Board of Education's oversight, reducing the state's input into decisions about faculty benefits such as retirement and healthcare.

During her 40-year career, Professor Howard was not active in AAUP. She chaired the academic freedom section of the Modern Language Association (MLA) and became more involved in AAUP. She was the former department chair and associate dean of the English Department. She has come to appreciate the work of SACUA and shared faculty governance, and she sees AAUP as a compliment to faculty governance. She wants to revive UM Ann Arbor's involvement. Professor Toyama said that until twelve years ago, there was a lot of interaction between the two organizations. He said the relationship between AAUP and faculty governance will be good while he serves on SACUA.

Professor Conway asked what would be the target numbers or percentages for healthy representation? Professor Toyama responded that one- or two-hundred dues paying members would be a healthy number. LEO and graduate student instructors are eligible for membership in AAUP, although dues may not be affordable for them. Dues are scaled to income from \$100-\$300 per year, however no one is prohibited from attending meetings for nonpayment. Professor Conway also asked the length of the terms of service for officers? Professor Howard thought term limits are capped at 2-3 years, most likely 3 years. When asked how many people are in leadership, the response was that it was a small number, including members at large.

There has always been a small group in leadership. Leadership encourages bringing issues to AAUP. The Flint chapter has expressed interest in working with the Ann Arbor chapter.

When Professor Howard asked the membership what was most important to AAUP Ann

Arbor faculty, their response was the presidential search. Professor Toyama has heard nothing of the format for the presidential search from the regents. He and others on SACUA referenced a situation at Indiana University where the search for the university president resulted in three recommendations, all of whom were rejected by the regents.

Professor Toyama stated that SACUA must be reasonably protective of our relationship with the administration. AAUP could represent jointly with SACUA and faculty governance on many issues. Professor Howard stated that there is an administrative role that SACUA plays which AAUP does not. AAUP could add additional weight and perhaps be able to apply more pressure in cases where SACUA could not. Professor Howard said that AAUP could help support the Senate Assembly as well.

The AAUP chapter is now re-building around its history of academic freedom vs. free speech and preparing graduate students. History reveals activities from the records of the general membership. A significant example is how AAUP wanted to reconfigure the ways in which deans is chosen from the top candidates. The faculty vote but the administration chooses, indicating that the issues have not changed over the years.

3:58 Felony Disclosure [SPG 601.38](#) -- Professors Ahbel-Rappe and Atzmon led the discussion: Professor Atzmon drafted a policy to limit application of the SPG to charges or convictions of the most egregious cases and offenses. Professor Ahbel-Rappe thought the entire SPG should be eliminated. Professor Ashley Lucas provided input to Professors Ahbel-Rappe and Atzmon about people harmed by the policy and whose standing in the university was compromised. Formerly incarcerated individuals have served their time, and a returning citizen struggles with how they will be received into the community. Professor Lucas has a video which interviews returning citizens and supports their objection to further stigmatization.

There was a brief discussion regarding the 'check the box' movement. Chair Liu said 'check the box' is already gone. The return to normal life for the returning citizen is hindered by the policy.

Professor Conway asked if Professor Lucas wanted to eliminate the policy in its entirety? The answer was yes. Professor Atzmon suggested eliminating required disclosure of charges, especially in certain cases where there are no threats to the university community, but not convictions.

Professor Ahbel-Rappe asserted that the question at issue is how the new community will receive the returning citizen, and that the policy makes it difficult for the formerly incarcerated to change their status in the community. It was stated that more people of color are incarcerated than whites, and so the policy disproportionately affects people of color who face a second punishment. For example, Professor Lucas was trying to hire a formerly incarcerated person to work with the Prison Creative Arts Project (PCAP). They were trying to hire former PCAP artists, and they were unable to do so. Vice Chair Finlayson took issue with applying the SPG to those who are charged only. She argued for narrowing the policy to reduce compounding trauma.

Professor Freeman didn't see a compelling reason for why people who are charged were included. He suggested that this is where we should place our emphasis. The administration won't scrap the entire SPG but might proceed with convictions only, and not charges. Chair Liu stated that only certain types of charges should be reported.

Chair Finlayson wasn't happy with the responses because someone wrongfully charged or not convicted must re-experience the trauma and pain by reliving it all over again. Professor Ahbel-Rappe said certain employees must share their status as a returning citizen. Professor Ahbel-Rappe noted that she has worked with former prisoners who were hired as GSI's and now they are not able to work, part of which is due to their zip code. If only 8-9 people have reported while employed, there aren't that many people affected.

Professor Conway suggested Professor Lucas' report should go to Senate Assembly. Professor Conway asked why would David Daniels voluntarily advertise this type of information if he weren't asked?

Professors Atzmon and Ahbel-Rappe agreed that it would be good for Senate Assembly to hear people speak to these issues. It would be good to hear from experts who could speak to low recidivism rates (the rate of people who get out of prison and then return). It would be good to hear from those with the data. Chair Liu said he can invite people from HR to visit as well.

4:20 Senate Assembly Agenda and SACUA nomination committee ballot consent vote approval. – Chair Liu asked SACUA to review the January Senate Assembly meeting agenda. He agreed that Senate Assembly should hear from Professors Thompson and Lucas and not just the administration regarding SPG 601.38. Professors Thompson and Lucas were added to the agenda. Professor Singer agreed with Professors Atzmon and Ahbel-Rappe that the Senate Assembly would like to hear from all: Vice Provost and Director for Academic Human Resources Sasha Matish, Senior Director, University Human Resources, Tim Wood, Professor Ashley Lucas, and Professor Heather Thompson co-founders of the Carceral State Project.

Professor Ahbel-Rappe said Professor Lucas was going to collect information for people who had experienced harm from this policy. This material could be distributed to Senate Assembly prior to discussion.

A Motion was made for the ballot and Senate Assembly agenda be considered together. After a change and the addition of names, both were approved by consent vote.

4:33 Chair of the Committee for Fairness Equity and Inclusion (CFEI) Associate Professor of Computer Engineering, at UM Flint, Mark Allison proposed a revised definition of the term inclusion. Those in attendance at the meeting introduced themselves. Professor Ahbel-Rappe was introduced as the SACUA liaison to the committee.

Professor Allison introduced a proposal to consider and revise the university's language on the definition of "inclusion". This is the first step of a larger effort to have the university be more diverse and inclusive.

Original Language:

Inclusion: We commit to pursuing deliberate efforts to ensure that our campus is a place where differences are welcomed, different perspectives are respectfully heard and where every individual feels a sense of belonging and inclusion. We know that by building a critical mass of diverse groups on campus and creating a vibrant climate of inclusiveness, we can more effectively leverage the resources of diversity to advance

our collective capabilities.

Proposed Language:

Inclusion: We commit to ensuring that our campuses are a place where differences are welcomed, different perspectives are respected, and every individual has equal access to opportunities and resources.

The prior language was passive. The definition is important and is the first steppingstone to having an inclusive university.

The original language includes 'pursue', which does not promise anything of substance. All people are 'respectfully heard', and everyone has a 'sense of belonging'. This type of terminology is the DEI equivalent of 'thoughts and prayers'. He proposed to remove all passive language. He asserted that the new language is more concise and actionable which is a guide for more constructive work. Professor Allison stated that there should be equal access to opportunities and resources, and that we aren't there yet, but this is where we want to be.

Professor Allison took questions: Professor Toyama did not agree with the omission of the language of individuals having a sense of belonging. In his department some people of color don't feel they belong due to their cohort or enrollment. Resources are fairly easy to provide. Professor Allison asserted that we can say we will 'make you feel welcome' but asked the question 'are you actually welcome'? Professor Singer asked how this will get into the language of the university. Professor Singer also asked where the original language came from. Professor Allison responded that this language is on the UM website describing DEI across campuses.

Vice Chair Finlayson asked if this was across all campuses (referring to the regional campuses). She said there was less than inclusive language used to describe regional campuses. She agreed with the more active language. Professor Allison said the committee will be doing more work across the regional campuses. There was some discussion of everyone having the same access to resources across the campuses. It was suggested that the word campus or campuses should be changed to university. Vice Chair Finlayson preferred the term 'campuses' to 'university'.

The committee would appreciate the change of wording. Chair Liu asked if the language would be used without further amendments, and whether the wording would remain about the issue of belonging. Professor Allison and Professor Ahbel-Rappe said that Professor Karen Thomas Brown (formerly of UM Dearborn but now Associate Dean for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion at the University of Washington) said we at Michigan don't have a critical mass, and that is why people of color don't feel welcome. As a result, they leave. It is not just a matter of resources and the representation. Professor Allison said critical mass is conflated with diversity. If we had the mass, it would contribute to the state of inclusion, and even more so if we had a voice.

He would like to be laser-focused on measurable goals, and concrete actionable activities, mapping between this verbiage. The reason some issues are not included is because they would be difficult to map and measure.

Vice Chair Finlayson moved that we approve the substance of the statement, and the committee could go back to discuss it. Professor Singer seconded it. The committee

could decide whether to further change the language. A consent vote was taken to approve the language.

4:56 Executive Session – Where do we stand regarding issues of COVID?

4:58 Matters Arising

5:09 Adjourn

Respectfully submitted,

Deirdre D. Spencer
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."