November 2022

Call meeting to order

- Plan to adjourn 5min early to help facilitate Zoom'd out calendars

Attendees (green = present):

- Donny Likosky - Med School
- Hani Bawardi - CollCollege Arts & Sciences (Dearborn)
- Naomi Binnie - University Library
- Tom Braun (SAUCA Liaison)
- Adam Burak - Engineering
- Arlo Clark-Foos - CASL (Dearborn)
- Gabriela Hristova - College Arts & Sciences (Flint)
- Jacob Lederman - Dept Behavioral Sciences (Flint)
- Massy Mutumba - Nursing
- Karen Staller - Social Work
- Chuanwu (Wu) Xi - Public Health
- Eric Vandenberghe - U-M Faculty Senate
- Lucas McCarthy - U-M Faculty Senate

1. Oct 2022 minutes: October 2022 Meeting minutes
2. SACUA Approved Charge
    1. Review action items
    2. Complete review of charges (we did not review the second bullet point under the second charge)

Suggestion to

- Focus on what we can control and achieve this academic year
- Pick the highest-leverage area within these options (or alternatives) for each component of our charge.
- Focus on developing our evaluation plan this month.

We agreed to start the next meeting with reviewing the action items and complete the review of the second charge.

Evaluation of Deans and Department Chairs

1. Critically review processes (and their strengths and weaknesses) across UM Schools, Departments and campuses
    1. Consider our opportunity to inform the new independent central ethics, integrity and compliance office for the Ann Arbor, Dearborn and Flint campuses, including Michigan Medicine.
        a. Identify recommendations to make it easier to "cut the red tape" at U-M departments, schools and campuses.
    2. What is done with results?
    3. Issues brought to our attention with existing workflows and expected timelines

Evaluation of processes for UM employees experiencing harassment and retaliation

1. Recommend specific modifications to existing processes to enhance objectivity, fairness to all parties, and resources available to UM employees
   1. What would our "customers" want in terms of resources rather than asking what the University offers?
      i. Mapping out the process of going from complaint through resolution, and what processes are recommendations vs SPGs (the latter are obligations to follow)
         1. Is there discretion to follow recommendations?
         2. **ACTION ITEM**: Gabriela and Massy - can you forward the mapping and SPGs at [Flint](#) and Ann Arbor?
      ii. Does it (e.g., exit interviews, role of an Ombuds) differ by department, school, and campuses?
      iii. Who would we interview?
      iv. Invite OGC to attend a future COAA meeting.
2. Recommend specific modifications to faculty grievance resources (e.g., transitioning the grievance form to an electronically available portal on the Academic Human Resources website) to enhance their availability
   1. What would our "customers" want in terms of resources?
   2. What would be the barriers to creating such a resource?
   3. Codify and examine the effectiveness of the role of the Ombuds in the process (pre, during and post)?
   4. How to more effectively use the mediation process? Can this be another layer to increase effectiveness?

Context regarding policies across campuses
Regarding the approach towards which policies would need to differ/be customized across campuses (Dearborn, Flint, Ann Arbor): (From Luke)

- Great question here. The closest I am aware of a general policy about creating SPG's is [SPG 601.35 (Development of University Policy)](#). However, that SPG covers the creation of "institution-wide policies and procedures." There are a number of areas, such as for student conduct issues or faculty grievances, where each campus has separate policies and procedures. I have not heard yet why certain policies/procedures are customized per campus, but my best guess is that policies that require considerable administrative coordination on campus, such as for investigations on campus regarding sexual misconduct issues, are going to tend to need a separate office on each campus with customized policies/procedures.
- Nonetheless, all the policies specifically listed as a "SPG" on the Flint page (https://www.umflint.edu/ecrt/policies-standard-practice-guide-spg/) are the *same* across all three campuses. Those SPGs also all have specific offices associated with them who are responsible for periodically reviewing and revising them. During that review process, that responsible office is primarily tasked with developing the rationale for why the policy is drafted as it is, with input often solicited in the process from other affected parties.