

October 21, 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
- Lucas McCarthy - U-M Faculty Senate

1. Approve 2021-2022 minutes: [COAA 2021-2022 Minutes for Approval](#) - this item was approved
2. Sep 2022 minutes: [September 2022 Meeting minutes](#)
3. [SACUA Approved 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.

Discuss action items from last meeting: During our meeting we discussed our committee's liaising with other committees. In particular, we discussed efforts to partner with the Administration Evaluation Committee (AEC). We agreed to identify what is in our sphere of control, stay focused on our approved charge, and strive to remain productive during our time together this year.

Review Charge and update evaluation processes: During our meeting we reviewed the steps that we would take to advance each charge. We noted action items associated with specific areas of focus underneath each charge. We finished reviewing/updating the first charge and the first bullet point underneath the second charge. 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. **ACTION ITEM:** Donny to reach out to Silvia about making an official recommendation to serve as a liaison (we represent all 3 campuses)
 - b. 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?

[See piece in the Detroit Free Press](#)