

January 2023

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

- December 2022 minutes: [December 2022 Meeting minutes](#)

- The December Minutes were approved

- [SACUA Approved Charge](#)

1. Call to order, approval of agenda and minutes
2. Announcements
3. Overview of COAA Schedule for Winter 2023 Term
4. Evaluation of Deans and Department Chairs
 - a. Review "[Process for the Provost of Deans \(Ann Arbor\)](#)" document
 - i. Action item: Donny to send Eric his PDF. Eric to upload the PDF as a Google Doc with Donny's comments.
 - ii. Committee members to put their comments in the Google Doc over the next 2 wks.

- b. Critically review processes (and their strengths and weaknesses) across UM Schools, Departments and campuses
- 5. Evaluation of processes for UM employees experiencing harassment and retaliation
 - a. Update on meeting with Beth Manning (UM Flint Head of HR)
 - b. Discussion of recommendations for a central web page to assist in putting the procedure into action. Include nuances for different units and campuses.
 - c. Discuss framework and timeline for submitting recommendations to SACUA
- 6. New Business
- 7. Adjournment

Winter Term Overview and Timeline

Evaluation of Deans and Department Chairs

1. January: Discussion of plan moving forward, as well as overview of Ann Arbor process
 - a. Consideration of 2023-2024 Charge: charge should include evaluation of provost and president.
2. February: Feedback to enhance and add precision to Ann Arbor process, recommendations
 - a. Luke to request the other files from Dearborn and Flint campuses
3. March: Draft of recommendations to send to SACUA
 - a. Action item: include making evaluations publicly available and prominent
 - b. Request Provost to provide similar action-oriented, measurable, recommendations for how Chairs are reviewed by their Deans. Should be similar across Schools and campuses.
 - c. Phase 2 (2023-2024) will be focused on the Chairs.
4. April: Finalize recommendations; look ahead to next academic year

Evaluation of processes for UM employees experiencing harassment and retaliation

1. January: Discuss framework of recommendation of central web page for procedure implementation. Discuss framework of improving resources for respondents in harassment cases (e.g., legal counsel options) - articulating short and long-term strategies.
 - a. including issues related to the openness of interpretation of the SPGs. Provost has committees to aid in interpretation of the SPGs.

Example SPG: sexual misconduct (601.89)

<https://spg.umich.edu/policy/601.89>

- b. focus on whether issues within the institution vs. outside of the institution.
2. February: Provide examples or descriptions of content, layout, etc. for potential central web page for procedure implementation. Craft rough draft identifying issue of improving respondents' resources
3. March: Rough draft of Recommendation for SACUA regarding central web page for procedure implementation. Finalize draft of identifying issue of improving respondents' resources
4. April: Finalize draft of recommendation for SACUA regarding central web page for procedure implementation; look ahead to next academic year

January Business

Evaluation of Deans and Department Chairs

1. Critically review processes (and their strengths and weaknesses) across UM Schools, Departments and campuses
 - a. Evaluate "Process-for-Dean-Review-October-20-2021" file
 - b. Brainstorm potential improvements that can be recommended
 - c. Consider inviting guest to discuss process further
 - d. Request files from Dearborn and Flint

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
 - a. 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)
 - ii. [Grievance Procedure and Dispute Resolution](#):
 1. Is there discretion to follow recommendations?
 2. Gabriela and Massy - forwarded the mapping and SPGs at [Flint](#) and Ann Arbor?
 - b. **ACTION ITEM**: Ask the campuses what policies exist with regard to addressing harassment and retaliation concerns among faculty
 - i. Beth Manning, Flint HR Director.

1. Update on meeting
 2. [Policy and Standard Practice Guide](#)
 - ii. Rima Berry-Hung [Dearborn]
 1. Human Resources Director
 2. Phone: 313-593-5190
 3. E-mail: rberry@umich.edu, Dearborn
 - iii. Pamela Heatlie [Dearborn]
 1. Director of ECRT and Title IX Coordinator
 2. Phone: 313-436-9194
 3. ECRT-Dearborn@umich.edu
 - iv. Sacha Matish, Ann Arbor - Academic HR
 - c. **ACTION ITEM:** committee members to identify specific language in the SPG on [Sexual and Gender-Based Misconduct](#) that strikes as especially vague
 - d. 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
 - i. What would our “customers” want in terms of resources? Can we make it customer-focused?
 - ii. Each member of COAA consider being put through the grievance and identify potential roadblocks
 - iii. Speak to those who have put in grievances
 - iv. Speak to Academic HR who identify a grievance monitor for the faculty
 1. What would be the barriers to create such a resource?
 2. Codify and examine the effectiveness of the role of the Ombuds in the process (pre, during and post)?
 - v. How to more effectively use the mediation process? Can this be another layer to increase effectiveness?
2. Identifying disparity in resources for respondents to harassment and retaliation claims
 - a. Issue: respondents to these claims are not provided resources through the University when the claims are made by the University
 - b. **ACTION ITEM:** Identify the issue for SACUA
 - i. Recommend a roadmap for addressing the issue through phases:
 1. Phase 1: Adopt list of local attorneys with experience with relevant cases and faculty peers who could be trained as faculty support persons
 2. Phase 2: Address the resource disparities stemming from Faculty out-of-pocket coverage of legal expenses.