

## **Summary of University Senate Restructuring Options**

The Senate Assembly is considering four Senate restructuring proposals. The proposal the Senate Assembly selects will then serve as the framework for drafting an implementing resolution. If that subsequent implementing resolution is then approved in the Senate Assembly, it would be presented to the full University Senate for a vote.

In all four proposals under consideration, a new Library unit would be created so the Librarians can have Senate Assembly representation.

### Proposal 1: Representatives

Does not expand the University Senate to add new voting members. Clinical Professors (Assistant, Associate, and Full) would be invited to have 2 non-voting members on the Senate Assembly. The Librarians could also invite 1 Archivist or Curator to be a non-voting member of the Senate Assembly.

### Proposal 2: Expansion

Expands the University Senate to add the Clinical Professors (Assistant, Associate, and Full), Archivists, and Curators into the existing University Senate structure. Creates a cap of 17 Senate Assembly representatives on the number of representatives that any school, college, or campus may be apportioned. This cap preserves the existing apportionment so that no unit gains or loses seats due to the new members being added to the Senate. For a few issues, it restricts who can vote, such as by restricting votes on tenure-related matters to tenure-track faculty.

### Proposal 3: Expansion with Restructuring

Restructures the University Senate while expanding it to add Clinical Professors, Archivists, and Curators. The current Senate Assembly would be replaced. Separate governance structures would be created for four “campuses”: Dearborn, Flint, Ann Arbor Medical School, and Non-Medical Ann Arbor. Each would have a separate Senate Assembly and Executive Committee. SACUA would meet with the Executive Committees from all four, and its membership would be drawn from all four governance structures. For a few issues, it restricts who can vote, such as by restricting votes on tenure-related matters to tenure-track faculty. Each campus could have representatives on all Senate Assembly committees.

### Proposal 4: Multi-Branch Collective Senate

Does not expand the University Senate to add new voting members. Creates a new “Collective Senate Committee” with combined representation from the existing University Senate, the Lecturers, the Clinical Faculty, and the Archivists/Curators. This Collective Senate Committee would not have the power to vote on motions. It would be a forum for representatives to discuss shared concerns. Those concerns could then be brought back to the membership of each separate group for possible action. Students may also be invited to share their perspectives with this Collective Senate Committee. Also, two members each from the Lecturers, Clinical Faculty, and Archivists/Curators (six total) could join the Senate Assembly as non-voting members. One member each from the Lecturers, Clinical Faculty, and Archivists/Curators (three total) could join SACUA as non-voting members. One member each from the Lecturers, Clinical Faculty, and Archivists/Curators (three total) could join each of the Senate Assembly Committees as voting members.

## University Senate Restructuring Options

### PROPOSAL #1: Representatives

#### Summary:

Keep the current structure but add 2 non-voting representatives from the Clinical Professors (Assistant, Associate, and Full) to the Senate Assembly to ensure their voices are part of the conversation. Also, all Librarians, who are currently members of the faculty senate, will constitute their own unit for the purposes of apportionment in the Senate Assembly. Pursuant to the existing apportionment rules, a total of 3 representatives will be allocated for the Library unit. The Senate Assembly will also be increased by 3 representatives so that no other unit loses any seats due to the addition of the Library unit. The Librarian unit may consider electing 1 Archivist or Curator as an additional non-voting representative.

#### University Senate Impact:

No change.

#### Senate Assembly Impact:

Add 2 new non-voting Clinical Professor members to the Senate Assembly. Add 3 new Library unit representatives. Increase the size of the Senate Assembly by 3 voting members (to 77 total voting members) and 3 non-voting members.

#### Senate Assembly Committee Impact:

No change.

#### SACUA Impact:

No change.

## **PROPOSAL #2: Senate Expansion**

### Summary:

Expand the current University Senate ( $\approx 4,151$  total) by admitting all Clinical Professors (Assistant, Associate, and Full) ( $\approx 1,771$  total) as well as Archivists and Curators ( $\approx 39$  total) while modifying the Senate Assembly as follows:

(1) the Senate Assembly will be increased in size to 77 members, but done so that no unit loses any seats in comparison to its current apportionment

(2) each unit represented in the Senate Assembly will be limited to a maximum of 17 Senate Assembly members.

(3) all Librarians, Archivists, and Curators will constitute their own unit for the purposes of apportionment in the Senate Assembly.

(4) each unit will decide how to apportion the faculty composition of its Senate Assembly representatives. Specifically, (i) LSA will decide faculty representation from each of humanities, natural sciences and social sciences, (ii) all units will decide its composition of representatives among tenure-track, research, and clinical faculty, and (iii) Librarians, Archivists, and Curators will decide the composition of representatives among its three groups.

Senate Assembly members will be eligible to vote on all resolutions except in the case of tenure-related issues, where only tenure-track faculty are eligible to vote. Voting restriction decisions are made by the Chair & Vice Chair of SACUA, in consultation with the Faculty Senate Office.

Only Faculty Senate members who fall under current (i.e., 2022) rules may vote on issues related to Faculty Senate membership, the above tenure-track restriction voting rule, or Faculty Senate structures.

### University Senate Impact:

Addition of all Clinical Professors (Assistant, Associate, and Full), Archivists, and Curators. Tenure-related issues would be voted on by the Tenure-Track Faculty.

### Senate Assembly Impact:

Increase the Senate Assembly (SA) to 77 members, but apportion representatives to each unit so that no unit loses seats while also capping unit size at 17. Only tenure-track faculty members can vote on tenure-related matters.

### Senate Assembly Committee Impact:

Clinical Professors, Archivists, and Curators would be members of SA committees. Only tenure-track faculty members can vote on tenure-related matters.

### SACUA Impact:

Clinical Professors, Archivists, and Curators will be eligible to be elected to SACUA. Only tenure-track faculty members can vote on tenure-related matters.

### **PROPOSAL #3: Senate Expansion with Restructuring**

#### Summary and Rationale:

Create separate faculty governance structures – a Senate Assembly *and* a Senate Executive Committee – for each of four “campuses” at U-M, corresponding to each of the four administrators who report directly into the U-M President: Dearborn (Chancellor), Flint (Chancellor), Medical School (Executive Vice President), non-Medical Ann Arbor (Provost). Create a single SACUA that draws its membership from the respective Senate Assemblies / Senate Executive Committees. SACUA would have seats reserved as follows: 1 for Dearborn; 1 for Flint; 4 for Medical School; 9 for non-Medical Ann Arbor (15 total). Each campus could have its own rules about electing their Senate Assemblies and Senate Executive Committees (the default would be something analogous to the current processes). The 4 Senate Assemblies would meet together at least once a semester; the 4 Senate Executive Committees would meet with SACUA at least once every other month.

Expand the current University Senate ( $\approx 4,151$  total) by admitting all Clinical Professors (Assistant, Associate, and Full) ( $\approx 1,771$  total), including those not in the Medical School, as well as Archivists and Curators ( $\approx 39$  total).

Within each campus, Librarians, Archivists, and Curators will constitute their own unit for the purposes of apportionment in the respective Senate Assembly.

This addresses the historical oddity that current Dearborn and Flint faculty are members of two governance bodies (their campus Faculty Senate, *and* U-M’s overall Faculty Senate), while neither Medical School nor non-Medical Ann Arbor faculty have faculty governance venues to raise issues that largely concern only their own “campus.” (E.g., Medical School faculty today cannot raise a Medical-School-only issue in the Senate Assembly or SACUA without involving Faculty Senate members who are not part of the Medical School.) Meanwhile, any issues common to more than one campus can still be addressed through SACUA.

Voting on formal resolutions at the Senate Assembly or Faculty Senate levels would be restricted as follows: Only tenure-track faculty may vote on issues related to tenure. Only Faculty Senate members who fall under current (i.e., 2022) rules may vote on issues related to Faculty Senate membership, the tenure-track voting restriction rule (above), or Faculty Senate structures. SACUA may choose to limit voting on other issues, in each case seeking to ensure that the voices of those most affected by an issue are best heard. All voting results will be reported in a way that is broken down by campus *and* track.

This proposal arises partly in response to the desire by the Medical School to include Clinical Faculty in the Faculty Senate. The vast majority of Clinical Faculty are in the Medical School; they are very large in number and would be certain to impact the center of gravity of the Faculty Senate. This proposal partially limits that impact to the Medical School, where support for including Clinical Faculty in the Faculty Senate is strongest.

#### University Senate Impact:

Addition of all Clinical Faculty, Archivists, and Curators.

Senate Assembly Impact:

The current Senate Assembly would be replaced by four separate Senate Assemblies, who sometimes meet separately and sometimes meet together. In the non-medical Senate Assembly, a new library unit would be included.

Senate Assembly Committee Impact:

Each campus should have the right to seat representatives on any or all Senate Assembly Committees. Proportions could aim for something similar to the 1:1:4:9 SACUA representation indicated above. (In practice, however, filling seats on SA Committees is the challenge.)

SACUA Impact:

SACUA would be augmented by four new bodies, and SACUA, itself, would change in terms of how it is elected and what it focuses on. First, there would be four SACUA-like bodies (called “Senate Executive Committees” in this proposal), one for each “campus.” These would serve as SACUA does today for issues that affect each campus. Second, the new SACUA would have membership drawn from (and elected by) each of the four campus structures, with a total of 15 members. This new SACUA would focus primarily on issues that affect multiple campuses or the university as a whole.

## **PROPOSAL #4: A Multi-Branch Collective Senate (aka the “Super Senate”)**

### Summary:

At present, there are four branches of faculty: The Lecturers, Clinical Faculty, Archivists/Curators, and the TT/Research/Librarians faculty of the Faculty Senate. There’s no formal mechanism for communication between these branches, and access to advising administrators is disproportionately in the hands of the Research/TT faculty.

This proposal utilizes the fact that most of these branches currently have their own Assembly, Executive Committee, agendas, and meetings by building upon existing structures to create a forum — a **Collective Senate Committee** — that would bring representatives of all parties together to have conversation about shared concerns.

An odd number of representatives from each branch would form this Collective Senate Committee. The suggested number of representatives is 3 - the number of representatives is the same for each branch so that each branch can include diverse perspectives, and isn’t intended to be proportional to the size of each branch as there’s no voting. For example, the TT/Research/Librarians may choose to have one TT faculty, one Research faculty, and one Librarian as their three representatives. Discussion about shared concerns could lead back to motions / a vote within each individual branch. There would be no motions or voting within the Collective Senate except for straw polls.

The role of the Collective Senate Committee is modeled on the role of SACUA, only on a “federal” level, where SACUA only deals with the concerns of the Faculty Senate. In addition, the Collective Senate could invite members of the Undergraduate Student Government and GSIs/GSIRs to report.

In addition, one member from the Lecturers, Clinical Faculty, and the Archivists/Curators branches would be invited to join each TT/Research/Librarians Branch Senate Assembly Committee, one member would be invited to be a non-voting member of SACUA, and two members would be invited to join the TT/Research/Librarians Branch Senate Assembly as non-voting members.

Finally, all Librarians, who are currently members of the faculty senate, will constitute their own unit for the purposes of apportionment in the Senate Assembly. Pursuant to the existing apportionment rules, a total of 3 representatives will be allocated for the Library unit. The Senate Assembly will also be increased by 3 representatives (to a total of 77 members) so that no other unit loses any seats due to the addition of the Library unit.

Note: The Clinical Faculty are not currently organized, with an Assembly and Executive Committee. We hope that the formation of the Collective Senate might inspire them to organize.

### **Q: How would the LEO union work with their new body? Would they even want one?**

The fact that two of the branches also have union representation would not prevent them from participating in the Collective Senate. If Research/TT faculty were to unionize, we would still use governance channels of the Assembly and SACUA and a Collective Senate would still be valuable in enabling conversation about cooperative and competing concerns.

**Q: Why do we need SACUA with the new Collective Senate?**

SACUA is the Executive Committee for just one branch – the TT/Research/Librarians. The role of SACUA relative to the Faculty Senate hasn't changed. The role of the Collective Senate is to provide opportunity for all four branches to come together.

University Senate Impact:

No internal change.

Senate Assembly Impact:

Two members of the Lecturers, Clinical Faculty, and the Archivists/Curators branches join the TT/Research/Librarians Branch Senate Assembly as non-voting members. (Six additional members, non-voting).

Senate Assembly Committee Impact:

One member of the Lecturers, Clinical Faculty, and the Archivists/Curators branches can join each TT/Research/Librarians Branch Senate Assembly Committee as a voting member. (Each Senate Assembly Committee has at least 6 TT/Research/Librarians Branch members and a total of three members drawn from the other branches.)

SACUA Impact:

One member each of the Lecturers, Clinical Faculty, and the Archivists/Curators branches join SACUA as a non-voting member. (Three additional members, non-voting).