The hybrid meeting was held in 1100 Ruthven and via Zoom

In person attendance – Chair Tom Braun, Professor Allen Liu, Professor Silvia Pedraza, FSO Director Luke McCarthy, FSO Coordinator Eric Vandenberghe, Secretary Deirdre Spencer

Online attendance – Vice Chair Damani Partridge, Professor Lindsay Admon, Professor Simon Cushing, Professor Vilma Mesa, Professor Heather O’Malley, Professor Rebekah Modrak, Professor Alex Yi

Guests -- in person – Professor Nicolai Lehnert and Professor Rogerio Pinto
Guests -- Online – Professor Analisa DiFeo, Professor Yasmina Laouar, Dr. Yulia Sevryugina

Press: Katie Kelton – University Record; Joshua Nicholson – Michigan Daily

3:02 -- CTO the meeting was called to order at 3:02. The minutes from the May 8th meeting were approved by consent.

3:05 -- Chair Update: -- The University Senate meeting scheduled for May 25th has 300 RSVPs to date, but fewer than 10% are scheduled for in-person attendance. A new amendment was added to now include Lecturers to the Faculty Senate. Questions were asked why the addition of Lecturers was presented after the fact as an amendment to the proposal instead of a new resolution. The reason is that it was presented to SACUA as an amendment, and not as a resolution.

The question was asked if there could be more time granted for members to consider the new amendment and be able to address the issue publicly within the appropriate timeline. It was decided that a special vote could be held if done so within the required timeframe. In response to a request, it was also decided that Faculty Senate members would have an opportunity to vote on the amendment to include Lecturers.

There are 4 people to speak in support of the original resolution and 1 person to speak against. Since Clinical faculty and LEO’s are not members of the Senate, they would have to contact a member of the Senate to advocate for their position from the floor and otherwise.

A question was raised regarding adherence to Roberts Rules of Order, to which the questioner was encouraged to contact Parliamentarian Paul Fossum for clarification.
3:20 Committee Chair Reports

Analisa DiFeo – Medical Affairs Advisory Committee, advisor to Marshall Runge – (MAAC)

This was DiFeo’s first time chairing the committee after serving as a member for 2 years. The committee wanted an agenda that was more relevant to the faculty of the Medical School and fewer guest speakers on topics not deemed as relevant. Two undergraduate students who were hospital volunteers served on the committee and were active participants.

DiFeo met with Assistant Dean (and former SACUA Vice Chair) Durga Singer and Marshall Runge to plan the meeting agenda, asking what Dean Runge thought was most important to cover. There were 4 meetings planned and 2 were held.

The 4 most important issues to be discussed were: (1) assessment of faculty and staff burnout; (2) childcare assistance; (3) The Call Center and problems associated with it, (which was a contributor to faculty / staff burnout); (4) compensation equity within the Medical School.

The burden of administrative duties, staff shortages, and both faculty and staff not being able to do the work they were trained to do were also contributors to burnout.

There are several health initiatives that should all be in one place rather than siloed than several locations.

A just released survey indicated that while 72% of staff reported burnout, the overall findings of the survey were positive.

Regarding the call center, patient satisfaction surveys indicate that more staff are needed, and that staff recognition initiatives were undertaken to boost morale. Many faculty leave the university due to salaries. We are no longer in the 50th percentile for physician’s salaries.

Interconnecting themes improved the meetings. Since many faculty in the Medical School are unaware of MAAC, they will publicize the committee activities in The Faculty Wire, a newsletter for the Medical School faculty.

The Medical School and Michigan Medicine have connections across the state from which to recruit staff.

A question was asked whether faculty other than tenure directed were surveyed. PhD and research faculty were included in the survey data, and there was post-COVID burnout across the board.

There was a question regarding the status of the childcare facility, to which the response was that a pending report was due very soon.

A question regarding the identification of “burnout” was addressed, and among nurses: (1) not being appreciated or compensated; (2) no longer doing the job that you were hired to do were stated as reasons.
Regarding diversity, Michigan Medicine is doing well with racial and ethnic diversity but not so well with gender and age diversity.

**Yasmina Laour Committee on the Economic and Well-Being of the Faculty (CESWF)**

This year there were 3 important goals:

1. Establish the importance of faculty oversight of their classrooms and their choice to decide the appropriate instructional mode including remote options.

2. Examine faculty salaries based on race and gender by instituting a new salary report, as the last one was conducted in 2011 and released in 2012. They would like the parameters of the salary survey to include years of work in the field, at what rank, the highest degrees earned, and a breakdown by units.

She asked SACUA to reach out to the deans and unit heads.

The provost was not committed to a salary survey, but SACUA will reach out again to the Provost’s Office, and perhaps conduct the survey ourselves if necessary, via Senate Assembly. We would have to obtain the necessary expertise, and we would want to contact ADVANCE and Chief Diversity Officer Tabbye Chavous to ensure this is done correctly.

3. Protect faculty from student retaliation. Professor Samir Ali of Middle Eastern Studies was a guest speaker at one of the meetings. Different strategies are needed to address different kinds of retaliation. Fields in the Humanities and Engineering are among those which experience high volumes of teaching and thereby student retaliation. What policies are in place to protect faculty? Appeasing students at all costs runs the risk of lowering academic standards. Students often want their grades changed, but there is no guidance regarding this in the faculty handbook other than speaking with the instructor, then going up the chain of command. Academic freedom means that the faculty member has control over the classroom, yet there have been times when an administrator sided with the student. We need to look at policies and procedures and streamline them.

5 people attended each meeting this year, which consisted of 50% attendance. This was considered good. She recommended that the number of committee members be increased.

Laour met with FSO Director McCarthy to recruit members with expertise to enhance the committee’s work.

**Yulia Sevryugina - Research Advisory Committee – Rebecca Cunningham – RAC**

Initially there was confusion coordinating schedules with VP Cunningham’s office. After the first meeting ORAC suggested three meetings where Yulia would meet with Cunningham’s assistant to suggest topics and speakers (although some were rejected on occasion). There were four meetings each semester.

Topics discussed were stewardship, the opioid epidemic, and research pods. A representative from the University Library spoke on Open Access publishing. Other
topics included grant support, internal and external, all of which support faculty. We need to amplify strategies. Look to foundations to provide infrastructure.

We need to pay more attention to faculty service and accolades. The university should publicize this more. More funding and support for faculty research is needed.

**Nicolai Lehnert – Committee on Fairness Equity and Inclusion (CFEI)**

This year there were two areas of focus: (1) to quantify and track campus climate; (2) DEI 2.0 (there are several initiatives).

He met with Dr. Tami Strickman of ECRT to discuss racial discrimination being addressed with the same diligence as sexual misconduct. This request was well received. Issues addressed included how should data be analyzed? We would like to look at exit interviews. 40% - 50% of those questioned said that campus climate was among the reasons they were exiting the university. Most exit interviews were handled by unit human resource departments. (ADVANCE tracks people after they have already departed.)

He also met with CDO Tabbie Chavous with talking points. We would like to increase the numbers of under-represented groups on campus; however, they leave through the back door. Unit HR needs to communicate with Academic HR (AHR). It might be difficult to achieve this information, but it would be good to have.

Many units do not have by-laws, nor any set procedures of how tenure is handled. There is no transparency without equity. There is no filing of complaints without by-laws. The regents could possibly suggest a basic guide for by-laws which could be individualized by unit.

DEI 2.0 allows for a committee meeting with CEFI and CAR to meet with Dr. Chavous.

**Rogerio Pinto – General Council Advisory Committee - Tim Lynch – (GCAC)**

There were four meetings of the committee. There were always timely topics of discussion. There was lots of cross-pollination among committees. Sometimes meetings were postponed or adjusted for recent occurrences. Questions asked included: (1) what is the role of the committee? (2) How can we help? (3) How can the OGC use the committee? Faculty need a presence, a voice and implementation of their ideas.

Human resource issues were raised such as incarceration screening and in-person meetings. Retaliation of students toward faculty was often discussed, even though it is not necessarily a legal issue. There was an enlightening conversation regarding how faculty perceived and expressed what happens in the classroom. There should be a statement of solidarity between the faculty and the regents. We need to know how the university is investigating faculty for reasons which are unclear, or perhaps the investigations should not have taken place.

It was suggested that there be an interface between committees, or a merger of committees. There can be synergistic collaboration among committees. There was some disagreement here and it was suggested that each committee should have its own
meetings but could share reports. It was suggested that there be a channel by which committees could communicate with each other. There are SACUA liaisons at each meeting to assist with this process.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

4:25 Pre-planning: Regent and President Visits

OPEN SESSION

4:45 Matters Arising – Concerns were expressed regarding UM Flint possibly entering into a collaboration with Cooley Law School for a part-time, pre-law curriculum.

4:52 Adjourned – The meeting was adjourned at 4:52

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.”