Minutes of Meeting: 04/06/2023
Circulated: 09/29/2023
Approved: 10/05/2023

Present: Christine Gerdes (Special Counsel to the Provost), Bruno Giordani, Rachael Goldman, Emmanuelle Marquis, Luke McCarthy, Laurie McCauley (Provost), Frank Pelosi, David Potter, Mark Rosentraub, Priti Shah (Chair), Gabrielle Scott, Priti Shah, Jordan Siegel, Eric Vandenberghe, Sergio Villalobos-Ruminott

Absent: Andrew Chang, Julie Catalano, Aubree Gordan, Artemis Leontis, Mark Rosentraub

1. In preparation for the arrival of the Provost, the minutes were approved and there was a brief discussion on the Jennifer Frey lecture planned for the fall.

2. Provost McCauley provided an update on the GEO Strike and invited faculty input. Discussion included: The Provost has received feedback from multiple perspectives on the strike. GEO continues to ask for a 60% salary increase. Rackham's new funding program for graduate students (see FAQ) had been planned for some time and is scheduled to begin May 1, 2023. Rackham is an academic program funded by the general fund and is not covered by union contracts. Faculty are not yet sure how to navigate the new Rackham funding in terms of how many semesters of teaching are most beneficial for graduate students. Just under 12% of all graduate professionals are a GSI/GSA for winter term 2023. AAAC members remarked on the impact of the strike on their grading. An update was provided on GEO-related legal proceedings, including as related to potential breach of contract and unfair labor practices.

   - Discussion included: The next two weeks are not a good time to engage faculty. Conducting world class research and being world class teachers are top priorities for faculty. Faculty priorities might not be heard or understood if faculty don't participate in the process. Given the high workload of faculty, it can be challenging for faculty to get excited about a general visioning project.
   - Possible recommendations included: Utilize ADVANCE to involve departments and gather faculty input; engage with SACUA as the representative leadership body of the faculty; rely on research methods used to gather input from constituencies under significant pressure; gather feedback from chairs and ask chairs to devote time to the topic at faculty meetings.

4. AAAC SPG Subcommittee Presentation & Discussion. The document, “SPG Review Process” was presented and discussed, noting this is an initial discussion with more follow-up to come.
   - Faculty are less engaged in SPGs than before and a need for faculty to effectively be involved in the SPG process; AAAC recommends a committee or working group created
by faculty leadership to review the SPGs and to publish SPGs in the *Record* before implementation. Additional improvements could include: a public comment period (as is done for Medicare policy), an expiration date, and a vote (as is done in the Medical School).

- For example, AAAC recommends revising Fitness for Duty. There are issues of both ableist language and out-of-date gender language. A question was raised about does this come from the Dean, from the Medical school or who “owns” it? Relevance of addressing issues related to Work Connections and when the issue is not medical leave. Fitness for Duty also overlaps with other SPGs and the issue of inconsistencies. Work on SPG 201.96 was raised as an example of a faculty-driven committee.

5. After the Provost left the meeting, the committee had additional discussion on SPGs, noting that SACUA review requires lead time; a public comment period as helpful even if not all suggestions are tenable; the importance of Fitness of Duty as a document and that AAAC members have already done some significant work on the Fitness of Duty SPG; the importance of communication between both administration and faculty on SGPs.

6. The AAAC Subcommittee on SPGs will bring the “SPG Review Process” document and their recommendations to SACUA.

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Ann Marshall, Faculty Governance Coordinator (FSO)