The Hybrid meeting was held in University Hall 2000 Ruthven and virtually via Zoom

Guests: President Santa Ono

Press: Katherine Kelton, University Record

3:15 – Call to Order and Welcome to President Ono--The Chair called the meeting to Order at 3:18 after finding that a quorum was present, and welcomed President Santa J. Ono, the 15th president of the University of Michigan. --

3:25 -- President Ono’s Address -

He has long respected the University of Michigan. He has been engaged on a listening tour since his arrival and is taking cues from us. The Ombuds code of ethics will be the North Star of the Office of Ethics, Integrity, and Compliance (OEIC): https://www.ombudsassociation.org/standards-of-practice-code-of-ethics

Establishing the OEIC and restoring trust and integrity in central administration are his top priorities. He is building on our record of DEI 1.0, transitioning into DEI 2.0. He thanked the many thousands of people who have written to him. He is committed to maintaining our academic excellence. He is making positive new leadership hires, including a director of carbon neutrality. He supports synergistic interaction on all three campuses and held his first regent’s meeting at UM-Flint. He would like to create childcare for all three campuses as well as affordable childcare for Michigan Medicine. He wants to fight against cyberattacks with cutting-edge prevention. He seeks to build a collective vision, co-creating not just from the top down but receiving input from all levels.

3:35 -- Q & A Session with President Ono – Chair Pedraza fielded numerous questions submitted in advance for the president to address.) –

Q. Though most of the attention always falls on the Ann Arbor campus, U of M actually has three campuses. Flint, in particular, has recently undergone what some like to call a transformation and others call a crisis. The Flint campus has recently experienced low student enrollment, as well as layoffs of full-time, tenure-track faculty, lecturers, and staff, as well as lack of shared governance between the administration and the faculty. What is your vision for the three campuses and, in particular, the kind of education the Flint and Dearborn campuses should deliver?

A. Pres Ono met with faculty, students and staff on all 3 campuses. In the 1st 3 weeks he visited Flint twice.
He noted that increasing enrollment at Flint and improving financial stability at UM-Flint is important. He voiced support of the chancellor. Flint’s enrollment is trending in the right direction. Programming is not within the purview of the president, and he does not want to micromanage. He believes in and supports and defends shared governance. He believes in robust consultation and will not opine on his own. He chooses to wait and see how things play out at UM-Flint.

Q. U of M’s website states that “The belief that an opinion is pernicious, false, or in any other way detestable cannot be grounds for its suppression.” Can you be explicit about under what circumstances we should invite and welcome speakers with whose views we strongly disagree? What is the difference between free speech and hate speech?

A. He explained that there are jurisdictional differences. UM has a different governance as a public institution. There are First Amendment protections. The Supreme Court ruled in 1988, 1998, and 2017. There is clear policy grounded in law which is important to the state. UM’s policy is well-grounded in the McCarthy era. – The president was informed of the dark days leading up to the reason for the Davis, Markert, and Nickerson lecture when UM professors were fired for not testifying before the House Un-American Activities Committee. There was considerable debate to change the policy and it is a slippery slope regarding what can and cannot be said.

Free speech is the bedrock of academic institutions. You have the right to say things and others have the right to rebut what you said. For the university, safety of individuals is important. It must provide safety and protect people. Hate speech can put individuals in jeopardy. Free speech must be judged on a case-by-case basis.

Q. Please discuss your commitment to supporting innovation and entrepreneurship in research and in teaching. What plans do you have to build and invest in a culture of innovation more like that which exists in East and West Coast schools?

A. The president expressed respect and admiration for the Innovation and Entrepreneurship at Michigan as equal to, or better than the east or west coast schools. He quoted statistics of UM rankings: undergrad #5, grad #3 in the country in entrepreneurship. Harvard is UM of the east. What they offer is no better than here. We can demonstrate that we are on the upswing.

Q. A faculty member commented that he was impressed with the campus resources for wellness of faculty and staff.

A question regarding AI was also asked and answered.

Q. There is a disconnect between faculty and top down administrative leadership. This faculty member wants to meet with the president but his emails are ignored. UM home to large Iranian community of faculty, staff and students. What is UM doing to reach out and support Iran? Waterloo, UBC, Yale, etc. all have responded, and President Ono has previously made a statement at UBC in support of the Iranian community.
A. He agrees with the Iran statement. He will check with Mary Sue Coleman.

Q. Regarding Iran a faculty member agrees with the public statement and asks to extend beyond that. For example, extend application deadlines and waive application fees. Establish Scholar at Risk positions for faculty. He did this for Ukrainians. He hasn’t seen the position and wants to see it.

Q. Another faculty member celebrates Mary Sue Coleman’s international outreach in Africa, particularly South Africa. What does his justice and internationalization look like? UM and other global initiatives lead to extensive global experiences in Kyoto, University College London, Harvard.

A. He is beginning the visioning process. He wants to speak with everyone prior to speaking on his vision. He has a history of internationalism.

Q. A comment regarding bricks and mortar was asked. We’ve reduced energy costs in buildings. Some buildings need renovation, perhaps converting to using geothermal for energy.

A. He supported mega projects at UBC. He likes CFO Geoff Chatos and looks forward to working with him.

UNIVERSITY SENATE REGULAR BUSINESS

3:45 – Approval of October 4, 2022 Minutes. /Announcements/ Faculty Senate Restructuring Discussion -- The minutes from the October 4, 2022 meeting were approved.

3:50 – Overview of the Faculty Restructuring Discussion – Slide presentation by Chair Pedraza to introduce and discuss the expansion of the Faculty Senate to include Clinical Faculty and Lecturers. There has been a dramatic growth in Clinical track but not Tenure track faculty. Growth in numbers of non-tenure track faculty is high. We are looking at expand membership to clinical faculty and lecturers with 50% appointments or more.

Restructuring – If clinical faculty were included, reapportionment would be required. There is sympathy for inclusion but the medical school would dominate by number. There is a plan being considered to have a cap so that no school would have more than a maximum of 17 seats. 2 minimum. Votes could be tallied by tracks.

4:00 – Brian Zink, speaking in favor of admitting clinical Faculty – argues for inclusion. Since 1850 it was the first medical school to own and operate its own hospital, to admit women and to teach them medicine. They are Leaders and Best in the field of Medicine. Clinical track faculty do significant amount of teaching and research. They are major investigators for R01 grant. Clinical track faculty attended to COVID patients. They are innovators engaged in cutting-edge research. Why are they not included in the Faculty Senate? The clinical track began in 1986. There are 5 pathways to advancement and promotion. The clinical track faculty all have MD’s and/or PhD’s. The clinical track has more women and are younger.
Laura Hopson and Gifty Kwakye are scholars which Dr. Zink used as examples.

4:10 – **Margherita Fontana**, Speaking in favor of admitting Clinical Faculty – Clinical faculty in the School of Dentistry are active in teaching and research. More than half teach but they have no representation in the faculty senate. Hard to recruit the very talented. The clinical faculty are not afraid to speak out. It is not fair that they are not members of the faculty senate.

4:15 – **Kentaro Toyama**, Speaking in favor of admitting Lecturers and Clinical faculty. It is the right thing to do. It is not voter suppression. They should serve in an advisory capacity only. We would be adding thousands of more members.

**Silvia Pedraza** suggests having votes recorded and reported by different schools (only Michigan Medicine and tenure track.)

4:20 – **Michael Thouless** – Speaking against expanding the Faculty Senate. Thouless, a former SACUA chair, argues against inclusion because it could swamp the Senate Assembly – he likes the idea of people voting for issues that affect them. All units are free to decide how to vote, etc. It’s not a club for addressing academic issues which cut across units. It is not for addressing grievances. Michigan Medicine runs more like a business and less like an educational institution.

This muddies the waters between tenure track and other tracks. The clinical track professor title was needed by the Medical School for recruitment. Michigan Medicine had 10-year tenure track cap. The academic side of Michigan Medicine reports to the provost. Adjuncts were given the title clinical track faculty. If clinical faculty engaged in research, teaching and service, the Medical School should give them tenure. Research clinical faculty is a small fraction in education vs more in clinical practice. SACUA could work with the issues of common interest – bring LEO to work with SACUA. SACUA should work with the Medical School.

4:30 – **Rebekah Modrak**, Speaking against expanding the Faculty Senate – Each group needs their own representation. Have an all-faculty group but not this faculty senate. They all have their own interests. The lecturers, and now Librarians have unions. It should only be Tenure Track, research, teaching, and governance. Tenure-track faculty would lose its voice. It is the only group protected from retaliation. Some clinical faculty didn’t support the no-confidence vote on Schlissel. Tenure track faculty would have been marginalized. Michigan medicine would have outsized influence and would overwhelm other influences. The imbalance could overwhelm us. We should help them form an all-university faculty group, allowing each group advocacy. Ad hoc SACUA group could help form this.

4:35 – **Chair Pedraza**, Presenting common arguments against expanding the Faculty Senate. LEO already represents lecturers. Clinical faculty have no representation. LEO would have the loyalty. Michigan Medicine and LSA overwhelm everything.

Prof. Modrak proposed a motion for SACUA to appoint an ad hoc group to make a recommendation regarding inclusion.

A faculty member responded with voting on a motion about people not in the room as
not being good. Another faculty member commented that we take votes all the time on people who are not present.

There should be a second to the motion. Two faculty members seconded the motion.

This exchange resulted in confusion regarding Parliamentary procedure. The Parliamentarian said that under the Senate Rules, since this particular motion was not already on the agenda, adding it to the agenda so it could be considered would take a 2/3\textsuperscript{rd} vote in the affirmative by those members present.

A vote took place by a show of raised hands connoting “YES”. Because two-thirds of the members present did not vote “YES,” the motion was not placed on the agenda for consideration.

4:55 – Discussion of how to communicate feedback resulted in a request for entries to be placed into a (Google Form), with the link shared with the members present.

5:05 -The meeting adjourned at 5:05pm.

**Addendum**

**University Senate Actions**

Between meetings, the following actions occurred that should now be included in the minutes of the University Senate:

- On August 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2022, the Ann Arbor members of the University Senate elected Bryan Karle Roby to serve a two-year term as the Faculty Senate member of the Police Department Oversight Committee.
- Pursuant to the decisions of the award committees, two individuals were honored this academic year in recognition of their exemplary service within the U-M Library system. Librarian Judy Smith, in the Taubman Health Sciences Library, received the 2022 University Librarian Achievement Award. Callum Carr, an Assistant Archivist in the Flint Library, received the 2022 Librarian Recognition Award.

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 policies 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.”