



Academic Affairs Advisory Committee (AAAC) Minutes
February 13, 8:45 – 10:15 am (Provost attending 9-10 am)
Ruthven Conference Room 1100 and via Zoom (hybrid)

Minutes of Meeting: 2/13/2025

Circulated: 3/6/2025

Approved: 3/13/2025

Present: Aubree Gordon (Chair), Robert Deegan, Christine Gerdes (Special Counsel to the Provost), Emmanuelle Marquis, Ann Marshall (FSO), Luke McCarthy (FSO), Laurie McCauley (Provost), Frank Pelosi, Mireille Roddier, Jordan Siegel, Kentaro Toyama, Jon Wargo

Absent: Colleen Conway, Albert Liu, Rahul Mannan, Heather O'Malley (SACUA liaison), Arthur Verhoogt

1. In preparation for the arrival of the Provost, the minutes from 01/16/2025 were approved and AAAC members briefly discussed AAAC agenda items.

2. Update on SPG review (201.15-01, 201.11-1, 201.12, 201.15) – Provost's Office

- The Provost's Office provided a brief update on the in-progress revisions for four SPGs, noting that a revised SPG that combines 201.15 and 201.15-01 will be available by the end of the semester. There will be an opportunity for AAAC to review this revised SPG and to provide feedback. The revisions for the other two SPGs (201.11-1, 201.12) are still ongoing.

3. *Creation and Review of SPGs resolution*

- In brief, the adopted [resolution](#) provides a means for faculty to be involved in those SPGs that are most relevant to faculty as well as SPGs that could benefit from faculty expertise and experience.
- Each SPG has an owner, and SPGs changes take place frequently. SPGs fall under the discretion of various members of the U-M leadership team. Some SPGs are more complex and are owned by multiple offices. In some instances, changes to SPGs may be more immediate while, in other cases, there is more time for review.
- The Provost remarked on being very open to faculty feedback on SPGs and also to more formal ways to consider feedback, such as piloting a form on an SPG portal that invites feedback on a particular SPG and section of an SPG.
- There was discussion about whether SA committees that advise executive officers could be a mechanism for reviewing and making updates to SPGs. It was noted that summer is a time when the Provost's Office often catches up on work related to SPGs. It was proposed that, for example, the Provost might bring some SPGs that are undergoing review in the Provost's Office to AAAC for consideration.
- The Provost offered to raise these issues with the leadership team and to report back.

4. Preliminary discussion of input on leadership appointments

- The Provost provided an overview of the appointment and reappointment process for deans, vice provosts, and high level director. The process includes outreach to the community to



identify faculty to serve on a search committee and to identify the critical responsibilities for the position. A search firm is identified to orchestrate the appointment with care given to nuances within the units. Nominations come from both the community and search committee, with support from the search firm. There are two rounds of interviews, with a short list of candidates brought to campus. The president and provost make the final decision. Feedback is sought widely from the community, and the Provost, as well as an additional person in the Provost's office, reads through all the comments submitted as part of the interview process and also consults AEC survey results for internal candidates. As part of this review, the Provost checks for comments about inappropriate behavior and may also identify areas of growth for appointees, i.e. to work better in small groups, with alumni, or with fundraising, etc.

- There was discussion about how ECRT reports are consulted. If there are issues of concern, that information is conveyed to the Provost. In some cases, external investigations have been done. If there are issues that are not reconciled, the president and board would discuss these issues and make a final decision.

5. Discussion on impacts of recent developments in Washington DC, including DEI and indirect costs

- The NIH cuts shake at the core of what it means to be a research university, including a recent announcement on a Friday set for implementation on a Monday.
- Entities such as the American Council on Education (AEC), Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU), American Association of Universities (AAU), Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC), National Academy of Sciences (NAS) are working on responding. The DEI cuts are highly politicized without an understanding of DEI or discrimination. A possible response to such attacks is to "pivot and protect."
- Appreciation was shared for OVPR communications and the impetus that we're all in this together. There is concern and confusion about the status of federal grants. Faculty are encouraged to consult Public Affairs's [Key Issues](#) page, and faculty appreciated U-M leaning into providing information. A faculty member noted the targeting of specific scientists as well as misunderstandings about what indirect costs cover.

6. Agenda item on childcare was postponed to a later date.

7. Additional Committee Discussion

- After the Provost left the meeting, there was brief committee discussion related to AAAC next steps.

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Ann Marshall, Faculty Governance Coordinator (FSO)