



**Committee on Oversight of Administrative Action (COAA) Minutes for 1/12/26 Meeting**

**Meeting information:**

Circulated: 3-16-26

Approved: 3-23-26

Members present: Wayne C. Petty (Chair), Devi Chiravuri, Hari Nathan, Kristen Verhey, Oleg Zamulin, Adam Matzger, Lauren Smith, Vilma Mesa (SACUA), Mary Franklin

Members absent: Mimi Dalaly, Cynthia Gabriel, Parag Patil

Faculty Senate Office staff present: Eric Vandenberghe

**Minutes:**

**10:01am-10:03am: Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Minutes, Announcements**

The agenda was approved. The minutes for the December COAA meeting are approved.

**10:03am-11:00am: Continued discussion of the provost's new tenure policies**

Summary: The Chair reviews the Minutes of the most recent COAA meeting to refresh the committee's memory of the conversation. A call for further ideas related to this topic is made. A member indicates that if new pertinent materials or information are available during a promotion and tenure review, they should be made available for consideration to the review committee. The member indicates that this is a point that was primarily agreed upon by the committee at the previous meeting.

A member discusses the related policies of LSA. This review points out some of the issues that need to be considered. The Chair suggests that this could be an area where COAA could collaborate with the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee (AAAC). The Chair and FSO staff will coordinate with the AAAC leadership on this matter.

The Chair asks the committee several questions: Is it appropriate for the Provost's Office to overrule a strong unit-level case? What would be the appropriate safeguards put in place? When should a Provost's substantive review be triggered?

A member indicates that a review at the Provost's level should only ever be reviewing the procedure. In cases that the Provost's Office finds a case has what they perceive to be substantive issues, the case should be sent back to the units for further consideration and justification. Another member of the committee suggests that context is important for these matters.

A member discusses a case that was overturned at the Provost's level. They indicate that there is a need for safeguards in this process. They indicate that the Provost's Office can solicit new recommendation letters during their review if they choose. A member pointed

out the problematic aspects of this.

A member acknowledges the problematic nature of the previous example of tenure denial. They indicate that the process seems to be set up to allow Provost to make 11<sup>th</sup> hour rejections. They reiterate the prior suggestion to send back cases to the unit level for further review.

In cases where the Provost's Office overturns a tenure case, there is no appeals process. Issues with the current grievance process are discussed, including that the Provost cannot be grieved. Even if there are legitimate reasons for the Provost to overturn, the appearance of a non-transparent process is problematic. The last resort is taking the University to court, which is costly and draining. A court case is not the best solution for this type of issue.

A member indicates that there are scenarios where full transparency is not possible. Pending or settled ECRT cases are listed as potential reasons for denying tenure that could not be disclosed.

A member indicates that they can imagine situations where the Provost needs to override promotion and tenure decisions on substantive grounds. They further indicate that the Provost's Office should engage in a dialogue with the unit, rather than a final decision with no discussion.

A member indicates that reviews at the unit level need to be honest and accurate. They discuss the policy in their department. They try to make the decision unanimous, but if there are concerns raised, those should be reflected in writing. A member indicates that this unit has a good policy, however not all units have such policies.

A member offers insight into their unit's process. It is a larger unit that has multiple layers of review, including department and college level reviews. Further examples of unit reviews are shared.

A member indicates that this conversation is analogous to the clinical track in certain ways, and that each level needs a fair review process.

A member indicates that the differences across units in terms of review policy may be necessary. A member indicates that all cases need subject matter experts as reviewers. They suggest that requiring a supermajority opinion at the department level may be helpful.

A member indicates that having the Provost's Office making the final decision without an appeals process is the biggest issue. They further indicate that there is need for more transparency.

The Chair and Faculty Senate Office will coordinate with the AAAC to gain their perspective.

Action: Discussion

**11:00am: Adjournment**

Respectfully submitted,



FACULTY SENATE  
**SENATE ASSEMBLY**  
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Eric Vandenberghe  
Faculty Governance Coordinator  
Faculty Senate Office

1120 Ruthven Building  
1109 Geddes Avenue  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109