

My comments today express my personal views, but also those that I believe align with the views of the American Association of University Professors. The AAUP is America's foremost institution for protecting the principles of academic freedom and shared governance, and in 2021, I was part of a group that revived the local chapter here in Ann Arbor.

The composition of today's Faculty Senate is largely an accident of history: At the time when the University of Michigan's current bylaws about the Faculty Senate's membership were codified several decades ago, we didn't have the proliferation of instructional tracks that we do today. There didn't seem to be categories for "clinical faculty" or "lecturers," for example. But, the explicit mention of research-track faculty and librarians in the definition of the Faculty Senate even then suggests that the intention was to include anyone who engaged in scholarship or teaching, very broadly defined.

In any case, to the extent that the purpose of the Faculty Senate is to enable shared governance and to defend academic freedom, it makes sense for our Senate to include *everyone* who is engaged in the core mission of the university. Academic freedom should be available to *all* instructors, not just tenure-track faculty. Governance of the university should involve *all* who invest in the core mission of the university through scholarship and instruction. Thus, many of our peer institutions have analogous bodies that already include clinical faculty and lecturers. The reason why we don't, is again, just an accident of history.

With respect to the specific amendment to include lecturers, we absolutely should consider lecturers while we're considering clinical faculty. Though some suggest that lecturers are represented through the LEO union, and therefore don't need representation on the Faculty Senate, unions serve different, if overlapping, purposes with shared governance. The university administration need not entertain topics outside of compensation, benefits, and working conditions with unions, for example, even though faculty concerns about the university range more widely. LEO members themselves want representation in the Faculty Senate for that reason. One day, we may have our own tenure-track faculty union here. Should we then exit the Faculty Senate at that point? That wouldn't make sense. The AAUP notes that the vast majority of universities with faculty unions *also* retain their faculty governance bodies, and that shared governance works best when the two work together.

In any case, both clinical faculty and lecturers are our colleagues. Even as they share our academic goals, they typically undertake a greater share of teaching and practice so that those of us with the privilege of tenure can focus more of our time on research and scholarship. I hope you'll agree that we should welcome them into the Faculty Senate, so that their voices can join with ours as we together press to ensure strong academic values and shared governance at the University of Michigan. Thank you.

Kentaro Toyama

W K Kellogg Professor of Community Information and Professor of Information
School of Information