Governing Faculty Meeting Minutes

May 18, 2016

Michigan Rooms B-C, 2:30pm-4:00pm

In attendance: V. Larsen (ENG), J. Blumner (ENG), F. Svoboda (ENG), B. Veillet (PHL), E. Britt (ENG), J. Sanders (BIO), B. Rodda (PT), A. Yorke (PT), K. Schellenberg (MPA), S. Dean (THE), J. Schimer (ENG), A. Goldberg (PT), T. Nas (ECN), P. Nas (ECN), J. Kelts (CMB), J. Tischler (CMB), S. Drummond-Lewis (SOC/ANT/CRJ), A. Khal Smith (SOC/ANT/CRJ), C. Thomas (SOC/ANT/CRJ), H. Laube (SOC/ANT/CRJ), K. Litwin (SOC/ANT/CRJ), C. Tierman (PT), Min H. Huang (PT), K. Berg (PT), M. Craft-Blacksheare (NUR), V. Robinson (NUR), B. Kupferschmid (NUR), H. Wehbe-Alamah (NUR), M. Filter (NUR), S. Moreau (NUR), K. George (NUR), M. Vaziri (CSEP), R. Ganguly (CSEP), J. Alsup (CSEP), J. Olson (POL), J. Blackwood (PT), O. Aluko (CSEP), S. Parker (PHHS), C. Turkelson (NUR), D. Cooper (NUR), L. Knecht (NUR), B. Dabney (NUR), T. Wrobel (PSY), W. Mazumder (CSEP), F. Miskevich (BIO), L. Smith (PT), J. Creps (PT), G. Hristova (MUS), K. Hansen (MTH), M. Andrews (NUR), B. DiBlassio (MUS), B. McKibbin (PSY), J. Slater (BIO), R. Barnes (CAS), M. McGrath (PSY), K. Hollis-Etter (BIO), J. Broadbent (PSY), M. Keiser (NUR), J. Lawand (FOR), M. McFarland (NUR), S. Selig (PHHS), J. Song (CMB), M. Paroske (COM), S. Talley (PT), T. Hemphill (SOM), S. Myers (BIO), L. Han (MTH), T. Wasif (CMB), A. Lutzker (ECN), S. Newport (THE/DAN), D. Baird (AAH), B. Smith (SOC/ANT/CRJ), B. Alsalahen (PT), L. McLeman (MTH), S. Knight (ENG), K. Salvador (MUS), G. Gameda (AFS), C. Kenney (EDU), S. Lippert (CVA), K. Schilling (MTH), C. Douglas (ECN), S. Banerjee (SOM), E. Newberry (LIB), A. Dorfman (SEHS), C. Larson, C. Miller (SOM), M. Simkani (MTH) R. Alfaro (MTH)

The meeting was called to order at 2:40pm

Chris introduced Chancellor Borrego who addressed the faculty. She thanked the faculty for the opportunity to discuss the evaluations with them. She is disappointed if her leadership communicated disregard and is looking forward to better communication. Chancellor Borrego informed that the university is in good economical standing with a reserve of over 20 million dollars. She takes seriously any feedback that will improve an open dialogue in the future. She then addressed specific issues:

1. Transparency and communication has been seen as the main problems indicated by the evaluations. She has started lunches with several committees and open coffee meetings as a mean of informal communication. She asked faculty to suggest to her what mechanisms she needs to use to improve communication.

2. New administrative positions and reorganization of upper level administration have been made to address challenges she saw at her arrival at UM-Flint. Chancellor Borrego indicated that we had been admitting too many students that did not have the necessary academic skills or experience to succeed. She has asked to limit the numbers of such students to about 35 (matriculated) rather than around 300 (matriculating 80-100 normally) as was in the past. In addition, low retention rates and an extreme competition for recruiting were, in part, reasons for her creation of a Vice Chancellor for Student Enrollment. The increase in student housing and campus health and well-being called for a new position at the Associate (rather than Assistant) Vice Chancellor level. She indicated that the Provost wanted to move student success to student affairs. If we look at the cabinet positions she has, there is no net change from the previous administration. Chancellor Borrego also indicated that there is no hiring freeze. She also indicated that the resurfaced VC for Development position is needed in view of the current Capital Campaign.
The floor was open then for questions and comments from the faculty.

H. Wehbe-Alamah asked the chancellor about changes she instituted after viewing the results of her evaluation. Chancellor Borrego listed some initiatives including but not limited to meeting one on one with faculty and in small soup & bread meetings with small groups of faculty.

S. Selig asked how do we know the restructuring is a step in the right direction? Chancellor Borrego indicated that Development is easy to check by the amount of money coming in, as well as Enrollment Management by increase of student body. With regards to improvements in campus inclusion, she mentioned that we have great experiences, but also many problems for students that need to be addressed. We want depth and breadth of support to students, as well as a functioning Alumni Program. Chancellor Borrego indicated that Mary Joe Sekelsky saw improvement in Alumni functions as a challenge and accepted the shift of her position.

M. Vaziri indicated that DEEP issues with regards to enrollment have been pointed out to the administration in the past, without response. Chancellor Borrego indicated that she was informed that DEEP was seen as a community service, but the Dean and Provost can change the scope of the program if needed. She is concerned if our best professors are in a high school setting, and that conversations with Deans about the role of DEEP in enrollment goals (together with transfer and freshman) needs to take place.

Chancellor Borrego said that she made her decisions considering the role of administrators and faculty in the university. We need to talk about how we get appropriate resources appropriate and a fair distribution for different units, as well as addressing inconsistencies like GE vs Budget model. She also described the need for increased faculty support in the RTP process, identifying a 300,000 increase for faculty/student research and 9 TT lines added last budget cycle.

J. Lawand indicated that we have had, in the past, administrators in the positions that Chancellor is supporting, but now the faculty has been reduced in size. Administrators incentivized participation in DEEP by promising Lecturer III positions that would turn into tenure-track positions, but that has not occurred. Faculty has not been at the table in making decisions (DEEP, professional advising, etc.) Chancellor Borrego said would let Provost Knerr respond to advising issues. Data shows faculty and staff positions has had a steady increase. Money has been given to CAS for equipment and faculty lines. Conversations with the Provost need to take place on what things we need to stop doing and/or do different.

T. Wrobel thanked Susan for meeting with FC throughout the year, and invited her to come to every Governing Faculty meetings. He asked how she sees the role of faculty on the changes she has implemented? Chancellor Borrego indicated that some changes are going to upset some people. She understood that meeting with FC and groups other faculty was setting the groundwork for her decisions. She asked faculty to suggest to her ways in which the information is to be communicated. She cannot be the only communicator, and needs to be aided by the deans, Faculty Council and other Faculty Committees that advise her. It is their place to flow the information down. Chancellor Borrego said she tries to move quickly on her decisions, coordinating programs and providing resources. This has been her positive experience in her prior places of employment. We may have a blip in enrollment this year, but is a short term impact.

C. Douglas thanked the Chancellor for her attendance and comments.
Chancellor Borrego left the meeting.

**Minutes.** Chris asked for amendments to the minutes of April 4th, to be sent to him via email (he has already received several.) Chris mentioned that, in the future, we would like to circulate draft of meeting minutes soon after the meeting for faculty review. Changes would need to be submitted via email, so they can be incorporated in time for the next meeting. No objections to this process were made.

**Ad-Hoc Committee.** A Lutzker, Chair of the Ad-Hoc Committee, indicated that they have met twice. Their charge is to understand the evaluation of the Chancellor, analyze responses and make recommendations to improve communication and faculty-administration relationship. They have identified several sources for information: survey numbers data, CAC/BCP committee, Chancellor, people in search committees among others. They have also identified six areas of concerns on the Chancellor evaluations that they will use to frame their report.

H. Wehbe-Alamah asked if the committee was, in addition, going to focus on the positive aspects of the evaluation and chancellor’s performance. She indicated that a balanced and objective report is needed. Adam invite faculty to send concerns as well as points of grace.

T. Hemphill asked Adam to explain to the faculty the restrictions on access to the comments from the Chancellor Evaluation, and the possible conflict of interest of members of the ad-hoc committee who have seen the comments by being members of Faculty Council. Adam did not see a problem, inviting faculty to send comments directly to him. C. Douglas clarified that Ann Arbor Counsel sent him a binding opinion that according to our Faculty Code only members of the Faculty Council can have access to the comments and that cannot be extended to any ad-hoc committee or other faculty committee.

B. Smith asked why does the FC have access to the comments? to which H. Wehbe-Alamah responded that upon reviewing the feedback, FC met with the Chancellor, where she provided feedback and shared initiatives to address faculty concerns. FC then related this info to the faculty at a Governing Faculty meeting.

Faculty asked that, along with evaluations, a document should be sent with expectations of what we are evaluating, as well as description of the job of the administrator being evaluated. The ad-hoc committee was also asked to consider staff concerns, which impact the job of faculty.

C. Larson mentioned that CAC/BCP has discussed adding a job description as well as a statement from the chancellor on what she has accomplished as part of future evaluations. C. Schellenberg mentioned that the Chancellor’s comments focus primarily on students, including the role of faculty on student success; but we should also focus on faculty support for their own research and programs and careers. M. Vaziri indicated that too often faculty has been given incomplete or wrong information by the administration, particularly on budgets. He asked to tell the Chancellor to set the tone on communicating accurate information.

T. Wrobel mentioned that the Chancellor did not address his question on the involvement of faculty on her decisions. We, as faculty, need to tell her how she can incorporate our input. This should be part of the recommendations form the ad-hoc committee.

D. Baird asked about a timetable for the ad-hoc committee? Adam indicated they will try to have the report by early fall.
C. Thomas indicated that the deans have been marginalized from the decision making process and the Chancellor should consider putting them back. Adam indicated that the only person form Academic Affairs on the Chancellor’s Cabinet is the Provost.

J. Sanders asked the ad-hoc committee to include a feedback loop in the report. T. Hemphill indicated that the budget is becoming more centralized in contrast with the decentralized intent of the budget model. S. Banerjee said the committee will collect information form the deans in this issue.

S. Lippert requested the committee to ask the Chancellor what guidance is she providing to her leadership team on how to respond to faculty concerns.

**Announcements.**

C. Miller, from the GEC said they are reviewing the General Education and FYE programs. A call for faculty to serve in subcommittees to work during spring and summer will be coming shortly.

C. Douglass indicated that annual reports from some of the Faculty Committees are up on Blackboard, and asked those who have not completed them, to please send them to him ASAP.

Meeting **adjourned** at 4:00pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Ricardo Alfaro
Secretary Faculty Council