The meeting was called to order at: 9:02am

1. **Minutes**: The minutes of the March 30, 2017 meeting were approved as amended.

2. **Proposal 1: Changes to the Administrators Survey procedures.**

   R. Alfaro began the discussion on the proposal by explaining methods and procedures used by Ann Arbor and Dearborn. Following this model would streamline the process.

   J. Sanders asked if Faculty Council thought they had enough time to review comments this time. R. Alfaro indicated that FC had two 30 minute special sessions to read the comments. C. Douglass commented that Faculty Council didn’t think anything was actionable on the comments. S. Lippert did not think they had fully discussed the comments and if there was anything concerning with them.

   S. Roach commented that the proposed method was problematic. With faculty evaluations, others get to see those, why do others not get to see administrator comments. Would like accountability and patterns to be recognized by others. Faculty have to be responsible and accountable to those comments. She indicated she is against
the idea that comments would only go toward the person being evaluated. C. Miller agreed with S. Roach.

J. Sanders asked why administrator comments are not available to a variety of people.

S. Lippert commented on issues with credibility due to incident last year. Results not deemed credible by Ann Arbor. We have concerns that there aren’t as robust measures to evaluate faculty if we eliminate comments.

H. Laube questioned why comments aren’t useful. Comments tell us more than just numbers.

S. Selig commented the intent of comments is to provide feedback to those being evaluated. The other person who should have access would be the person for whom that administrator reports.

M. Paroske commented that either way this seemingly makes the comments useless.

S. Selig commented that nothing should keep Faculty Council from requesting a meeting with an administrator that has received negative scores.

A. Lutzker commented Faculty Council should have the comments. That information would help to have better conversations with administrators. We shouldn’t change based on one bad experience.

C. Douglas commented that the president made it clear that our policy has lost credibility.

H. Laube asked why would our policy lose credibility due to one bad experience. S. Selig commented that our policy does not ensure confidentiality.

3. Proposition 2: Changes to the Faculty Grievance

R. Alfaro began the conversation. R. Alfaro and C. Douglass met with B. Manning who consulted with legal counsel in Ann Arbor.

Typos in the document were presented and fixed. There was no need for a motion to fix typos and they were changed.

C. Douglas stated this proposal was brought to FC by the faculty grievance committee claiming faculty grievance procedures in the faculty code was ambiguous. Things were getting kicked back between units and university and things were not getting resolved. Faculty grievance committee suggested following the SACUA model adopted by Ann Arbor and Dearborn. This would provide one process for all units.

R. Alfaro commented that CAS supports this model.
S. Lippert stated ambiguity a problem in grievance. People get stuck in ambiguity and sometimes there is no resolution. Suggests using a tried and true method.

R. Alfaro put up a flowchart to summarize the new procedure.

The new Faculty grievance panel of 12 members would take over FGC with 2 years rotating terms, form which the boards are formed. Board determines grievability.

J. Sanders, as a way to deal with issues of ambiguity, moved that the proposal be amended to include principles of due process as stated in the report of the Office of Institutional Equity, Procedures and Conduct. S. Lippert seconded the motion. It was proposed that a link to the document would be inserted in the proposal.

D. Lair asked if report adopted by SACUA was used by Ann Arbor or Dearborn.

Motion to add the reference for the Report on the Office of Institutional Equity Procedures and Conduct was voted on and passed

C. Creech asked what if the grievance has legal implications. Faculty Council would talk to HR if there were legal issues.

C. Thomas asked if the decision or recommendation be final. R. Alfaro commented there would be actions to take and that either side could appeal.

4. **Announcements:** FC Reports on Ad-Hoc Committee Recommendations, Guidelines for Searches for Administrative Appointments, FG Task Force meetings and AAUP announcements.

R. Alfaro reported that Faculty Council report on Ad-Hoc Committee recommendations was distributed, and that conversation with administration on those issues is a work in progress.

R. Alfaro reported on guidelines for search committees regarding administrative appointments presented by AAAC. He asked faculty to send him additional comments on these guidelines in the next two weeks, as FC would be taking them to the Provost and Chancellor.

J. Sanders commented that an email would be coming out to faculty from AAUP sharing the new website containing readings and policy documents as well as a report on the status of government at UM-Flint. There will be a government professional development summit in June.
5. **Strategic Plan Priorities**

Provost and Chancellor gave a few words on the Strategic Plan Priorities.

Chancellor Borrego thanked H. Wehbe-Alamah and the committee for all the work they did. They were charged to be as broad and as inclusive as possible.

Provost Knerr recognized members of the steering committee. D. Knerr commented this was the most organic, transparent, and inclusive strategic planning process he has seen. What goes on next? Move forward with accountability. Include broad participation across campus.

H. Wehbe-Alamah presented a video that highlights the Strategic Planning Steering Committee process.

Five representatives presented the five high-level priorities of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee.

H. Wehbe-Alamah stated that the Steering Committee has fulfilled its charge to identify four to six high-level priorities to guide the university for next 5 years. The Governing Faculty members of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee move that Governing Faculty adopt priorities and supporting information.

Discussion on the motion.

C. Miller asked to hear information from outside of a faculty impression.

Provost D. Knerr talked about what happens next. The framework is the same moving forward. What groups continue to work on this? We will proceed with Governing Faculty groups, students, admin to work on this moving forward. The Provost will consult over the summer with groups to begin next steps.

R. Alfaro asked if the steering committee was dissolved. D. Knerr stated members of the Steering Committee will remain involved. Do not want to commit any person at this moment if they have other obligations.

A. Lutzker asked if there will be an implementation committee? Chancellor Borrego sees smaller teams to organize around goals, which would include people from the Steering Committee along with units. Use CAC/BSP for oversight and check-in and tracking of the process.

S. Rosaen stated she was worried about a clear plan for next steps. Work is already happening that might inform some of these priorities. How do we capture work that is already being done that can inform this so many committees aren’t working on the same thing? S. Borrego stated that this process has already began to avoid duplication
of efforts. That was why the steering committee met with so many people. H. Wehbe-Alamah commented that there will be ongoing consultation with groups across campus.

C. Thomas asked how would we measure the success of this plan in the future. H. Wehbe-Alamah answered that this would be taken care of during implementation. The motion was voted on and the motion passed.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30am.

Respectfully submitted,

Mickey Doyle