Faculty Council Past-Chair Ken Schilling called the meeting to order at 10:01am in Room 111 of French Hall.

There was a quorum.

K. Schilling encouraged faculty to read the Interest Survey for Standing Committees of the Faculty.

**Discuss and Vote on the School of Nursing proposal.** M. Andrews stated the following motion: The Nursing faculty proposes the creation of an independent School of Nursing at the University of Michigan-Flint.

The motion was seconded by S. Myers.
There was a motion by B. Bix to have the vote on the motion for a School of Nursing take place via electronic ballot. The motion was seconded. H. Wehbe-Alamah expressed concern that some faculty might not attend Governing Faculty meetings if voting occurred via electronic ballot. She said that a purpose of attending meetings was to hear various opinions about a matter and to participate in live dialogue. M. Vaziri encouraged electronic ballot for purposes of confidentiality. T. Hemphill suggested that a paper ballot be used for the proposed SON vote. H. Wehbe-Alamah stated that paper ballots had been prepared for the vote.

K. Schilling asked faculty to vote by a show of hands on the motion to vote electronically on the SON proposal. The motion failed.

The motion for a paper ballot was made, seconded, and approved by voice vote.

K. Moreland asked for clarification on the result of the vote to be taken re the SON proposal. K. Schilling explained that the faculty does not have the authority to create a School of Nursing; the administration (Provost and Chancellor) has that authority.

M. Andrews responded to a question raised by K. Moreland about competitiveness. She stated that a SON would allow for competitiveness in recruitment of students, faculty, and funding for research. M. Andrews also responded to a question about the number of governing faculty in Nursing and their respective ranks. J. Tischler asked for clarification about clinical faculty. M. Andrews answered that clinical faculty are those who have both academic backgrounds and practice in the discipline.

M. Vaziri mentioned that the budget model discouraged collaboration and encourages course duplication. He asked whether or not the proposed SON would teach its own general education courses, and hire faculty to do that. He further stated that SHPS was practicing course duplication of a course in ethics, which had been a CAS Philosophy Department course. M. Andrews promised no course duplication in the proposed SON. L. Knecht clarified the situation regarding the ethics course offered by Nursing for its students. She explained that the decision to house an ethics course in Nursing was a joint decision between Nursing and Philosophy faculty. The Nursing faculty requested online delivery of this course due to demand, however Philosophy was not prepared to deliver the course in that mode. Therefore, the joint agreement between Nursing and Philosophy was that Nursing would create its own ethics course.

B. Bix asked how the rest of SHPS viewed the SON proposal. D. Gordon stated that creation of a SON would not have a major negative effect on SHPS, due to the manner in which budgets are constructed and managed. He encouraged faculty not to make a judgment about the SON proposal based on SHPS Dean’s Office funding, but rather on what is best for students. He also stated that SHPS faculty are being encouraged to move in interdisciplinary ways (toward interprofessional collaboration), and the SON
proposal does not encourage that. H. Wehbe-Alamah stated that, based on a poll of Nursing faculty, the Nursing faculty expressed interest in interprofessional collaboration with SHPS faculty and with others on campus. D. Gordon asked how the SON proposal enhanced collaboration, and H. Wehbe-Alamah responded that the SON does not change it.

H. Laube asked why a School of Nursing was being requested, instead of two separate units within SHPS. C. Creech responded that such is not a common model, and is not consistent with nursing as a profession.

E. Freedman asked for reasons for the rationale that a SON would create a better nursing program for students. M Andrews answered that students perceive a difference, particularly at the graduate level, between a department and a school. She added that a new school would provide opportunities to attract the best students.

D. Fry stated that an alternate model was developed; however, that model was not for discussion at the present meeting. She stated that there was no governance mechanism for moving an alternative proposal forward because the Nursing faculty constitute a majority vote in SHPS. Alternatives cannot be moved forward in SHPS without the votes of the Nursing faculty. She also said that SHPS was a dysfunctional school.

D. Lair asked why a School of Nursing was more attractive to students. M. Murray-Wright explained that is matters particularly at the doctoral level. She mentioned that Michigan has the lowest number of doctorally-prepared nurses in the United States. A school would offer a higher level of sophistication. E. Newberry asked why a SON was being considered at this point in time and not in the future. M. Murray-Wright answered that research is the future and Michigan needs more doctorally-prepared students. Nursing students have a rich practical experience, but need more research experience. A “hybrid nurse” is desired. R Richardson added that a school would attract better faculty and gave an example of Nursing losing a scholarly faculty candidate to another institution.

S. Wandmacher inquired about whether a change in SHPS’ current name would serve the same purpose. M. Murray-Wright emphasized the need for autonomy in making decisions for Nursing; a school would allow for that.

D. Gordon stressed his respect for his colleagues in Nursing. He raised a concern that the Governing Faculty had been given limited information due to a Faculty Council decision preventing distribution of his response to the SON proposal. C. Creech responded that D. Gordon’s documents were distributed to Faculty Council, Graduate Programs Committee, AAAC, and CAC/BSP.
T. Williams stated that the Standing Rules do not require a vote of the unit from which a proposal comes. He objected to the fact that D. Gordon’s alternative proposal was not sent to the Governing Faculty.

E. Freedman expressed concern that the Governing Faculty did not have all the information available for making a good decision.

K. Schellenberg asked whether or not there was some kind of restraint on autonomy placed on the faculty in Nursing now. D. Gordon responded that it always was easier for a unit to do its own work. G. Gemeda asked on what grounds an alternative proposal to the SON was prevented from reaching the Governing Faculty. L. McLeman asked if the alternative was a formal proposal. D. Gordon replied that it was not, rather “an idea.” J. Furman said that there was no reason not to know the alternative idea. D. Gordon responded that it was not part of the agenda, adding that it was put forth as a compromise.

D. Fry drew a hierarchical diagram, on the meeting room’s chalkboard, of the alternative’s overarching structure:

```
  COLLEGE
     /   \
   SON    SHPS    UHNS    Shared Services
```

J. Haefner stated that the alternative was discussed and rejected by Nursing because the pathway for making decisions is the same as in the current structure; no structural changes are presented in this alternative, only name changes.

A question was raised about competition for funding. M. Andrews responded that granting agencies are discipline specific and the majority of health professionals are nurses; therefore, the majority of funding is given to nurses. She added that the notion
that Nursing is not going to collaborate well with others is erroneous because Nursing has collaborated with those inside and outside SHPS and would continue to collaborate in a School of Nursing.

Discussion was closed and the paper ballot was taken.

**Code Amendment regarding the Faculty Advisory Committee on University Outreach and Engagement.** K. Schilling read a motion made by J. Blumner to amend the Faculty Code. The motion was seconded by C. Waters, and approved by voice vote of the Governing Faculty. The approved amendment to the Faculty Code is as follows (amendment in bold):

*The Faculty Advisory Committee on University Outreach and Engagement*

The Faculty Advisory Committee on University Outreach and Engagement shall consist of five faculty members serving three year, rotating terms and includes at least one member from each instructional unit and one student member. The Director of University Outreach **and the Director of the Thompson Center for Learning and Teaching are ex officio members** of the committee.

The committee charge is to monitor the effectiveness of University Outreach’s programs as aligned with Outreach’s purpose and values. Thus, the committee is responsible for reviewing and maintaining the quality of programming built upon public scholarship, community engagement, and mutually beneficial partnerships between the university and its larger community. The committee evaluates applications and awards the annual Freeman and Saab service scholarships to students. Also, the committee provides a blind, peer-reviewed selection process to choose the participants for the annual Boyer Faculty Scholars Program.

**General Education Curriculum Committee Update.** K. Moreland encouraged faculty to send comments about the General Education Curriculum to the Committee because a survey is being constructed as part of a charge to review the General Education Curriculum. The General Education Curriculum Committee is charged with the review; the review includes a review of data collected, observations by the Committee, and a survey of the faculty. S. Seilig added that the Committee’s goal was to complete the review by the end of this academic year. F. Svoboda instructed faculty to send their comments to K. Moreland. V. Lotfi noted that when the Higher Learning Commission visited UM-Flint, it expressed concern that General Education was not assessed as a program (in its entirety). Therefore, UM-Flint must not neglect this component of its accreditation responsibilities. S. Gano-Phillips stated that data was being collected according to Learning Outcomes.
Initial Discussion of the Proposal for a College of Science and Engineering. S. Turner, S. Myers, J. Tischler, and M. Kaufman presented a summary rationale for the CSE proposal, which included: nation-wide calls for STEM education, state-wide calls for STEM education, and a strategic imperative. A CSE would result in greater enrollment and greater number of grants. Also stated was the opportunity to better serve students. M. Kaufman noted that increasingly deans are involved in the search and application processes for grants; a CSE dean would possess a science background and be able to participate fully in the process of seeking funding.

T. Hemphill asked why Math was not included in proposal. S. Turner replied that CSE proposers met with a representative from Math and received a clear “not interested” message. Subsequently, S. Turner and V. Lotfi presented the idea of a CSE to Math and again received a “not interested” message. However, Math would be “allowed” at a later date, if Math chooses to join CSE.

J. Furman asked whether or not this was a coherent collection of interdisciplinary subjects without Math. J. Tischler replied that it is necessary for the lab sciences to work with Math and that fact would not change. S. Turner added that sometimes Math is in a college similar to the proposed CSE and sometimes it is not.

R. Barnett expressed concern that no one from the proposed CSE has approached SEHS math faculty. J. Tischler recognized that the proposed CSE would need collaboration with SEHS. R. Barnett followed up with reminder that the proposed new school would affect programs in SEHS.

A question was raised about how a CSE would encourage collaboration. M. Kaufman responded that there is always a need for collaboration.

R. Alfaro said that it was not true that Math was not interested in the proposal. He added that there were two ways to look at the proposal: 1) as a response to problems in CAS or 2) as part of the Strategic Plan. Also, R. Alfaro mentioned was that Math was given eight days to respond to an invitation to join the proposed CSE. He concluded by saying that Math will not be rushed into making a decision.

The discussion was closed and the meeting adjourned at noon.

Respectfully submitted,

Lois Alexander