Faculty Council member H. Wehbe-Alamah called the meeting to order at approximately 10:10 a.m. in KIVA, UCEN.

There was not a quorum.

No comments were voiced about the draft minutes from the Governing Faculty meeting of February 14, 2014.

Discussion of motion re electronic voting and Code change: B. Bix presented the motion for the proposed Faculty Code change regarding the Governing Faculty voting process. He mentioned anecdotal information about faculty concerns re confidentiality. The proposed motion means that the Faculty Council Chair and Chair-Elect/Secretary would be charged with prioritizing the ballot. Also, if a substantive amendment to a proposal were proffered, the Chair would need to draw the appropriate conclusions for its presentation on the ballot. Bix’s personal view is that it is difficult to make governance by the whole faculty work because it is a large body of individuals. If a majority of the faculty vote in favor of the proposed Code change, then more responsibility will be placed on the Chair and the Chair-Elect/Secretary.

J. Tischler suggested an addition to the motion: that electronic balloting be administered by a third party, such as the Office of Research, and that the period of voting be one week in length. K. Moreland asked why the Office of Research was preferred, citing the Faculty Council’s administrative assistant support from the Provost’s Office (Jill Hubbard). K. Schilling echoed this sentiment, stating that Governing Faculty voting is administered through the Provost’s Office. Schilling also asked why a
period of one week was necessary for voting electronically. Tischler stated that certain
times in a semester are busier than others – finals week, for example. B. Kupferschmid
asked whether or not both sides of a matter would be presented in electronic voting
information. Bix responded that motions shall be accompanied by the Secretary’s
report, which would contain opinions pro and con. H. Wehbe-Alamah clarified that live
discussion of motions would be held at Governing Faculty meetings, as usual. Bix added
that a longer voting period has the potential of gaining more interest in the issue.

C. Thomas spoke in favor of a 5-day voting period, rather than a 2-day period. E.
Newberry asked how achieving a quorum would be handled? Bix responded that there
is no statement about a quorum in the motion because the ballot is distributed to all
governing faculty, which is as close to a quorum as possible. M. Vaziri mentioned that in
order to have full participation of the faculty, perhaps Faculty Council should investigate
the possibility of using technology similar to that of the cyberclassrooms. Q. Mazumder
stated that a two-week period for voting was a long time, adding that live participation
is good but faculty could participate from a location off-campus via a cyberclassroom
arrangement.

K. Schellenberg offered an observation: many students do not attend class meetings
because information is available to them on Blackboard. Are faculty becoming like
them? Vaziri blames the faculty for students not attending class. He further stated that
if Faculty Council assigns a certain time for a governing faculty meeting, then chairs and
deans are responsible for encouraging their faculty to attend the meeting. His observes
the absence of a quorum at numerous meetings.

Tischler voiced support for the voting process to be administered by the Provost’s Office,
the current practice. She noted that there seemed to be no consensus re the period of
time for faculty voting.

Bix re-read the motion. Tischler questioned how it would be determined that an
amendment substantive is enough to be included in a motion. Bix responded that it
would depend on the goodwill of the Chair.

D. Baird stated that procedural matters should be obvious: anything that changes, adds,
amends, etc. would require a vote. M. Murray-Wright submitted that for the proposed
process to work, detailed minutes must be taken at faculty meetings.

A. Price reminded those present that sometimes a quorum was not achieved for a
period of two years, delaying action on important matters. L. Koch stated that
electronic ballots would discourage faculty participation, and erode the governance.
H. Wehbe-Alamah voiced agreement with Koch.

Schellenberg remarked that an electronic ballot protects anonymity and confidentiality;
she further noted that no perfect solution exists.
H. Laube observed that when a divisive matter arises, the faculty hold open forums and more meetings so that a matter can be discussed extensively.

Baird suggested that faculty give evidence of reading motions before voting electronically.

Murray-Wright asked whether those present believed that all those not present were teaching at the moment or attending a professional conference.

Bix stated that he does not want to judge or exclude faculty who are committed to professional work of varying kinds at the time of governing faculty meetings, and therefore cannot attend them. He further noted that the university benefits by a diverse faculty, elevating the cosmopolitan nature of the institution.

Mazumder again spoke in favor of a shorter voting period. Vaziri countered that there is a benefit to having more days in a voting period, and asked the following questions: What is wrong with me meeting with my colleagues to discuss how to participate? (I don’t have this flexibility with such a short voting period.) Why are we concerned with number of days? We have a hard time even trying to meet? He concluded by noting that Faculty Council needs time to meet and develop the ballot, therefore, timelines should not be shortened.

Murray-Wright asked about the number of reminders re voting that would be sent to faculty.

**Discussion of the Michigan Transfer Agreement (MTA):** Jon Davidson, Director of Admissions presented information about the MTA. He clarified that Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies C. Waters and Assistant Director of Admissions L. Cruppenink were more involved in the MTA process than he, and they would be able to respond to aspects of the MTA to which he was not privy. The MTA was created by action of the State of Michigan legislature. The goal is to improve the transfer process for those moving from a community college to an institution that grants baccalaureate degrees. The MACRAO was plagued by many provisos and obstacles, hindering ease in the transfer process. The MTA is simpler. Davidson reviewed the MTA course requirements. He stated that UM-Flint must identify the courses in the UM-Flint general education curriculum that will be satisfied by the MTA. He referred to the one-page MTA/UM-Flint document, stating that C. Waters and others on campus had written it. Courses in the third set of bullets on the document are those that a transfer student would need to complete at UM-Flint. Davidson cautioned that there was no way that a set of MTA certified courses from a community college will match exactly the UM-Flint general education curriculum, or any other institution’s general education curriculum. MTA guidelines were completed in September 2013; Chancellor Person signed on in December 2013.
Laube asked how the MTA requirements differed from what is required at UM-flint. Davidson responded that one difference was that a second course in English composition (Eng 112) was not required by the MTA. Rather a student could take a course in communication and that qualifies as a course certified in the MTA. Therefore, a transfer student would not be required to take Eng 112 as part of the general education curriculum at UM-Flint. He added that this requirement was written specifically to accommodate MSU’s communication requirement in their general education curriculum. Another difference is in the area of fine arts. Many UM-Flint courses that satisfy the fine arts attribute are courses in studio art or performance. Cruppenink and Davidson examined what past transfer students brought to UM-Flint, there appears to be not much difference between the MTA and past practices. They considered 165 courses from Mott that transfer to UM-Flint – course that are not exact equivalencies, but transfer in as specific courses at UM-Flint according to the Transfer Equivalency Database. He noted that Mott Community College considers foreign language as humanities attribute, but that foreign language courses taken at MCC have not fulfilled the humanities attribute here. He said compromises must be made.

Schellenberg mentioned that there appeared to be other requirements that the MTA does not speak to regarding equivalencies in the UM-Flint general education curriculum.

Murray-Wright asked about the last two bulleted categories of the document – who decided how these were determined? Davidson answered that UM-Flint determined them. Murray-Wright asked whom, Waters and Cruppenink? Davidson responded that the document was presented to AAAC. Vaziri asked what happens if the faculty do not agree to this document. Davidson did not respond.

Wrobel explained that Waters, Davidson, and Cruppenink came to AAAC with the document. AAAC brought the document to Faculty Council, and Faculty Council sent it to the General Education Curriculum Committee. Wrobel added that Faculty Council and the GECC are are trying to figure out how to handle the matter, given that faculty control curriculum per the Regents’ By-Laws and the UM-Flint Faculty Code. Bix questioned whether or not it is an option for the faculty to say that the current general education requirements have to be fulfilled. Could Eng 112 be kept as a requirement? Davidson said that UM-Flint could decide that, but that it would move away from the MTA recommendations. He also said that UM-Flint retains the authority to say that none of UM-Flint courses accept those certified by the MTA. His opinion is that UM-Flint has a lot more to gain in attracting transfer students than it has by being strict in the interpretation of course equivalencies.

Tischler asked whether the 30 credits transferred in are transferred as department credits or as specific courses.
Davidson answered that all of the courses still will be evaluated individually. If they are equivalents, they will be transferred in as that.

F. Miskevich asked whether all 30 credits would be brought in to UM-Flint. Davidson responded affirmatively.

Davidson reiterated that the MTA agreement requires that UM-Flint transfer in 30 credits. In Mott’s case, 100% of the courses in the MTA are already transferable.

He stated that if there are concerns about how the MTA “plays out” in the long-term, changes could be made to the implementation. He predicted that perhaps 50 MTA transfer students would be appearing at UM-Flint during the next two years.

Moreland spoke on behalf of the GECC, noting that Davidson mentioned that the reason that the second course in English composition was not required was because of MSU’s inclusion on the committee that designed the MTA. Moreland’s concern is that UM-Flint was not in the group that designed the MTA and that the entire process was taken away from the faculty. “What fits MSU is what we end up with and this is unsettling to me. You (Davidson) mentioned that it is ambiguous as to what the role of the faculty is. It is not ambiguous to the faculty.”

Davidson responded, “If it is clear to you that faculty should be involved, then that is ok with me.”

Wehbe-Alamah reminded faculty that the matter was being investigated by Faculty Council and the GECC, and that both would report back to the faculty.

**LEAP Initiative:** J. Furman spoke on behalf of C. Waters re the LEAP initiative among Michigan’s 15 public 4-year institutions. There is a move to create LEAP states, with the goal of institutions creating a consortium. This initiative rests with the associate provosts among the 15 public institutions in Michigan. Each of the 15 public institutions is at a varying stage of the initiative. Some have decided to come into the consortium. Waters would like UM-Flint faculty to consider whether or not they wish to become part of the LEAP initiative. One desired outcome of LEAP is creation of a common voice with which to communicate ideas and concerns to the Michigan legislature; another outcome is to communicate with other LEAP states. At this moment in time, LEAP involves only 4-year institutions, however some 2-year institutions are interested. A concern might be what would be required of faculty, and the answer is “nothing” unless faculty wish to be involved. At present, there is no defined initiative; one will be identified.

Schellenberg indicated that “knowledge of human cultures” was included in the LEAP statement. She asserted that anthropology and sociology are the two disciplines that specialize in human culture, yet the Michigan state legislature does not recognize these two disciplines as having that expertise. Furman replied that the emphasis is at the level
of learning outcomes and education of our students. For example, how do we produce an educated citizenry? She remarked that, philosophically, Michigan is already a LEAP state. Further, she envisions that the fact that these two disciplines are not included in the social sciences, according to the state’s legislature, is a matter of import that would be addressed by LEAP in Michigan.

Thomas said that until the mid-1990s, sociology and anthropology were part of the social sciences. The Engler administration eliminated them.

F. Skarsten added that in the recording scheme for the state of Michigan these disciplines are in the social sciences, but in teacher education they are not.

Furman responded that this validates the need to collaborate as LEAP institutions because we have more authority as a group than as an institution.

Bix asked if the faculty could wait on deciding whether or not to join until the specific initiative is known.

S. Rosaen asked if the initiative was a collaborative one.

Furman responded that the assumption is one of collaboration.

F. Svoboda asked for an example of how other states have collaborated.

Furman cited the Massachusetts initiative.

**Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty Report:** J. Song presented the annual report of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, calling attention to five specific issues addressed in the report. These issues are given on page 2 of the report. (For the last two years, this CESF report has not been sent to Ann Arbor; rather, it has become an internal document.) Additionally, this year, the Committee conducted a review of the literature on the topics of the CESF report. The Provost suggested that the Committee should consider peer groups when considering costs associated with transitioning lecturer positions to tenure-track positions; the Committee considered peer groups, and that did not change the Committee’s conclusion. For several years, the recommendation to the Provost has been to hire more tenure track faculty and nothing is being done about it.

Of particular important to the Committee were the results of its retention of tenure-track faculty. Of the 94 tenure track faculty hired between 2000 and 2007, only 43 were tenured and still work at UM-Flint. 46 faculty left before their tenure was reviewed or granted.
Sanders observed that the situation has not changed for several years re the number of tenure track faculty. Should Faculty Council hold an extended discussion about this and ask the administration to address the problem?

Song responded that the Provost has been attending committee meetings since last April, knows the problems, but does not have a response to them.

Sanders noted that the CESF reports are thorough and consistent.

Song said that the CESF could work with Faculty Council; however, year after year the response from the administration is the same.

S. Johnson asked about transitioning lecturers into tenure track positions. Song responded that permission to do that is not given to faculty.

Thomas asked how UM-Flint’s tenure and retention rates compare to the campuses in Ann Arbor and Dearborn. Song answered that the Committee did not know.

D. Fry stated that this is an opportunity to request dialogue on the topic, adding that a formal request is likely to get a response.

Baird mentioned that Dearborn’s faculty became very frustrated because of its inability to get the Regents’ attention on the matter.

Schellenberg asked whether or not UM-Flint was unique re the amount of service required of faculty (heavy load).

Rosaen responded that an article published in The Chronicle of Higher Education indicates that faculty’s heavy load of service obligations is a national trend/condition.

B. Jones suggested that faculty consider that face that the literature on this topic is just emerging. The Regents are not too interested in addressing the problem because of the economic challenges that the university faces. Across the US, universities hire nontenure faculty to address teaching, which means that the tenured faculty must do the majority of service.

Sanders made the following motion: Per the 2014 report submitted to the Governing Faculty by the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, there exists a consistent and long-term problem retaining tenure track faculty, resulting in greater reliance on part-time LEO faculty. The University of Michigan-Flint is adversely affected by this condition. Therefore, the Governing Faculty of the University of Michigan-Flint requests that the administration take appropriate action, with quantifiable metrics, to remedy this state.
Murray-Wright seconded the motion.

**Other business:** Tischler reminded faculty that a revised proposal for a CENS was sent to faculty last week. Please read this proposal.

The meeting adjourned at 11:56 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Lois Alexander