Faculty Council Chair Vince Prygoski called the meeting to order at 10:06am in Room 111 of French Hall.

The minutes of February 14, 2014 and April 11, 2014 were approved.

V. Prygoski announced that two motions made at the April 11th Governing Faculty meeting passed; therefore, voting on the proposed CESN and Code change to Article 3, Section 4 (adding “r. Curriculum Coordination Committee”) would be conducted by electronic ballot.

Discussion of the College of Engineering and Natural Sciences proposal: J. Tischler, M. Kaufman, S. Myers, and S. Turner expressed thanks to the committees that reviewed the CESN proposal and wrote reports (AAAC, CAC/BSP, and Graduate Programs Committee). Tischler briefly summarized the rationale for the proposal: the faculty of four departments (BIO, CSEP, CMB, and ERS) voted to put forward the CESN proposal; faculty in these departments believes a separate college is the best way to serve students, create new programs, recruit and retain students, and move UMF forward; faculty in these departments concluded that a separate college would not harm CAS, rather, the remaining units left in CAS would have more budget surplus to invest in their initiatives; science departments are dependent upon other units for collaboration and they envision a strong science and technology education for students.
Tischler presented the motion for a College of Engineering and Natural Sciences to be created at the UM-Flint. Turner seconded motion.

J. Sanders voiced support for a separate college, but stated that long term problems need to be addressed. Specifically, a CENS needs to be well supported financially. He referred to his own budget analysis (circulated by email on April 25, 2014), showing the proposed CENS operating with a substantial deficit.

Turner countered that the budget was thoroughly checked for accuracy by C. Brownell, and he is confident that the budget numbers in the proposal are correct. F. Skarsten added that Brownell could clarify the budget, should that become necessary.

Interim CAS Dean A. Price mentioned that the CAS response to the CENS proposal was not included in the documents circulated for the faculty meeting. He stated that budgets are different from revenue and expenditure projections. Price said CAS was not consulted re the CESN proposal, and the budget numbers in the CAS response do not match those in the proposal. A. Lutzker noted that discussions about the proposed CENS budget included an added expenditure $800,000 necessary for the CENS’s establishment. Would that amount be transferred to the proposed CENS from central administration? Turner responded that the four departments asked for $800,000 in base budget funding. C. Douglass inquired further – if that amount is not transferred, does that mean that a CENS would go into deficit immediately? Turner responded that CENS proposers trust that administration will give the $800,000.

B. Bix responded that he had no doubt that the administration could find money for another dean. The question is whether the university spends money on a new dean or new faculty posts. Tischler said that the proposed college’s budget would address faculty posts. She also said that the university should be careful not to spend money on an associate dean who has no power. Turner drew attention to the fact that the proposal adds new faculty members to the university as a whole.

A. Aiyer mentioned that that CAS faculty voted in favor of the solution offered in the CAS response to the CENS proposal. He reminded faculty that they voted in support of a School of Nursing and the administration did not follow through on creating one. If faculty votes to approve a CENS, will administration follow through on that? Aiyer also asked about the projected enrollment growth. Turner responded that from 2003 to 2012, there was a 2% enrollment growth. There was a significant drop in some departments because the general education program affected that credit hour production. Re the vote on the CENS, Turner stated that the difference between the two proposals is the difference in the number of tenure track faculty.

Tischler pointed out that the vote in support of the CAS response was not a vote against a CESN.
H. Laube asked whether or not the projected growth was realistic. Turner answered that a CENS would develop 3-10 new programs. New programs are enrollment growth.

H. Wehbe-Alamah stated that faculty votes matter. Even though central administration did not move the faculty-approved SON forward, motions are not time bound. The SON is not over.

Douglas remarked that a political scientist was the Dean of LSA on the Ann Arbor campus, and several associate deans for various disciplines housed in that unit. Tischer countered that comparing UM-Flint to UM-Ann Arbor was not a suitable comparison. She asserted that LSA does not operate as CAS operates because it has a different structure.

Price explained that an associate dean for STEM was not perceived as a barrier to moving forward the STEM disciplines. He also mentioned that no one among the CENS proposes has talked about the attrition rate in those disciplines. One of the purposes of an associate dean would be to advocate for the sciences. He and CAS associate deans act as a group and create consensus. He added that faculty should make sure that this does not change after he leaves the dean’s position. He envisions that a STEM associate dean would meet with CAS Executive Committee, form community partnerships, and engage in outreach to industry. The advantage of an associate dean for STEM in CAS is that it would be more efficient way of moving STEM forward.

D. Fry said that program development can happen both in CAS or apart from CAS.

B. Smith, noting that the CENS budget is heavily dependent on fees, asked whether the CENS proposers have discussed what might happen if CENS were to become the largest college at UM-Flint. S. Myers said that he did not think that a CENS would become the largest. Tischler added that the fees proposed are not too high. Programs are expensive and consumable expenses great, but this is what modern programs cost.

G. Gemeda stated that new program development does not require a separate college. How does a separate college benefit students and how does it avoid some curriculum duplication? How is it possible to avoid this? Tischler said that CENS proposers understand the concern about curriculum duplication. It is not their intent to take general education courses away from other units.

K. Schellenberg asked how a new college would help the science faculty members’ professional careers. Tischler responded that a large part of budget is to provide funding for instrumentation and equipment. Almost all science faculty work involves undergraduates who assist faculty research. Base level funding in proposed budget brings the disciplines’ equipment/labs up to modern standards, and junior faculty would have more startup funding.
Q. Mazumder addressed enrollment growth. He said that UM-Flint is growing internationally, but does not engage in enough marketing. New college gives opportunity to market. Re program development, a new program was proposed last year, but CSEP could not implement it because the CAS Executive Committee and dean did not approve the required faculty post for the program. A separate college would give new posts for program development. Also a CENS would provide significant potential for grants, bringing in additional funds to college. The existing structure does not support this.

A faculty member who served on the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty noted that the CESF impressed on the Provost the need for more tenure track faculty and the Provost said that such funds were not available. Why should faculty voice their approval for something that has the assumption of money?

L. McLeman expressed concern for the faculty responsibilities in a smaller college – for example, given the committee structures required, where would faculty find time to carry out research and community engagement? How would junior faculty be protected? Tischler responded that CENS proposers considered a committee structure for the new college. Probably CENS would not need the number of committees currently in CAS. Also, a staff restructuring would be undertaken so that those positions would be used more efficiently.

E. Newberry, chair of the CAC/BSP, said that in CAC/BSP discussions about the CENS proposal, the idea of a $800,000 loan (to be paid back to central administration) was mentioned.

**Discussion of motion for Code Change (to add a Curriculum Coordination Committee):**

B. Bix introduced the motion (circulated by email on April 18). Instructional units would maintain autonomy over their curriculum – this motion does not change that. This committee would provide a mechanism to address duplication of curriculum and/or resources.

Mazumder asked why another curriculum committee was needed when the General Education Curriculum Committee already exists. Why cannot the GECC’s charge expand? GECC is a channel for approval of general education courses, so has oversight on what is being done. Bix responded that his experience is that the GECC has avoided the issue of whether or not actions are appropriate re general education courses. The idea of creating a separate committee highlights the issue. It is true that the GECC’s charge could expand, however, the GECC does more than approve courses for general education. Too extensive a charge might mean that some things drop by the wayside. The proposed Curriculum Coordination Committee would meet only when needed. McLeeman asked what the relationship between the two committees would be (GECC and CCC). Is it only after something has been duplicated that it would be brought to the
new committee? Bix responded that the CCC would “react.” K. Moreland asked “do you envision it dealing with course duplication that already exists.” Bix answered affirmatively – if someone brings the issue to the committee. He added that historical precedent should be considered. Aiyer offered that CAS has not duplicated any courses, but other schools have.

L. Knecht stated that she did not recall that the motion was about a reactive committee. Lutzker clarified. Curriculum coordination issues are broader than duplication. There are other issues that have arisen and not been discussed. G. Gemeda added that the GECC is limited to general education. There are other issues outside general education, and those matters should be investigated. Another way to look at the proposed CCC is to envision it as proactive, rather than only reactive.

Bix read the motion because the smart cart was not smart/working. He offered that, in practice, it is difficult for him to know how the proposed committee would seek out issues because faculty committees usually do not work that way. B. Smith maintained that the proposed CCC is a good idea because it provides a way to avoid course duplication and still keep the matter under faculty control, rather than taking the issue to an administrator.

D. Abubakar stated that the issue of duplication is that it not only does not help students, but also increases costs. D. Fry believes that such a committee is overkill. Course duplication matters could be added to the charge of AAAC, or Faculty Council could appoint a task force charged with looking at course duplication on a case by case basis – for a short duration of time.

S. Roach offered that expanding the charge of the GECC would overwhelm it. She added that the work being proposed for the new committee is something distinct and separate and added her support for the proposed committee.

Aiyer asserted that it is time for an examination of the general education program because there are so many approved courses.

H. Ozsoy said that he did not know much about the history of general education at UM-Flint. However, it was discouraging to discover that the decision-making process of the GECC was primarily a technical one.

Schellenberg said that “we’ve already made a big mess of things” re general education. Perhaps the slate should be wiped clean and a fresh start begun.

Bix reminded faculty that instructional units have the ability to create their own general education curricula. What is being proposed is a committee that will address issues of
units acting inappropriately or collaboratively. The Provost said that he would adjust the budgets of units, if such cases were to be found.

Several faculty members stated that the general education course attributes are so broadly defined that it is difficult to do anything but approve the requests that come to the GECC. If more specific definitions were developed, then the GECC might be able to make better decisions.

Moreland added although there seems to be faculty consensus re concern about course duplication, that is not one of the criteria that GECC is charged with considering. The GECC is preparing a survey to be sent out to faculty - should course duplication be in the purview of the GECC? Curriculum is decided by each of the four faculties. The GECC is an advisory step, but individual units decide which courses are considered to be part of their general education course offerings.

Other faculty members noted that departments/units are encouraged to develop general education courses via the budget model. How would the proposed CCC address this issue? Bix responded that that is exactly the point of the sentence that reads “The Committee shall seek to resolve issues by agreement among the instructional units involved and, if that fails, by asking the Provost to adjust budgets of instructional units in accordance with the Committee’s findings.” A faculty member asked for clarification – “So, the Provost incentivizes us to fight and then punishes us?” Bix responded “yes.”

F. Skarsten asked, “Doesn’t the chief academic officer have the authority to sign off on these?”

D. Baird further clarified that looking into the matter of course duplication has been an ongoing charge from the Provost, however there was no mechanism for doing so (prior to this motion). The consensus was that there was ownership of courses in certain areas of study, and the Provost would not reward certain other areas for duplicating courses.

D. Gordon suggested that the composition of the proposed committee is very important. He reviewed the history of the course in medical ethics.

Roach said, “we’re viewing the wrong proposal. We should not be reviewing the GECC charge nor the general education curriculum. We should review the charge for the proposed committee and consider how this mechanism could open the possibility to an important conversation on campus.”

S. Lippert agreed with Roach, adding that the outcome of such a committee could be positive. If the Provost tells the faculty that it needs this committee, then faculty should listen to his concern.
B. Jones warned that given the report of the CESF re the heavy service burden of faculty, it seems that one more committee might not be the answer.

Aiyer suggested that faculty should examine the definitions of general education areas. He added that a new committee would encounter the same problems as other committees, and that such an important committee cannot be relegated to one faculty member from each unit.

Abubakar offered that, from the previous comments, it is clear that the institution should be developing interdisciplinary programs and areas of study.

E. Collardey mentioned that accreditation requirements should be considered in the discussion of course duplication.

**Michigan Transfer Agreement (MTA):** K. Moreland introduced the topic, acknowledging that there existed a lot of concern among faculty about this agreement, signed by all 15 public institutions in Michigan. One concern was that lack of faculty involvement on UMFlint campus up to this point. When GECC was asked to review the MTA, it identified a couple of specific issues that might be problematic. Eng 112 – it is possible that an MTA transfer students would not have to take Eng 112. The other issue is that, under the MTA, what is equivalent to MTH 111 would fulfill the FQ requirement. However, UMFlint’s general education curriculum does not recognize MTH 111 as fulfilling the FQ requirement. What most faculty members have seen is the one-page draft document with “Michigan Transfer Agreement University of Michigan-Flint” at the top. A student who has met the MTA at Mott receives a block of 30 general education credit hours at UMFlint. As understood by the GECC, that provision does take some control of general education away from the faculty because those general education credits are defined by the community college “certifying” the MTA. In communications with Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies Christine Waters and Assistant Director of Admission Lee Cruppenink, GECC has been told that Mott’s students who complete MTA will be in compliance with UMFlint’s general education curriculum. Moreland knows that this is not 100% true. The GECC has not yet responded completely to Faculty Council’s charge re the MTA because it still is getting answers from those on campus who worked on the MTA.

Schellenberg asked about the percentage of community college students who transfer in 30 hours? Moreland responded that he does not have data necessary to answer that question. He said that “the powers that be” believe that a lot of students will have a chance to benefit from this agreement. Skarsten said that most transfer students enter UMFlint with sophomore status.

Prygoski announced to faculty that a majority of Faculty Council sent message to the Provost and also met with him, outlining concerns about the MTA and faculty control
over curriculum. The Provost acknowledged a breakdown in communication with faculty about the MTA.

Moreland stated that only this morning (April 25) did he discover that there had been communication on March 9, 2012 from Provost’s office to the GECC about the MTA. Since Moreland has been on the GECC, the topic of the MTA has not come up at all – until now.

Lutzker asked whether or not the faculty were free to adjust the MTA’s implementation at UMFlint.

Moreland responded that faculty could, but are somewhat limited. For example, Eng 112 could be required. He reiterated that general education approval rests with four individual units on campus.

Price reminded faculty that they could make adjustments to requirements for their majors.

J. Ellis spoke about how the MTA might bring about structural changes in departments/units because of dependence on general education course offerings (for faculty loads).

S. Bernstein questioned whether or not it is theoretically possible for a student to receive MTA 30-credit certification, but UMFlint maintain that the student has not met UMFlint’s general education requirements.

T. Wrobel responded that there are all sorts of unlikely things possible because community colleges determine which courses meet their requirements for the MTA.

B. Smith said that manipulating the MTA to UMFlint’s general education curriculum seems to be the wrong approach. The receiving university can decide which parts of the MTA are accepted as fulfilling requirements.

Bix encouraged the faculty to distinguish between the one-page draft titled “Michigan Transfer Agreement University of Michigan-Flint” and the actual MTA document. For example, the MTA document does not say that the MTA English requirement needs to be accepted as meeting UMFlint’s English general education requirement. Summarizing with, “As far as I can tell, our general education curriculum stands and no one has the authority to tell us that it doesn’t.”

Aiyer asked, “What do we do about the documents? We need to have a discussion about this.”
Moreland reiterated that the 30 hours transferred in to the receiving institution are 30 hours of general education. It might be difficult to add another course to the English requirement.

**Matters Arising:**

Roach called attention to the Faculty Code Standing Rules 6.d. and 6.e. The Faculty Council did not integrate the reports of AAAC, CAC/BSP, and Graduate Programs Committee and write recommendation about the CENS proposal. Instead, Faculty Council distributed each separate report from these committees. Faculty Council should have provided a synthesis of the three reports. Roach requested that more attention be given to this detail in future.

Baird asked Roach, “What would integration be to you? Because after 5 meetings on CENS, there was a decision to allow each report to go forward as is.”

Roach responded that Faculty Council should follow the Standing Rules and assume the responsibility for writing a synthesis. Perhaps a bulleted list of pros and cons would suffice. Each of the three committees examines the subject from a different perspective, but Faculty Council needs to help the governing faculty collectively understand the issues raised by each report. A report from Faculty Council should add another layer of understanding.

Aiyer requested that Faculty Council to check the list of eligible voters for ballots for accuracy. Mistakes were made re the last ballot that was sent out.

R. Richardson asked for clarification about a quorum.

Schilling responded that there is no quorum requirement for an electronic ballot.

The meeting adjourned at 12:01pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Lois Alexander