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SECTION 1: GTF RECOMMENDATION

Part I: Cover Letter from the GTF:

To: The UM-Flint Governing Faculty, Faculty Council, UM-Flint Executive Officers, SACUA, Senate Assembly, members of the Board of Regents, and President Mark Schlissel

Please find here a proposal from the GTF as it pertains to UM-Flint’s governance structure, Faculty Code, and other recommendations. Although our reasons vary, GTF members are in unanimous agreement that the UM-Flint governing faculty should adopt a faculty senate model of campus-wide governance, to include a structure that mirrors that of the University of Michigan, being comprised of a Senate Advisory Committee (UM-Flint /SAC), a UM-Flint Assembly, and a UM-Flint Senate. We are also in unanimous agreement that the new structure (which modifies 2 existing governance bodies at UM-Flint and adds a new third body) should be derived through the authority of the University Senate (through action of the Senate Assembly). The transformation of UM-Flint governance to the proposed structure is consistent with best practices in governance and higher education, where a senate is the most common form of faculty governance, and in many ways is an imperative, practically, ethically, and for growth. UM-Flint is about to seek re-accreditation from the HLC, and has reached a point in its mission that campus-wide governance stands to play a foundational role in its success and future as a campus.

A number of circumstances led to the development of this report and the GTF’s motion, which was not without challenges. The possible adoption of a new governance structure, however common that structure might be in higher education, requires informed and engaged action on the part of UM-Flint faculty and a willingness to recognize current obstacles in the campus’s potential. Faculty action is needed to carefully consider and understand the report, to vote, and if implemented to support the proposed structure. GTF members have unanimously endorsed this structure because the proposed model objectively best matches a governance structure at UM-Flint to the governance standards articulated in U of M policies applicable to our campus, and because it best addresses the challenges created for faculty and administrators by the current system, to include: the question of proportional representation; confusion over the roles of the faculty, administrators and the Regents in shared governance; and, a need for greater accountability and transparency both between the faculty and their elected representatives, and between the faculty and the administration. There are many interests that could impact both the reception and success of this proposal. We invite UM-Flint faculty to share the GTF’s vision for how faculty can shape the campus’s success. UM-Flint has room to grow, in terms of the strength of its governance and how it can ensure the highest academic quality, as well as recruitment and retention of students, faculty, staff, and administrators, and the campus’s standing within U of M and higher education.

Should any department, school/college, committee wish to have GTF delegates appear to discuss the proposal please contact Provost Knerr’s staff to schedule a visit of GTF delegates to your group. Individual faculty and informal groups who wish to consult with GTF members should contact the GTF chair.

Respectfully submitted by the Governance Task Force
Part II: Executive Summary

a) GTF Objectives:

The GTF was convened by joint effort of FC and the Provost Knerr as articulated in the GTF’s charge,\(^1\) as well as in the motion approved by UM-Flint governing faculty (Table 1).\(^2\) Tasks included research of governance best practices and structures including a senate, consultation of the faculty regarding governance concerns, and an overall revision of the faculty code. To address all areas the GTF concentrated on the following: the authority and standing of Flint campus-wide governance within U of M, compliance in areas of governance with accrediting bodies and U of M, clarifying roles of faculty and administrators within shared governance, coming to a research-based conclusion regarding which governance structure would best serve UM-Flint, aligning UM-Flint governance with the campus’s goals and mission, clarifying governance policies and standards within U of M that are applicable to UM-Flint, and providing the legislation needed for the faculty

\(^1\) GTF Charge approved by Faculty Council in consultation with Provost Knerr in March 2017:

\(^2\) Table 1: March 2017 Motion approved by the UM-Flint Governing Faculty:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73.91%</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26.09%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to act on GTF recommendations. The new structure would heighten accountability, transparency, and cohesion between faculty, and between faculty and executive officers. This would be achieved by creating a UM-Flint Senate Assembly with an executive committee and a University of Michigan-Flint Senate. Faculty standing committees would exist as committees of the UM-Flint Assembly, which would be created through the authority of the U of M Senate Assembly; the UM-Flint Assembly would have the authority to make decisions regarding more than one unit (college/school) or the Flint campus as a whole.

Revision to the Faculty Code includes a compilation of governance policies applicable to Flint in Guiding Principles (comparable to the function of the Principles of Faculty Involvement in Institutional and Academic Unit Governance at the University of Michigan), best practices for campus-wide standing committees, alignment of the Code with Regents Bylaws, and code revision to Article 3 to create and initiate the proposed governance structure. Additional recommendations not represented in code revision have also be included, along with an implementation plan that articulates how to transition from the current to new structure pending approval by the faculty, so that the new structure could take effect Sept. 1, 2018.

Lastly, the campus’s values and ethics regarding governance need to be imminently well articulated for the upcoming HLC re-accreditation. A governance structure that reflects best practices (such as a senate model, proportional representation, and checks and balances of power) could support re-accreditation, the campus’s welfare, and UM-Flint’s standing within U of M. For more on selected sources in GTF research see Appendix 7.

b) Motions of the GTF for the UM-Flint Governing Faculty:

Based on this work, the GTF makes the following motions:

Resolved, that the governing faculty of the University of Michigan-Flint:

1) Endorse the recognition of campus-wide governance at UM-Flint as a subsidiary branch of the University of Michigan Senate Assembly.

2) Endorse the establishment of a University of Michigan Senate Assembly (hereafter UM-Flint Assembly) with an executive committee (University of Michigan-Flint Senate Advisory Committee hereafter UM-Flint /SAC), a University of Michigan-Flint Senate (hereafter UM-Flint Senate) and standing committees with the authority to make decisions regarding more than one unit (college/school) or the Flint campus as a whole through proposed code change (see 16-49 of this document).

3) Endorse the proposed implementation plan, articulating how to transition from the current to the new structure (see pp. 11-12).

4) Endorse the proposed list of further recommendations for consideration by the new UM Flint Senate Assembly once it is formed

Part III) GTF Origins and Methodology:

The GTF was created to look at campus-wide governance at UM-Flint. Provost Knerr introduced his plan for a governance task force in August 2016 while FC identified that year that it would be helpful if the Faculty Code was revised to be adaptable to unit changes. In March of 2017, some faculty expressed at a governing faculty meeting an interest in code revision, as well as consideration of proportional representation. Seventy-four percent of voters supported a measure related to code (Table 1: Mar. 2017 Motion), which listed consideration of a senate model as the primary justification. In fall 2016, the Senate Assembly created the Tri-Campus Task Force (TCTF) to address how U of M’s 3 campuses might work more cohesively. It identified that UM-Flint’s current governance structure (which has been in place for roughly 25 years) had never been approved or recognized by the Board of Regents.

The GTF’s charge was a document approved by vote of FC in Mar. 2016. Code revision, investigation of best practices and structures in governance, and consultation of faculty on governance concerns were at the forefront (see Appendix 4). The GTF hosted two fora on faculty concerns in May 2017. It became clear that to make recommendations the GTF needed to first
articulate how governance at UM-Flint should align with the campus’s mission and goals, how it should function within U of M, and how its structure and policies (Faculty Code) should reflect the ethos, values, and standards of governance that UM-Flint is both required to have as a part of U of M, and to which its faculty and leaders aspire. So, the GTF compiled governance policies and values applicable to UM-Flint, recommended a new structure, and revised the Faculty Code and devised an implementation plan to meet the GTF’s recommendations. Recommendations for future consideration were also articulated.

Updates on GTF work were provided to FC between Apr. and Dec. 2017. At each visit FC was informed about the scope and nature of the GTF’s recommendations. Additionally, Provost Knerr, Chancellor Borrego, and the faculty (at the two fora held in Sept. and Oct.) were updated. Along with faculty and FC, consultation with the TCTF, SACUA, and UM-Flint executive officers informed the work.

Code revision on structure was adapted from the University Faculty Senate Rules [or policies]3 and the Regents Bylaws.4 Because the proposed structure would be created through the University Senate’s authority (via its Senate Assembly), it is imperative that UM-Flint’s policies be consistent in language, format, and the nature of policies as compared to Regents Bylaws and University Faculty Senate Rules. By adapting institutionally approved policies, the code language could be revised with little concern for conflict or ambiguity. Where the GTF recommended deviating from U of M policies, this was to preserve elements of current governance that might be preferred by UM-Flint faculty and did not conflict with institutional governance policies or undermine best practices.

The Guiding Principles is a collection of policies that apply to UM-Flint. These clarify application of U of M policies at UM-Flint and the comparative roles of faculty, administrators, and Regents in shared governance.

Part IV) Motion 1: Establishing Authority through the University Senate (via the Senate Assembly)

MOTION 1: Resolved, that the governing faculty of the University of Michigan-Flint endorse the recognition of campus-wide governance at UM-Flint as a subsidiary branch of the University of Michigan Senate Assembly.

UM-Flint is the only campus of three that does not use a senate assembly. The fact that UM-Flint is an outlier is not justification in and of itself to dispense with a possibly well functioning system, but adopting a structure that more recognizably parallels that of U of M would make it easier for the campuses to speak the same governance language. The place of the current system of campus-wide governance at UM-Flint within the wider university system is problematic and the source of its authority is unclear. Although the Regents Bylaws establish the existence of a chancellor, schools, colleges, advisory committees, and their executive committees, at UM-Flint the existence of a campus-wide governance structure (including FC) is unrecognized in the Regents Bylaws and thus lacks the associated status, powers and protections of Regental recognition.5

In contrast, the Regents Bylaws establish the university-wide University Senate (and its elected Senate Assembly) as the faculty’s legislative arm with broad powers to consider any subject regarding the university and to make direct recommendations to the Regents. The Regents endow the University Senate with authority over matters affecting university policy as a whole, as well as

---

5 The Regents Bylaws explicitly recognize the following at the Flint campus: the Chancellor; CAS, SHPS, SEHS and SOM; the executive committees of CAS, SOM, SEHS and SN; the Citizens’ Advisory Committee; Regents Bylaws, Secs. 2.03, 11.01-11.215, 6.02.
academic policies that impact more than one college or school. Its decisions are regarded as the
binding action of the university faculties.6

Like the Regents Bylaws, neither the U of M Faculty Handbook nor the University Faculty
Senate Rules formally recognize the existence of campus-wide governance at UM-Flint. This
relationship is further complicated because of the overlap between the presumed authority of UM-
Flint’s FC and the recognized authority of the University Senate and the Senate Assembly.

Through consultation with the TCTF and SACUA, the GTF investigated the best way to
legitimize UM-Flint’s campus governance within the broader U of M system, to establish the
source of authority for UM-Flint governance, and clarify its relationship to the university system, of
which it is an integral part. Based on this consultation and investigation, the GTF recommends that
UM-Flint governing faculty formally ask that its institutions of campus-wide governance be
recognized as a subsidiary branch of the Senate Assembly.

With the endorsement of the UM-Flint governing faculty, Flint’s representatives to the
Senate Assembly (standing in the assembly is normally needed to bring forward a motion) would
ask the Senate Assembly to create the UM-Flint Assembly. Once the motion is approved by the
Senate Assembly it becomes policy within U of M, necessitating that the motion be accompanied
by Faculty Code revisions to create the new structure. Like Dearborn, to ensure institution-wide
representation, the U of M Senate and Senate Assembly would retain its Flint representatives as
mandated by the Regents Bylaws and University Faculty Senate Rules. For more information about
the differences between a board and an assembly and UM-Flint’s past and current governance
models see Appendix 2.

Part V) Establish a Campus-Wide Governance Structure through a UM-Flint Assembly

MOTION 2: Resolved, that the governing faculty of the University of Michigan-Flint endorse
the establishment of a University of Michigan Senate Assembly (hereafter UM-Flint Assembly)
with an executive committee (University of Michigan-Flint Senate Advisory Committee hereafter
UM-Flint/SAC), a University of Michigan-Flint Senate (hereafter UM-Flint Senate) and
standing committees with the authority to make decisions regarding more than one unit
(college/school) or the Flint campus as a whole through proposed code change herein [see pp.
16-49 of this document].

There are two main models of governance in parliamentary procedure that are practiced in faculty
governance: a board and an assembly. We have a board (FC), but the GTF proposes adopting an
assembly with proportional representation. By shifting proportional representation out of the
committees and into an assembly, more equitable representation may be had for all units. Moreover,
this eliminates the need for proportional representation in the committees. The GTF is proposing
the adoption of a model that balances minimum representation with seats by proportion. For more
information about the recommendation for proportional representation see Appendix 3, and for
more about resources for a UM-Flint Assembly see Appendix 5. For excerpts on the history of
governance at UM-Flint see Appendix 6.

Proposed Governance Structure Composition, Authority, and Duties:

a) UM-Flint Senate:
   ➢ Delegates its authority to the UM-Flint Assembly but retains the right to overturn the latter.

6 “The senate is authorized to consider any subject pertaining to the interests of the university, and
to make recommendations to the Board of Regents in regard thereto. Decisions of the University
Senate with respect to matters within its jurisdiction shall constitute the binding action of the
university faculties. Jurisdiction over academic policies shall reside in the faculties of the various
schools and colleges, but insofar as actions by the several faculties affect university policy as a
whole, or schools and colleges other than the one in which they originate, they shall be brought
before the University Senate.” Regents Bylaws, Sec. 4.01.
Has sole authority to approve changes to the UM-Flint Faculty Code and Standing Rules.
Votes on decisions explicitly not delegated to the UM-Flint Assembly in the Faculty Code.
Votes on UM-Flint Assembly membership.
Votes on Standing Committee membership.
Meets minimally twice a year.
Is convened/led by the UM-Flint /SAC and its officers.
Formerly the UM-Flint governing faculty.

b) UM-Flint Assembly:
- Is a branch of the U of M Senate with authority to make faculty governance decisions for the Flint campus.
- Considers proposals on all matters of interest to the UM-Flint Senate (governing faculty).
- Is the site of most voting and decision-making for campus-wide matters on educational policy.
- Ensures accountability and transparency in all matters under its purview and consideration.
- Meets minimally once a month.
- Elected proportionately by the UM-Flint Senate.
- Elects the UM-Flint/SAC and its internal positions and has the authority to appoint/convene ad hoc committees and task forces as needed.
- Works within its purview to strengthen communication and shared governance between the faculty and the administration.

Total seats in proposed model (the total seats would change as the size or number of units change, but without having to adjust the code for each change): currently 36 seats (19 needed for a quorum). See Table 2 (below) for seats per unit. Total seats: 36 (but will change automatically if the number of UM-Flint Senators or units change).

c) UM-Flint/SAC:
- Leads the business and meetings of the UM-Flint Assembly and UM-Flint Senate.
- Oversees the UM-Flint Assembly standing committees.
- May propose the establishment of ad hoc committees or task forces to the UM-Flint Assembly.
- Presents its own proposals and those of the standing committees to the UM-Flint Assembly or UM-Flint Senate.
- Works within its purview to strengthen communication and shared governance between the faculty, governance structures, and the administration.
- Meets minimally twice a month during the 9 month academic year.

*Note: Faculty governance bodies on the Ann Arbor, Dearborn and Flint campuses are all equally subject to the University Senate’s authority, in which all Ann Arbor, Flint and Dearborn governing faculty are members. Although rarely if ever exercised, the University Senate may overturn any decision of a governance body on any of the three campuses.
d) Table 2: Proportional Distribution of Seats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit/group</th>
<th># of UM-Flint Senators</th>
<th>Seats formula: (\text{Int}((\text{UM-Flint Senators} \times 0.066))+3) rounded down to nearest whole #)</th>
<th>Total seats per unit/group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>(177 \times 0.066 = 11.682 ) or 11+3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3 (less than 15 faculty)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEHS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(20 \times 0.066 = 1.32 ) or 1+3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHPS</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(34 \times 0.066 = 2.244 = 2+3)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(33 \times 0.066 = 2.178 ) = 2+3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SON</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(33 \times 0.066 = 2.178 ) = 2+3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part VI) Implementation Plan and Timeline for Adopting the Proposed Governance Structure

**MOTION 3:** Resolved, that the governing faculty of the University of Michigan-Flint endorse the proposed implementation plan, articulating how to transition from the current to the new structure.

1) In the early to mid Winter 2018 semester, the faculty will consider for vote by electronic ballot of the governing faculty the GTF’s motion to adopt a new structure with proposed Faculty Code content, which will be presented to the governing faculty by the GTF (pursuant to its request for a governing faculty meeting agenda item). Appropriate measures will be taken through Academic Affairs to avoid conflict of interest in the voting process. If passed, the proposed new governance structure goes into effect on Sept. 1, 2018 with regular meetings beginning Sept. 2018.

2) Because of their official standing in the Senate Assembly from which UM-Flint would be requesting action, Flint’s elected Senate Assembly representatives will jointly present the UM-Flint faculty’s motion to SACUA for a vote of the Senate Assembly, ideally by its March 2018 meeting, but no later than its May 2018 meeting. Upon approval of the UM-Flint Report by the Senate Assembly, the new UM-Flint governance structure will be officially approved through the authority granted to the Senate Assembly by the Board of Regents.

3) Elections for the UM-Flint Assembly, open or new standing committee seats (according to the new structure), and Secretary of the UM-Flint Senate will occur between May 1-15, 2018 through a mechanism through Academic Affairs that avoids conflict of interest between the old and new structures. Once elected the Secretary of the UM-Flint Senate will convene a meeting of elected assembly representatives between May 16-31, 2018 for the purposes of electing the UM-Flint /SAC members and officers according to the procedures adopted in the Faculty Code. Once elected, the members of the UM-Flint /SAC should internally determine at their first meeting in Sept. 2018 which seats will be for 1, 2, or 3 year terms.

4) Continuing Faculty on Standing Committees: Since UM-Flint Assembly standing committees will be elected by governing faculty (as the UM-Flint Senate) with little change to constitution, all seats currently elected to standing committees will remain in effect. Seats that cease to exist Sept. 1, 2018 according to UM-Flint Assembly standing committee composition criteria will not be replaced as those positions are vacated.
5) Faculty Council: Seats that do not expire before Aug. 31, 2018 will end on that date. Dissolution of FC seats is necessary to mark changes in methods and duties, and because the UM-Flint /SAC is elected by a different governance body than were FC members. FC members are eligible to run for UM-Flint Assembly and UM-Flint /SAC seats.

6) The Parliamentarian elected by the governing faculty in 2017 will complete his/her current term and be eligible for re-election.

7) The UM-Flint Assembly and UM-Flint /SAC will address recommendations made in the GTF Report to a new UM-Flint Assembly within 1 year of the UM-Flint Assembly being formed.

Part VII) Other Recommendations

MOTION 4: Resolved, that the governing faculty of the University of Michigan-Flint endorses the proposed list of further recommendations for considered by the new UM Flint Senate Assembly once it is formed.

Further recommendations for the consideration of the UM Flint Senate Assembly

During its consultations with the faculty, executive officers, and research, the GTF learned that several areas of governance might warrant greater attention than the GTF could give. Part of the motion endorsed by the faculty should include that within 1 year of its possible formation, a UM-FLINT Assembly should consider the following issues.

a) Executive Committees: Within U of M, executive committees are called ‘executive’ because they have executive power to act. However, as the histories and reports of UM-Flint demonstrate, faculty have had longstanding concerns regarding overreach of executive committees (particularly with respect to the autonomy of academic instructional units like departments and programs), as well as diminishment of their executive functions. In a 2005 task force report, the Report of the Unit Shared Governance Task Force reviewed the functions and practices of executive committees across the Ann Arbor campus. A similar effort is warranted on the UM-Flint campus. As such, the GTF recommends the following:

i) That a UM-Flint Assembly conduct a comparable comparison of executive committee practices and functions across campus, or work with the TCTF to do so, to both inform and perhaps document best practices, which faculty within each unit might consider adopting.

ii) To ensure consistency in promotion and tenure processes across campus, a UM-Flint Assembly should consider recommending to a UM-Flint Senate the creation of a campus-wide executive committee that could provide a measure of protection for faculty by mitigating political pressures that create inappropriate variability in the quality of candidates between units.

iii) The recommended scope of executive committees might be evaluated with appropriate recommendations to the faculty of the units. For example, should executive committees conduct all executive functions for the faculty of a unit by themselves, or could combining certain functions within the same committee present conflicts of interest?

b) Standing Committees: The GTF recommends the following regarding campus-wide standing committees, which could be evaluated by a UM-Flint Assembly for possible recommendation to a UM-Flint Senate:

i) Standing committee unit representation:
To conservatively manage the service burden for faculty, that it be considered whether all faculty standing committees require representation from each unit. For example, the following standing

---

committees might require only 3-4 governing faculty, rather than 6, as unit interests might not be as relevant to the committee’s work:
- Committee on Undergraduate Admission Standards (CUAS)
- Faculty Advisory Committee on University Outreach and Engagement (FACUOE)
- Library Committee (LC)
- Office of Extended Learning Advisory Committee (OELAC)
- Scholarships, Awards and Special Events Committee (SASEC)
- Student Concerns Committee (SCC)
- Technology Committee (TC)

ii) Committee Charge: Periodically the charges of committees should be evaluated along with how they are defined in the Faculty Code. The GTF notes that the following could be considered by a UM-Flint Assembly:
   a) The need for a separate Financial Affairs Advisory Committee and a Chancellor’s Advisory Committee for Budget and Strategic Planning
   b) If the Graduate Board, which evaluates all graduate programs including those with special revenue agreements, might be charged with overseeing the establishment and implementation of accountability mechanisms for administrators to ensure the success of existing and new graduate programs.

iii) Additional Committees: That a UM-Flint Assembly consider recommending to a UM-Flint Senate the adoption of language (below) to create the following committees within the assembly, the rationale being that committees (or functions) of this nature exist in the Senate Assembly, but UM-Flint does not have comparable bodies for the work in all cases.

**Governance, Rules, Policies, and Practices Committee (GRPPC):**

**Composition:**
Standard membership. Shall include a non-voting member from the Senate Advisory Committee.

**Charge:**
1. Upon the request of the UM-Flint Senate, UM-Flint Assembly, UM-Flint /SAC, or any member of the UM-Flint Senate, reviews and suggests changes, if any, to policies campus-wide, including the SPG.
2. Advises upon proposed formulations of changes in campus-wide policies; upon policies alleged to be no longer descriptive of the functions to be performed, and shall furnish interpretations of the meaning and application of existing policies.
3. Serves as a resource for faculty and administrators regarding the interpretation of campus-wide policies.
4. Supports professional development opportunities for faculty and administrators to become adept at developing policies for any level of shared governance within the university.
5. Regularly advises the UM-Flint Senate and UM-Flint Assembly regarding possible changes to campus-wide governance documents, resolutions, and the Faculty Code and Standing Rules.
6. Serves as a resource for faculty regarding governance concerns.

**Tenure, Promotions, and Professional Development Committee (TPPDC):**

**Composition:**
Standard membership except that there will be no student or ex officio members.

**Charge:**
1. As the voice of faculty, the committee advises and consults on policy and procedure issues related to the broad range of University tenure activities.
2. Review the University Tenure and Promotion policy and identify unit-level T & P policies that deviate from, or present ambiguities such that their implementation raises
questions of risk to the university and of fairness when applied to their faculty. Provide a summary report of findings and recommendations aimed at eliminating ambiguities and for promoting fair T&P policy application.

(3) To ensure that all units contribute to the meaningful prestige of rank and promotion with U of M, in a manageable review cycle, ascertain if all departments, programs, schools, and colleges have clearly articulated T & P policies (standards and procedures) that have been approved by their respective faculty at the various appropriate levels, and that are in keeping with the Regents Bylaws and U of M Faculty Handbook.

(4) Review T & P packets (summary materials and review documentation) to ensure consistent and fair standards of T & P between the academic units and within U of M. For casebook decisions that appear to be inconsistent with campus-wide standards or non-compliant with institution-wide policies, refer the case back to the level of school/college review in consultation with the Provost.

(5) Provide a summary recommendation on each casebook to the provost.

(6) Work with the Office of the Provost to ensure that T & P procedures are uniformly accessible and clear.

(7) Collect data from the units on the following: number of faculty who resign before tenure; number of faculty who are unsuccessful applicants for either tenure or promotion and from which units; data regarding the minority status of successful and unsuccessful candidates for promotion and tenure within each unit; and, the percentage of faculty at each rank in each unit. This information should be shared annually with the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty and the UM-Flint /SAC.

**Election Committee:**

**Composition:**

Standard membership except that there will be no student or ex officio members.

**Charge:**

(1) As the voice of faculty, the committee advises and consults on policy and procedure issues related to elections in the broad range of University activities.

(2) The committee ensures that elections for campus-wide positions are undertaken independently from other administrator or faculty bodies.

(3) All committee members act as tellers to arrange and review elections and results, verifying that procedures were followed, proper election mechanisms were employed, and that the correct results are reported.

(4) The committee may serve any faculty body in an election process, at the request of that faculty body (any program, department, committee, unit, etc.). Faculty deliberative bodies (departments, units, etc.) that do not have well defined measures to ensure fair and transparent elections, are strongly encouraged to make use of the Election Committee.

(5) The committee advises faculty and administrators (individuals or groups) on best practices in election procedures, including potential conflicts of interest, due process, and transparent reporting.

(6) The faculty in a particular group (determined by their own internal procedures for decision-making or Roberts Rules) may require that an election be conducted through the Election Committee.

c) **Standing Rules:** The GTF did not propose revisions to the Standing Rules of the UM-Flint Faculty. A UM-Flint Assembly should delegate an appropriate body to propose necessary revisions to the Standing Rules. Special consideration should be paid to the appropriateness of content to standing rules (as opposed to being codified). Generally something that is important enough to require a super-majority to change should be in Faculty Code rather than Standing Rules.

d) **Grievance Process:** In the 2016-17 year the UM-Flint governing faculty adopted a new grievance structure campus-wide that replaced grievance processes within the schools and college. This eliminated the problem that faculty were often having to appeal to the very bodies against
which they were grieving. However, because the new process adopted the process created by SACUA for faculty grievances against administrators and staff, but not the process adopted for grievances between faculty, the new process actually eliminated a mechanism to grieve against another faculty member using a faculty developed process. Either the code language should be changed to include faculty-to-faculty grievances, or SACUA’s second process for faculty-to-faculty grievances could be similarly modified and adopted.
The University of Michigan-Flint, one of three campuses of the University of Michigan, serves the citizens of the city of Flint and the surrounding region. We are committed to the highest standards of teaching, learning, scholarship, and creative endeavors. Our urban location affords us an opportunity to provide a University of Michigan education to students with varied life experiences. The community is invested in our University, and together we work to enhance the cultural, economic, intellectual, and social vitality of the city and region. Rooted in the historical tradition of excellence of the University of Michigan, we offer bachelors and graduate degree programs in the liberal arts and sciences and in a number of pre-professional and professional fields.

Mission Statement
The University of Michigan-Flint is a comprehensive urban university of diverse learners and scholars committed to advancing our local and global communities. In the University of Michigan tradition, we value excellence in teaching, learning, and scholarship; student centeredness; and engaged citizenship. Through personal attention and dedicated faculty and staff, our students become leaders and best in their fields, professions, and communities.

Article 1 The Organization of The University of Michigan-Flint

Section 1. Definitions (See Regents Bylaws Section 5.01.)

a. The term faculty shall include members of the teaching and research staff together with the executive officers; the directors of various teaching, research, and library units; research associates, curators, and persons with similar duties.

b. The term professorial staff shall include professors, associate professors, and assistant professors.

c. The term "instructional unit" shall be used to designate a school or college or such other comparable entity as may be established by the Board of Regents of the University of Michigan.

d. The term governing faculty, when used in connection with a school or college, shall include those members of the school or college who are professors, associate professors, and assistant professors, and clinical professional staff. The governing faculty shall include instructors and lecturers who hold appointments of one-half time or more; provided, however, that such instructors and lecturers may vote at faculty meetings only if they have held appointments for one or more years and are authorized to vote by a majority of the professorial staff of the appropriate school or college. The governing faculty may include clinical professors, clinical associate professors, research scientists, associate research scientists, assistant research scientists, research investigators, research professors, research associate professors, and research assistant professors when authorized by, and in accordance with, the policies and bylaws of the appropriate school or college.

e. The term "University of Michigan-Flint (UM-Flint) Faculty" shall consist of governing faculty in part d, whose appointments are on the Flint campus, of the instructional units, professional librarians, archivists and curators, as well as administrators with academic appointments.

f. The term teaching staff shall include professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, lecturers, and teaching fellows.

g. The term university year, as used in connection with appointments of members of the faculty and other personnel, contains any two terms in the calendar, as defined for the year in
question. Faculty members are expected to participate in orientation, registration, and commencement.

Section 2. Faculty Role in Matters of Educational Policy and Unit Governance

a. UM-Flint faculty interests include all issues which affect the functioning of UM-Flint as an institution of higher learning, which concern its obligations to the state and to the community at large, and which relate to internal organization, insofar as such matters involve general questions of educational policy. The UM-Flint faculty may make recommendations on all UM-Flint academic matters not delegated to the individual instructional units by the Board of Regents.

b. as listed below (see Article 2, Section 1).

Article 2    Matters Delegated to the Governing Faculties by the Board of Regents

Section 1. Guiding Principles of Governance:

The UM-Flint Guiding Principles of Governance represent internal and external policies that apply to all levels of faculty responsibility throughout the University of Michigan-Flint.

Section 2. Powers and Duties of the Governing Faculties

In each school, college, or degree granting division of the university, the governing faculty shall be in charge of the affairs of the school, college, or division, except as delegated to the executive committee, if any. (See Regents Bylaws Section 5.02.)

The faculty of each instructional unit shall from time to time recommend to the board Board of Regents for approval such regulations as are not included within these bylaws Bylaws and which are pertinent to its structure and major operating procedures, such as departmental organization, requirements for admission and graduation, and other educational matters, the determination of which is within the peculiar competence of the faculties of the several instructional units schools and colleges.

Subject to the ultimate authority of the board Board of Regents, the faculty of each instructional unit school and college is also vested with plenary powers to make rules and regulations concerning other matters such as grading regulations, class attendance, committee organization and related internal matters admissions, degree requirements, curriculum, general education, grading, class attendance, operating procedures, department organization, committee organization and related internal matters. All such regulations shall be recorded in the minute books of the adopting authority and filed [as needed] with the secretary of the University.

Each faculty shall provide suitable instruction for the students enrolled in its school or college. Each faculty shall recommend to the board Board of Regents these students under its jurisdiction who qualify for university University degrees. It shall, subject to the board Board of Regents, possess such other powers as are necessary to the performance of its duties. (See Regents Bylaws Section 5.03.)

Section 3. Faculty Procedure:

Each faculty shall adopt rules and procedures for its own governance, and shall appoint a secretary, define the secretary's duties, and keep a record of faculty action.

In the absence of specific rules to the contrary, the rules of parliamentary procedure as described in Robert's Rules of Order shall be followed by the faculties, committees, boards, and other deliberative bodies of the instructional units. (See Regents Bylaws Section 5.04.)

Section 4. Faculty Communications to the Board of Regents

Each faculty shall submit its communications to the board Regents in writing through the chancellor. Each dean shall endorse faculty communications, making appropriate explanatory statements as needed. (See Regents Bylaws Section 5.05.)
Section 5. The Deans and Executive Committees

The dean or director or administrative head of an institutional unit—a school, college, or department of instruction or research—will be appointed by the board on the recommendation(s) required under these bylaws, and in all cases, on the recommendation by the president, to act as executive officer of the school, college, or department. They shall be appointed by the Board of Regents on recommendation by the chancellor and by the president to act as executive officer of the institutional unit or department.

If an executive committee has been created by the Board of Regents for the unit, school, college, or department, the dean, director, or head shall be assisted by the executive committee and will be, ex officio, the chair. The executive committee, in addition to assisting with administrative functions, shall be charged with the duties of investigating and formulating educational and instructional policies for consideration by the faculty and will act for the faculty in matters of budgets, promotions and appointments. (See Regents Bylaws Section 5.06.)

Article 3

[New content to replace Article 3 in FC]

Part A: Governance at the University of Michigan

UM-Flint Campus Governance Structures: There shall be a UM-Flint Assembly consisting of members elected by a UM-Flint Senate. It shall be the legislative arm of the UM-Flint Senate. The UM-Flint/SAC shall coordinate the work of the UM-Flint Senate, UM-Flint Assembly, and standing committees. The UM-Flint Assembly shall be constituted through the authority of the U of M Senate Assembly upon recommendation by the UM-Flint Senate members. The campus shall adhere to the Guiding Principles for Governance at UM-Flint.

Part B: University of Michigan-Flint Senate

Section i: Membership: The UM-Flint Senate shall consist of all Flint campus members of the professorial staff, the executive officers of the Flint campus, the dean of each school or college, and such members of the research and library staff as may be designated in accordance with standards and procedures approved by the UM-Flint Senate Assembly, Research personnel who hold Primary Research rank (Assistant Research Scientist, Associate Research Scientist, Research Scientist, Senior Associate Research Scientist, Senior Research Scientist, Distinguished Senior Research Scientist) and have a full-time appointment as a regular staff member shall be designated as members of the UM-Flint Senate. Librarians of any rank who have full-time appointments as regular staff members shall be designated as members of the UM-Flint Senate. Lecturers III and IV who hold governing faculty status as defined by the Board of Regents will also be members of the UM-Flint Senate. Visiting, Adjunct or Clinical Professors, acting or interim appointees to executive or Dean positions are not entitled to UM-Flint Senate membership in the absence of a regular professorial appointment. Directors of centers or institutes who do not hold professorial rank are not entitled to UM-Flint Senate membership unless they qualify under the preceding three paragraphs.

Section ii: Authority and Duties: The UM-Flint Senate delegates its authority to the UM-Flint Assembly, but retains the right to overturn the latter. It has sole authority to approve changes to the UM-Flint Faculty Code and Standing Rules. It shall vote on matters not delegated to the UM-Flint Assembly in the Faculty Code. It elects UM-Flint Assembly and standing committee members. The UM-Flint Senate is convened by the UM-Flint Senate Chair to meet twice per year. The UM-Flint Senate is authorized to consider any subject pertaining to the interests of the Flint campus, and to make recommendations to the UM-Flint Assembly thereto. Decisions of the UM-Flint Senate with
respect to matters within its jurisdiction shall constitute the binding action of the Flint campus faculties. Jurisdiction over academic policies shall reside in the faculties of the various schools and colleges, but insofar as actions by the several faculties affect the campus’s policy or welfare as a whole, or schools and colleges other than the one in which they originate, they shall be brought before the UM-Flint Senate.

Section iii: Officers: See Part E.

Section iv. Meetings
(1) When Held. Regular meetings of the UM-Flint shall be held either in the Fall term or in the Winter term. Special meetings shall be called by the Chair of the UM-Flint Assembly on the request of the Chancellor and may be called by the UM-Flint Assembly, by the UM-Flint /SAC, or by petition of not less than ten members of the UM-Flint Senate.
(2) Disclosure of Proceedings. UM-Flint Senate meetings shall be open to the public except when the UM-Flint Senate, the UM-Flint Assembly or the UM-Flint /SAC deems an executive session advisable.
(3) Quorum. A total of 60 members of the UM-Flint Senate shall constitute a quorum.

Section v. Agenda; Motions and Resolutions
(1) Who May Propose. Items may be placed on the agenda by the Chancellor, by the UM-Flint Assembly, by the UM-Flint /SAC, by standing or special committees of the UM-Flint Senate, or by any member of the UM-Flint Senate provided that the motion or resolution be supported by two other members of the UM-Flint Senate. The Chancellor shall have the right at all reasonable times to address the UM-Flint Senate on such matters as the Chancellor deems appropriate.
(2) Form of Proposals. Except for motions of a procedural nature, all motions or resolutions, in order to be included on the agenda, proposing UM-Flint Senate action, must be in writing. A motion or resolution introduced by the UM-Flint /SAC must be certified by the respective chair. A motion or resolution introduced by a special or standing committee of the UM-Flint Senate must be certified by the chair of the committee involved. A motion or resolution introduced by a member of the UM-Flint Senate must bear the signatures of the movant and of the two supporting members. A motion to overrule an action of the UM-Flint Assembly must be announced prior to the meeting as a specific agenda item. An agenda item that merely proposes consideration of a UM-Flint Assembly action, or of a subject on which the UM-Flint Assembly has acted, is not a proposal to overrule the action of the UM-Flint Assembly.
(3) Time of Submission and Distribution. All motions or resolutions, in order to be included on the agenda, must be submitted to the Secretary of the UM-Flint Senate, at least fourteen days before the meeting at which they are to be introduced. They must be delivered by the UM-Flint Secretary to the Campus Mail Room or via e-mail for distribution to all members of the UM-Flint Senate at least ten days before they are to be voted on.
(4) Motions Not in Agenda. Except for motions of a procedural nature, motions or resolutions proposing UM-Flint Senate action may be introduced from the floor without previous inclusion on the agenda only by consent of two-thirds of the members present.

Section vi. Voting
(1) Who May Vote. Only members of the UM-Flint Senate as defined in Part B, Sec. 1 shall be entitled to vote at UM-Flint Senate meetings. Emeriti/ae professors shall be entitled to attend UM-Flint Senate meetings without vote.
(2) Form of Vote. Unless otherwise specifically provided for in these rules or in the Regental Bylaws, all questions put to the UM-Flint Senate shall be decided by majority vote of those voting. Voting shall ordinarily be by voice but a standing vote shall be ordered by the chair if requested by any member of the UM-Flint Senate. A vote by secret written ballot may be called for by a concurring vote of any thirty-one members. A mail or e-mail vote by UM-Flint Senate members on any issue on which the UM-Flint Senate is competent to act may be authorized at any UM-Flint
Senate meeting by a majority vote of those voting. Any such mail votes shall be conducted in such manner as to ensure secrecy and shall be administered by the Secretary of the UM-Flint Senate.

Section vii. Rules
(1) Adoption. The UM-Flint Senate may adopt rules concerning its own government and procedure and concerning its officers and committees.
(2) Amendment. Rules adopted by the UM-Flint Senate may be changed or amended by a majority vote. A motion to amend the rules is not a procedural matter for purposes of Section 5 (Agenda).
(3) Cases Not Covered. In all cases not covered by rules adopted by the Senate, the procedure in Robert's Rules of Order shall be followed.

Part C: University of Michigan-Flint Assembly (UM-Flint Assembly)

Section i: Composition: The UM-Flint Assembly ensures proportionate representation between the colleges and schools in campus-wide governance, but guarantees a minimum level of representation, irrespective of changes to the size or number of units. Each school, college or institute (as well as library faculty) shall have at least 3 seats. UM-Flint Senate members who have standing in more than one unit must select their primary unit of appointment for the purposes of UM-Flint Assembly service. Additional seats beyond the minimum guaranteed per group are added per unit based on proportion using the following formula: 3 seats plus \( \left( \frac{\text{number of governing faculty}}{10} \right) \times \frac{2}{3} \) or 0.66, rounded down to nearest whole seat = number of seats through proportional representation for a given unit. Groups of less than 15 governing faculty do not participate in the seats allocated through proportionate representation. The UM-Flint Assembly shall make a reapportionment every three years. The formula to calculate the number of UM-Flint Assembly seats is as follows:
Number of UM-Flint Senate members in the unit total (as defined in Part B, section i) \( \times 0.066 + 3 \), rounded down to nearest whole number = number of UM-Flint Assembly seats per unit.

Section ii: Powers and Duties: The UM-Flint Assembly shall serve as the legislative arm of the UM-Flint Senate. It shall be a branch of the U of M Senate Assembly with the authority to make decisions for the Flint campus by considering proposals on all areas of concern of the UM-Flint Senate (governing faculty). The UM-Flint Assembly shall be the site of most voting and decision-making for campus-wide matters on educational policy. The UM-Flint Assembly is the body responsible for responding to governance concerns of the faculty. It elects the UM-Flint /SAC and its officers. It works within its purview to strengthen communication and shared governance between the faculty, its elected representatives, and the administration.

An action of the UM-Flint Assembly shall have the effect of an action of the UM-Flint Senate unless and until it is revoked by the UM-Flint or U of M Senate. Changes to the UM-Flint Faculty Code require the approval of at least 2/3 of the UM-Flint Senate membership. The UM-Flint Senate makes recommendations to the Board of Regents through the U of M Senate Assembly. Standing committees (and ad hoc committees appointed by the UM-Flint Assembly) shall report to the UM-Flint Assembly (and UM-Flint Senate as directed by the UM-Flint Assembly).

The areas of concern of the UM-Flint Assembly shall be those of the UM-Flint Senate. The UM-Flint Assembly meetings shall be open to all UM-Flint Senate members, and to the public when not in executive session. The UM-Flint Assembly shall have power to consider and advise regarding all matters within the jurisdiction of the UM-Flint Senate that affect the campus’s functioning as an institution of higher learning, which concern its obligations to the state and to the community at large, and which relate to its internal organization insofar as such matters of internal organization involve general questions of educational policy. The UM-Flint Assembly shall advise and consult with the UM-Flint Chancellor on any matter of university policy which the UM-Flint Chancellor may place before it. The UM-Flint Assembly may request information from any member of the university staff, and may invite any such person to sit with it for the purpose of
consultation and advice. Standing and special committees that are required to report to the UM-Flint Senate shall present such reports to the UM-Flint Assembly for study and transmittal to the UM-Flint Senate, with such recommendations for action as the UM-Flint Assembly shall deem proper.

The UM-Flint Assembly shall communicate its recommendations and decisions to the UM-Flint Senate from time to time, and at fall and winter meetings of the UM-Flint Senate in each academic year, shall present a formal report of its activities. The UM-Flint Assembly shall meet at least once per month from September 1 through May 31 of each year. Periodically, but not less than once each year, the UM-Flint Assembly shall meet with the executive officers of the university.

UM-Flint Assembly members should act in the welfare of the campus and faculty at large, and not solely based on the interests of their own units.

Section iii: Member Eligibility: To serve as a UM-Flint Assembly representative the following conditions must be met prior to nomination: standing in the UM-Flint Senate, a minimum %50 instructional appointment. UM-Flint Assembly representatives should not concurrently hold authoritative or supervisory positions that may pose a conflict of interest by compromising their ability to act as a resource, peer, and representative to individual faculty members; such positions include those that involve evaluation and supervision of other faculty, such as chairpersons, directorships, or membership on a school or college executive committee (units with 20 or fewer UM-Flint Senate members are not required to restrict eligibility based on these criteria of conflict of interest, but should endeavor to do so when possible). A member who has served one term will not immediately be eligible for re-election.

Section iv: Election: The members of the UM-Flint Assembly shall be elected by the UM-Flint Senate. All UM-Flint Senate members are entitled to vote on all UM-Flint Assembly seats from all units/groups. Units may not impose internal election procedures or otherwise limit candidates for Assembly service internally before an election is held through the UM-Flint Senate. Terms are for three years, beginning September 1 and ending August 31. Roughly one third of Assembly terms expire each year. UM-Flint /SAC members whose Assembly terms are expired during committee service will retain voting membership in the UM-Flint Assembly until their terms on the committee expire.

Section v: Committees: The standing committees are those established by the UM-Flint Senate in the Faculty Code. They shall make recommendations to the UM-Flint Assembly. The committees report in writing to the UM-Flint /SAC by April 30 of each year. Each UM-Flint Assembly standing committee shall be comprised of one representative from each school/college/institute or library plus one at-large seat. Terms are for three years, beginning September 1 and ending August 31. Roughly one third of each committee’s membership shall expire each year. To be eligible for nomination and service on a standing committee, a candidate must be of standing in the UM-Flint Senate, and hold a minimum of %50 instructional appointment. Standing committee nominees may or may not be members of the UM-Flint Assembly, and do not receive standing in the UM-Flint Assembly through service on one of its committees. All UM-Flint Senate members are entitled to vote on the election of all seats for all UM-Flint standing committees. Units may not impose internal election procedures or otherwise limit candidates for standing committee service within the unit before an election is held by the UM-Flint Senate.

The UM-Flint Assembly may establish committees to advise and consult with the executive officers of the University on matters within the areas of their respective responsibilities. The UM-Flint Assembly may create other special committees to assist with its work. It may define the qualifications for membership of such committees, provide for the number of members thereof, provide how they are to be appointed and their terms of office, and define their duties and obligations. The UM-Flint Assembly shall provide for the appointment of all committees created by the UM-Flint Senate, and except when otherwise provided by UM-Flint Senate action, such committees shall be considered as committees of the UM-Flint Assembly. Committees established
in accordance with this section shall report through the UM-Flint /SAC to the UM-Flint Assembly and to the UM-Flint Senate as directed by the UM-Flint Assembly.

Section vi: Officers: See Part E

Section vii. Organization
(1) Meetings. Meetings of the UM-Flint Assembly shall be held at such times as the UM-Flint Assembly shall determine. Periodically, but not less than once each year, the UM-Flint Assembly shall meet with the principal administrative officers of the University. The UM-Flint Assembly meetings shall be open to all UM-Flint Senate members. The UM-Flint Assembly meetings shall also be open to the public except when the UM-Flint Assembly or UM-Flint /SAC deems an executive session advisable. A majority of the members of the UM-Flint Assembly shall constitute a quorum. Items may be placed on the agenda by the Chair of the UM-Flint Assembly, by the UM-Flint /SAC, by any committee of the UM-Flint Assembly, or by any two members of the UM-Flint Assembly. All matters for inclusion on the agenda of an UM-Flint Assembly meeting shall be submitted at least five working days before the meeting to the Secretary of the UM-Flint Assembly. Any matter not included on the agenda distributed in advance of a meeting may nevertheless be acted on by the UM-Flint Assembly unless objected to by a vote of one-third of the members present.
(2) Rules. The UM-Flint Assembly may adopt rules for the transaction of its business. In appropriate cases not covered by rules of the UM-Flint Assembly, the rules of the UM-Flint Senate shall apply.
(3) Officers. See Part E.

Section viii. Convocation of Meetings.
(1) Who May Call. A meeting of the UM-Flint Assembly may be called by the chair, by the UM-Flint /SAC, by five members of the UM-Flint Assembly, or by vote of the UM-Flint Assembly in a prior meeting.
(2) Notice of Meetings. Each meeting shall be announced by e-mail and a notice in writing addressed to each member and deposited in the campus mail not more than thirty days and not less than ten days before the day of the meeting. The notice need not state the business of the meeting, except for emergency meetings, but shall state the hour and the place.
(3) Place of Meetings. Meetings may be called to meet on the Flint campus, or at any other reasonable location.
(4) Emergency Meetings. A meeting may be called on less notice in case of emergency, of which the meeting itself, if a quorum is present, shall be the judge. The notice of an emergency meeting shall state the subject of the meeting, and no business shall be transacted on any other subject.

Part D: University of Michigan-Flint Senate Advisory Committee:

Section i: Composition: The committee shall have one seat per school/college/institute and one for the library faculty. Its members must be current or former members of the UM-Flint Assembly. Members of the UM-Flint /SAC whose terms on the committee extend beyond their UM-Flint Assembly terms shall be voting members of the UM-Flint Assembly until committee terms expire.

Section ii: Terms: Terms are for three years (September 1 through August 31). Roughly one third of the membership shall expire each year. Open seats are elected by the UM-Flint Assembly members no later than May 31 of each year. Temporary or permanent vacancies shall be elected by the UM-Flint Assembly.

Section iii: Powers and Responsibilities: The UM-Flint /SAC on behalf of the UM-Flint Assembly shall advise and consult with the Chancellor of the Flint campus on matters of campus policy and shall serve as an instrument for implementing the actions of the UM-Flint Senate and
UM-Flint Assembly. It shall oversee the committees of the UM-Flint Assembly and shall perform other functions delegated to it by these rules or by the UM-Flint Assembly. Overseen by its officers, it leads the business and meetings of the UM-Flint Assembly and UM-Flint Senate. It may propose the establishment of ad hoc committees or task forces to the UM-Flint Assembly, and presents its own proposals to the UM-Flint Assembly or UM-Flint Senate. It assists committees in making proposals to the UM-Flint Assembly. Campus-wide, the committee works within its purview to strengthen communication and shared governance between the faculty, Flint governance structures, and the administration.

Section iv. Election
(1) Procedure. The UM-Flint Assembly shall organize for the ensuing year by choosing the UM-Flint Senate members to serve on the UM-Flint /SAC. Eligibility for membership on the UM-Flint /SAC shall be limited to voting members of the UM-Flint Senate who are currently or were previously members (including alternates) of the UM-Flint Assembly or its standing committees. Members of the UM-Flint /SAC shall be elected by the UM-Flint Assembly from a slate listing nominees submitted by a UM-Flint /SAC Nominating Committee composed of two outgoing members of the UM-Flint /SAC and four outgoing members of the UM-Flint Assembly elected by the UM-Flint Assembly, plus nominations from the floor. The names of the nominees chosen by the UM-Flint /SAC Nominating Committee must be transmitted to UM-Flint Assembly members at least two weeks before the meeting at which the vote is to take place. The election shall take place after the election of UM-Flint Assembly members, and the new UM-Flint /SAC members and UM-Flint Assembly officers shall assume office on September 1.
(2) Notification of SACUA. The Secretary of the UM-Flint Senate shall inform SACUA of the membership of the UM-Flint /SAC at the time of the election.

Section v. Meetings
(1) When Held. The UM-Flint /SAC shall meet as frequently as it deems desirable, but not less than once a month from September 1 to May 31.
(2) How Called. Meetings of the UMF/SAC may be called by the chair, or by two members, who shall make reasonable efforts by letter, telephone, or electronic mail to notify each member.
(3) Procedure. A majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum. The committee shall act by a majority of those voting, provided a quorum is present. The committee may adopt rules for the transaction of its business.

Part E: UM-Flint Senate, UM-Flint Assembly, and UM-Flint/SAC Officers

Section i: Chair of the UM-Flint /SAC, UM-Flint Assembly, and UM-Flint Senate: The Chair is elected annually from the UM-Flint Assembly membership and by UM-Flint Assembly members. The position begins September 1 and ends August 31. The office holder is first among equals; normally the Chair shall include committee members in business brought forward and in communications of relevance to the committee. As a rule, the Chair shall be accompanied by another committee member (the duty should rotate) when meeting with an executive officer or other group in his/her capacity as Chair of the UM-Flint Assembly, Senate, or UM-Flint /SAC. All meetings with executive officers or other groups in this capacity must be reported to the committee before and after such a meeting takes place. A Chair who serves a full year shall not be eligible for immediate re-election.

Section ii: Vice Chair of the UM-Flint /SAC, UM-Flint Assembly, and UM-Flint Senate: The Vice Chair is elected annually from the UM-Flint Assembly membership and by UM-Flint Assembly members. The Vice Chair is responsible for chairing meetings and performing Chair duties in the Chair’s absence. A Vice-Chair who serves a full year shall not be eligible for immediate re-election.
**Section iii: Secretary of the UM-Flint /SAC, UM-Flint Assembly, and UM-Flint Senate:** The Nominating Committee will oversee nominations and the election of the UM-Flint Senate Secretary. The secretary is responsible for generating minutes of UM-Flint /SAC, UM-Flint Assembly, and UM-Flint Senate meetings. To be eligible, the secretary is elected by the UM-Flint Senate for a three-year term, beginning September 1 and ending August 31. The secretary is a non-voting member of the UM-Flint /SAC and UM-Flint Assembly (and may not concurrently hold voting seats on these bodies while serving as secretary, but may concurrently hold a seat on a standing committee). The secretary is responsible for submitting agendas, resolutions, minutes, rules, and other documents generated by these bodies to the library for archival access, as well as to provide access to these resources for the faculty and public. Execution of some of these responsibilities may be delegated to the staff of the UM-Flint Senate office, with the approval of the UM-Flint /SAC.

**Section iv: UM-Flint Assembly and UM-Flint Senate Parliamentarian:** This officer acts as a parliamentarian in UM-Flint Assembly and UM-Flint Senate meetings and is elected for a three-year term by the UM-Flint Senate, which may be consecutive. The Parliamentarian may concurrently hold a seat in the UM-Flint Assembly, any standing committee, or the UM-Flint /SAC. It is the duty of the Parliamentarian to provide education and guidance to the chair, faculty, and bodies of the UM-Flint Senate and Assembly on parliamentary procedure.

**Part F: UM-Flint /SAC Election Procedures**

During the annual election process to replace outgoing or resigning UM-Flint /SAC members, the following procedures shall be followed:

1. The UM-Flint Assembly Chair will preside over the UM-Flint Assembly during the election and exercise general oversight throughout the process. Two tellers will be selected at the meeting on the day of the election. If the tellers are not members of the UM-Flint Assembly, then at least one UM-Flint Assembly member shall be elected to monitor the counting of ballots.

2. A UM-Flint /SAC nominating committee shall be elected by the UM-Flint Assembly composed of two outgoing members of UM-Flint /SAC and four outgoing members of the UM-Flint Assembly.

3. At the UM-Flint Assembly meeting immediately prior to the election meeting, the nominating committee will provide the UM-Flint Assembly with a slate of eligible candidates for the positions requiring replacement.

4. The nominating committee will verify the eligibility of each candidate.

5. A UM-Flint Assembly member may also offer nominations from the floor of any UM-Flint Assembly meeting up to and including the election meeting. Members of the nominating committee will verify the eligibility of any candidates nominated from the floor as well. If it is not possible to determine eligibility, the Chair will postpone the election to the next subsequent UM-Flint Assembly meeting.

6. Statements and/or biographical sketches of each of the candidates will appear in an e-mail distribution at an appropriate time before the election meeting. Traditionally, this has been the week immediately before the election.

7. The UM-Flint Assembly Chair, on behalf of UM-Flint Assembly, will either re-verify or accept the determination of the nominating committee's verification of the candidates' eligibility.

8. At the beginning of the election meeting, the UM-Flint Assembly Chair will ask if there are any further nominations from the floor. When satisfied that all nominations have been given, the Chair will announce that nominations are closed. Ballots will not be distributed until after nominations are closed.

9. All nominations however offered shall designate the candidate's unit affiliation and rank. If there are questions about unit affiliation (e.g., if the candidate has been elected to UM-Flint Assembly from two or more units), the unit affiliation shall be that used for the candidate in the most recent UM-Flint Assembly apportionment.
10. In advance of the election meeting, a ballot will be prepared that will list all candidates, their unit of affiliation, directions for voting, and a statement specifying any unit representation limitation and/or term limitation considerations, if applicable.

11. If there are nominations from the floor at the election meeting, the election will be temporarily postponed until the new nominations are placed on the ballot at that same meeting, and directions of voting amended, if appropriate.

12. All candidates may make oral statements prior to the vote, including nominees from the floor.

13. Candidates are not required to be present at the time of the election.

14. Voting shall be by a ballot bearing the names of all candidates. Voters shall be instructed "Vote for at most N", where N is the number of vacant seats on UM-Flint/SAC. Voters shall signify their choices by marking the names of at most N candidates. Voters are not required to mark their ballot if they so choose. Any ballots that are marked for more than N candidates will be placed aside as "illegal ballots" and not counted.

15. Tellers shall count the number of votes for each candidate as marked on ballots submitted by voters. The candidates with the highest vote counts will be elected to the open positions in an ordered sequence determined by descending vote totals. In the case of a tie when there are not enough open positions available to avoid a conflict, a tie-breaking election shall be conducted in the same manner as the general election but with only the tied candidates included on the ballot. All other election results shall stand.

16. After all valid ballots are counted, the Tellers shall read their report of the election results to the UM-Flint Assembly and then submit their report to the UM-Flint Assembly Chair, who as he/she reads the results again, declares the results for each office. Results shall become effective immediately. After the election results are announced, objections to the current implementation of these procedures will not be in order except for an allegation of fraud or of simple factual error such as counting error.

17. Notwithstanding the finality of election results specified above, an immediate request for a re-count of votes already cast will be allowed.

18. Failure to adhere to these guidelines will not necessarily invalidate an otherwise valid election. The UM-Flint Assembly Chair, UM-Flint/SAC, and the UM-Flint Assembly have the authority to use any appropriate remedy.

19. A quorum only is needed to conduct a valid election.

20. The election meeting will occur prior to May 1 and the newly elected members of UM-Flint/SAC shall take office on Sept. 1. Traditionally, the election meeting has been the March UM-Flint Assembly meeting.

21. The UM-Flint Assembly itself is the judge of all questions arising which are incidental to the voting or the counting of the votes. The tellers should refer to the UM-Flint Assembly for decision all questions on which there is any uncertainty.

22. These guidelines are effective immediately but not retroactively.

23. After the election of UM-Flint/SAC members from the UM-Flint Assembly, it will vote at its April meeting to select a Chair and Vice Chair from the new membership.

PART G: STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE UM-Flint ASSEMBLY

[New content to replace Article 3 section on Standing Committees]

Section i. Policies for University Faculty Standing Committees
Members of standing committees and the UM-Flint/SAC should act in the welfare of the campus and faculty at large, and not solely based on the interests of their own units, and adhere to the best of their ability to the Standing Committee Best Practices and UM-Flint Guiding Principles of Governance.
a. Election and Conditions of Membership
(1) Members of faculty standing committees shall be elected for three-year terms in March-April of each year by the UM-Flint Senate. The Nominating Committee (see Section 4k below) shall send a list of nominees to members of the UM-Flint Senate by March 21. Members of the UM-Flint Senate may submit additional nominees to the Nominating Committee until March 31.
(2) The UM-Flint/SAC shall circulate an electronic ballot by April 7, due no later than April 21 and shall notify the faculty and the Student Government Council (SGC) president by April 30 of the results of the election. Ties shall be resolved by sending additional ballots to the faculty, and the UM-Flint Senate Chair shall notify the UM-Flint Senate of the outcome.
(3) Members of the UM-Flint faculty who hold administrative appointments of 50% or less shall be eligible for election to standing committees.
(4) Members may continue to serve at their own discretion (and cannot be required to drop a service activity by a supervisor, administrator, or other governance committee) during an academic leave (sabbatical or modified duties), as long as the leave does not significantly impact attendance and participation.
(5) If the Nominating Committee does not receive nominees for unit designated committee seats from the units, the Nominating Committee may nominate persons from any units for such seats. Individuals then elected will occupy such seats for their entire three-year terms.
(6) With the exception of CACBSP, all terms on standing committees run from September 1 to August 31, and committees shall meet and elect their respective chairs and Senate Advisory Committee representatives (if any) by May 31. The continuing member of the committee who is first alphabetically has the task of arranging the first meeting, and should expect to be notified by those student members who have been appointed by the SGC to be student members.
(7) A faculty vacancy is determined by the Chair of the Nominating Committee and shall be filled through a special election following a call to the UM-Flint Senate.
(8) SGC may appoint eligible student members on standing committees. Student members shall be enrolled in at least nine hours of credit, shall be in good standing, and shall have at least sophomore standing. In the event the SGC does not appoint representatives then committee chairs should assume responsibility to seek student representation.
(9) An ex officio is considered a member of the committee but shall be without vote. They may choose representatives to serve in their stead.

b. Reporting
(1) UM-Flint Assembly committees shall advise and inform SAC, UM-Flint Assembly, and other relevant assembly committees of its activities and the pertinent issues that come before it. The committee shall carry out specific charges from SAC and the UM-Flint Assembly.
(2) The advice of a committee shall be sought and given in a timely manner so that the advice could affect the decision-making outcome.
(3) All standing committees report to the UM-Flint Senate through the UM-Flint Assembly and must submit a report by August 31 of each year to the UM-Flint Senate. Reports, agendas, and minutes of all faculty committees (advisory, standing, ad hoc, task forces, etc.) must be kept and posted within 1 month of the meeting at which they are approved.
(4) Committee recommendations, as a rule, should come first to the UM-Flint/SAC, which brings them forward to the UM-Flint Assembly or UM-Flint Senate as appropriate. However, any member of the UM-Flint Assembly may bring something forward directly to the UM-Flint Assembly. Recommendations for actions that fall under primary or secondary faculty purview within shared governance (see the Guiding Principles of Governance at UM-Flint) should come before the UM-Flint Assembly through the UM-Flint/SAC. The UM-Flint Assembly may recommend further action through an executive officer or other governance body.

c. Composition and Function:
(1) Standard Membership: Standing committees of the UM-Flint Assembly or UM-Flint Senate includes as voting members one representative from each school or college and the library faculty
and one at-large seat. Committee composition will note additional seats reserved for student members (selected by the SGC unless otherwise noted). All standing committees except the UM-Flint/SAC will be elected by the members of the UM-Flint Senate.

(2) Committee chairs and representatives to other committees (if any) are elected by the voting members of the standing committee.

(3) The UM-Flint/SAC may appoint one of its members as a non-voting liaison to any standing committee. Liaisons should be identified and selected by September 30.

(4) All standing committees may invite guests (such as members of the U of M institution, Flint community, staff, student body, faculty, or administration) as needed to inform their work.

d. Shared Responsibilities:

(1) To make recommendations under the committee’s purview to the UM-Flint Senate through the UM-Flint Assembly, bringing forward recommendations to the UM-Flint Assembly as appropriate.

(2) To advocate for the academic needs of the university.

(3) To defend the standards of shared and faculty governance at UM-Flint as articulated in the UM-Flint Guiding Principles of Governance and in the Committee Best Practices.

(4) All standing committees shall meet twice a semester, with fewer or additional meetings at the discretion of the committee members.

(5) For committees with ex officio members, agendas are set cooperatively between the committee chair and ex officio in consultation with committee members.

Section ii. Standing Committees of the UM-Flint Assembly (in alphabetical order):

a. Academic Affairs Advisory Committee (AAAC):

Composition: Standard membership plus one undergraduate and one graduate student. The provost shall be ex officio.

Charge:

(1) As the voice of faculty, the committee advises and consults with the provost on academic affairs, matters of concern, and related policies and procedures having campus-wide implications.

(2) Advises on the allocation of resources among instructional units and other academic support.

(3) Clarifies the jurisdiction of instructional units over curricular areas.

(4) Advises on the preparation of the calendar and the official University of Michigan-Flint Catalog.

(5) Reviews and recommends new degree programs to the UM-Flint Assembly (which in turn makes recommendations to the provost and chancellor as appropriate).

(6) Supports program development and reviews existing programs.

b. Academic Assessment Committee (AAC):

Composition: Standard membership plus one student member. The provost shall be ex officio.

Charge:

(1) Oversees UM-Flint’s assessment of student learning.

(2) Approves all assessment proposals for new and revised programs.

(3) Reviews and evaluates department and program assessment activities.

(4) Provides feedback to and consults with departments and programs to ensure a standard of quality in student outcomes assessment within the curricula approved by the faculty.

(5) The committee will work with the campus to provide development opportunities and support the analysis and use of assessment results to improve student learning.

(6) Ensures that campus-wide assessment efforts are grounded in the principles of student-centered learning and remain consistent with the policies of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA).

(7) Provides an annual report on student learning.

(8) Advises and assists the provost in formulating assessment policy, distributing funds designated by the provost’s office for assessment, and preparing materials on student learning for NCA accreditation.
c. Chancellor's Advisory Committee for Budget and Strategic Planning (CACBSP):
Composition: Standard membership. Ex officios shall be the chancellor, provost, and vice chancellor for Business and Finance.
Procedure: Meets typically twice a month from September 1 to May 31, and at least once a month from June 1 to August 31.
Charge:
(1) As the voice of faculty, the committee shall advise and consult with the chancellor on policy and procedure issues related to the broad range of University activities under his/her purview (particularly regarding budget, strategic planning, resource allocation, and facilities).
(2) Periodically review the effectiveness of the current budget model and make appropriate recommendations to the chancellor and UM-Flint Assembly.
(3) Recommend accountability measures in strategic planning, use of facilities, and budgeting.
(4) Obtain and examine the information necessary to sustain effective involvement in the ongoing budget and strategic planning processes at UM-Flint, making this information available as needed to the UM-Flint Assembly.
(5) Annually, in the fall, the provost will review the academic plans and goals with the committee for both the past year and the coming year in terms of their congruence between the budget and the strategic plan. CACBSP members will provide feedback on this presentation.
(6) In the absence of an academic unit budget committee, assist faculty with accessing public budgetary information and advocate for faculty involvement in budgeting as appropriate throughout academic affairs.

d. Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (CESF):
Composition: Standard membership. There shall be no ex officio member.
Charge:
(1) Gathers information regularly from the faculty and other sources about workplace satisfaction, faculty retention, salary, benefits and other compensation received by the faculty.
(2) Consults on matters of data collection and analysis with the Office of Institutional Analysis and the chancellor and provost.
(3) Presents its findings to U of M Assembly and the UM-Flint Senate once a year, making appropriate recommendations for UM-Flint Assembly action.
(4) Advises the UM-Flint Assembly regarding procedures and policies at various levels of faculty compensation within the university that would improve fair and transparent compensation for faculty.

e. Committee on Undergraduate Admission Standards (CUAS):
Composition: Standard membership in addition to one extra student. The vice chancellor for enrollment management shall be ex officio.
Charge:
(1) Reviews and recommends to the faculty requirements for admission to the University of Michigan-Flint. (2) Advises the directors regarding the administration of the admission requirements.
(3) Recommends admission standards for approval by the UM-Flint Assembly.

f. Curriculum Coordination Committee (CCC):
Composition:
Standard membership. The provost shall be ex officio. A member of the UM-Flint/SAC and a member of the GECC shall be additional voting members.
Charge:
(1) Advises the provost on curricular matters that impact more than one unit or fall outside of an existing unit.
(2) Reviews and recommends cross-unit curricula to the UM-Flint Assembly (including General Education curricula).
(3) Addresses issues of course or program duplication across instructional units (which may be brought by any faculty member or executive officer), adjudicating such issues to promote academic quality, use faculty resources efficiently, and respect historical precedent on this campus. The committee shall seek to resolve issues by agreement among the instructional units involved and, if that fails, by asking the UM-Flint Assembly to recommend to the provost to adjust budgets of instructional units in accordance with the committee’s findings.

g. Faculty Advisory Committee on University Outreach and Engagement (FACUOE):
Composition: Standard membership plus one undergraduate and one graduate student. The director of university outreach shall serve as ex officio.
Charge:
(1) Monitors the effectiveness of the university outreach programs as aligned with outreach’s purpose and values.
(2) Advises the director of university outreach on policies, procedures, programs, and initiatives that support outreach and engagement.
(3) Reviews and maintains the quality of programming built upon public scholarship, community engagement, and mutually beneficial partnerships between the university and its larger community.
(4) Evaluates applications and awards the annual Freeman and Saab service scholarships to students.

h. Faculty Grievance Hearing Panel (FGHP):
Composition: The Faculty Grievance Hearing Panel (FGHP) shall consist of eleven tenured faculty members, and an associate librarian, elected by the governing faculty. Membership on the FGHP will be allotted as follows: the College of Arts and Sciences shall have three members, the School of Education and Human Services, the School of Management, the School of Nursing, the School of Health Professions and Studies shall have two members, and the Library shall have one member. FGHP members will serve single staggered terms of two years. FGHP members may not serve consecutive terms. Vacancies will be filled in the same manner except that if the unexpired term is one year or less, the replacement member shall serve an additional two-year term.
Procedure: FGHP shall meet once a year. The committee shall advise and inform the Senate Advisory Committee, UM-Flint Assembly, and other relevant assembly committees of its activities and the pertinent issues that come before it, in keeping with confidentiality requirements. The committee shall carry out specific charges from the Senate Advisory Committee and UM-Flint Assembly. Grievances filed will be heard by a Grievance Hearing Board (GHB). Members of the GHB will be selected from the FGHP in accordance with the corresponding rule of the UM-Flint Faculty Code. Refer to the full grievance procedure.
Charge:
(1) Is the pool of faculty available to be selected as members for the Faculty Grievance Hearing process.
(2) Advises the UM-Flint Assembly and Faculty Ombudsperson Committee on policies and procedures related to faculty grievances.

i. Faculty Ombudspersons Committee (FOC):
Composition: At least three ombudspersons will serve three-year terms (staggered). All must be tenured full professors from any academic unit. The Nominating Committee must ensure that candidates represent diverse identities (men and women, diverse ethnicity, etc.). Candidates may not serve as ombudspersons while holding positions on the Senate Advisory Committee, on executive committees, or as chairs or directors of academic programs. If an ombudsperson is not able to carry out his/her duties on a given matter due to conflict of interest, he/she should refer the faculty member to another ombudsperson. Otherwise, the faculty member may choose which ombudsperson is most equipped to assist in a given matter.
**Procedure**: The committee shall meet as needed and at least twice per academic year, with additional meetings at the discretion of members. The committee shall advise and inform the UM-Flint/SAC, UM-Flint Assembly, and other relevant assembly committees of its activities and the pertinent issues that come before it. The committee shall carry out specific charges from the Senate Advisory Committee and UM-Flint Assembly.

**Charge**:  
(1) Provide confidential and impartial assistance supporting faculty in the resolution of matters related to their employment.  
(2) Respond to faculty concerns for assistance in a timely manner and provide options for addressing faculty concerns.  
(3) A faculty member may invite an ombudsperson to any meeting where he/she deems his/her services to be helpful. The ombudsperson may use his/her judgment to determine the appropriateness of such a request, but a supervisor, administrator, or staff person may not deny the faculty member the ability to bring an ombudsperson or any other support person to a meeting.  
(4) Participate at least once per term in training available to U of M faculty, including bias training.  
(5) Advise the UM-Flint/SAC, Human Resources, and chancellor and provost on training or other methods to improve climate that should be available to faculty, staff, or students.  
(6) As needed, ombudspersons may assist in faculty grievance processes and may advise on the development of written statements.

**j. Financial Affairs Advisory Committee (FAAC):**  
**Composition**: Standard membership plus one undergraduate and one graduate student. The vice chancellor for business and finance shall be ex officio.  
**Charge**:  
(1) As the voice of faculty, the committee advises and consults with the vice chancellor for business and finance on policy and procedure issues related to the broad range of University activities,  
(2) Recommends administrative policies affecting academic affairs to the UM-Flint Assembly regarding services, facilities, parking, building maintenance, accessibility issues, space utilization, etc.

**k. General Education Curriculum Committee (GECC):**  
**Composition**: Standard membership plus one student member. The provost shall be ex officio.  
**Charge**:  
(1) With a firm commitment to a campus-wide perspective, works to refine and improve student learning within the university’s General Education curriculum.  
(2) Advises the faculties of the academic units on General Education curriculum, assessment, and programming.  
(3) Reviews and recommends General Education distribution applications, proposed First-Year Experience (FYE) courses, and other changes to the program to the unit faculties.  
(4) Ensures that individual courses are aligned with the appropriate General Education program learning outcomes.  
(5) Undertakes periodic reviews of the entire program to make sure that the program goals are met.  
(6) Evaluates FYE courses.  
(7) Facilitates dialogue and communication to support improvements to the General Education program.  
(8) Approves non-equivalency requests from students for General Education transfer courses.

**l. Graduate Board (GB):**  
**Composition**: Standard membership but the at-large position should go to a current graduate program director, and the student member should be a graduate student. The dean of graduate programs and director of graduate admissions shall be ex officios.  
**Charge**:  

(1) Advises the provost on matters relating to the development and operation of graduate programs.
(2) Reviews and fosters proposals for new graduate programs at UM-Flint and makes recommendations to the provost and chancellor with regards to their development and implementation.
(3) Promotes the quality of graduate programs and advocates for necessary resources, including through timely review, which may include consideration of reports and documents submitted to external review organizations.
(4) Shall act as a liaison with the Rackham Graduate School.

m. Library Committee (LC):
Composition: Standard membership plus one undergraduate and one graduate student. The director of the library shall be ex officio.
Charge:
(1) Advises and makes recommendations to the director of the library on library operations and matters related to campus need, the educational objectives of all units, including new programs and their impact on library resources and services, and library policies and practices.
(2) Reviews library usage and trends in library service, administration, and operation.

n. Nominating Committee (NC):
Composition: Standard membership. No ex-officio or Senate Advisory Committee member may serve on the Nominating Committee. No students serve on the NC.
Charge:
(1) The chair with committee consultation ascertains vacancies elected by the UM-Flint Senate for annual elections and replacements.
(2) Solicits nominees from the UM-Flint Senate and prepares ballots for the UM-Flint/SAC. Elections for positions beginning May 1 should be called by March 21.
(3) The UM-Flint Assembly oversees the election procedure for the UM-Flint/SAC (see Article 3, section 2, Part F).
(4) Seeks nominees with expertise or interest in the positions to be filled and ensures that nominations are consistent with requirements of the Code.
(5) Other recruitment and election tasks delegated by the UM-Flint/SAC.

o. Office of Extended Learning Advisory Committee (OELAC):
Composition: Standard membership plus one undergraduate and one graduate student. The director of the office of extended learning shall be ex officio.
Charge:
(1) Purview is limited to programs outside instructional units or other established faculty bodies (e.g., the Honors Council or International and Global Studies core faculty).
(2) Reviews and maintains the quality of programs that extend teaching and learning beyond the immediate campus.
(3) Ascertains faculty resource needs in course management and online learning, making appropriate recommendations to the UM-Flint Assembly.
(4) Oversees the administration of student evaluations through Courseval.
(5) Oversees faculty training in course management.

p. Research and Creative Activities Committee (RCAC):
Composition: Standard membership plus one student. The director of research and sponsored programs, who facilitates and manages the administrative processes, shall be ex officio.
Charge:
(1) As the voice of faculty, the committee advises and consults with the director of research and sponsored programs on the support of research available to UM-Flint faculty and students, and on policy and procedure issues related to the broad range of University research activities.
(2) Recommends the disbursement of research initiative, research excellence, faculty development, and undergraduate and graduate research grants under faculty mentors.

(3) Ascertains professional development needs for faculty and students regarding application for sponsored research, and makes appropriate recommendations to the UM-Flint Assembly.

**q. Scholarships, Awards and Special Events Committee (SASEC):**

**Composition:** Standard membership plus one undergraduate and one graduate student. The vice-chancellor and dean of students shall be a member, ex officio.

**Charge:**

(1) Makes recommendations to the UM-Flint Assembly to establish and review policies and criteria for granting campus-wide awards and honors to students and faculty, as well as granting of such scholarships and awards.

(2) Solicits, screens, selects, and funds special events sponsored by UM-Flint and supported by income from UM-Flint endowment funds and other funds that may be available to support events that contribute significantly to the intellectual and artistic development of campus and the Flint community.

(3) Through the provost, shall be responsible to the chancellor for its expenditures of funds on special events. (4) At the close of each academic year, the provost shall report to the chancellor on such expenditures and on the committee's assessment of the effectiveness of the special events presented. The provost and the committee shall also project the general program for special events during the next year and present to the chancellor a budget request for funding.

(6) Consults with and advises the provost on the planning of academic ceremonies, including commencement exercises, and the selection of the student commencement speaker.

**r. Student Concerns Committee (SCC):**

**Composition:** Standard membership plus one undergraduate and one graduate student. The vice chancellor for campus inclusion and student life shall be ex officio.

**Charge:**

(1) Advises the vice chancellor for campus inclusion and student life and makes recommendations regarding issues affecting the lives of students and their academic success.

(2) Serves as the selection committee for the Faculty/Staff Scholarship.

(3) Provides a forum for direct communication from students to faculty.

(4) Reviews and evaluates data and policies that impact student satisfaction, success, and well-being, and propose matters of action to the faculty, faculty committees, and/or administrative units.

**s. Technology Committee (TC):**

**Composition:** Standard membership plus one undergraduate and one graduate student. The Associate Provost for Academic Operations shall be ex officio.

**Charge:**

(1) As the voice of faculty, the committee advises and consults on policy and procedure issues related to the broad range of University IT activities.

(2) Advises the Director of Information Technology Services (ITS) on the issues and needs of instructional technology and budgetary priorities within ITS.

(3) The committee shall make recommendations for the allocation of technology grant funds.

### Article 4 Amendments to this Code

[To replace former Article 4 with revisions]

Proposals for amendments to this Code may be submitted by any member of the UM-Flint Senate to the UM-Flint/SAC. The UM-Flint/SAC shall receive all such proposals and after due deliberations shall communicate these, with its recommendations, for consideration at a meeting of the UM-Flint Senate, provided that the UM-Flint Faculty be not its members have been given notice of
any proposed amendment to the Code at least fourteen days prior to the meeting at which it is to be considered. All modifications to the Faculty Code must be voted upon by a two-thirds majority of the members of the UM-Flint Governing Faculties. UM-Flint Senate voting on an electronic mail ballot.

**Faculty Code Appendix A:**

**Governance Structures of the University of Michigan**

As a public university, the University of Michigan is governed by the Board of Regents, a deliberative body elected by the citizens of Michigan. Through its bylaws, the Board of Regents defines and delegates authority to a system of shared governance, where the administration and University Senate members cooperate in the management of the university. The bylaws establish an administrative structure led by the university’s executive officers. The Regents delegate broad authority and responsibility for university affairs to the president. For matters pertaining to the campuses at Dearborn and Flint, similar powers are delegated to their respective chancellors. These executive officers delegate authority and responsibility to the administrative leaders and offices of the three campuses, including the deans of the university’s schools and colleges. The Regents’ Bylaws also define the criteria for membership of the university’s governing faculty and endow it with broad authority to organize and govern itself through individual instructional units and the university senate.

While participating in and consulting with their counterparts on all aspects of university governance, the administration and governing faculty are granted primary responsibility over different aspects of university affairs. The administration is granted primary authority in formulating policies and procedures on administrative matters, while the governing faculty is granted primary authority in formulating policies and procedures related to academic matters. Secondary responsibility occurs when the faculty have a rightful expectation to meaningful impact and consultation in decision making that is shared with the administration.

Although the bylaws mandate agencies for faculty participation at all levels of their responsibility, the Regents recognize two primary forums for faculty governance of academic matters: the instructional unit and the university senate. The bylaws include a list of recognized instructional units, which include the various colleges and schools of the three campuses of the University of Michigan. The Regents grant the governing faculty of these units considerable autonomy in organizing and governance, subject to consistency with the university’s governing documents. In consultation with the unit’s dean, the governing faculty of each instructional unit determines its own governing procedures and establishes the academic policies of its unit, but these must be in keeping with any procedures that the faculty have established for the campus or institution. In some but not all units, the governing faculty of the unit elects an executive committee to assist deans with their administrative duties, to act for the unit’s governing faculty on specified matters, and to recommend academic policies and procedures for the consideration of the unit’s governing faculty.

Composed of the university’s governing faculty, the University Senate is endowed by the Regents with primary responsibility over academic matters that concern more than one unit, or that pertain to the university as a whole. The Regents Bylaws grant the senate authority to determine its own procedures and rules of governance. The Regents Bylaws recognize the senate as the legislative arm of the governing faculty and describes its actions as binding. The senate delegates its authority and responsibilities to the Senate Assembly, as a deliberative body elected by senate members and led by an elected Senate Assembly Committee for University Affairs (SACUA).
Across the University of Michigan and its campuses governance responsibilities and authority have been delegated by the Board of Regents to faculty, administrators, and the Board itself, to ensure that institutional governance serves the university’s academic mission. The Guiding Principles recognize that an institution of higher learning’s academic integrity is largely dependent upon the strength of its faculty governance. By the authority of the UM-Flint governing faculty the Guiding Principles (based upon U of M established policies) articulate a common understanding of governance practices for all participants in UM-Flint shared governance. To comply with these principles the faculty will maintain more specific internal procedures reflecting individual governance needs of committees, departments, programs, schools, and colleges.

I. Governing Documents

The University of Michigan-Flint is an integral part of the University of Michigan. As such, all forms of faculty and shared governance at the University of Michigan-Flint adhere to the policies and procedures of the institution as a whole. The following documents provide the foundation for governance at the University of Michigan-Flint in order of their authority. The values and principles identified in this document are drawn directly from these authoritative sources and are consistent with governance practices across the institution.

1. Bylaws of the Board of Regents (hereafter Regents Bylaws).  

1 “Shared governance is a cherished tradition of American universities, including the University of Michigan.” Principles of Faculty Involvement in Institutional and Academic Unit Governance at the University of Michigan (hereafter Principles), 2nd ed., preface, p. 3. These Guiding Principles for UM-Flint parallel the purpose and spirit of the Principles document, which also states that “Faculty participation in governance promotes and encourages diversity of ideas, a sense of shared responsibility, collaboration, collegiality, and institutional excellence. The faculty of the University of Michigan is encouraged to use these principles as a basis for participation in governance at all levels and in all units.” Principles, introduction, p. 4. The academic mission of UM-Flint is as follows “The University of Michigan-Flint is a comprehensive urban university of diverse learners and scholars committed to advancing our local and global communities. In the University of Michigan tradition, we value excellence in teaching, learning, and scholarship; student centeredness; and engaged citizenship. Through personal attention and dedicated faculty and staff, our students become leaders and best in their fields, professions, and communities.” See the University of Michigan-Flint Faculty Code (hereafter UM-Flint Code), p. 1.

2 Within shared governance there are matters over which faculty preside exclusively, including the establishment of faculty deliberative bodies. Effective shared governance includes some levels overseen by faculty only (such as standing committees and elected governance structures).

3 “The governing board of an institution of higher education in the United States operates, with few exceptions, as the final institutional authority...The governing board of an institution of higher education, while maintaining a general overview, entrusts the conduct of administration to the administrative officers—the president and the deans—and the conduct of teaching and research to the faculty (1966 Statement, part 3, p. 4).” Shared governance occurs in institutional management shared between administrators, faculty, and the Board of Regents. Shared governance does not mean that all of these parties have an equal say on all matters. The level of input and which group’s input takes priority on a given matter depends upon Regental delineation of primary and secondary responsibilities for different types of decisions and/or procedures put in place by the faculty where they have responsibility. Generally, the Board approves final decisions of administrators and faculty, administrators handle administrative decisions, and the faculty oversee teaching and research.

4 See the Board of Regents: http://www.regents.umich.edu/bylaws/bylawsrevised_07-17.pdf.
3. Principles of Faculty Involvement in Institutional and Academic Unit Governance at the University of Michigan, 2nd ed (hereafter Principles).  
4. All system-wide resolutions and policies of the U of M Senate Assembly and SACUA, including but not limited to: the *Statement on Academic Freedom* (adopted by the U of M Senate Assembly), and the *Open Governance Resolution* (adopted by the U of M Senate Assembly, hereafter OGR), and the *Regents Communication (U of M) Governance in Academe*.  
6. College/School Faculty Codes.  
7. Departmental/Program/Standing Committee Bylaws (Standing Rules and other policies).  

**Other recognized authorities for faculty governance at the University of Michigan and UM-Flint**


Note: Although not a governance document, faculty should also be aware of the use of the Standard Practice Guide throughout the University of Michigan (hereafter SPG).

**II. Governance Values and Ethics**

The following are governance values and ethics for UM-Flint. They: support the institution’s governance traditions and reputation; defend UM-Flint’s academic integrity through shared and faculty governance; maintain the standards that UM-Flint’s accrediting body (the HLC) requires; align UM-Flint governance with established best practices in higher education; and encourage effective shared governance in areas of joint responsibility between administrators, faculty, and staff. These values and ethics ensure that the manner in which governance at UM-Flint is practiced serves the university’s core mission of excellence in teaching, learning, research, and student centeredness. UM-Flint is an institution that cultivates and defends:  

---

7 See pp. 7-8 of the UM Handbook or see: https://facultysenate.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2015/03/01-25-10_Academic-Freedom.pdf.  
10 See the Office of the Provost and Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs at UM-Flint: https://www.umflint.edu/sites/default/files/groups/Office_of_the_Provost_Vice_Chancellor_for_Academic_Affairs/documents/faculty_code_june_2017.pdf.  
11 See the college/school websites for faculty resources.  
12 See the department, program, or standing committee’s chair or director.  
13 See http://www.robertsrules.com/.  
15 See the HLC: http://www.hlcommission.org/Publications/guiding-values.html.  
16 See in particular the SPG *Hierarchy of Legal and Policy Requirements*, For the hierarchy see http://spg.umich.edu/about/policy-hierarchy. For the SPG website see: http://spg.umich.edu/. If policies conflict, those of the higher level prevail.
1. The highest standards of shared governance (defined in the U of M Open Governance Resolution as that shared by the Board of Regents, the administration, and the faculty).  
2. Adherence to policies and procedures of the institution at each level.  
3. Consistent standards of decision making in the pursuit of equal and fair treatment of all members of the campus community.  
4. Faculty authority in decisions regarding the educational process and robust participation of faculty in areas of secondary responsibility.  
5. A culture of self-governance at each level of faculty responsibility.  
6. Accountability for the cultivation and implementation of faculty decisions.  
7. Transparency in all appropriate ways relevant to a federally and state-funded institution, including accurate and balanced reporting to accrediting agencies and other bodies.

---

17 UM-Flint is accredited by the HLC, which requires certain values and ethics: “HLC understands integrity broadly, including wholeness and coherence at one end of the spectrum and ethical behavior at the other. Integrity means doing what the mission calls for and not doing what it does not call for; governance systems that are freely, independently and rigorously focused on the welfare of the institution and its students; scrupulous avoidance of misleading statements or practices; full disclosure of information to students before students make any commitment to the institution, even a commitment to receive more information; and clear, explicit requirements for ethical practice by all members of the institutional community in all its activities.” HLC Guidelines: Criteria for Accreditation, Guiding Values.

18 See especially the OGR, p. 1.

19 Decision-making is understood as a conclusion made by an individual or group without necessarily compelling action (i.e. some are vetted by additional levels of review).

20 “The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, evaluation of student performance, research, faculty status, standards for admission of students, and those aspects of student life that relate to the educational process.” Principles part A. 1. p. 5. Secondary areas of responsibility occur when a given group merits inclusion in decision-making, but it shares responsibility with another group that may have primary or equal responsibility.

21 Administrators are ministers to the success of students and faculty. See especially the Regents Communication (U of M) Governance in Academe, which states that administrators are responsible for “Enabling and channeling the ideas that emerge from the creative ferment associated with faculty who are among the best in the world is the challenge for the administration, and it requires multi-directional communication. This multi-directional communication may not be comfortable, and it may not be quick, but it is at the heart of what we call ‘faculty governance’ at the university level in the UM model.” And, “Do not confuse management with administration. The core element of any university is the interaction of the faculty and the students. Administrators are needed to support the faculty and students, and to accomplish the business that enables research and education to happen. They take their name from this service role: ministers or administrators. Ideally, administrators come from the faculty because they understand the issues of scholarship and teaching. The best administrators take care to listen to their faculty colleagues regularly and respectfully.”

22 On cultivation: “A commitment to open governance provides people with an opportunity to share their views and provide input early in the decision making process, at a time when the input can shape the decision. University administrators are encouraged to actively seek out and provide for opportunities where broad faculty participation is available early in the process to complement the work of administrative staff … [T]he election or appointment of representatives [of the faculty] does not end the general faculty interest in how the business of the university is conducted, nor does it end the faculty’s right to be involved in university decision-making. The university is stronger when faculty understand and participate in the governing process, have access to good, clear information, and are able to place confidence in their administrative partners.” OGR, pp. 2-3. On implementation: see OGR, p. 2.

23 See especially the OGR, p. 2. “Access to information is the foundation for transparent university governance. Open governance requires that faculty and staff have complete information in a format which they can understand and use. As the first directive of this policy, all administrators shall aim to provide complete information to the faculty whenever possible, recognizing that privacy must be respected whenever appropriate. In addition, Administrators shall work to ensure the faculty is able to understand, or reasonably should be able to, the information provided without special
8. The professional success and dignity of all members of the campus community.
9. The assurance of due process for all members of the campus community.
10. Equal access to consideration for opportunities for all members of the campus community.
11. A diversity of ideas through vigorous academic debate and freedoms, including a culture that respects and encourages free speech, dissent, internal criticism, and academic freedom, including the following specific freedoms:
   a. Freedom of research and publication.
   b. Freedom of teaching.
   c. Freedom of participation in public debate.
   d. Freedom of internal criticism.

III. Principles of Governance

1. The principles of faculty participation in governance apply at all levels (including ad hoc and standing committees, departments, programs, schools, colleges, and a campus-wide body for faculty representation.).
2. The faculty at each level must set and practice procedures to ensure accountability and transparency of both administrators and elected faculty bodies. If delegated authority is not working in accordance with policies and procedures, the faculty must act to correct the problem.
3. The faculty have primary responsibility and authority for the educational process. The expertise of the faculty serves as the primary input into related decisions. This includes policies related to:

a. Methods of instruction, which require faculty authority in delivery, testing, and laboratory procedures.
b. Curriculum, which includes faculty authority over curriculum campus-wide (i.e. General Education, transfer equivalencies, and transfer agreements) and approval at each level of curricular development (program, department, committee, school/college).
c. Evaluation of student performance, which includes primary authority of the faculty over methods and standards of program and curricular assessment.
d. Standards of admission, which include meaningful faculty involvement in institutional admission standards and authority at the program-specific level.
e. Those aspects of student life that relate to the educational process, which include the ability of the faculty in departments and programs to devise procedures to participate in the management and oversight of the instructional unit’s resources.

4. The faculty have authority over the organization and procedures of governing faculty meetings; standing committee organization, procedure, and charge; changes to departmental structures; and, promotion and tenure (including procedures and standards in agreement with those of the institution). New or changed policies and procedures regarding areas of faculty responsibility (primary or secondary) must be approved by vote of the governing faculty.

5. Faculty have primary responsibility in considerations of faculty status and related matters, including but not limited to: hiring of instructional faculty (rank, specialization, procedures, and

---

29 "The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, standards and procedures for admission of students, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process (UM Handbook, Part 4B, 1a)." Primary responsibility herein means that certain institutional decisions should normally comply with the judgment of a specific group. It often corresponds to the group that should have authority over the development of policies and procedures by which it arrives at such judgments.

30 See f.n. 17. And, “Governance of a quality institution of higher education will include a significant role for faculty, in particular with regard to currency and sufficiency of the curriculum, expectations for student performance, qualifications of the instructional staff, and adequacy of resources for instructional support.” HLC Guiding Values.

31 For instance, such instructional resources might include, but are not limited to, scholarships, equipment, safety supplies, facilities, student travel, and research funding.

32 “The governing faculty of each academic unit shall establish the policies and procedures of each academic unit governance entity in relation to: curriculum; admission requirements; graduation requirements; major operating procedures such as departmental organization, committee organization, committee appointments; budget; faculty appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint; faculty promotion and tenure; and policies concerning reviews of faculty for merit salary increases.” Principles part B. 3., p. 6.

33 Faculty status in practice at the University of Michigan relates to decisions impacting individual faculty (hiring, promotions, review/search procedures, sabbaticals, appointments/reappointments…), and in keeping with the definition provided by the National Education Association: “Faculty members in higher education should have primary responsibility to: Exercise, where the faculty deems it appropriate, primary responsibility for determining the status of colleagues, especially appointment, reappointment, and tenure ... Establish procedures for awarding promotions, sabbaticals, research support, and other rewards or perquisites,” See: http://www.nea.org/home/34743.htm.

34 “Considerations of faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes matters relating to academic titles, appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the recommending of tenure and dismissal. Policies and procedures shall be developed for the implementation of these faculty responsibilities.” Principles part A. 3., p. 5.

And, “The primary responsibility of the faculty for such matters is based upon the fact that its judgment is central to general educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues; in such competence it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgments. Likewise, there is the more general competence of experienced faculty personnel committees having a broader charge.
selection of candidates); selection of appointed faculty representatives, including selection of academic administrators, chairs, and directors through criteria and procedures established by the faculty who are to be represented by the leaders being selected; review of sabbaticals and academic leaves; and, decisions to renew/promote/dismiss. Faculty with disciplinary expertise are best equipped to be leaders of units representing their discipline, so as to serve the university’s mission of academic excellence in such roles.  

6. Administrators are responsible for documenting how their decisions are made and making those details public as appropriate to those impacted by the decision. When faculty decisions are overturned (by an administrator or other faculty group), a written explanation to the faculty at the time that the decision is made is required.  

7. The governing faculty at each level of faculty responsibility will ratify and practice their own policies and procedures.  

Determinations in these matters should first be by faculty action through established procedures, reviewed by the chief academic officers with the concurrence of the board. The governing board and president should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail.” 1966 Statement part 5., p. 5. 

36 Ibid. Executive officer experience does not supersede qualified disciplinary faculty expertise to oversee a department/program, or to make decisions in which the faculty has primary responsibility. See the UM-Flint Academic Affairs Advisory Committee 2015 Resolution on administrators being appointed as departmental chairs and ensuing conflicts of interest (see the Office of the Provost faculty resources): “The Academic Affairs Advisory Committee (AAAC) strongly recommends the appointment of peer faculty to interim chair and director positions when such needs arise. The committee advises against the appointment of administrators as interim chairs and directors whenever possible. Having administrators in these roles, the committee believes, creates serious risks of conflicts of interest and may even undermine the free expression of ideas and opinion among faculty and staff in the affected departments. Both departments and administrators should be shielded from any bias that might result from an individual’s potentially conflicting obligations of chair, on the one hand, and administrator, on the other. When a peer professor or, in extraordinary circumstances, an administrator, is asked to serve as interim department or program head on a temporary basis, the AAAC recommends the development of clearly articulated guiding principles for the interim appointment that include the term of service, voting rights, leadership duties and responsibilities, and other appropriate conditions of the appointment.”

The connection between the role of the faculty in appointing leaders and the academic excellence of an instructional unit is also underscored in the 1966 Statement part 5., p. 5: “The chair or head of a department, who serves as the chief representative of the department within an institution, should be selected either by departmental election or by appointment following consultation with members of the department and of related departments; appointments should normally be in conformity with department members’ judgment. The chair or department head should not have tenure in office; tenure as a faculty member is a matter of separate right. The chair or head should serve for a stated term but without prejudice to reelection or to reappointment by procedures that involve appropriate faculty consultation. Board administration, and faculty should all bear in mind that the department chair or head has a special obligation to build a department strong in scholarship and teaching capacity.” A unit most commonly refers to a school, college, or institute in the Regents Bylaws. However, common usage, including in the U of M Faculty Handbook and multiple U of M faculty codes and bylaws, is as a generic instructional body, including departments and programs (i.e. UM Handbook part 3G). In various governance documents (LSA Faculty Code, College of Business (UM-Dearmom, etc.) a department is referred to as an instructional unit, an academic unit, or a basic unit.  

36 “The reasons behind administrative decisions are often as important as the decisions themselves. Letting the faculty know why decisions are made ensures honest, reasonable, fair, and open governance. It also protects the faculty from arbitrary administrative interference or worse. Administrators shall work to document any significant facts and criteria guiding a decision of broad impact on the faculty, staff or students and make the justification publically available early-on in the decision-process.” OGR, p. 2.  

37 The levels of governance at which a given faculty body may ratify and practice its own policies and procedures include committees, departments, colleges, and schools. “Agencies for faculty participation in the government of the college/school or university shall be established at each level where faculty responsibility is to be met. A faculty-elected campus-wide body shall exist for the presentation of the views of the whole faculty. The agencies may consist of meetings of all faculty members of a department, school, college, division, or university system, or they may take the form
Faculty are fully involved in budget decisions at all levels of their responsibilities and will establish procedures to ensure their involvement in budgeting, including decisions regarding faculty compensation (at levels where such deliberations might occur). Executive committees (where established), as per the Regents Bylaws, are required to assist with managing budgetary resources and setting budget priorities for the unit-level where they are appointed. Criteria for decisions made in financial exigency, and procedures to ensure faculty involvement in determining financial exigency, will exist at the campus and school/college levels. The faculty have free and transparent access to all levels of budgetary information and data related to the institution’s resources.

of faculty-elected executive committees in departments and colleges/schools, and a faculty-elected body for larger divisions or for the institution as a whole.” Principles part A. 5., p. 5.

“Governance of a quality institution of higher education will include a significant role for faculty, in particular with regard to currency and sufficiency of the curriculum, expectations for student performance, qualifications of the instructional staff, and adequacy of resources for instructional support.” HLC Guiding Values part 7.

For example faculty at a given level of responsibility may establish procedures to participate in reviewing and setting budgets and budget priorities. “Budgetary policies and decisions directly affecting those areas for which the faculty has primary responsibility such as, but not limited to, curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, admission of students and those aspects of student life that relate to the educational process shall be made in concert with the faculty.” Principles part A. 6., p. 5. And, “We recognize that some decisions the university must make are basically business matters, and that the optimal way for the university to make such decisions resembles the optimal way a large corporation would make them. But for decisions that significantly impact the core of the educational function, the corporate model would be counterproductive for a university.” Regents Communication (U of M) Governance in Academe.

“The faculty shall participate in the determination of policies and procedures governing compensation of faculty.” Principles part A. 4., p. 5. For possible faculty involvement in merit-program decisions at U of M see the ‘Faculty Compensation Guidelines Study,’ from the Office of the Provost (U of M): http://www.provost.umich.edu/reports/faculty_compensation/appenax-A.html.

An executive committee is vested by the Regents and governing faculty to make decisions of a certain type on behalf of a college, school, institute, center, department or program. Executive committees exist throughout the university, although some units use alternative structures (in such instances the faculty’s primary responsibilities remain the same and the Guiding Principles still apply). “The executive committees of the schools, colleges, or departments assist the dean or director in formulating educational, instructional, and research policies for consideration of the faculty and act on the behalf of the governing faculty in matters of budget, appointments, and promotions. They also assist with administrative functions. In some units, the dean or director performs executive duties without an executive committee (bylaws 5.02 and 5.06). (UM Handbook 3H, p. 17).” Also, “Unit-Level Faculty Governance Structures: The most immediate way by which faculty participates in the governance of the University is within appointment units. Faculty involvement in departmental, school, or college governance activities is essential to the University’s teaching, research, and service missions (UM Handbook, Part 4c, p. 22).” Moreover, “Although the principles of governance apply to all academic units the forms of faculty governance may vary among units (Principles, Part B1).”

See f.n. 28 and the U of M SACUA Report of the Unit Governance Task Force (2005), part 1.2, pp. 1-2, clarifying that executive committees that do not act on or assist with budgets are not adhering to the Regents Bylaws: “The second reason for the TF formation was the concern that not all ECs are permitted to participate in areas of governance specified in Regents’ Bylaw Sec. 5.06, according to which ‘The executive committee ... shall act for the faculty in matters of budget, promotions, and appointments.’ Specifically, while in some units the ECs discuss and vote on administrative appointments and the budget, in a number of units the deans do not involve the ECs in these issues. In still other units, the issues of budget and appointments are presented to ECs for information only. Redressing this possible non-adherence to the Regents’ Bylaws in some units was another goal of the TF formation.”

See f.n. 33-5.

See f.n. 20. And, “The allocation of resources among competing demands is central in the formal responsibility of the governing board, in the administrative authority of the president [chancellor], and in the educational function of the faculty. Each component should therefore have a voice in the determination of short- and long-range priorities, and each should receive appropriate analyses of past budgetary experience, reports on current budgets and expenditures, and short- and long-range...
9. The governing faculty determine voting methods and how names are transmitted to the Regents. This must necessarily include access to results and authority over election procedures and verification. 45

10. Executive Committees act under the authority of the governing faculty and assist deans with their duties. 46 The relevant governing faculty will determine the voting weight of ex officio members of executive and standing committees, as well as the duties of the chair. An EC may investigate and propose policies for the faculty, but such policies must be brought to the faculty legislative body that it serves for its consideration. ‘Acting’ for the faculty does not allow for unilateral changes to or interpretation of policies, and nor does it entitle an EC to make decisions outside of its charge for other levels of faculty governance (higher or lower than itself). Questions of interpretation should be brought to the relevant legislative body.

11. Strategic planning includes phases of the broadest possible involvement of the relevant governing faculty group in developing, approving and implementing a plan, as well as determining the procedures by which it will take shape. 47

12. Faculty are involved in decisions regarding facilities and resources, especially those regarding the use of buildings and facilities that are involved with the educational process. 48

13. Administrators or representatives of the faculty must be responsive to faculty communications and requests for information and assistance. 49

"The governing faculty shall establish policies and procedures by which a vote by secret ballot among nominees for membership on the executive committee will be conducted, and for the transmission of the names of those elected to the Regents." UM Handbook part 4B, 3.b.v., p. 22. See also Robert Rules of Order chapter 13. 45

"If an executive committee has been created by the board for the school, college, or department, the dean, director, or head shall be assisted by the executive committee of which he or she shall be ex officio the chair. The executive committee in addition to assisting with administrative functions shall be charged with the duties of investigating and formulating educational and instructional policies for consideration by the faculty and shall act for the faculty in matters of budgets, promotions, and appointments." Regents Bylaws Sec. 5.06, p. 5-25. By virtue of authority delegated to them by their governing faculty and the Board of Regents, executive committees are not by definition advisory committees, which do exist within U of M but are by contrast distinctly established as advisory to an executive officer through recognition in the Regents Bylaws (see Sec. 11, pp. 11-49 to 62 for those committees that are exclusively advisory).

"The framing and execution of long-range plans, one of the most important aspects of institutional responsibility, should be a central and continuing concern in the academic community. Effective planning demands that the broadest possible exchange of information and opinion should be the rule for communication among the components of a college or university." 1966 Statement part 2. c., p. 2.

"A second area calling for joint effort in internal operation is that of decisions regarding existing or prospective physical resources. The board, [chancellor], and faculty should all seek agreement on basic decisions regarding buildings and other facilities to be used in the educational work of the institution." 1966 Statement part 2. c., p. 3.

"The faculty believes that administrators can affirm, expand, and protect the University of Michigan’s culture by asserting open, inclusive, transparent, responsive, and accountable government." OGR, p. 2.
University Faculty Standing Committee Best Practices:
This document sets guidelines for standing committee functions across the university. Although generally applicable to committees at all levels of governance, the guidelines apply to all campus-wide deliberative groups (standing committees, advisory committees task forces, search committees, working groups, etc.).

Authority of the Standing Committees:
- The authority of the Standing Committees is the University of Michigan-Flint faculty code: Article 3, Section 3.
- Committees are elected to conduct or recommend business of the faculty. Faculty decisions that are overturned by executive officers or other parties must be justified in writing to the committee.

Committee Meetings:
- Standing committees should review their charges in the faculty code, any committee-specific standing rules, and prior year reports at the beginning of each academic year.
- Except for committees whose established meetings are published in the faculty code, a meeting schedule should be set at the first meeting of the year and scheduled around the teaching schedules of the elected representatives.
- Standing committee meetings are open to the public, unless the committee votes to go into executive session.
- Approved minutes must be kept for all meetings and available to the faculty via established mechanisms.
- Agendas should be disseminated beforehand in accordance with the faculty code and/or Roberts Rules (in most instances no less than 2 business days before the meeting).

Leadership of Committees:
- Chairs are normally selected at the start of each academic year by committee member vote.
- Chairs should attempt to ensure an inclusive and collegial climate for all committee members.
- The Chair should make sure that any Blackboard materials (if used) are up to date and all elected members have access to the materials.
- Chairs should ensure that the approved minutes and supplemental materials are available to the full faculty via established mechanisms.

Committee Communication:
- Committee communications and business should usually include all committee members.
- Committee members should recuse themselves if they have a conflict of interest with the business at hand (see SPG 201.65-1).

Committee-Administrator Relationships:
- Committees may ask administrators to attend committee meetings. Such requests should be made in consultation with committee members.
- Committee chairs are strongly encouraged to take a committee member with him/her when meeting with an administrator. The duty should alternate and not always be the same person.
Committee Documents:
- An elected faculty member on the committee should take responsibility for minute-taking, since minutes are an official record of faculty action.
- Members must be given an opportunity to review minutes before being asked to vote upon them. Minutes should be disseminated at least 48 hours before a meeting at which they will be discussed (although more time is often better).
- Minutes should be available to the campus governing faculty.
- Minutes must be approved by vote of the committee members. Minutes that are not approved by vote should be marked ‘draft.’ Typically, motions are made at the beginning of meetings to approve minutes from the meeting prior.
- Committees are encouraged to make available to the campus faculty any public documents that were consulted by the committee.
- Each standing committee produces an end-of-the-year report that goes to the UM-Flint Senate. This should summarize its business and note adoption of internal procedures. These should be approved by the committee and made available to the governing faculty.

Committee Business:
- Elected representatives should be open to meet with their constituents and should seek faculty feedback when possible.
- Matters requiring a vote should typically be disclosed in the agenda. If something requiring a vote comes up in matters arising, every effort should be made to put in on the next agenda in order to include all members in the decision.
- Committees should have a plan in place for how to handle time-sensitive business that arises when faculty are off contract.
- Where improvements to committee procedure and/or charge are necessary, the committee should propose code changes to the UM-Flint Senate for vote by the governing faculty.
- Committees may develop their own standing rules for operating procedures, providing that these do not conflict with the faculty code or standing rules, are recorded in the minutes and a copy is available to members of the campus and public.

Issues of Privilege:
- The committee chair is first among equals—he/she brings committee business to the entire committee.
- Committee action should be brought to a question.
- Committee members are strongly encouraged to work towards a transparent and inclusive climate in their committee work.
- Special attention should be paid to giving a voice to all committee members.
- Where a minority view is particularly beneficial but absent, the committee might consider additional consultation of faculty in such groups for feedback.
- Representatives of the faculty are strongly encouraged to participate in periodic bias training.
- Robust debate of committee business should be welcome and facilitated whenever possible.
- Faculty in service roles through committee appointments and leadership positions should review the following resources to prepare for university service:
  - The UM-Flint Faculty Code
  - Senate Assembly Statement on Academic Freedom in the University of Michigan Faculty Handbook part 1.C (https://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/handbook/1/1.C.html)
  - SPG 201.96: Professional Standards for Faculty (http://spg.umich.edu/policy/201.96)
  - Principles of Faculty Involvement in Institutional and Academic Unit Governance (https://faculty senate.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2015/03/Principles.pdf)
Faculty Code Appendix D: Campus-wide Leadership

Section 1. The Chancellor

The chancellor of the University of Michigan-Flint will be appointed on recommendation of the president and, subject to the general direction of the president, will serve as the chief executive officer of the University of Michigan-Flint in all educational, service, and supporting activities of the campus, including general oversight of the teaching and research programs; the libraries and other supporting services; the general welfare of the faculty and supporting staff; the business and financial welfare of the campus; and the maintenance of health, diligence, and order among the students. The chancellor will meet with the board, is the UM-Flint liaison with the Board of Regents (See Regents Bylaws Section 2.03.)

Section 2. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Under the direction of the chancellor, the provost will serve as the chief academic officer of the UM-Flint campus. The provost will be expected to participate in the formulation of undergraduate and graduate academic policy and plans, working with deans and appropriate campus-wide committees and bodies in so doing. The provost will provide leadership in the pursuit of campus-wide academic excellence. The provost will ensure coordination of general education among the instructional units.

The provost will supervise administration of instructional units and academic support units including the College of Arts and Sciences, School of Management, School of Health Professions and Studies, School of Nursing, School of Education and Human Services, Graduate Programs and Research, Library, and Information Technology Services. Administrators of these units will report directly to the provost. In addition, the provost's office provides general oversight for the Honors Program, the Office Extending, the International and Global Studies Program, the Thompson Center for Learning and Teaching, and the Office of Institutional Analysis.

The provost will support and encourage faculty development, and policies for the recruitment, selection and retention of faculty. The provost will review all new tenure track appointments and recommendations for tenure prior to credential action. Faculty morale and well-being must be a continuous concern and a primary duty.

The provost shall be advised by the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee on programs having campus-wide implications that affect academic affairs. This includes coordination and allocation of resources among instructional units, program development, academic support services, preparation of the calendar and the official UM-Flint Catalog, and other matters of concern to the committee or the provost.

The provost will serve as chief administrative officer of the campus in the absence of the chancellor.

Section 3. Faculty Code Appendix E: Survey of Administrators: General Policy

The process of obtaining faculty views about the University of Michigan-Flint’s administrators shall be regularized and conducted via surveys. Each survey shall contain items that pertain to the administrator’s job description, matters that affect the faculty, and areas of which the faculty have knowledge. Below is summary of the UMF/SAC’s General Policy.
1. Who should be assessed a. A survey of each central administrator will be conducted regularly. b. Central administrators include the chancellor, provost, senior vice provost, associate provosts, vice chancellors, deans, associate deans, and assistant deans.

2. Method of collection a. The UMF/SAC adopted survey items employed by the governing faculties at the University of Michigan Ann Arbor and Dearborn. The items provide a basis for comparison with the administrators’ counterparts at Ann Arbor and Dearborn. b. To expedite the collection and analysis of faculty responses and to increase anonymity, UMF/SAC recommends an online format with software such as Qualtrics.

3. Frequency and timing a. Timing: All surveys shall be released to the governing faculty in February. Governing faculty will be invited to survey the relevant administrators for their respective academic units. b. Chancellor and provost: These surveys shall be conducted biennially and rotated so that surveys of the chancellor and provost are in different years. c. Deans, associate deans, and assistant deans: Surveys of the deans, associate deans, and assistant deans shall be conducted annually. d. Senior vice provost and associate provosts: Surveys of the senior vice provost and associated provosts shall be conducted biennially. e. Vice chancellors: Surveys of the vice chancellors shall be conducted every third year.

4. Distribution of results of surveys a. Information to administrators: The UMF/SAC shall share all of the data (numbers and comments) from each survey with the administrator who is being surveyed. Information to governing faculty: All governing faculty shall receive tabular summary (means and SD), but not comments. UMF/SAC shall release the data for each dean to the entire governing faculty.

5. Interpretation a. Initial review: The UMF/SAC shall review the results of the surveys and present the results to the governing faculty. b. Executive officers: The UMF/SAC shall review survey results of administrators who have broad responsibilities to all governing faculty and may make recommendations to the governing faculty. However, it is the governing faculty who shall decide whether or not any specific action should be taken. c. Unit administrators: The governing faculty of each unit shall review survey results of the respective unit administrator(s), and shall determine whether or not any specific action should be taken. The UMF/SAC encourages executive committees (or other similar groups) to review and discuss survey results with their dean, associate dean, assistant dean, and the unit’s governing faculty. Administrators shall be allowed to comment on survey results.
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Appendix 2) UM-Flint Governance: A Description of Past, Present, and Future

a) Our Governance Past: Flint College was established in 1956 by the University of Michigan. It was considered a unit (like a school or college) within U of M and not its own campus. As such, most governance centered around its executive committee and governing faculty. To ensure that U of M standards in both academics and governance were followed at Flint College, four of 5 executive committee members were actually faculty from Ann Arbor rather than Flint. This eventually changed. Also notable about the early executive committee (which for all intents and purposes is the CAS Executive Committee today) is that the Regents temporarily granted the committee greater powers over decision-making than it was intended to hold long-term, the idea being that once the college was set up the governing faculty should be in charge of its affairs and the Executive Committee would become less involved in decisions that require the expertise of specific disciplines, such as decisions that could be made at the departmental level. As the historical documents show (see Appendix 6), faculty have expressed ongoing concerns about overreach of executive committees.

In 1971 Flint College became the University of Michigan-Flint. At the time that its first chancellor was appointed, it ceased to be merely a ‘unit’ of U of M and became its own campus. Advisory committees were established for senior executive officers, and departments were established to prioritize discipline-specific expertise in decision-making. These departments preceded schools or the college, and were central to faculty participation in governance, where U of M values of governance were expected to apply, as mandated by June of 1965 by the Regents:

The College [Flint College] shall establish such departments as shall from time to time be recommended by the Executive Committee, approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and reported to the Regents. Each department shall be organized in such a manner as to provide general participation by its staff members if the management of departmental affairs [Section 25.04 of the Regents Proceedings].

At some point in its history, seemingly following the establishment of schools and the college, a faculty senate assembly was established. Little information about this body was retained, but the histories of UM-Flint note that its size was almost 30 members. Information about why the assembly disbanded has not been forthcoming either from personal accounts or available documents. The only detail remembered was that perhaps it had been difficult to achieve a quorum for meetings. Historical accounts disagree on whether this was actually the case, however. Whether or not this was true (there is currently little to no evidence of this), the percentage of governing faculty that an assembly of that size would have required would be much different today, and there are other variables regarding faculty attendance at meetings that can be at play, many of which still apply as we have seen this year in some governing faculty meetings. In any case, FC replaced the
assembly. As historian Dr. Heywood pointed out, the elimination of the old assembly meant that as the campus grew, the number of faculty involved in its academic affairs decreased.¹

b) Current Governance Structure: There are two main models of governance in parliamentary procedure that are practiced in faculty governance in higher education: a board and an assembly. We have a board (FC).

Characteristics of a Board:
- Governing faculty authority is delegated to a board that acts for the governing faculty.
- Standing committees are established by the governing faculty’s code and report to the board. Power is shared between the board and its standing committees.
- A board, like FC, is usually 6-10 people, and is not big enough to have meaningful proportional representation, and therefore is less representative of the faculty’s will than other structures.
- The board reports to the governing faculty at an annual or semi-annual general meeting (accountability is self-regulated).
- Actions of the board (includes standing committees) do not require governing faculty consultation or approval, but their actions can be rescinded through a faculty vote at its semi-annual meeting.
- Governing faculty approval is needed to make changes to the code or standing rules.
- The board is accountable to the faculty through elections of board members.
- Administrator accountability to the board or standing-committees is compelled through board members (6-10 people).
- If an individual faculty member brings a concern to the board or a standing committee, it may not be required to respond to faculty concerns (responsiveness to faculty is self-regulated).

Characteristics of an Assembly with Proportional Representation:
- The governing faculty elects an assembly through guidelines established in the code.
- Governing faculty authority is delegated to the assembly, which acts for the governing faculty.
- From its members, the assembly elects a small executive committee (possibly comparable to or smaller than FC or SACUA) to organize, supervise and implement assembly actions.
- The executive committee recommends proposals for the assembly to consider but does not act for the assembly (unless otherwise specified in the code). The assembly acts through parliamentary procedure at its monthly meetings.
- Standing committees are established by the assembly’s code and report to the assembly.
- Power is shared between the assembly’s executive committee, standing committees, and the elected assembly members.
- The assembly (including its committees) reports to the governing faculty at an annual or semi-annual general meeting.
- Assembly actions do not require governing faculty approval except for changes to the code or standing rules, including the existence/function/composition of standing committees.
- Assembly actions can be rescinded through a faculty vote at its general meeting.
- The assembly is held accountable to the governing faculty through individual elections of assembly and standing committee members, and because meetings are open except for executive session.
- Administrator accountability to faculty decisions is compelled through a large representational group (assembly) rather than a small council or committee.

An individual faculty member may bring concerns to any assembly representative, the executive committee, or a standing committee. Assemblies are usually required to respond in some way to all faculty inquiries. Faculty at large have more representatives to whom they can bring their concerns, mitigating politics and non-responsiveness.

GTF research, as well as that of the 2016-17 TCTF (of the Senate Assembly) revealed the following issues with the current board model of governance at UM-Flint. The place of the current system of campus-wide governance at UM-Flint within the wider university system is problematic and the source of its authority is unclear. Although the Regents Bylaws establish the existence of a Chancellor, schools, colleges, advisory committees, and their executive committees, at UM-Flint the existence of FC and a campus-wide governance structure is unrecognized in the Regents Bylaws and thus lacks the associated status, powers and protections of Regental recognition.2

In contrast, the Regents Bylaws establish the university-wide University Senate (and its elected Senate Assembly) as the faculty’s legislative arm with broad powers to consider any subject regarding the university and to make direct recommendations to the Regents. The Regents endow the University Senate with authority over matters affecting university policy as a whole, as well as academic policies that impact more than one college or school. Its decisions are regarded as the binding action of the university faculties.3 Like the Regents Bylaws, neither the U of M Faculty Handbook nor the University Faculty Senate Rules formally recognize the existence of campus-wide governance at UM-Flint. This relationship is further complicated because of the undefined overlap between the presumed authority UM-Flint’s FC and the recognized authority of the University Senate and the Senate Assembly.

Through consultation between the TCTF and SACUA, the GTF investigated the best way to legitimize UM-Flint’s campus governance within U of M and to clarify the source of authority for UM-Flint governance and its relationship to the university system, of which it is an integral part. The options for how to derive authority were as follows:

OPTION A (Authority derived from a chancellor)
- Campus-wide governance would be established under a chancellor’s authority and would be advisory to a chancellor and provost, because the body that functions in this way is recommended to the Regents by an executive officer who is a liaison between the faculty governance body and the Regents.
- This model most closely represents the status-quo and would not require changes in practice, beyond clarification of UM-Flint code and possible changes to the Regents Bylaws.

OPTION B (Authority derived from the Regents)
- Campus-wide governance would be established under Regental authority to be recognized as the faculty’s legislative arm and authorized to consider any matters related to Flint interests and to make recommendations to the Regents. The Regents would delegate authority to campus-wide governance to take binding action over matters pertaining to the Flint campus alone or to those matters involving more than one unit on the Flint campus.
- This would require action by the Regents and significant changes to the Regents Bylaws. The changes would be recommended to the Regents most feasibly by a chancellor. Also, Regental action of this type has not been sought or forthcoming for Dearborn’s assembly, in

---

2 The Regents Bylaws explicitly recognize the following at the Flint campus: the Chancellor; CAS, SHPS, SEHS and SOM; the executive committees of CAS, SOM, SEHS and SN; the Citizens’ Advisory Committee; Regents Bylaws, Secs. 2.03, 11.01-11.215, 6.02.

3 “The senate is authorized to consider any subject pertaining to the interests of the university, and to make recommendations to the Board of Regents in regard thereto. Decisions of the University Senate with respect to matters within its jurisdiction shall constitute the binding action of the university faculties. Jurisdiction over academic policies shall reside in the faculties of the various schools and colleges, but insofar as actions by the several faculties affect university policy as a whole, or schools and colleges other than the one in which they originate, they shall be brought before the University Senate.” Regents Bylaws, Sec. 4.01.
part because of the difficulty of this path and confusion in jurisdiction between institutional and campus-wide governance that might occur as a result of this kind of authority.

OPTION C (Authority derived from the University Senate):

- Campus-wide governance would be established under the authority of a faculty rather than administrative body through the University Senate (which is itself already recognized and granted authority in the Regents Bylaws). This is the status quo to the extent that the senate already has jurisdiction over all three campuses on institution-wide matters, but UM-Flint does not yet have an officially recognized governance structure for matters exclusive to its own campus.
- This model of governance is not advisory to an executive officer as in Option A.
- Campus-wide governance at Flint would act as a branch of the Senate Assembly, with delegated authority over all Flint campus-wide matters in faculty governance. The right to make recommendations to the Regents would remain a power of the University Senate (as opposed to the chancellor in Option A). Administrative signatory authority for other matters approved by the Regents through shared governance remains the authority of the chancellor.
- This would require action by the University Senate through the Senate Assembly.

c) Future: The UM-Flint faculty can address legitimization, proportional representation, adoption of best practices, alignment with the U of M institution, and advancement of governance for re-accreditation with the Higher Learning Commission through adoption of the GTF’s motions.

Appendix 3) Selected Benefits of an Assembly derived through the University Senate

a) Regentally Recognized Governance:
The GTF’s unanimous recommendation is that UM-Flint faculty vote to create an assembly, which could then be approved and brought into being by the Senate Assembly, solving both questions of how UM-Flint authority is derived and whether it has been officially recognized. This eliminates the need to change Regental Bylaws and would more expeditiously resolve the question of Regental recognition. It is projected that both SACUA and the Senate Assembly will see the merit of supporting Flint faculty in such an initiative.

b) UM-Flint Governance within U of M:
A challenge, it would seem, for UM-Flint faculty has been interpretational disparities caused by U of M policy when applied to UM-Flint contexts. In deciding which structure to recommend, GTF members believed that the best approach would be to first understand standards of governance that apply to UM-Flint. That process mirrored that undertaken by the Senate Assembly, which in 2008 similarly reviewed governance policies and practices to develop a document called the Principles of Faculty Involvement in Institutional and Academic Unit Governance at the University of Michigan.4 The Guiding Principles of Governance at UM-Flint clarifies the role of faculty in governance at UM-Flint. Through consultation with governance leaders on governance practices across the institution, including across UM-Flint, the guiding principles provide clarity on standards and application. These policies reflect standards that each school or college applies according to its own faculty-approved specific procedures, and do not prohibit schools/colleges from developing internal procedures to meet institution-wide standards. School/college policies may differ between units as long as they have been established by the unit’s governing faculty.

---

4 Principles of Faculty Involvement in Institutional and Academic Unit Governance at the University of Michigan https://facultysenate.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2015/03/Principles.pdf
c) University of Michigan Governance Brand:
As noted in the *History of U-M Faculty Governance*, U of M has since its inception been considered a leader in faculty and shared governance. It collaborated with the American Association of University Professors in its early history, and significant portions of the Regents Bylaws and Faculty Handbook have been directly taken from the AAUP’s 1966 *Statement on the Government of Colleges and Universities*. Effective faculty governance supports faculty recruitment and retention.

d) Transparency, Accountability, and Effectiveness of Shared and Faculty Governance:
The proposed governance structure creates or adapts 3 bodies: a faculty senate, a senate assembly, and a senate advisory committee to provide transparency and efficiency. The UM-Flint Senate is the largest body and meets at a minimum, twice a year. The UM-Flint Assembly is a proportional governing body, elected from the larger UM-Flint Senate, that is efficiently able to conduct and vote on faculty business presented at monthly open meetings. UM-Flint Assembly members are available to the faculty for questions and consultation to increase transparency and accountability. The UM-Flint /SAC is a small elected working group, whose members can make recommendations on faculty business to the UM-Flint Assembly; but, the advisory committee does not vote faculty business into effect, as only the proportional assembly or the larger senate can do this. Thus the three-pronged structure has a small working group (senate advisory committee) that presents faculty business to the senate assembly for timely action and transparent communication to the larger faculty senate.

This new model with its three structures differs from the current model of a governing faculty and a faculty council in several ways, but most significantly by adding a proportional senate assembly. The addition of the third structure meets the goals of transparency and accountability for all members, yet streamlines faculty business, allowing for timely responsiveness through regular meetings. It is clear from previous attendance patterns at governing faculty meetings that a significant number of eligible faculty do not attend or vote, thus a representative model with a senate assembly will be able to conduct faculty business while still representing the faculty as a whole.

e) Efficiency and Timeliness:
Of the arguments considered against having an assembly, the GTF considered the possibility that another level of governance as the site of approval for recommendations from faculty bodies would delay faculty business. In practice, however, an assembly has proven to expedite faculty business in both U of M and in the ubiquitous examples of well-managed faculty senates across North America. Although a much larger institution, the process of standing committees reporting to the Senate Assembly has not made U of M governance too slow to function or otherwise ineffective. First, the faculty assembly would meet more frequently than do the governing faculty in the current system (9 times per year instead of 2-4 times per year). The frequency of meetings makes the assembly responsive to the need for action. By contrast, FC has at times struggled logistically with bringing business to the faculty, both because there are limited meetings each year, and because the body is often deemed too unwieldy to hold meaningful discussions. Perhaps more plainly, if an assembly made faculty business too slow then senates would not be most common in higher education. In order to ensure timely action, the GTF has recommended the adoption of language in the standing committees code (taken from the Senate Assembly’s language) that requires both faculty and administrators to consult with each other and act in a timely fashion.

---

5 *History of U-M Faculty Governance*, https://facultysenate.umich.edu/about/history-of-u-m-faculty-governance/
f) Proportional Representation: Proportional representation was a central reason for forming the task force (according to the motion passed in March 2017) and faculty members also raised it in the fora. The current attempt to have proportional representation through standing committee composition means that proportional representation is actually not effective or consistent. When additional seats were added for CAS in winter of 2017, this was not done for any of the other units, so the schools do not share in proportional representation despite their varying size. Meaningful proportionality is easier to achieve in an assembly than a board (like FC), since a board. A model was recommended to balance size disparities between units with proportionality. It became redundant, consequently, to have varying numbers of seats on standing committees. Also, to balance the proportionality, it was deemed appropriate to make standing committee representation based on an equal number of seats for each unit, which will make the standing committees slightly smaller and easier to schedule.

To derive proportional allocations in the assembly, the GTF recommends an equation that provides a minimum number of representatives per school/college/library (3) with a larger number of seats determined by proportion based on the number of governing faculty per unit. To keep the assembly’s overall size to a reasonable number, the equation recommended is: (# of senators per unit*0.066) +3, which means that the number of governing faculty as defined by our campus per unit is divided by 10 and multiplied by 2/3; this allocates a portion of seats to each unit based on its size before the minimum of 3 seats is added. Currently this would allot the following seats: CAS 14, Library 3, SEHS 4, SHPS 5, SOM 5 and SON 5, or 36 total. The number of seats would be reapportioned every 3 years.

This model provides the largest unit with the largest number of seats but guarantees reasonable reliable representation for the smaller units as well as voting power for the schools, if not individually then collectively. In order to protect smaller units from being burdened by assembly service, any unit with less than 15 senators would not share in seats by proportion and would only have the minimum of 3 seats. The recommended formula allows for new schools/colleges/units to be added without requiring modification to the Faculty Code.

Having a proportional legislative body also ensures that faculty decisions are more representative of the faculty’s will. Instead of decisions being a result of an accident of scheduling (how many faculty from a given unit are able to attend a given meeting), faculty will be able to count on their units being adequately represented at assembly meetings.

g) Clarified Roles in Shared Governance: Certain challenges have arisen over UM-Flint’s history that have led to confusion about the role of faculty, administrators, and the Regents in campus affairs. The Guiding Principles address this by compiling definitions of faculty and shared governance, for example. Within higher education administrators and faculty have very different roles. Because U of M practices shared governance, there are areas where responsibilities are shared. However, this does not mean that input is meant to be equal or that all responsibilities are shared. There is a sliding scale of influence over matters of different types for faculty and administrators. Decisions regarding the business and non-academic functions or staffing of the university often do not require faculty consultation. Decisions regarding academic functions should often be primarily made by faculty or their representatives. Decisions that have significant impact over academic matters, such as budgeting, should often be jointly made between faculty and executive officers. The closer the decision to its impact on academics, the more it should be based on the faculty’s academic expertise and judgment. For example, whether or not there is a Pizza Hut versus a Taco Bell in a campus food court is not likely to materially impact academics. By contrast, budgets apportioned to departments or other units, funding available for research, etc. directly impact academics. Confusion also exists around signatory authority, which has been misinterpreted as a right to primary input in decision-making, or as rendering the decisions of faculty groups advisory. An assembly would help to clarify the roles and responsibilities of faculty, administrators, and the Regents, by putting the weight of a faculty legislative body behind faculty decisions. It is harder to consider merely advisory the decision of a body comprised of several dozen faculty, as opposed to perhaps a handful of faculty on a committee.
An assembly might also improve communication and transparency between faculty and senior executive officers, since a body that meets regularly (and that is open to all faculty to attend) can more frequently host executive officers without sacrificing the business of the faculty to the time available in meetings. This provides faculty with more opportunity to engage with their leaders, and visits by leaders give them more opportunity to share information and consult with the faculty.

h) Distribution and Recognition of Service: For some faculty the service burden for UM-Flint campus-wide standing committees is excessive. A UM-Flint Assembly does not reduce the cumulative work effort, but disperses it in perhaps more manageable ways. While it requires faculty from each unit to serve as representatives, they would be meeting only monthly, and would provide a much larger pool from which one-time tasks could be sourced.

Service on a faculty senate assembly is generally considered a well-respected professional service in academia. Recognition of senate service is more visible and transferable to other institutions.

i) Updating Faculty Code Content: As the national AAUP Review of Governance at UM-Flint (Dec. 2016) indicated, much of the UM-Flint Faculty Code is out of date, because it extensively quotes Regents Bylaws, but has not been updated when Regents Bylaws have changed. Moreover, the 2016 Report of the Ad Hoc Committee and AAUP review noted that UM-Flint faculty rely on a number of ‘oral traditions’ never articulated in code, making it difficult for new faculty and administrators to respect past practices. The code revision included in this proposal rectifies these inconsistencies and updates UM-Flint’s code by bringing it into maturity with its own history. The Guiding Principles also align governance standards and expectations, by showing how UM-Flint’s governance must align with those of the institution.

Appendix 4: Overview of Faculty Concerns regarding Governance at UM-Flint:

Over the course of the GTF’s consultation with governing faculty and executive officers certain areas for growth in governance became clear. Highlights of these include the following themes:

a) Structural concerns: Does UM-Flint meet best practices in higher education, within U of M, or with the Regents, and how might proportional representation work at UM-Flint?

b) Improved clarity in governance: What are the disparities between actual and practiced faculty authority across the campus; what does it mean to have primary or secondary purview over university affairs; and, what are the appropriate roles for faculty and administrators in higher education and U of M (i.e. how are the Regents policies regarding faculty purview historically meant to be practiced and interpreted throughout U of M?)? Have U of M policies lost perceived applicability (in meaning and practice) at UM-Flint, perhaps due to the silo effect that sometimes emerges in a multi-campus system?

c) Improved transparency in governance: Might there be improvements to checks and balances of authority and power within the UM-Flint governance system; and, could meaningful consultation of the governing faculty in campus decisions be increased? Can there be greater accountability of administrators to faculty decisions on academic matters, and greater input of faculty in campus-wide governance (i.e. more representational decisions and more responsive and transparent representation)? Could accountability of standing committees be improved?

d) Understanding core governance values: Can there be common governance goals and guidelines that align with UM-Flint’s mission?
Appendix 5) UM-Flint Assembly Resources

The Office of the Provost will support a faculty senate governance structure in the following ways:

a) A staff person will be assigned by the Provost in consultation with Senate leadership to hold an appropriate percentage of effort for the needs of the UM-Flint Senate and its bodies (UM-Flint Assembly, UM-Flint /SAC, and their officers).

b) A physical space for a UM-Flint Senate Office will be provided (primarily for use by the UM-Flint /SAC officers and possibly staff).

c) An annual budget for office supplies for senate business will be provided.

d) A listserv of governing faculty will be maintained for UM-Flint Senate members, to which the UM-Flint /SAC Chair and Vice Chair will have access.

e) An annual hosting budget for UM-Flint Senate, UM-Flint Assembly, and UM-Flint /SAC meetings will be provided.

Appendix 6: Excerpts of Histories of Governance from Histories of UM-Flint

Explanation of the document:

This document includes excerpts from studies about UM-Flint history as they relate to UM-Flint governance history and issues that the GTF have heard about from faculty. They are in order of chronology.

1970:


On July 1 of 1971 the first Chancellor was appointed, converting Flint College to the University of Michigan-Flint.

1973:


Pg 93: “One of the first priorities for the campus [new Flint College], according to the Advisory Planning Committee, was the selection of a Dean.

The administrative officer in charge of the Flint unit of the University of Michigan should be a dean with the same responsibilities, functions, and authority as a dean of the 15 degree-granting units on the campus in Ann Arbor. He would have the same administrative relationships to the Board of Regents and the officers of the University as would a dean of a school or college in Ann Arbor... The man selected … was David M. French … a Harvard-educated … Rhodes scholar … The choice … reflected the academic interests and personal qualities admired by top administrators in Ann Arbor.”

Pg 93-4: [From a report to the Ways and Means Committee in the Michigan legislature for proposing the Flint College]:

“The University program at Flint … should have its own faculty, primarily in residence, and its own administrative head who would be directly responsible to the President of the University. The faculty should maintain standards of the same level as for the comparable programs in Ann Arbor.”

Pg 98-9: “The Executive Committee [the oldest version of the CAS EC] of the Flint branch was a legal entity formulated according to the same requirements as those pertaining to the schools and
colleges in Ann Arbor. However, the membership was set to represent the interests of the faculties involved in the program being developed for Flint:

In the words of the first Dean

The Committee [Executive Committee] is charged with the duty of investigating and formulating educational and instructional policies for consideration by the faculty, and it shall act for the faculty in matters relating to budget, promotion, and appointments. It shall, during the academic years 1955-56 and 1956-57, act for the College in all matters of educational policy, including the selection of faculty, the preparation of suitable requirements for admission, courses of instruction, and requirements for graduation. … The Executive Committee shall consist of the Dean and five members of the University faculties, at least one of whom shall be a member of the Flint College faculty. … In the selection of members first to be appointed to the Executive Committee of the Flint College and their immediate successors, care should be taken to represent the several instructional areas to be developed and, to assure such representation, two members of the Committee shall be appointed from the faculty of the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts [LSA Ann Arbor], and one member each from the faculties of the Schools of Business Administration and Education, respectively, with the understanding that these appointments shall be made from panels of nominees selected in such manner as shall be deemed appropriate by the deans, and executive committees of the units named.”

Pg 99: The Ann Arbor members of the regional campus executive committees made very sure that the programs being offered were of a quality commensurate with programs in Ann Arbor …

Pg 99-100: The Dean—Executive Committee model which was established by Regential action did not provide a clean delineation of roles to be exercised by the Dean as opposed to the Executive Committee.

[Interview with Dean David M. French]:
The relationship between the Executive Committee and the Dean was very fuzzy. The Bylaws say the Dean and Executive Committee will exercise power over budget, promotions, appointments, and make suggestions to the faculty. They do not say how many votes the Dean got, and how many were for the Executive Committee. I was certainly more than a chairman, but I exercised my authority at the risk of my own life. The whole game plan was to avoid confrontation if matters could possibly be worked out.

Pg 104: There were no departments when the college began—Dean French acted as chairman of all disciplines.

Pg 150-1: “The full-time faculty members … soon realized that their contribution ot the developing branch called for active participation in many aspects of campus business. Everyone served on at least one standing committee, assumed a very heavy advising load, planned all courses in the discipline their appointment covered, and worked to establish governance structures for the college. … The ‘one man departments’ with which the college opened exacted a strong commitment from every faculty member.”

Pg 152-3: “Faculty members said the all-important reason for their contentment in Flint was their status as University of Michigan faculty members. Without that association, the very low faculty turnover rate experienced in Flint would have become, in the words of one faculty member, ‘one hundred percent per year.’ Thoughts of severing this Ann Arbor tie were vigorously opposed on the infrequent occasions when they were broached.”

Pg 153: “The Executive Committee helped develop the budget which was transmitted to Ann Arbor.”

Pg 154: “The budget sequence [i.e. how budgets in Ann Arbor were allocated to the Flint campus] also created conflict between the Dean and Executive Committee. Because the Committee had no
direct contact with Ann Arbor, members had to trust the Dean to interpret their needs. They felt that Ann Arbor priorities came first and so the Dean did not get sufficient attention. Urgent Flint needs were not presented with adequate force and conviction. The secrecy which surrounded the requests and allocations made everyone unhappy and mistrustful. But the budgeting process remained unchanged.”

Pg. 154: “[T]he early years of the College are recalled primarily for the frustration everyone felt at not being able to add faculty and expand departments. Faculty members looked forward to being rid of one-man departments, and to having colleagues in their own disciplines. This led eventually to concern for increasing enrollments, but not in the first years of operation.”

Pg 159-61: “The Bylaws of the Board of Regents of the University of Michigan, Chapter XXV, Section 25.03 stipulate that

The functions of the Flint College shall be performed by a Dean assisted by an Executive Committee. The Committee is charged with the duty of investigating and formulating educational and instructional policies for consideration by the faculty, and it shall act for the faculty in matters relating to the budget, promotion, and appointments.

The Bylaw further requires that from 1955-1957, the Executive Committee will assume the duties usually exercised by the governing faculty; including faculty selection, setting admission requirements, determining courses of instruction, and drawing up graduation requirements. At their meeting on July 24, 1959 the Board of Regents formally transferred the faculty’s traditional powers from the Dean and Executive Committee to the faculty. ‘The Flint College faculty is now the “governing faculty” of the Flint College, with the usual functions and responsibilities of “governing faculty.”’ …

“In actual practice, the family had exercised faculty prerogatives much earlier. Because the campus was small, the faculty was regularly involved in governance functions. Both standing committees and monthly meetings of the full faculty provided decision making opportunities. Proceedings are recalled as being unusually democratic. ‘Once the faculty had come into being in September, 1956, the Executive Committee not only permitted but urged it to take the initiative in considering and recommending academic policies and procedures.’”

“Although the Executive Committee was composed primarily of Ann Arbor faculty, everyone was interested in shifting responsibility to the newly assembled Flint faculty. There was too much work for one small body to accomplish. Including the faculty in Flint was a pragmatic as well as democratic consideration.

The one limitation (not imposed on the faculties of the other schools and colleges [in Ann Arbor]) has been that all actions of the Flint faculty have required subsequent Executive Committee approval before such actions could become effective. That requirement ended in 1959 with the Regents’ transferral of ‘governing faculty’ powers to the faculty.

The language of the grey book [plan to build the campus] made it quite clear that the new College was to work gradually towards self governance. This was not intended to mean that the unit would become independent or ‘spin-off’ from the University of Michigan, but instead that it would enjoy the same relationship to the University as the other Schools and Colleges in Ann Arbor. Responsibility for Schools operations was expected to be shared by the Dean, Executive Committee, and faculty, with each performing the tasks allocated according to the normal governance functions of a school or college.”

Pg 163: “There were no salary or released time benefits for the faculty members, but everyone expected to be involved in the governance of the College. Because the Dean’s administrative staff was so small, including the faculty was a practical necessity.”

Pg 241: “The budgeting process now includes departmental inputs as well as Executive Committee review. It has become possible to express priorities for programs and plans through the budget.”
Pgs. 240-242: Flint faculty felt there was a ‘veil of secrecy’ over budgeting that was preserved by the Flint administration and Ann Arbor campus.

Pgs. 243-4: “The faculty governance structure at the Flint College was greatly simplified by virtue of the campus’ small size. During the first years of operation the faculty met as a whole. Most of the work done by the faculty was accomplished by its elected committees. Standing Committees ‘handled course authorization, student affairs, admissions, scholarships, public affairs, and the library. When the faculty convened for its regular monthly meeting, one purpose was the hear the reports from their committees.’ There were no departments, and so there was no need for the usual discipline-oriented committees and other structures. A faculty code was developed within the framework of the Bylaws of the Board of Regents. ‘The code was modeled on the Lit School in Ann Arbor.’”

Pg. 244: Faculty code was developed to mirror that of the Regents.

Pg. 244: June of 1965 departments were established through the Regents. Passage approved for the creation of departments “The College [Flint College] shall establish such departments as shall from time to time be recommended by the Executive Committee, approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and reported to the Regents. Each department shall be organized in such a manner as to provide general participation by its staff members if the management of departmental affairs [Section 25.04 of the Regents Proceedings].”/The disciplines at Flint College were given departmental status when they included at least three faculty members. Departments of Biology, Business Administration, Chemistry, Education, English, Foreign Languages, and Literature, History, and Physics were established on July 23, 1965. Chairmen were named in September. Four full professors and four associate professors became department chairmen. All were members of the original Flint faculty. With increased size, the interests of the faculty turned more to departmental matters than all-college concerns.”

Pg. 245: When the first Chancellor was hired, the executive committee was advisory to him. The hiring of a Chancellor also marked the point at which Flint was perceived to become a campus and not just a college or schools like comparable units in Ann Arbor, although this could be said to have officially occurred around 1975 when the first school was created.

1989:

NCA Self-Study Report, 1989: Volume 1:

Pg 17-8: “The 1975 and 1980 NCA reports note substantial uncertainties in regard to the organizational structure and inter-relations among governance elements. Departments and programs were asked whether the inter-relationship between the administrative structure (including the executive committee, if the unit has one) and faculty governance facilitates or hinders the governance process.

Of the 19 departments or programs who answered this question, 5 expressed satisfaction with the current governance process. The others expressed various levels of dissatisfaction. Six departments indicated problems with the CAS Executive Committee. They expressed a need for greater autonomy in budget, evaluation, and personnel decisions; a need to articulate the role of the CAS Executive Committee, the CAS Dean, and CAS department chairs; a need to reverse the reduction of department chairs to clerical functions; a need for greater coordination between the CAS Curriculum Committee and the CAS Executive Committee; a need for CAS departments to regain governance power from the CAS Executive Committee. Graduate programs affiliated with CAS and the Education department expressed the greatest frustration.”
Pg 18: [From a faculty survey]: “The CAS Executive Committee is undercutting previously existing practices. New policies appear to make it desirable to avoid graduate teaching, to avoid thesis direction, and to avoid program direction.”

“There is too much reliance on CAS in decisions that affect the entire campus.”

Pg 22: “Of the 14 departments or programs that addressed the issue of [faculty] morale at UM-F, 10 felt that faculty morale was low and 4 felt that it was high. But even the departments that reported high faculty morale qualified their remarks and added the same items of dissatisfaction that are cited as contributing to low morale, namely, inadequate salaries, inadequate fringe benefits, lack of an adequate library, lack of computing equipment for faculty, bad promotion/merit system, inadequate research and travel support, frustration with shared governance, over-dependence on part-time faculty, lack of space, lack of collegiality.

It seems that many faculty members are more satisfied as members of their department than as members of the University.”

Pg 41: “The Academic Affairs and Program Development Committee makes its recommendations to the Faculty Assembly, an elected body of 25 members of the UM-Flint governing faculty, for final recommendation to the Provost and Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs.”

NCA Self-Study Report, 1989: Volume 2:

Pg. 3: “Many departments expressed a need for more faculty, more instructional equipment, and more resources. Some departments included convincing evidence of their current level of understaffing. Many departments have difficulty providing for upper-level students and expressed the need for a plan to offer upper-level courses on a regular basis.”

Pg. 5: Survey question to faculty: “The 1975 and 1980 NCA Reports note substantial uncertainties in regard to the organization structure and inter-relations among governance elements. Does the inter-relationship between the administrative structure (including the executive committee, if your unit has one) and faculty governance facilitate or hinder the governance process?”

Sample survey answer to the above question: “University faculty are intrinsically ineffective at governance, and department and school politics often hinder the process.”

“The CAS Executive Committee is undercutting previously existing practices…”

“There is too much reliance on CAS in decisions that affect the entire campus.”

Pg. 8: “The governance structure at UM-F is seen as unresponsive by some, but equally many others are satisfied. Departments and programs outside CAS express the need for a university-wide curriculum committee to address issues such as general education requirements.

Pg. 9: Survey question: “In 1980 the fairly high degree of turnover among key administrators was seen as a potential problem. Do we still have this problem?”

Summary of responses: “[T]he majority of departments felt that the University of Michigan-Flint no longer has the problem of high turnover among key administrators [elsewhere in the study identified as the Chancellor and Provost positions throughout the early 1980s]…The comments make it clear that the faculty sees a high turnover rate among key administrators as detrimental to the institution in that it makes a consistent vision for the future difficult.”

Pg. 6 Survey of Individual Faculty Members:
In response to the adequacy of planning and decision-making, the faculty were asked to rate such adequacy at the UM-F, Unit, and Dept./Prog. levels. Results show that:

- Departments were considered an integral part of faculty involvement in institutional decision-making.
- Effectiveness of faculty involvement in curriculum decisions was overwhelmingly greatest at the departmental level (59 of 70 responses gave departmental adequacy the highest rating).
- Effectiveness of faculty voice in administrative decision making was lowest at the campus-wide level and highest (48/70) at the departmental level.
- Only 20/62 gave the structure of faculty governance committees at the campus-wide level the highest adequacy rating. The highest satisfaction for faculty governance committees was those in departments and programs (33/50).
- Faculty meetings were rated as having the lowest adequacy at the campus-wide level.
- Effectiveness of faculty codes were typically scored as adequate over inadequate for all 3 types of structures.
- Promotion policies and procedures were deemed the most adequate at the department level (30/57) and the least adequate at the campus-wide level (16/52).
- Concern by the administration for individual faculty members was considered most adequate at the dept. level (56/69) and least adequate at the campus level (15/47).

Sample Survey Responses of Individual Faculty Members: pg 13:

“Consistent with other parts of this survey, the salary structure generates the greatest amount of dissatisfaction.”

It was noted that there were more appointed committees than standing committees, and that appointed committees seemed to represent a significant drain on faculty time.

Pg. 13-14: “Another problem that needs to be addressed is the tension between the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) and the professional schools (School of Management and School of Health Professions and Services). The point of view often voiced by faculty members in the College of Arts and Sciences is summarized by one of the comments in the survey: ‘The other units were created with money taken from CAS, and they continue to prosper while CAS suffers.’ On the other hand, the professional schools chafe under the CAS control of the general education requirements and because CAS problems tend to become UM-F problems by virtue of the size of CAS.”

Pg. 14 in ‘Highlights of Section IV’

“More than %50 of all respondents who expressed an opinion disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that UM-F consistently demonstrates concern for staff. Almost %50 disagreed or disagreed strongly with the statement that senior administrative officers at UM-F clearly communicate their objectives and policies to the University community. About one third of all respondents disagreed or disagreed strongly with the statements:

The organizational structure at UM-F is clear and workable.
On the whole, I respect the competence of those in positions of responsibility at UM-F.
UM-F makes every reasonable effort to offer opportunities for employment/promotion to women.

Pg. 17 …

“The Self-Study Committee has discussed the survey and tried to identify common themes in the various perceived unsatisfactory aspects of life at UM-F. The committee concluded that there are two main sources for perceived difficulties

i) lack of adequate funding (for salaries, fringe benefits, facilities)
ii) lack of adequate communication from the senior administration

1990:


Pg. 64: “In the area of governance of the institution it should perhaps be said that this is a shared task for, dating from the early period of the school’s existence, there are faculty committees of various kinds. These, provided for in the Faculty Bylaws, are assigned to work with the top officials, e.g. to assist the Chancellor there is an Advisory Committee made up of elected faculty members. (Since 1967 there has been also a Regentally-appointed Citizens Advisory Committee made up of local townsfolk who at first met with the Dean, but after the reorganization in 1971 have advised the Chancellor.) There is a faculty committee which advises the Provost, and another to assist the Librarian. There are also committees which have statutory, rather than merely advisory, functions, e.g., the Executive Committees of the several Colleges and Schools. These, working with the several Deans and Directors, are charged, in particular, with the responsibility for handling such crucial matters as their unit’s faculty appointments, promotions, merit increases, budgets, discipline problems, and program development.

Not all of the structures were established without struggle. From the school’s beginning the governing faculty—all those full-time persons of professorial rank on regular appointment, plus by the vote of these senior persons a number of their junior, temporary, and part-time staff associates—has had considerable clout in the decision-making process. The Faculty Bylaws, compiled in 1958 and modified several times since, were approved, after several delays, by the Regents in 1962. By this act the Regents (who in 1959 had granted the professorial staff in Flint all the prerogatives of a governing faculty) officially recognized the considerable authority of the faculty and its committees over such matters as curriculum, staffing, student discipline, budgets, graduation requirements, the calendar, changes in course offerings and concentration programs.

Almost from the school’s start the potential for faculty-administration conflict has been present, for each party has been delegated real powers of decision, the boundaries often overlapping (especially in the areas of budgets).”

1996:


Pg 47: “When shared governance has worked well on campus, administrators have been open with information, have been serious about involving faculty, staff, and students in the process before decisions are made, have sought advice and been open to persuasion, and have explained decisions when those decisions have been at variance with the view of one of the campus constituencies – faculty, staff, or students. … It works in an environment where the administration both trusts and values faculty involvement in decision making.”

Pg 47: “For all of the Regents’ Bylaws, a Faculty Code and Faculty Bylaws, a Student Government Council, a Staff Council, and a Standard Practice Guide (for personnel matters), there is clearly no single campus perception of how governance and decision-making are to be understood and applied at any given time and with any given issue … Small wonder, then, that there are varying perceptions, on occasion little understanding at all, of the nuances of campus governance!”

Pg 47-8: “ What makes occasional conflicts likely at The University of Michigan-Flint is that both the administration and the faculty have been delegated real powers of decision by the University Board of Regents. They are also likely to bring different perspectives and values to bear on the same situation. What it so often has come down to, on the Flint Campus, is the attributes of the
people involved—the skills, values, and talents of faculty and administrative leadership. When these attributes have been lacking – on either side – there have been difficulties. Sometimes the resulting collisions have been very difficult, even bruising, ones.”

Pg 50-1: “The difficulties facing faculty governance extended beyond any particular instructional unit … There were matters, from time to time, requiring the attention and action by the entire Governing Faculty. While sometimes difficult in early years, it was not impossible to secure a quorum so that motions might be made and votes taken. When this was no longer possible, a Faculty Assembly, numbering some twenty-four or so, functioned as the legislative arm of the Governing Faculty. In time (the early 1990s), this was replaced by a yet smaller group: the Faculty Council. However else one might assess the health of faculty governance and the seriousness with which faculty regarded insititutional responsibilities, the changing system of governance meant that fewer, in fact, were involved.

Other problems were to surface in these years as well. An administrative policy that was largely unknown in earlier years was that of granting faculty ‘reassigned time,’ or ‘released time.’ Administrators, unless they slipped into the more commonly used phrased, on occasion granted faculty ‘reassigned time’ from a part of their teaching responsibility to handle a program development matter, a committee responsibility, or some other non-instructional task. Released or reassigned time was occasionally abused. The tasks did not always warrant a reduction in teaching load. Some argue that these administrative arrangements were seldom justified. The obvious exceptions were teaching load reductions for those faculty who had assumed administrative responsibility for large and complex departments and programs. There was a time when a considerable number of non-instructional tasks were simply assumed to be a part of the broader responsibilities of the faculty. Yet some faculty came to see ‘released time’ as a way to of reducing their teaching load, as allowing more time for professional and scholarly development, or, at the least, as the only way they could be persuaded to take on some ‘extra’ task. The problem has been a major one. Only on occasion have faculty been led to comment about it. But the problem has existed since the early 1980s. Comprehensive and responsible guidelines for ‘released time’ have yet to be formulated.”

Pg 94-5: “It seems increasingly evident that, over the past quarter of a century, universities have come to set themselves up with an eye to the corporate model, with the president or chancellor running these places as though they were businesses. And like the concerns of the CEO of a business enterprise, the primary concerns of university officials have become those of ‘the bottom line’ – enrollments, marketing, advertising, total quality management strategies, leadership teams, costs per student credit hour, head counts, retention rates, and various other aspects of what is really a rather narrow perspective on accountability. One faculty member was overheard remarking that this focus has turned everyone into ‘just bean counters.’

While budgetary matters are clearly important, cannot one reasonably ask where teaching, learning, indeed education, fit into this hierarchy of corporate business priorities and values? Surely an organizational model more appropriate to learning, to a faculty-student centered enterprise, could be found. More than likely, those models do exist and can be found scattered about in higher education. It might be advisable for both administrative and faculty leadership to look about.”

“These should be the first two points of accountability: the student, and the faculty – the measure of who they are, what they are doing, and what they are accomplishing. When this priority is clearly established and acted on, then an appropriate organizational model, with all of the necessary administrative policy, procedure, and rhetoric, could then fall in place. Maybe then market strategies, total quality management, head counts and retention rates, advertising schemes, and decision making procedures that diminish shared governance will all be set aside for concerns and values more appropriate to the central tasks of higher education. Maybe then the interests of faculty and students engaged in learning will be at the top and center of administrative concerns. The practical matters of administrative responsibility, however obviously important and urgent, thereby become the necessary means and not the evident ends of what they, the administrators, are about. Only then does accountability acquire appropriate meaning.”
Report of the 2011 Ad Hoc Faculty Concerns Committee convened by Faculty Council (charged with assessing faculty concerns). Issues below were identified in the report. Only those that relate to governance are included here (in the report these are identified by issues looked at, descriptions of the issues, and recommendations). Descriptions seem to be representative comments submitted by faculty members and selected by the committee to explain the issue. Theme headings are not from the report:

A) Space/Facilities/Budget/Resources:

1) Issue: How is faculty office space determined and assigned?
   Description: “Many departments seem tapped out in terms of office space. In some cases departments are forcing multiple lecturers to share a space meant for one. Also departments are not able to house any incoming tenure-track faculty. Commenter also suspects there may be departments that don't have any office space to offer lecturers at all.”

2) Issue: Who decided the base budgets of units and on what grounds?
   (no description was listed)

3) Issue: Can an initiative submitted by faculty to get, for example, 60% revenue from tuition "fly"?
   Description: “More generally perhaps, how are administrative and fiscal policies and procedures adopted and to what degree to faculty have input or influence on this process?”

4) Issue: Comment is that a disproportionate amount of the university’s resources is being devoted to administrative positions and costs.
   Description: “Michigan, it is shocking that UM-Flint is tied with Ann Arbor for first place in “Administration Salary Pool compared to Faculty pool” and tied in third place for “Raise in Admin Salary Pool” over the last five years.”

B) Issues of Faculty purview:

1) Issue: Do promotion and tenure processes vary across academic unit and should they?
   Description: “CAS Dean overrides Executive Committee recommendations both for and against promotion and tenure of some candidates. Also, the appeal procedure calls for the Dean and Executive Committee ruling on appeals of their own previous decisions, which may result in a conflict of interest.”

2) Issue: To what extent does the faculty control curricular matters, particularly regarding approval of academic programs and online courses?
   Description: “A “handout” distributed at a recent session on online courses indicated that the Dean’s office approves curriculum changes.”

3) Issue: Who approves course caps and course cap changes?
   Description: “Recently, CAS chairs were told that course caps are under the control of the CAS Dean. Previously, CAS course caps were proposed by department chairs and approved by the CAS Curriculum Committee.”

4) Issue: What is the process to change the 30-hour rule regarding simultaneous bachelor's degrees?
   Description: “More generally perhaps, who determines degree and other academic requirements, particularly those that cross academic units?”
5) Issue: Priority is given to Lecturers over tenured/tenure-track faculty members in staffing Spring/Summer courses.
   Description: “Comment is that administrators are trying to force departments and department chairs to do this.”

C) Governance structures/status of faculty in governance:

1) Issue: Our faculty self governance system is ineffective.
   Description: “[T]his is due in part to increasing service responsibilities of faculty which are in turn due to constantly changing administrator priorities.”

2) Issue: Do the practices and structure of faculty governance here at UM Flint (particularly within CAS) conform to that practiced at UM Ann Arbor and Dearborn? If not, why? Are we in compliance with University standards?
   Description: “Rather than the executive branch of the faculty and a counterweight to the power of the dean, the CAS Executive Committee is regarded as merely an “advisory committee” to the dean. It is common knowledge that the decisions and recommendations of the EC (including those regarding tenure/promotion) are overruled by the dean. At the level of the CAS governing faculty meetings, the dean’s role and conduct as chair is often intimidating and manipulative.”

3) Issue: Faculty governance has been diminished because faculty perceive role therein as cosmetic/non-substantive.
   Description: “Comment is that CAS has a problem getting people to meaningfully participate in faculty governance because there is a growing perception that there is no meaningful faculty governance in which to participate.”

4) Issue: What are the roles and respective standing of tenured and tenure-track faculty and lecturers?
   Description: “In a recent CAS governing faculty meeting, the dean stated that there is no difference between tenured/tenure-track faculty and LEO lecturers in regards to their role and standing in the university. The dean has acted accordingly- strongly suggesting that seniority (ie., time served) be used instead of rank in determining questions of precedence and priority (for example, in the march at graduation and in scheduling spring/summer teaching.) Is this consistent with practices in Ann Arbor and Dearborn? Combined with the growing ratio of non-tenure to tenure track faculty, this is alarming. Many feel that this is a gross devaluation of tenure and rank and a further step towards the de-professionalization of the academy. Like the lack of meaningful faculty governance, this devaluation of tenure is demoralizing and cultivates a culture of detachment and passivity as well as division and resentment between tenure and non-tenure track faculties.”

5) Issue: Service is not only becoming a greater and greater burden to faculty, it is becoming a larger and larger component in the evaluation of faculty in regards to merit pay and promotion.
   Description: “In part, this is being accomplished by transferring certain activities (such as assessment and civic engagement) to the teaching or scholarship categories. As demands for service increase, our standards regarding scholarship are slipping. "Applied scholarship" in areas that are outside the faculty’s discipline, pedagogy or are essentially service in nature is increasingly accepted as sufficient scholarship for promotion and tenure. While such applied scholarship should be recognized, it should supplement rather than replace the main responsibility of contributing to one’s discipline- otherwise I think we are on a slippery slope towards the marginalization of scholarship at our university.”

6) Issue: Is it true that departments serve no governing function but are merely part of the administrative structure?
Description: “Comment is that the CAS dean recently suggested this.”

7) Issue: Is it not the case that department chairs play a key role in scheduling courses and assigning faculty to courses?
   Description: “Recently, an administrator approached faculty members directly about teaching specific courses in specific semesters.”

D) Academic Freedom:

1) Issue: Assessment is continuing to absorb more time and attention from the faculty, leaving less time for faculty to engage in their discipline as scholars and learners.
   Description: “The growing demands of assessment are also inevitably invasive of academic freedom, particularly in programs attached to teacher certification programs where a large part of the curriculum is dictated by the state or by inherently political bodies such as NCATE. Because of the escalating political demands being put on the academy in the form of accreditation requirements, there is perhaps a limit to what can be done about assessment. The university, however, should seek to minimize the requirements of assessment, not promote a burdensome ‘culture of assessment.’”
   Recommendation: “These two comments suggest an over-emphasis of assessing student learning using a structure that may infringe on academic freedom and faculty governance of academic issues.”

Appendix 7: Selected Sources

*Please note that these are only selected sources and do not represent the breadth of GTF Research.

Internal Sources:

Faculty Senate of the University of Michigan (represents all 3 campuses)

   Senate: https://facultysenate.umich.edu/
   ▪ History of Governance at U of M: https://facultysenate.umich.edu/about/history-of-u-m-faculty-governance/
   Senate Assembly: https://facultysenate.umich.edu/senate-assembly/
   ▪ Principles of Faculty Involvement in Institutional and Academic Unit Governance at the University of Michigan-Flint: https://facultysenate.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2015/03/Principles.pdf

SACUA: https://facultysenate.umich.edu/sacua/
   ▪ Annual Presentation to the University of Michigan Board of Regents by the Chair of SACUA (2005) [on faculty purview]: https://facultysenate.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2015/03/regup11-05.pdf
- Faculty Governance Update on Merit Pay [example of faculty involvement in budgetary matters]: https://facultysenate.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2015/03/regup10-11.pdf
- Open Governance Resolution [on administrative accountability and transparency to the faculty]: http://facultysenate.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2015/03/01-23-12_BSC-Open-Governance.pdf


Regents Bylaws (all 3 campuses): http://www.regents.umich.edu/bylaws/
Chapter 4 on the University Senate: http://www.regents.umich.edu/bylaws/bylaws04.html

Standard Practice Guide (all 3 campuses): https://www.UM-Flintlint.edu/hr/policies-procedures
Hierarchy of Legal and Policy Requirements: http://spg.umich.edu/about/policy-hierarchy

University of Michigan Faculty Handbook (all 3 campuses):
http://provost.umich.edu/faculty/handbook/

University of Michigan-Flint
- Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for Instructional Track Faculty at the University of Michigan-Flint: https://www.UM-Flintlint.edu/sites/default/files/groups/Office_of_the_Provost_Vice_Chancellor_for_Academic_Affairs/documents/p_t_guidelines_1-1-14_rev.pdf
- Report of the Faculty Concerns Committee 2011: [https://bb.UM-Flintlint.edu/webapps/blackboard/execute/content/file?cmd=view&mode=designer&content_id=6605277_1&course_id=3567091_1](https://bb.UM-Flintlint.edu/webapps/blackboard/execute/content/file?cmd=view&mode=designer&content_id=6605277_1&course_id=3567091_1)

**External Sources:**


American Association of University Professors:
- Governance and Faculty Satisfaction: [https://www.aaup.org/article/governance-and-faculty-satisfaction#Wk8qpainHIU](https://www.aaup.org/article/governance-and-faculty-satisfaction#Wk8qpainHIU)
- Reaffirming the Principles of Academic Governance (on shared governance): [https://www.aaup.org/article/reaffirming-principles-academic-government#.Wk8jzqinHIU](https://www.aaup.org/article/reaffirming-principles-academic-government#.Wk8jzqinHIU)


Higher Learning Commission:
- Guiding Values: [https://www.hlcommission.org/Publications/guiding-values.html?highlight=WvJnb3ZIcm5hbwNlI0=](https://www.hlcommission.org/Publications/guiding-values.html?highlight=WvJnb3ZIcm5hbwNlI0=)