Governing Faculty Minutes – DRAFT

March 19, 2015 meeting
2:00 – 4:00 pm Michigan Rooms C+D UCEN

In attendance: Dauda Abubakar (AFA/POL), Sandy Alberto (TCLT/Women’s Commission), Lois Alexander (MUS), Ricardo Alfaro (MTH), Vera Anderson (Library), Marge Andrews (Nursing), Brian Blume (SOM), Jacob Blumner (ENG), Erica Britt (ENG), Elizabeth Collardey (SWK), Melva Craft-Blacksheare (Nursing), Aviva Dorfman (EDU), Chris Douglas (ECN), Mickey Doyle (Library), Sasha Drummond-Lewis SOC, Marilyn Filter (Nursing), Jan Furman (ENG), Karmen Hollis-Etter (BIO), Bob Houbeck (Library), Gabriela Hristova (MUS), Linda Knecht (Nursing), Barbara Kupferschmid (Nursing), Marsha Lesley (Nursing), Sarah Lippert (CVA), Adam Lutzker (ECN), Marilyn McFarland (Nursing), Marianne McGrath (PSY), Laura McLeman (MTH), Murali Mani (CSEP), Otrude Moyo (SWK), Steve Myers (BIO), Emily Newberry (Library), Hisyar Ozsoy (SOC/ANT/CRJ), Vince Prygoski (Library), Richard Richardson (NUR), Stephanie Roach (ENG), Veronica Robinson (Nursing), Sarah Rosaen (CVA), Kathryn Schellenberg (SOC/ANT/CRJ), Elizabeth Svoboda (Library), Fred Svoboda (ENG), Jessica Tischler (CHM), Stephen Turner (CSEP), Suleyman Uludag (CSEP), Hiba Wehbe-Alamah (NUR), Ted Williams (SOM), Matthew Wolverton (Library), Thomas Wrobel (PSY)

1. Minutes of November 5, 2014 were approved.

2. Faculty Council update; a summary of Faculty Council recent activity:
   * jointly, with AAAC, solicited and collected nominations for interim provost and sent to Chancellor Borrego
   * jointly, with AAAC, solicited and collected nominations for Provost Search Committee and sent to Chancellor Borrego
   * met with President Schlissel on December 11th
   * jointly, with HR, sponsored two workshops on Title IX procedures as practiced by the Office for Institutional Equity
   * communicated to the Senate Assembly, in concert with UM-Flint Senate Assembly representatives, concerns about the Title IX investigative procedures as practiced by the Office for Institutional Equity
   * conducted administrator surveys and distributed results to faculty
   * undertook an assessment of faculty standing committees’ charges in the Faculty Code and posted results in Blackboard’s Faculty Council Community
   * undertook updating of the Faculty Code. Faculty Council is grateful to all the standing committees for their work on updating the Faculty Code.
   * the Nominating Committee chair, Jessica Kelts, has prepared a draft of the Standing Committees ballot and we received a tremendous response from faculty willing to serve on committees.
   * the chairs of AAAC, CAC/BSP, and Faculty Council have met together twice in order to better communicate and coordinate the efforts of our committees

3. Women’s Commission – Jessica Tischler, Co-Chair, greeted the faculty and formally introduced the Commission, founded by Chancellor Person in June 2014 with specific charge: 1) to ensure campus attention to women’s issues and climate on campus; 2) to create regular, biannual reports to the campus on the state of women on our campus. There will be an email announcing upcoming first open meeting in April.
4. General Education Curriculum Committee – Elizabeth Collardey announced the upcoming meeting Thurs. March 25th where the committee will report on an evaluation study of the General Education Program and discussion will address ways for General Education to evolve. The report will be distributed by email prior to the meeting.

5. Update on the provost search. Linda Knecht, co-chair of the Search Committee with Interim Provost Barbara Dixon, presented an update. Ad is posted to our HR website and we have a large pool of applicants. Review of candidates is currently proceeding, in an early phase of review, by members of the committee with representatives of Korn Ferry, the consulting firm. Knecht requested nominations of interested and qualified persons from the governing faculty.

6. This segment of the agenda began with a vote to waive the 14-day rule. Chair of Faculty Council made and justified the motion to waive due to the general clarity of the motions involved and the fact that the language of all the code revision motions was distributed to the Governing Faculty 48 hours prior to the meeting as required by the Code. Motion carried unanimously. The motions, as distributed by Faculty Council, are attached to these minutes as a separate document. Statements and actions of the governing faculty regarding the motions appear in these minutes.

7. Motion 1. Administrator Surveys, extend to associate and assistant deans – amendments to the Survey of Administrators: General Policy, and The University of Michigan-Flint Faculty Code.

Part 1: On January 26, 2015, the Senate and Assembly in Ann Arbor voted to include the associate and assistant deans in its survey of administrators; December 14, 2010, the UM-Flint governing faculty voted to conduct administrator surveys, administered by Faculty Council with support from the Office of the Provost. In an effort to match what was done by the Senate Assembly on the Ann Arbor campus, Faculty Council recommends including associate and assistant Deans in the annual survey (Motion #1). Faculty Council chair read the motion. Steve Myers seconded. Discussion ensued. Questions arose concerning to whom the results are reported. Jessica Tischler and Brian Blume asked if it would not be better to release the results of the associate and assistant deans only within each unit, rather than to the whole university.

Kathryn Schellenberg stated that Ann Arbor releases the results to the whole world and wondered who actually needs to know. Adam Lutzker spoke to current practice. Brian Blume reiterated his suggestion that only the governing faculty of the unit need to know. Sarah Lippert expressed curiosity about the necessity of limiting the release of information. She said that we are all invested in the success of the university and therefore all governing faculty would be interested in knowing how administrators are evaluated across all the units. Sarah Rosaen explained that as it stands all the campus would receive the results, but only the numerical results, without the written comments. Kathryn Schellenberg commented that the results are easy to distribute and asked if there is a place or a way to comment on the results. Lois Alexander suggested that if the results were sent to Faculty Council, they could be posted to Blackboard and therefore limited for viewing only by the governing faculty. Brian Blume expressed concern that the roles of deans and associate and assistant deans are different, and few grasp the latter outside of the unit. If someone receives unfavorable survey results, might it affect his/her reputation and would that be right? Laura McLeman asked who has access to completing the surveys, and who would have access to surveying associate and assistants. Lois Alexander explained that practice had changed. Prior to this year, all faculty could access any
survey, but currently faculty evaluate only their own direct administrators (deans of their respective units), but all can see the results. Implementation of change would begin in February 2016. Discussion was closed.

Part 2: Motion was reiterated to add the Survey of Administrators: General Policy to The University of Michigan-Flint Faculty Code. Steve Myers seconded motion. Discussion ensued concerning the language of the survey, to whom surveys are distributed for completion, and to whom the results are released - especially because the language distributed to the faculty did not reflect the changes discussed. Questions arose regarding governing faculty within units surveying only the administrators from their respective units. The discussion culminated in amendments to change the language in the Survey of Administrators: General Policy to reflect: 1) clarification regarding to whom the surveys are distributed for completion - faculty shall survey the administrators of their own respective units and university-wide administrators; 2) that all governing faculty across units may have access to the survey results; 3) change the order so that all references are to “deans, associate deans, and assistant deans.” Faculty Council was charged with clarifying the language and reviewing for consistency.

8. Motion 2. Librarian Representatives on Student Concerns Committee and Extended Learning and Service Committee – Faculty Code amendment. The motion was read and seconded by Hiba Wehbe-Alamah. Background the motion is that librarians requested representation on more standing committees and upon review, and in respect for their particular perspective on students and their needs, Faculty Council suggested that the librarians have representation on the Student Concerns Committee and Extended Learning and Service Committee.

Discussion ensued addressing committee structure, that librarians can serve as at-large members though some committees do not have at-large members, and included expression of the appropriateness of the motion and of library representation on these committees. Discussion was closed.

9. Motion 3. Student Representatives on Faculty Standing Committees – Faculty Code amendment. Motion 3 was read and Richard Richardson seconded the motion. Faculty Council chair justified the motion as proposed by Faculty Council. Discussion addressed the importance of student representation, the concern of many faculty members that students already do not attend as regularly as might be desired, and that taking away voting rights would be a disincentive to participation in committees. Concern was expressed that the amendment to the Faculty Code be reviewed for coherence with the whole document.

A second, opposing, motion arose out the discussion; Steve Myers made the following motion: “The Student Government Council may appoint student members on standing committees as provided in Section 4 below. Student members may vote but are not counted toward a quorum.” Richard Richardson seconded. This will be Alternative Motion 3. Discussion was closed.

10. Motion 4. Faculty Code amendments: updates to mission and titles. The motion was read. Ricardo Alfaro seconded the motion. There was no discussion.
11. Motion 5. Amendments to the Faculty Council’s charge in the Faculty Code. The motion was read, and seconded by someone. Faculty Council chair explained the changes were updates - adding Survey of Administrators: General Policy and striking public posting of the agenda in each building of the university. Discussion included comments of language that ensure consistency within the code document. Discussion was closed.

12. Motion 6. Amendments to the CAC/BSP’s charge in the Faculty Code. The motion was read and seconded by Emily Newberry. Adam Lutzker, chair of CAC/BSP, explained the updates. There was no discussion.

13. Motion 7. Amendments to the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee’s charge in the Faculty Code. The motion was read and seconded by Bob Houbeck. No discussion.

14. Motion 8. Amendments to the Student Concerns Committee’s charge in the Faculty Code. The motion was read and seconded by Jan Furman. Discussion included a comment raised that the language of membership needs to reflect the inclusion of library representation if that motion is approved by the governing faculty vote.

15. Motion 9. Amendments to the Graduate Programs Committee’s charge in the Faculty Code. The motion was read and seconded by Marge Andrews. Discussion included amendments suggestions by Vahid Lotfi, brought by Hiba Wehbe-Alamah, to reflect the language changes of the name of the committee (See Motion 6 Article 3. Section 4a. above.) Discussion closed.

16. Motion 10. Amendments to the Library Committee’s charge in the Faculty Code. The motion was read and seconded by Marsha Lesley. No discussion.

17. Motion 11. Amendments to the Research and Creative Activities Committee’s charge in the Faculty Code. The motion was read and seconded by Otrude Moyo. Discussion consisted of brief comment for clarification. Discussion closed.

18. Faculty Council chair explained an error in numbering the motions sent to governing faculty in preparation for the meeting. There were two motions numbered “11.” Therefore, the second number 11 motion will now be motion 12, and subsequent motions will be renumbered to reflect accuracy.

Motion 12. Amendment to the Economic Status of the Faculty Committee’s charge in the Faculty Code. The motion was read and seconded by Vince Prygoski. Kathryn Schellenberg commented that the word “workplace” is a single word, not two words. Correction will be made. Discussion closed.

19. Motion 13. Amendments to the Extended Learning and Service Committee’s charge in the Faculty Code. The motion was read and seconded by Marge Andrews. No discussion.

20. Motion 14. Amendments to the General Education Curriculum Committee’s charge in the Faculty Code. The motion was read and seconded by Laura Friesen. Discussion ensued regarding the phrase “when appropriate.” Amendment offered was to replace “when appropriate” with “when approved.” Discussion closed.
21. Motion 15. Faculty Council chair explained that the Faculty Ombuds position was not in the Faculty Code and read the following additional motion: “Faculty Council motion to amend The University of Michigan-Flint Faculty Code. Include the ombuds positions in the Faculty Code by adding a part s. to the Article 3, Section 4.

‘The Faculty Ombuds shall be a tenured full professor elected by the faculty for a three-year term. The ombuds shall provide confidential and impartial assistance supporting faculty in the resolution of matters related to their employment. The ombuds shall respond to faculty requests for assistance in a timely manner and provide options for addressing faculty concerns.’

The motion was seconded by someone. Faculty Council chair explained that the charge was taken from the web site of the Office of the Provost. No discussion.

22. Matters arising. There were no matters arising.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Aviva Dorfman, Faculty Council