Approved Minutes from the February 22, 2017 Faculty Council Meeting


Absent: None.

Guests: D. Knerr, Provost.

The meeting was called to order at 9:00am.

Minutes from February 08, 2017 were approved as revised.

Provost Knerr presented his view on the current orientation of the conversation on faculty governance on campus. The original ad-hoc committee he called for in Fall could serve as a starting point to comply with the will of the faculty of reviewing the code. He mentioned that the current process of building the code for the new SON could serve as an example, and his office will provide all necessary support for the successful completion of this task.

S. Lippert presented her concerns on accountability for the task force, and asked that it works and reports frequently with the Faculty Council. A. Goldberg asked to have a fair representation of the units. S. Selig mentioned that the purpose of this task was to step back and look carefully at faculty governance from the outside, looking at what works, what doesn’t and look at other models to see what can be used. We should be more focus on the task.

Some ideas were presented on the model, members and goals of the task force. The following objectives were proposed:
- Evaluation of the current code, what are the practical problems.
- Assure compliance with the Regents by-laws.
- Propose recommendations for changes, revisions, or overall overhaul of the Faculty Code.
- Seek further input from the faculty on what kind of revision they would like to see.

Provost Knerr left at 9:40am.

We discussed the ballot results. Specifically Proposal 4 and 7 failed very narrowly. It was suggested that the at-large members let their term run until they expire rather than terminating it at the end of this year. There was unanimous support. Some members raised the issue of clarity of the questions on the ballot, and if faculty really understood the arguments for the proposal.

The next Governing Faculties meeting is scheduled for Thursday March 30 at 1:45pm in room Michigan Room D. The Provost and Chancellor will attend the meeting. It was suggested that we arrange for the meeting to be broadcast live or taped. There was no much support for this.

The proposal from B.Rhoda was supported and will be send to faculty for a vote at the next Governing Faculties meeting.

S. Banerjee motivated discussion on Centralized Marketing. He used the four questions on his handout as starting point. He indicated that financial statements do not include the status of General Fund Cash balance since last Fall. It is unclear if a centralized marketing will be more effective, and rather synchronization might be a better approach. We supported C. Douglas to ask J. Glasco to come to our next meeting to address the questions. At the same time it was suggested to ask the Chancellor on her
ideas of centralized marketing, what are the variables of the ROI? is the centralized model a means to synchronization with the units or be housed completely in the Chancellor’s office?

J. Furman reported on AAAC. The committee is working on a recommendation for faculty representation on all search committees. The committee is also continuing conversation on the proposed policy from Graduate Board.

S. Lippert reported on CAC/BSP. The budget town halls have been completed and they are in the process of making recommendations on requests given the marginal revenue of the units. There was conversation of how to address the budget deficit, but there was no clear plan.

C. Douglas clarified that the request from S. Lippert from last meeting did not apply since the appeal was handled by the CAS appeals committee, not the University Faculty Grievance committee.

Meeting adjourned at 10:45am.

Respectfully submitted,
Ricardo Alfaro
Secretary Faculty Council