Faculty Council Meeting Minutes

September 10, 2014


1. The agenda was accepted as proposed. The minutes of April 28, 2014 were corrected. (a duplication of wording on page 1 and corrected spelling of Vahid’s name.

2. Reports of CAC/BSP and AAAC
   a. Adam (rep) reported that CAC had not yet met. Chris Pearson will be the likely CAC rep on Faculty Council. CAC had met with Sue Borrego in August
   b. Tom (rep) reported that AAAC had not yet met, but reported an August meeting with Sue Borrego who indicating that she is interested in seeking faculty input on matters

3. Nominating Committee’s recommended replacements for SOM AAAC were accepted: Wieqi Li for Fall 2014 and Greg Laurence for Winter 2015

   a. Fall date for Governing Faculty meeting suggested: October 17th pm, or October 31st, 10 – noon. Lois will check to see if these dates conflict with important scheduled events.
   b. Lois circulated a Staff Council brochure and asked if Faculty Council should have something similar for faculty. It was agreed that information about Faculty Council should be communicated widely, but the format and content were not decided.
   c. Sue Borrego met with an ad hoc group and discussed where UM-Flint is relative to the last Strategic Plan. Those in attendance indicated that this group might be used to monitor the progress of the Strategic Plan and for visioning for the campus
   d. Faculty Council was in support of using Skype for meeting attendance when necessary
   e. There was follow up on BIT (Behavioral Intervention Team). The website had been changed to clarify that faculty data was not being collected
   f. Tom suggested sending the campus’ responses to a previous survey soliciting input, “What are you looking for in a new Chancellor?” All agreed that this should be forwarded to Sue Borrego

5. Provost Voland presented his concerns about the low retention rate of tenure track faculty as identified in the CESF Report. He indicated that he is interested in the following items, among others:
   a. Clarity of tenure expectations
   b. Level of expectations. Are they too high?
   c. Balance of work and life
   d. Level of support for scholarship. Are the efforts of the Office of Research sufficient?
   e. Degree of collegiality within departments. Do problematic factions exist?
   f. Is financial support adequate; e.g. salaries, support for research, start up funds?
   g. Support to achieve teaching effectiveness. Is TCLT support adequate?
   h. Regular and consistent feedback to faculty. Is it adequate?
   i. Are service demands excessive?
   j. Faculty mentoring within department and outside unit?
Provost requested that suggestions/recommendations be forwarded to him asap as to what additional items should be considered and how to go about assessing these? What committee/group should be involved?

Provost discussed the shortcomings of 2 and 4 year reviews in that they come too soon after the year of the initial appointment, as well as the short interval between the reviews. He raised the question whether a 3 year review might be more meaningful, recognizing that most units give an initial 3 year contract. This item will be revisited. There is a desire to have more standardization between units, recognizing that this might not be realistic.

6. Curriculog was described and discussed by Krista and Stacy making reference to the video that Faculty Council was requested to watch. They also distributed a handout.
   The following questions were raised:
   a. What would be done about the overlap with features of other software; e.g. Concur, SIS, BB. Will they be replaced by this new software?
   b. If Curriculog is adopted by UM-Flint, its full potential should be used. (presenters indicated that they would be several training sessions for faculty and staff)
   c. Are we paying for functions that our campus will not be using?

Meeting was adjourned at 3:56 pm.