Faculty Council Meeting Minutes, Feb. 17, 2016


Absent: G. Laurence (AAAC rep.), W. Li

Guest: Provost Knerr

The meeting was called to order at 2:30pm

1. The provost gave an update on the School of Nursing proposal. The provost supports a school of nursing, but wants input from experts in the medical field regarding the structure of the school to make the proposal as strong as possible. The provost met with CEO of Hurley to judge her willingness to participate in the process in forming the new school. The provost understands that the process is moving slower than people would like, but it is important to get the proposal right. The goal is to have the proposal finalized by the end of the semester.

S. Selig mentioned that the draft academic plan had been discussed in a previous Faculty Council meeting and Faculty Council would like to have a longer discussion with the provost about it. The provost agreed that this was a good idea.

Joint lunches between AAAC/CAC-BSP/Faculty Council and the provost/chancellor will be scheduled by the provost’s office in the near future.

S. Selig inquired whether the finalized School of Nursing proposal will need to go through the faculty approval process again. The provost thought that the original vote still held for the new proposal, since the original vote was not tied to a specific proposal. H. Wehbe-Alamah read the SON motion from the minutes of the February 14, 2014 Governing faculty Meeting which state: “M. Andrews stated the following motion: The Nursing faculty proposes the creation of an independent School of Nursing at the University of Michigan-Flint. The motion was seconded by S. Myers. It was pointed out that this is an issue for Faculty Council to decide, and the provost agreed.

L. Alexander pointed out that faculty are finding out about major university restructuring via the communications to the University of Michigan Regents on the University’s website. These major decisions should be communicated to the faculty, and faculty should have input on these decisions. The provost agreed and said it is not surprising that a new chancellor would want to restructure. He will be discussing these issues with AAAC. The question that needs to be answered is how can these offices be structured so they can deliver the services they need to deliver?

2. M. Farmer gave an update for CAC/BSP. Prioritization of funding requests in light of university goals such as increasing student retention were discussed by the new combined budget group. Faculty Council members expressed concern regarding the new administrative posts being created outside of the consultation of the faculty and the impact it will have on the budget. A memo from Faculty Council to the chancellor that expresses these concerns will be drafted.

3. In response to the Maize and Blue Distinguished Scholarship Award, it was suggested that an orientation be held for newly elected university committee members in April or September. This would help “green” committees to gain some institutional background regarding on the committee operations. Faculty Council will contact the provost’s office regarding setting up this meeting.
4. Matter arising: a faculty member made an inquiry to the provost’s office regarding how much Angela Davis is receiving for the Weingarten vising professorship and the length of time she will be on campus. The provost’s office did not issue a response, so the faculty member filed a FOIA request. Central administrators should be responsive to faculty requests, especially for publically available information. It was suggested that a memo be drafted by Faculty Council that expresses this sentiment.