Minutes
University of Michigan-Flint Faculty Council Meeting
April 9, 2014


The meeting was called to order at 11:03am.

The minutes 3/31/2014 were approved.

AAAC Report: T. Wrobel reported that AAAC met on April 8th and began drafting a response to the CENS proposal. Three days of classes were added to the approved academic calendar for 2015-2016; Fall 2015 semester begins on September 1, and includes a Thursday/Friday mid-semester break in October. AAAC received the annual report from the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty.

CAC/BSP Report: C. Pearson reported that CAC/BSP met on April 4. S. Turner and J. Tischler were present to answer questions about revisions to the CENS proposal (formerly called the CSE proposal). The proposal’s budget was discussed, specifically from which source(s) the budgeted $800,000 might come. J. Glasco mentioned that because UM-Flint will be receiving more money from the State of Michigan this year, $800,000 from the State could be used as “initiative funding.” Or perhaps the Chancellor’s office might offer $800,000 for the CENS initiative. Chancellor Person was not present at the meeting. CAC/BSP members asked Tischler and Turner if the anticipated growth for the proposed unit was realistic. They stated that enrollment in the four departments has been flat in last few years, yet some of their programs are growing. CAC/BSP will meet again on Friday, April 11, to further discuss the proposal. M. Bartholomew (Executive Assistant to the Chancellor and administrative support for CAC/BSP) mentioned that nothing had been sent forward to the Regents’ subcommittee re the SON and CENS proposals.

Governing Faculty Meeting on Friday, April 11, 2014: Immediately following today’s meeting, V. Prygoski will send Friday’s agenda and appropriate documents to the Governing Faculty. Documents for the meeting include: minutes from February 14th Governing Faculty meeting, the motion to change the Faculty Code re the voting process, MTA-UM-Flint document, LEAP information from Associate Provost Christine Waters, and the CESF report. K. Schilling noted that 84 faculty members constitute a quorum (30% of 280), and that the default voting mode is by voice or show of hands. Paper ballots will be available. Tellers will collect ballots and present results at the meeting.

If J. Davidson and/or L. Cruppenink are able to attend the Governing Faculty meeting on April 11th, then the MTA-UM-Flint implementation will be discussed. If they cannot attend the meeting, then the MTA-UM-Flint document will be for information only. K.
Moreland, on behalf of the General Education Curriculum Committee, wrote comments and questions regarding the MTA-UM-Flint document. These were forwarded to FC members.

If reports on the CENS proposal are received from AAAC and CAC/BSP by April 18, then a vote of the Governing Faculty on the proposed CENS will take place at the meeting on April 25th (or by electronic ballot, pending a Governing Faculty vote on the voting process). FC agreed that its report concerning the CENS will be the combined reports of the three committees (AAAC, CAC/BSP, and Graduate Programs). Prygoski will offer to meet with chairs of those committees.

CAS Response to CENS Proposal: CAS Interim Dean Albert Price joined the meeting at 11:54am. He stated that the CENS proposal is “less good” than the proposal which he put forth as a solution in the CAS response. He said that when he accepted the position as CAS Interim Dean, his assignment from Provost Voland was to improve morale in CAS. The CENS proposal is a symptom of low morale. The CENS proposers believe that the solution is to create a new unit; however, Price believes that the proposed new college does not solve the problem, and spends $800,000 to not solve the problem.

The CAS response to the CENS creates a division at a lower cost and makes STEM a reality. Price added that the long-standing demoralization of the science disciplines was based in part, on a misunderstanding of the budget model. Carry forward money could have been used to solve problems (for example, 5% of the total CAS budget is wrapped up in one department’s carry forward funds). The CAS response increases administrative costs by hiring a recruiter/grant-writer and an associate dean (an expenditure that is 30% less than what a new unit would cost to create). Price claimed that the CAS Dean’s office is the leanest of all units, that is, the percentage of budget used for administrative purposes. One of the primary concerns of the CAS response is that it does not give autonomy to the sciences. Price believes that autonomy is overrated and that there are more important concerns for the sciences – for example, funding for equipment. He mentioned that for the first time in its history, CAS has an equipment replacement plan in place. CENS, as an entity, has not asked for a meeting with Price; however, he met with each of the four departments in the proposal. FC asked Price how a CENS would affect CAS financially. He replied that the 58% revenue claim is not accurate. 53% is the percentage of revenue returned to CAS. CAS receives less of its revenue returned than any other unit, which is demoralizing to the College. His calculations indicate that CAS is underfunded by a million dollars. Price’s conclusion is that the CAS response to the CENS is a low-risk proposal.

Price left the meeting at 12:28pm.

Faculty Council’s next meeting is April 16, 11:00-12:30 in the Lapeer Room.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:29pm.
Respectfully submitted,

Lois Alexander