Minutes
University of Michigan-Flint Faculty Council
April 16, 2014


V. Prygoski called the meeting to order at 11:04am.

The minutes of 4/9/2014 were approved with one amendment.

CAC/BSP Report: C. Pearson reported that he and two other members were not present for the last meeting (also the Chancellor did not attend). However, Pearson was told that the meeting’s discussion focused on two items – the origin of the $800,000 necessary for creation of the proposed CESN (i.e., from which source would it come?) and the 3% enrollment growth projected in the CESN proposal.

Standing Committee Reports: Reports were received from the Graduate Programs Committee, the Nominating Committee, the Office of Extended Learning Committee, and the Research and Creative Activity Committee, and the Scholarships, Awards and Special Events Committee. L. Alexander will send thanks on behalf of Faculty Council to these committees’ chairs. She also will request that J. Hubbard post the reports in Blackboard.

Debriefing on Governing Faculty meeting, April 11: Faculty Council discussed the idea of videotaping Governing Faculty meetings, an idea mentioned in the April 11th Governing Faculty meeting. Faculty Council decided against videotaping meetings.

Michigan Transfer Agreement: Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies Christine Waters, Assistant Director of Admissions Lee Cruppenink, and General Education Curriculum Chair Keith Moreland joined the meeting at 11:29am. T. Wrobel provided background for Faculty Council’s request to meet with them. The MTA – UMF Flint implementation document was brought to AAAC, Wrobel brought the document to Faculty Council on March 19th, and the Council requested that the GECC review it and provide comments to Faculty Council. The document was discussed briefly at the Governing Faculty meeting on April 16. Faculty Council asked who wrote the MTA-UMF Flint document and how much faculty involvement was in drafting it? C. Waters drafted it and the faculty was not involved.

In 2012, the State of Michigan legislature decided that students transferring from a 2-year institution to a 4-year institution should have a way to do so with ease. The result was the MTA, which allows students to transfer a maximum of 30 general education credits “certified” by a 2-year institution. Because every institution has its own idea of what general education is, those who designed the MTA [representatives from
institutions] had to compromise. Each of the 15 state public institutions has signed on as participants in the MTA. The 2-year institutions are responsible for defining the MTA courses in consultation with 4-year institutions. 4-year institutions are responsible for deciding how to apply 30 credits in general education. All courses on the list identified by 2-year courses are already transferrable according to the Transfer Equivalency Database, said Cruppenink. Wrobel clarified that institutions must abide by what the state legislature dictated and what the 2-year institutions decided. UMFlint must decide how the MTA fits into its general education courses because 30 credits cannot be accepted without application to the general education curriculum.

Wrobel added that the UMFlint faculty went through a process of certifying courses in humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, etc. and that UMFlint should keep the integrity of the courses that were certified. Waters said that the intention of the MTA is to give transfer students a reasonable road map so that they save time and money. The Transfer Equivalency Database is being used to verify these courses as transferrable already. B. Bix said that it seems that the current UMFlint general education curriculum requirements are still in effect, and students still must complete them.

Moreland stated that the MTA-UMFlint draft document was the only information that had been presented to the Faculty Council, AAAC, and the GECC. He noted that it represents a change from the current general education requirements for transfer students because it does not require Eng 112. Waters agreed that Eng 112 could become a problem. She stated that Eng 112 had been made a prerequisite for courses in some programs of study, and suggested that more programs do the same. Moreland reminded Cruppenink that most Faculty Council members were familiar with the MACRAO agreement and its provisos, and there did not seem to be much difference between the MACRAO provisos and the last set of bullets on the MTA-UMFlint draft. He then stated that Admissions must have faculty support for an MTA implementation plan. Wrobel added that the faculty is charged, per the Faculty Code, with overseeing the curriculum. It is important to discuss this matter now because the faculty has a chance to create an implementation plan.

Wrobel asked who is making decisions about which courses will transfer in as general education courses? Cruppenink replied that community colleges were making those decisions.

Waters will send additional documents about MTA to Faculty Council.

T. Williams left meeting at noon.

Alexander asked Waters and Cruppenink what prevented them from working with the GECC toward an implementation plan? Waters responded that they had not been asked to work with GECC. Moreland emphasized that the Regents’ Bylaws are very clear –
faculty has control of curriculum. In order to implement the MTA, faculty must be involved.

Waters explained that the Provost had been meeting with her about MTA implementation. Dearborn and Ann Arbor have signed off on MTA without any voiced concern. Moreland remarked that it is not a surprise that Ann Arbor signed off on the MTA because transfer students are a small matter to such a large campus. He expressed “mild concern” that UMFlint was not adequately represented in the process of developing the MTA. Bix suggested that all could agree to charge the GECC with working toward an implementation plan, in consultation with Waters and Admissions.

Moreland expressed concern about how productive the GECC could be, given the short time between May and September. He asked Cruppenink about what Admissions considered to be UMFlint’s options. Cruppenink responded that UMFlint should communicate to community colleges that two courses in English composition are preferred.

Faculty Council members agreed that the Provost’s Office should be cautioned against acting on behalf of the faculty re the curriculum.

Waters and Cruppenink left the meeting at 12:26pm. S. Thwaite and C. Pearson also left the meeting.

**CESN Proposal:** J. Tischler and S. Turner joined the meeting at 12:26pm to present a CESN proposal update. Tischler mentioned that the proposal contained a revised budget and text. Tischler stated that the CESN budget would not negatively affect CAS. H. Wehbe-Alamah asked for their response to the Interim Dean Price/CAS Executive Committee response. Tischler summarized their response with the following points: the four departments have voted in support of a new college, the CAS response does not address issues of autonomy (i.e., faculty hires and expenditures), and they do not consider the CAS response to be a proposal. Wehbe-Alamah asked about Price’s assertion that CAS receives a 53% revenue return. Turner answered that that was inaccurate, rather the projected CAS return would be in excess of 59%. Wrobel replied that creation of a CESN would affect CAS, and noted that the CAS response did not consider the remaining departments. Tischler predicted that the benefits that would come to a CENS would come to what is left of CAS. Wehbe-Alamah asked what would happen to the morale of the science faculty if the proposed CESN did not come about. Tischler answered that the CAS response is a “band aid,” a short-term view of how to address problems in the sciences, and does not address long-term problems of equipment, faculty, and other needs. Turner added that creation of a CENS is a strategy that would move the university forward. He asserted that the CAS response would not move the university forward. The proposers of the CENS believe that they cannot rely on future administrations to address long-term problems. Tischer and Turner left the meeting at 12:45pm.
Alexander left the meeting at 12:58pm.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 1:00pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Lois Alexander