UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN-FLINT

AAAC
Academic Affairs Advisory Committee

Friday, January 16, 2015
10:00 a.m. – Grad Programs Conference Room

~ Minutes ~

Members Present: Ricardo Alfaro, Darryl Baird (Chair), Chris Douglas, Greg Laurence, and Tom Wrobel

Absent: Connie Creech, Aviva Dorfman, Nakshidil Sadien, and Diamond Wilder

Chair Baird called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

The Minutes of November 26, 2014 were approved as amended.

Darryl indicated that there was no formal agenda, but rather, at the request of Chair Lois Alexander via Faculty Council, AAAC was asked to assist in an assessment of the Faculty Code. Darryl explained that the first phase of the project is initiating an evaluation of the Standing Committees. He disseminated two documents: (1) descriptions taken from the Faculty Code regarding the make-up and responsibilities of AAAC and also a job description of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; and (2) Faculty Code Questions in regard to AAAC.

Much discussion took place regarding AAAC’s role in specific areas, with program review being a topic that emerged with the most discussion. (Darryl reminded the Committee that Associate Provost Chris Waters will be attending a future meeting to discuss program review.) There was consensus that when new programs are recommended that AAAC has the responsibility to try to make sure that there are appropriate resources to support the program. Also, discussion involved the differences regarding program review of undergraduate programs versus graduate programs. Some of the conversation included:

- Frustrating because when a new program is recommended, the proposal indicates that no new resources are needed, but then two years into the program, the department asks for new post(s) to support the program.
- New programs are added all the time but when discussion takes place regarding eliminating programs, there is always uproar.
- Most felt that each unit should have their own procedures/policy regarding program review.
- The current policy is that new programs should be reviewed Year 4 and existing programs reviewed in Year 5; however, neither is enforced.
- Most agreed that AAAC should serve as part of the approval process for program review.
- Faculty service was discussed briefly. Faculty service does not always mean committee work. There are many other service activities that faculty perform such as assessment, recruitment, professional work, etc.
Tom mentioned that the purpose of the Faculty Code and Standing Committees review is that with the new administration, Faculty Council felt that this would be a good time to bring both up-to-date.

**Action:** The Committee recommended changing the second paragraph of the AAAC description to read as follows:

The Committee shall advise the Provost on issues having campus-wide implications that affect academic affairs. This advice includes coordination and allocation of resources among instructional units; clarification of the jurisdiction of instructional units over curricular areas; academic support matters, preparation of the calendar and the official University of Michigan-Flint *Catalog*; and other matters of concern to the Committee or the Provost. The Committee shall make its recommendations on all new degree programs, review of existing programs, support their development, and make recommendations to the Provost on all matters affecting the academic life of the campus.

Discussion took place regarding the membership of Standing Committees in terms of student representatives. Although student participation on Standing Committees is very much welcome, having students as voting members is sometimes a problem because it affects quorum. Many times students cannot attend meetings and then the Committee cannot conduct business when they have to consider them as voting members because a quorum has not been established.

**Action:** AAAC will recommend to Faculty Council that as students join the Standing Committees that they do so as non-voting “participant guests.”

In terms of the Faculty Code Questions handout, Question ‘a’ was answered per the recommended change in the AAAC description in the Faculty Code (action item one above).

**Action:** In answer to Question ‘b’ from the Faculty Code Questions, AAAC does not address issues beyond the charge outlined in the Faculty Code.

The timeline for future meetings was discussed for Winter 2015 per the new Interim Provost’s work schedule.

**Action:** Based on everyone’s schedule, the only possible meeting times that may work would be Tuesdays – 4:00 to 5:30 or Thursdays – 4:00 to 5:30 p.m. Darryl will contact the members that could not attend to see if a common day/time could be established.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 noon.