Members Present: Ricardo Alfaro, Jan Furman, Aviva Dorfman, Jie Song, Dan Lair (Chair), Marilyn McFarland, and Rie Suzuki

Absent: Sy Banerjee and Doug Knerr

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair Dan Lair.

CARE Team Presentation ▶ The CARE Team Presentation was tabled until the next meeting due to a scheduling conflict.

Approval of Minutes – January 19, 2017 ▶ A motion was made and supported to approve the Minutes of January 19, as corrected. Motion carried.

Academic Calendar Scheduling Guidelines ▶ The Academic Calendar Guidelines were discussed and the following problems were noted in terms of the last several academic calendars:

- For the sciences, having uneven instructional days Monday-Thursday is problematic especially with lab scheduling.
- When the calendar ends with final exams scheduled a couple of days before Christmas, this is problematic for not only turning in final grades, but also for international students who may be traveling.
- When there is a closure because of inclement weather, some faculty have a difficult time adjusting their syllabi in order to cover all of the material that they want coupled with a very tight calendar.
- Faculty would like to thoroughly review finals week.

A decision was made that AAAC members will review the Academic Calendar Guidelines and bring back suggestions for the next meeting scheduled for Thursday, February 16. Following that meeting, an invitation may be extended to the Registrar to discuss either updated guidelines and/or the final exam schedule.

Matters Arising: HERI (Higher Education Research Institute) Survey – Additional Questions ▶ Chair Lair reminded the Committee that in their January 5 meeting, Fawn Skarsten sought the committee’s support in implementing the HERI Faculty Survey in April. This came about as a result of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty’s willingness to forgo their internal survey so that the HERI Survey could be administered. With the HERI Survey, there was an opportunity to include additional questions within the survey. AAAC supported the administration of the HERI Survey to faculty and asked the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty to formulate some additional questions for AAAC to vet.
The following questions were proposed by the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty to include on the HERI Survey:

1. Have you ever held an administration position (i.e. Chair/Director, Associate Director, Program Director)? Y/N
2. Would you like to pursue an administrative position (i.e. Chair/Director, Associate Director, Program Director, etc.) within your department, school/college, or UM-Flint? Y/N
3. If Yes to 1 or 2, there are established avenues for support and training from my department, school, or college to prepare me for administrative positions. Strongly Agree/Disagree

**Open-Ended Questions**

1. Please give any suggestions for how the process and established avenues for support and training from my department, school, or college preparing me for administrative positions could be improved.
2. Please comment on any other related faculty issues raised in this survey.

Following discussion, AAAC approved all of the questions with the exception of revising Question 1 under Open-Ended Questions to read:

“Please give any suggestions for how your department, school, or the college could improve the process of supporting and training faculty for administrative positions.”

**Membership of Executive Search Committees**

A concern among faculty arose in the early tenure of the current administration that either none or not enough faculty participation was included in upper level searches. In winter of last year, Faculty Council submitted the following proposal to AAAC to seek their input, with the idea that a final proposal would be submitted to both the Provost and Chancellor.

“A potential norm (for faculty involvement on search committees) would be majority faculty composition, with all academic units represented where possible, on search committees for positions within academic affairs whenever the position in question has wide reach across campus. Then, faculty representation on all other searches, where positions with greater academic involvement should have ‘more’ faculty involvement.”

At that time, AAAC had some questions of Faculty Council regarding the proposal asking for more specific language. Faculty Council in turn asked AAAC to determine the specifics of the proposal. Preliminary discussion included the following suggestions:

- For all search committees, have a faculty representative from each unit serve on the committee.
- Some felt uncomfortable putting a number on each type of search committee.
- Possible templates were discussed.
- Spell out only as a guideline.

Following much discussion, the Committee decided to start a process of going through the org charts of the Chancellor and each vice chancellor’s area and identifying for each position whether they thought “strong,” “moderate,” or “light” level of faculty representation should be included on future search committees. Once that is done, discussion will ensue to identify what each of the levels mean in terms of representation/numbers, and to summarize information in a more concise and detailed proposal. *(During this meeting, levels for each position were identified.)*

Other agenda items were tabled until the next meeting. The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.