At its January 7, 2015 meeting, Faculty Council decided to undertake an assessment of *The Faculty Code of the University of Michigan-Flint*. As one phase of this undertaking, Faculty Council initiated an assessment of existing University Faculty Standing Committees, as they appear in Article 3, Section 4. *University Faculty Standing Committees – Membership and Functions.*

Each faculty standing committee was asked to respond to the questions below:

a. Does the Faculty Code charge reflect current reality? Is the charge consistent with the current focus of the committee? Does the charge need to be updated by deleting, adding, or otherwise editing the language?

b. Does the committee address issues beyond the charge as outlined in the Faculty Code?

c. Are there issues that are included in the Faculty Code charge that the committee no longer addresses?

d. How effectively does the committee function?

e. How frequently does committee meet?

f. What is the usual duration of committee meetings?

g. What are identified obstacles in carrying out your committee's charge?

**Responses of Faculty Standing Committees, in order of appearance in Faculty Code**

**RESPONSE OF CAC/BSP**

To: Faculty Council  
From: CAC/BSP  
Re: Faculty Code

As you requested, we have reviewed our charge as laid out in the Faculty code (Section 4a on page 11). We note the need to update the job title for the Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance. We noted that our time spent reviewing new programs was not clearly reflected in the charge, although we felt it was one of our major activities. We noted some ambiguity with respect to space allocation issues, which seem to fall under our charge as part of resource allocation, but also under the charge of the Administrative Services Advisory Committee (Section 4d on page 12), and request clarification. We note that the Provost has not reviewed “Academic plans and goals with the Committee in terms of congruence between the budget and the strategic plan.”
RESPONSE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS ADVISORY

**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.
RESPONSE OF STUDENT CONCERNS

On behalf of the Student Concerns Committee, please find our responses to your questionnaire below. I should note that the section on membership of the committee mirrors a discussion that was held in AAAC about student membership on committees. I believe that we used the same language here, but depending on what other committees have to say in this regard, consistent language across all committee descriptions is probably best. I hope this is helpful in your efforts.

Best,
Greg

a. Does the Faculty Code charge reflect current reality? (No) Is the charge consistent with the current focus of the committee? (No) Does the charge need to be updated by either deleting, adding, or otherwise editing the language? (Yes) The Student Concerns Committee (SCC) shall consist of five faculty members, including at least one from each instructional unit. The Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs shall be a member, ex officio. Two students will be non-voting guests. The committee shall work with the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and make recommendations regarding issues affecting the lives of students and students’ academic success. It will serve as the selection committee for the Faculty/Staff Scholarship. It shall provide a forum for direct communication from students to faculty. The committee shall review and evaluate data and policies that impact student satisfaction, success, and well-being, and the committee shall propose matters of action to the faculty, faculty committees, and/or administrative units.

b. Does the committee address issues beyond the charge as outlined in the Faculty Code? No, if the suggested revisions are made.

c. Are there issues that are included in the Faculty Code charge that the committee no longer addresses? Yes, see suggested revision in “a.”

d. How effectively does the committee function? Very Well

e. How frequently does the committee meet? Eight (8) times each year – 4 meetings in the Fall and 4 meetings in the Winter.

f. What is the usual duration of committee meetings? Usual duration of meeting – 1 hour. Total annual time commitment is eight (8) hours of meeting time and eight (8) hours of preparation time.

g. What are identified obstacles in carrying out your committee’s charge? N/A

RESPONSE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ADVISORY

a. Does the Faculty Code charge reflect current reality? Is the charge consistent with the current focus of the committee? Does the charge need to be updated by either deleting, adding, or otherwise editing the language? (The committee voiced concerns with formulating administrative policies regarding space utilization. There seem to be an overlap with the CACBSP committee that needs to be clarified)

b. Does the committee address issues beyond the charge as outlined in the Faculty Code? (No)
c. Are there issues that are included in the Faculty Code charge that the committee no longer addresses? (No)
d. How effectively does the committee function? (Effectively handles all agenda items presented)
e. How frequently does committee meet? (At least twice a semester)
f. What is the usual duration of committee meetings? (One hour)
g. What are identified obstacles in carrying out your committee's charge? (None)

RESPONSE OF ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT

No response received

RESPONSE OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS

The Committee reviewed the Faculty Code verbiage at our meeting on January 27, 2015 related to the Graduate Programs (GP) Committee addressing and answering each of the questions listed below:

a. Does the Faculty Code charge reflect current reality? Is the charge consistent with the current focus of the committee? Does the charge need to be updated by either deleting, adding, or otherwise editing the language?

The GP Committee is recommending five key changes to the faculty code:

- Update the name of the committee to the Graduate Board to stay consistent with similar operations at UM-Ann Arbor and UM-Dearborn.
- Add an additional at-large member to the committee with preference given to a Graduate Program Director. With the expansion of graduate programs over the last few years, the addition of an at-large member will improve the ability of the committee to address issues relevant to graduate programs at UM-Flint.
- Include one student instead of two students on the committee. It has been challenging for the GP committee recruit two student members that are available to attend meetings on a regular basis. The GP committee recognizes the value of student involvement and believes this can be met by having only one student serve on the committee.
- Update the Provost designee language to be the Dean of Graduate Programs as an ex-officio member of the committee.
- Add the Director of Graduate Admissions as an ex-officio member of the committee.

b. Does the committee address issues beyond the charge as outlined in the Faculty Code?

No, the GP Committee does not address issues beyond the charge as outlined in the Faculty Code.
c. Are there issues that are included in the Faculty Code charge that the committee no longer addresses?

No, the GP Committee does not believe there are issues included in the Faculty Code that we no longer address.

d. How effectively does the committee function?

The GP Committee functions very effectively in order to meet the charges as outlined in the Faculty Code.

e. How frequently does committee meet?

The GP Committee meets two times/month.

f. What is the usual duration of committee meetings?

The GP Committee meetings usually last one hour.

g. What are identified obstacles in carrying out your committee's charge?

Scheduling of meetings has been challenging in the past; however, scheduling meetings early in the year (or semester) with a consistent date/time has assisted in this obstacle.

RESPONSE OF LIBRARY

Library (revised 1/22/2015)
The Library Committee shall consist of five faculty members, one from each instructional unit, and a librarian and two student members. The Director of the Library shall be a member, ex officio. The committee shall advise the Director of the Library on the operation of the library as related to the educational objectives of all units including new programs and the impact of new programs on library resources and services. The committee shall study library usage and trends in library service, administration, and operation, shall advise the Library Director and the Provost as appropriate on library policies and practices, and make recommendations regarding the library. It shall also investigate and recommend to the Faculty Council matters of significance regarding library services, operations, and resources.
RESPONSE OF TECHNOLOGY

a. Does the Faculty Code charge reflect current reality? Is the charge consistent with the current focus of the committee? Does the charge need to be updated by either deleting, adding, or otherwise editing the language?

The faculty code reflects the reality of the committee -- the committee handles issues and questions from the Director of ITS as they arise. The charge needs to be updated only to the extent that faculty wishes the role of this committee to be altered from the existing description.

b. Does the committee address issues beyond the charge as outlined in the Faculty Code?

Not recently. The committee addresses issues that are brought to it by ITS or Faculty Council.

c. Are there issues that are included in the Faculty Code charge that the committee no longer addresses?

In recent history the committee has had no involvement in the budgetary side of the mandate, addressing budget priorities for ITS. The budget structure for new purchases is rather complicated, being divided between various departments, colleges, offices, etc. ITS, and hence this committee, is not always consulted in the process. There is also the technology fee committee, which seems to serve more directly in this area than does this committee.

d. How effectively does the committee function?

Over recent years, the committee seems to have lost much of its institutional knowledge as to its proper charge and function, after a bout of inactivity. That said, the committee seems to be able to adequately respond to the questions and issues posed to us. It does not currently have sufficient institutional knowledge to take any initiatives on its own, but nor is this in principle expected of us as per the faculty code.

e. How frequently does committee meet?

As needed. Typically discussions are held via email as questions and issues arise, but in-person meetings are occasionally needed to coordinate with external contact points (e.g., a recent meeting with Ellucian over DegreeWorks).

f. What is the usual duration of committee meetings?
Email discussions can vary from near-instantaneous summary judgements to semester-long deliberations.

g. What are identified obstacles in carrying out your committee's charge?

Again we would mention here the bout of inactivity in recent years. We appear to have a completely new committee since the last time the committee was functioning "at full force." As such, the committee's standing policies and procedures (if there are any) have been partially lost to time, and so we rely exclusively on our ex officio member for such guidance.

RESPONSE OF RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

a. Does the Faculty Code charge reflect current reality? Is the charge consistent with the current focus of the committee? Does the charge need to be updated by either deleting, adding, or otherwise editing the language?

New edited language: The Research and Creative Activities Committee shall consist of five faculty members, including at least one representative from each instructional unit, and one student member. The Director of Research and Sponsored Programs shall be a member, ex officio, and the Director will facilitate and manage the administrative processes. The voting members make all decisions on proposals. The committee shall advise the Director of Research and Sponsored Programs. The committee shall establish and review policies and procedures regarding research and creative activities conducted by the UM-Flint community. In particular, the committee shall recommend the disbursement of research initiatives, research excellence, faculty development, and undergraduate and graduate research grants under faculty mentors.

b. Does the committee address issues beyond the charge as outlined in the Faculty Code? No

c. Are there issues that are included in the Faculty Code charge that the committee no longer addresses? The language was adjusted in regards to the PURA acronym

d. How effectively does the committee function? The committee functions best when all members of the committee are present and represent each of the instructional units. The Chairperson of RCA and the Director of Research work closely together and have additional planning meetings if needed.

e. How frequently does committee meet? We meet a minimum once per semester, when needed we meet more to discuss changes to the rubrics, and we usually meet once per year for a business meeting. Also, an optional meeting for an open forum to explain the guidelines and answer questions by the faculty was held in 2014.
f. What is the usual duration of committee meetings? The meetings usually last for 3-4 hours once a semester. The business meeting will last for an hour or two, usually held in September, including updating the rubric. The open forum was held for two hours in October 2014.

g. What are identified obstacles in carrying out your committee's charge? The obstacles vary from semesters to semester based on how many proposals the committee receives and how much money is available to distribute. There is often challenging conversations that happen when debating the rubric scoring from each member of the committee. The committee also faces some challenges after the deliberations have been made due to unhappy members of the faculty with the outcome of the funding. Less than a half of proposals are awarded due to limited funding. It would be helpful for the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor to allocate more funds, since there is a growing demand by faculty for internal grants for research and creative projects, for producing scholarly publications, and for enhancing the academic reputations of the faculty and of the university.

RESPONSE OF SCHOLARSHIPS, AWARDS, AND SPECIAL EVENTS

a. Does the Faculty Code charge reflect current reality? Is the charge consistent with the current focus of the committee? Does the charge need to be updated by either deleting, adding, or otherwise editing the language? We think overall the code for SASE seems fine. However, we are unsure about the role relevant to ‘special events’. Please see comments in Part C below.

b. Does the committee address issues beyond the charge as outlined in the Faculty Code? No

c. Are there issues that are included in the Faculty Code charge that the committee no longer addresses? During the last few years, we have not addressed issues related to the following section of the code:

“The committee shall be responsible for soliciting, screening, selecting, and funding special events sponsored by UM-Flint and supported by income from UM-Flint endowment funds and other funds that may be available to support events that contribute significantly to the intellectual and artistic development of UM-Flint and the Flint community.

The committee, through the Provost, shall be responsible to the Chancellor for its expenditures of funds on special events. At the close of each academic year, the Provost shall report to the Chancellor on such expenditures and on the committee’s assessment of the effectiveness of the special events presented. The Provost and the committee shall also project the general program for special events during the next year and present to the Chancellor a budget request for funding.”

We are not sure whether this is due to the fact that there has not been a need for the SASE committee to perform these responsibilities over the past few years or whether there is another committee or party responsible for these duties.

d. How effectively does the committee function? Fairly effectively. It should be noted that the time commitment for this committee is very concentrated, as we receive a large amount of material to review related to the documentation submitted for Maize & Blue awards (e.g., total
document size is a few hundred pages), and we have a fairly tight turn-around of about 1 week to select the recipients. We are exploring possible ways to allow more time to review these documents.

e. How frequently does committee meet? We typically meet a few times each semester around the deadlines for selecting Maize & Blue Candidates and student speakers for each of the commencement ceremonies. This is typically in late October to early November and late March to early April. We also typically meet in April to select faculty awardees and student scholarship recipients.

f. What is the usual duration of committee meetings? **1-2 hours**

g. What are identified obstacles in carrying out your committee's charge? None.

RESPONSE OF NOMINATING

This language does correctly reflect our current charge. It does not need to be updated. We do not address issues that are outside of the above charge. We continue to address all of the above on an as-needed basis.

This committee does not meet on a regular basis. Most of our business is conducted by email. This is more efficient than in-person meetings as there are periods where no nominations are needed for quite a long time and other times when we will need to find several in the span of a few weeks.

It would be an issue to have members on this committee that seldom check or answer their email, as that is the way business is conducted. This is not currently an obstacle to the committee’s charge, but could be in the future.

RESPONSE OF ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE FACULTY

a. Does the Faculty Code charge reflect current reality? Is the charge consistent with the current focus of the committee? Does the charge need to be updated by either deleting, adding, or otherwise editing the language?

The 2014-2015 CESF committee would like to add the phrase “work place satisfaction” to the list of information gathered annually by CESF. See below in bold and underline

Economic Status of the Faculty
The Committee on the Economics Status of the Faculty shall consist of five faculty members, including at least one from each instructional unit.
The committee shall gather information regularly from the faculty and other sources about **work place satisfaction**, salary, benefits and other compensation received by the faculty. The committee shall consult on matters of data collection and analysis with the Office of Institutional Analysis and the Chancellor, via the faculty advisor to the Chancellor. UM-Flint will provide staff support for timely and consistent data collection. After consultation with the Faculty Council, its findings shall be submitted to the President and Regents as appropriate. The committee shall also report its findings to the UM-Flint faculty at least once a year.
b. Does the committee address issues beyond the charge as outlined in the Faculty Code?

The committee will also be focusing on workplace satisfaction.

c. Are there issues that are included in the Faculty Code charge that the committee no longer addresses?

No.

d. How effectively does the committee function?

Based on changes made this year the committee functions very effectively.

e. How frequently does the committee meet?

Face-to-face one time per month. Email work and exchanges are done regularly.

f. What is the usual duration of committee meetings?

2 hours.

g. What are identified obstacles in carrying out your committee's charge?

Lack of follow through by administration in terms of recommendations.

RESPONSE OF FACULTY GRIEVANCE

Faculty Grievance meets only when a grievance is brought by a faculty member. In two years, the Committee has received and reviewed one case. In that instance, the Faculty Code provided a clear and rational process for successfully resolving the issue. Based on this work, the Committee has no recommendation for changes in the language, scope, guidelines, meeting schedule or other Committee function.

The Committee does, however, suggest adding a section in the Faculty Code for the Ombuds position since it was created by Faculty Council and is subject to governing faculty elections. Although the Ombudsman’s charge is not, it appears, related in function and procedure to Faculty Grievance, it is a related service. Perhaps just a description of the position in a second appendix in the Code would be sufficient.

The Committee also recommends creating a Blackboard site, for committee members only, where related policies and guidelines for academic units and non-confidential Grievance Committee documents are stored. Such information would provide useful guidance to new and continuing members.

RESPONSE OF EXTENDED LEARNING AND SERVICE

After careful reviewing of the current faculty code shown below, the committee would...
like to offer the following revisions to the Faculty Code, Section 3n. Please also see the response to your request below.

The Committee on Office of Extended Learning Advisory Committee and Service shall consist of five faculty members, including at least one member from each instructional unit and two student members. The Director of the Office of Extended Learning and University Outreach shall be a member, ex officio.

The jurisdiction of the committee is limited to programs outside the purview of instructional units or other established faculty bodies (e.g., the Honors Council or International and Global Studies core faculty).

The committee shall be responsible for reviewing and maintaining the quality of programs which extend teaching and learning beyond the immediate campus. The committee shall review and approve distance learning and off-campus programs, including and non-credit programs under the Office of Extended Learning. The committee shall review and approve student service programs for which students receive academic credit or transcript notation.

a. Does the Faculty Code charge reflect current reality?

No. The name of the committee was changed a number of years ago, separating oversight of the Office of Extended Learning from the Office of University Outreach. The name needs to be changed to Office of Extended Learning Advisory Committee. Moreover, distance learning programs originate and are approved within the academic units, not through the Office of Extended Learning, and service learning is the responsibility of University Outreach. (See suggested changes, above.)

b. Is the charge consistent with the current focus of the committee? Does the charge need to be updated by either deleting, adding, or otherwise editing the language?

See suggested changes, above.

c. Does the committee address issues beyond the charge as outlined in the Faculty Code?

Yes, programs related to online course quality, faculty professional development, state/national policies, best practices, etc.

d. Are there issues that are included in the Faculty Code charge that the committee no longer addresses? Please see the above.

e. How effectively does the committee function?

It has been a challenge to have all members of the committee present at the meetings due to faculty members' teaching schedules and student members'
class schedules.

f. How frequently does committee meet?
   2-3 times per year.

g. What is the usual duration of committee meetings?
   One hour.

h. What are identified obstacles in carrying out your committee’s charge?
   Unsure at this point. Lack of time, conflicts with teaching schedule, or lack of knowledge and interest in online/distance education could be possible factors.

RESPONSE OF GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Faculty Code

General Education Curriculum Committee
The General Education Curriculum Committee (GECC) shall consist of five selected faculty members (two from the college and one from each school), the chair (or designee) of the curriculum committee of each unit, and a student member. The Provost shall designate an ex officio member. Individuals representing their unit’s curriculum committee shall serve for one year.

With a firm commitment to a campus-wide perspective, GECC shall work to refine and improve student learning within the university’s General Education curriculum. GECC is advisory to the faculties of the college and schools. It will serve as a liaison between the schools and college curriculum committees and present pertinent program matters to the unit faculties for consideration by the faculties. GECC shall continue the implementation process by issuing requests for FYE and capstone proposals, soliciting and reviewing courses for the General Education program and recommending them to the faculties for their approval. The committee shall ensure that individual courses are aligned with the appropriate general education program learning outcomes. It will undertake a periodic review of the entire program to make sure that the program goals are met. The committee will also undertake evaluation of FYE courses. It will work in conjunction with the Academic Assessment Committee in the preparation of appropriate methods of evaluation. Finally, the committee shall facilitate dialogue and implement a communication plan to support improvement to the general education program.

a. Does the Faculty Code charge reflect current reality? Is the charge consistent with the current focus of the committee?
   Yes, the Faculty Code charge reflects the current reality of the committee’s duties and is consistent with our focus.

   Does the charge need to be updated by either deleting, adding, or otherwise editing the language?
   Changes are as follows (statements taken from above charge and reworded to reflect GECC input):

   1. GECC shall continue the implementation process by issuing requests for FYE and capstone proposals, soliciting and reviewing courses for the General Education program and recommending them to the faculties for their approval.

      Revision: GECC shall continue the implementation process by issuing requests for FYE proposals, soliciting and reviewing courses for the General Education program and recommending them to the faculties for their approval.

      Committee removed words: capstone proposals. GECC does not need to request capstone proposals as those are handled at the unit/department/program level.
2. **The committee will also undertake evaluation of FYE courses.**
   
   Revision: Delete this statement.
   
   Stated earlier in document and GECC reviews all courses for General Education including FYE courses.

3. **It will work in conjunction with the Academic Assessment Committee in the preparation of appropriate methods of evaluation.**
   
   Revision: Delete this statement
   
   There has never been direct communication between the two committees. Refer to c. in this document.

b. Does the committee address issues beyond the charge as outlined in the Faculty Code?

   No, the committee does not address issues beyond the charge.

c. Are there issues that are included in the Faculty Code charge that the committee no longer addresses? **We do not work directly with Academic Assessment Committee in preparing evaluation methods; however, the coordinator for General Education regularly shares assessment results with GECC.**

d. How effectively does the committee function?

   The committee functions effectively. The chair of the committee works with GECC support personnel (e.g. S. Alberto) to obtain courses for GECC review and receive updates on courses that have been approved. The chair develops the agenda. Committee members may also add items to the agenda for discussion. Meeting notes are recorded and posted to Black Board for the committee’s review.

   While the committee functions effectively, it wishes to stress the importance of having representation from all of the unit’s curriculum committee chairs or representatives. It is essential that each unit provides a representative from their curriculum committee to address questions or concerns that the GECC committee may have regarding courses that are being reviewed.

e. How frequently does committee meet?

   The committee meets biweekly on the 2nd and 4th Thursdays of the month.

f. What is the usual duration of committee meetings?

   The committee meets for 1 ½ hours.

g. What are identified obstacles in carrying out your committee’s charge?

   Our principal obstacle is in the distinction between our charge as written and the perception, both interior and exterior to the committee, as to the committee’s authority. The committee’s charge explicitly defines it as an advisory body, and so we lack the authority to act on issues that we observe in the course of our regular business (e.g., partially-approved general education distribution designations, course duplication, etc.). Relatedly, there is also some confusion as to our relationship with the newly formed Curriculum Coordination Committee.

**RESPONSE OF COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSION STANDARDS**
This language does correctly reflect our current charge, although our student members are not always present. The committee was only recently formed so the charge as written here still aligns quite well with what we are actually doing and there doesn’t need to be any changes to the wording.

At this point, the committee has discussed a couple of issues in meetings that are not directly listed in the charge. In Fall 2014, Jonathan Davidson, Director of Undergraduate Admissions, brought to our attention a conflict between the way we deal with GPAs of incoming students here at UM-Flint compared to other peer institutions across the state. The proposal was to stop truncating GPAs at 4.0 as many schools give GPAs scaled up to 4.4 for A grades in advanced placement in high schools. Most of our peer institutions do not truncate these grades. After much discussion, the committee determined that the decision to stop truncating these grades will not affect admissibility to the University at all and it would likely only cause more students to be scholarship eligible. The committee gave its endorsement and Jonathan took the proposal to the Provost. Ultimately, the practice has yet to change because the Provost thought it too hasty to change the policy without studying its affects.

Another issue that was discussed as we continued our discussion of transfer students was the misconceptions of transfer students from community colleges about the length of time to graduation. Jessica Kelts and Darryl Baird pointed out that this was especially true in Chemistry and Biochemistry and Art departments. Students that transfer from a community college with all of their general education credits finished have not finished their college career by two years in some majors. For example, Mott Community College only offers the first year of Chemistry courses. For Chemistry and Biochemistry majors we have a four-year sequence of courses that must be completed and because some are pre-requisites of others, there are a limited number of orders in which you can take those courses. Students are also limited by the amount of time students spend in lab because they cannot sign up for some courses at the same time. For these reasons, most students from a community college come in expecting to finish a Chemistry or Biochemistry degree in two years and it will often take three or more years, depending on the course work they took at the community college. They will also often not be able to stay full time because they often cannot take 12 credits of chemistry and they no longer need any general education courses to fill out their schedule. There is a desire to better communicate to community college students that may transfer here exactly what they should be taking while still at the community college if we could identify those students.

There are no tasks described in the charge that the committee no longer undertakes. The committee functions well. Fawn Skarsten will often send us data ahead of a meeting if there is a lot of it so that we can study it ahead of the meeting. The meetings usually end with a recommendation either to the Director of Admissions or to the Director of the International Center or with a request of Institutional Analysis for more data. This committee meets two or three times per semester and meetings are called when new data is available to discuss. Meeting frequency is somewhat affected by the priority of projects for the Institutional Analysis staff members. Communication between meetings is by email. There have been instances where recommendations to the International Center have been made by email because data was brought to us during the summer when not all faculty were on campus and/or a recommendation was requested within one to two weeks of the information being brought to the committee.

Meetings typically last an hour or a little over. The biggest obstacle to our charge is identifying all the data we may think we need at the beginning of a task. It is the nature of these undertakings that as more data is presented, more questions arise that may require extracting more data. The committee is currently at the point with the Transfer Student study that it is difficult to
know whether further data would change our recommendation or not so a recommendation about transfer student admissions should be forthcoming by the end of the year. This committee in its former structure studied the admission of first time in any college (FTIAC) students, reported to the faculty, and made recommendations to the Director of Admissions. We are currently studying admission of transfer students. After this large project, there are not any other large projects planned for this committee. The committee chair could then canvas the campus community through governing faculty meetings and/or a campus survey to identify other projects that this committee should address.

RESPONSE OF FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT

No response received

RESPONSE OF CURRICULUM COORDINATION COMMITTEE

a. Does the Faculty Code charge reflect current reality? **It is too early to tell.** Is the charge consistent with the current focus of the committee? **Yes.** Does the charge need to be updated by either deleting, adding, or otherwise editing the language? The committee began to convene in September 2014, and is developing its documents for use.

b. Does the committee address issues beyond the charge as outlined in the Faculty Code? **Not yet**

c. Are there issues that are included in the Faculty Code charge that the committee no longer addresses? **N/A**

d. How effectively does the committee function? **It is too early to tell.**

e. How frequently does the committee meet? **Every other week**

f. What is the usual duration of committee meetings? **One hour**

g. What are identified obstacles in carrying out your committee’s charge? **This is a new committee. It is in the process of developing its disposition as it relates to its charge. The committee’s effectiveness should be evaluated at a later date.**