The University of Michigan – Flint
Chancellor’s Advisory Committee for Budget & Strategic Planning

April 4, 2014
Minutes

Present: Gerard Voland, Emily Newberry, Chris Douglas, Cathy Larson, Jie Song, Wieqi Li, Chris Pearson, Jerry Glasco

Absent: Ruth Person, Greg Tewksbury

Guests: Jessica Tischler, Stephen Turner

Emily Newberry called the meeting to order.

Jessica Tischler and Stephen Turner were introduced and invited to speak in support of the CNS (formerly CSE) proposal. The name of the proposal was changed to include the natural sciences.

Item of Discussion

- CNS Proposal

S. Turner began by stating that the proposal has undergone a “re-write” ~ particularly with regard to the section entitled “rationale.” This re-write was undertaken to better address issues that arose from the open forums and as well, to better articulate the impact to students. The timeline also addresses concerns that were vocalized in the open forums and an “implementation” section was added. The budget was also modified (versus the version previously produced by V. Lotfi). Jessica Tischler stated she believes the revised proposal now positions the university for the future ~ emphasizing that the proposal is not designed to be “Kettering-like.”

J. Tischler stated her opinion that CAS would also gain from this proposal and that the creation of a School of Engineering and Natural Sciences would bring prominence to the University of Michigan-Flint. This proposal seeks to create deliberate policies to address diversity issues with regard to women & minorities in the sciences and she does not believe a separate school will impede collaboration among the remaining units within the College of Arts & Science.
C. Douglas stated he has four critical concerns with the proposal: (1) faculty posts, (2) space issues, (3) faculty governance issues; (4) financial resources. The proposal calls for 70 new faculty posts over a ten year period ~ where will the funding come from? Would a new school truly be able to support such an increase in faculty? If the projected enrollments come to fruition ~ is there space to accommodate such an increase? Why the need (or want) to govern themselves? What are the revenue streams?

S. Turner stated that the current budget model is based on growth and it is the belief of those in engineering and the sciences that their growth will be stunted if they remain within CAS. The dean's office is allotted “x” number of dollars that must be split among the various units. Even with modest growth in engineering/sciences, these units will not gain the faculty posts needed. J. Tischler added these units currently have fewer faculty than 13 years ago.

J. Tischler commented that large class sizes actually limits the number of students wanting to pursue careers in the sciences. While UM-Flint touts our small class size, among the sciences this is just not true. J. Song added that UM-Flint has the worst equipment in the State of Michigan.

E. Newberry thanked S. Turner and J. Tischler for their presentation. G. Voland excused himself from further discussion on this proposal as he felt the committee should feel free to engage in debate based on the merits of the proposal.

E. Newberry stated she would gather input from CAC/BSP members to develop a response to be delivered to faculty council.

J. Song stated his belief that there were unanswered questions in Interim Dean Price’s response to the proposal ~ particularly with regard to the "hierarchy" resulting from the creation of a STEM division within the college.

C. Douglas questioned where the referenced $800,000 would come from to establish a dean’s office for a new college (e.g. ~ increased state appropriation? Everyone contributes? Re-allocation of current resources?)

C. Douglas also questioned statements pertaining to obtaining increased grant funding. C. Larson inquired whether there might be external pots of money that could be tapped into.

C. Douglas inquired of J. Glasco what the tuition return to CAS would be relative to special revenue agreements. How is this negotiated? Would other units within CAS experience budgetary cuts? G. Glasco stated his believe that the university
must ask itself “what does the new college accomplish?” While certain issues may be resolved, would complications arise in the remaining units? Most likely there would be financial implications.

C. Douglas questioned the proposed growth outlined in the feasibility section (pg 12). Is this an increase in credit hours or students?

J. Song inquired whether or not it would be appropriate to seek input from the other schools (e.g. SEHS and SHPS)?

S. Siebenthal commented that the campus really does not have a process for handling proposals for new schools/colleges. What are the requisite criteria? How is long-term sustainability determined? This is much like driving down a road without a roadmap..... While the proposal highlights the need to be competitive with other peer institutions, what are the long-term ramifications if a school/college is not successful? How does the creation of a new school/college affect CAS?

It was the consensus of the committee that they needed to meet again to discuss the merits of the proposal further and it was agreed to meet again on 4/11 with the goal being to develop a responsive document to present to faculty council.