Meeting brought into session at 1:03pm

**Update from Chancellor Borrego**

S. Borrego thanked the faculty for their participation and support regarding commencement. Much of the chancellor’s spring has been involved in job searches (vice chancellor for student affairs, executive director for university communications and marketing) and fundraising campaigns, the latter of which includes remaining work in building a cohort of givers via alumni networking. Borrego also noted the MSB groundbreaking in mid-October and how UM-Flint might be counted as both business and educational entity by local/regional chambers and committees.

J. Sanders requested the release of unit budgets and expenditures to faculty in the
interest of transparency. S. Borrego expressed support for said transparency, noting that unit budgets are public knowledge and that the university overall has work to do on capacity and sustainability, particularly in the area of fundraising.

T. Wrobel asked if there was a firm deadline on the closing time for the ice cream social. S. Borrego replied that there was not.

**Update from Provost Knerr**

D. Knerr provided a recap of the deans’ vision and planning presentation, noting academic affairs commitments to transformation of curriculum and learning environments as well as to securing talent for said transformations. The provost explained that this is what we need as an institution to thrive in this region and in the overall competitive space of higher education. Knerr also discussed engaged learning as part of curricular reform, that it is scholarly, encompasses teaching, research, and service, that it is reciprocal and mutually beneficial. Furthermore, the provost encouraged the governing faculty to leverage our current strengths and to use the Institute for Integrative Learning as the “glue” for a renaissance of engaged learning.

D. Knerr also commented on the School of Health Professions and Studies (SHPS) changing its name to the College of Health Sciences (CHS). The unit presented to the provost and the chancellor a unanimous recommendation for the name change, which Knerr sees as affirmation of where the unit is headed in strategic focus and scale. The provost also views this naming as a way to extend UM-Flint’s power for future financial health and further refine its institutional identity.

J. Lawand asked about the formation and purview of the university appeals committee. D. Knerr noted that the provost will make the final decision, but that the committee will be advisory and assist in gathering information related to the standing, veracity, and reflection of a given appeal. A broader scope of information should help make for a more student friendly decision even if/when such a decision is not exactly friendly to the student.

H. Wehbe-Alamah congratulated SHPS on the transition to CHS, expressed willingness to continue existing collaborations, and requested, in the interest of transparency, the process and eligibility requirements for a unit name change. D. Knerr reiterated the unanimous faculty recommendation from SHPS as the first and most important step in the process, that discussion first happened among unit faculty. Knerr admitted that there could have been more transparency in subsequent discussions, but that the provost and the chancellor also retain great
authority in making such decisions. Wehbe-Alamah followed up on the importance of unanimous agreement among unit faculty and Knerr emphasized again the importance of strategic direction in such matters.

C. Creech asked about the financial structure of units regarding name change. Knerr noted that existing financial structures will remain the same. Creech asked what might prevent Nursing from having a nutrition program in the future. Knerr said that there is an existing framework for those discussions, a good structure controlled by governing faculty, although the provost will offer perspective, too.

H. Laube asked governing faculty how many were hearing about the name change for the first time. Many raised their hands.

**Update from Tri-Campus Task Force**

E. Newberry explained that Faculty Council shared concerns about the Tri-Campus Task Force (TCTF) at an April 6 governing faculty meeting and at an April 23 meeting of Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA). TCTF co-chairs S. Lippert and J. Beatty and member W. Schultz provided history and context related to the committee’s formation and recent work regarding institutional governance.

TCTF is a temporary committee with representation from each campus (Ann Arbor, Dearborn, and Flint), a faculty advisory body that offers recommendations that go through various considerations. W. Schultz explained that TCTF has not been secretive but has experienced challenges that were shared with Faculty Council in ways that created confusion, including attempts to prohibit communication and variance in interpreting bylaws. Schultz also expressed hope that TCTF and SACUA be considered not overlords but instead as potential resources and coordinators.

J. Beatty reiterated this later point, noting that TCTF intends to be a resource for all three campuses, coordinating and speaking. Beatty also emphasized how much current procedure is already set due to Ann Arbor’s size and influence and how importance it is for Dearborn and Flint to have a place at the table to bring forth other concerns, which may in turn benefit the main campus as well. Regarding the permanence of TCTF as a committee, this will be up for renewal every year. And while SACUA is concerned that local faculty governance is not sufficiently independent of university administration, part of the TCTF charge is to work with administrators for the greater good and for all of us to know what is going on across all campuses.
S. Lippert explained that TCTF is interested in hearing about institutional-level decisions that might help Dearborn and Flint have more impact and that the reorganization of university finances would be a reason to contact the committee. Lippert and Beatty will try to represent the concerns of faculty, but are not working on campus governance and noted that current resolutions are in draft form.

M. Paroske asked about SACUA jurisdiction regarding disputes internal to a unit, such as UM-Flint. W. Schultz emphasized resolution internal to that unit. J. Beatty noted that SACUA does not have authority to resolve that dispute, only the power to receive complaints, to investigate, and to send related information back to the unit. S. Lippert explained that recommendations can be made, but no actions taken. Paroske expressed concern over the number of complaints to SACUA and sought clarification that SACUA can only advise. Beatty replied that SACUA is obligated to respond to petitions from governing faculty but has no power to take over a unit, that SACUA’s role is to amplify voices to the right authorities. J. Lawand observed that faculty of senate rank, i.e., UM-Flint faculty, have a right to be heard by SACUA. Lippert reiterated that all governing faculty as defined by the university are members of the senate, that we have shared common cause, that SACUA is for that cause while TCTF is more focused on resources and cross-campus communication and not on grievances.

HLC update
S. Turner explained that UM-Flint is in the HLC Open Pathways process, which encompasses two review periods at years 4 and 10 along with more regular reporting. There’s also a quality initiative component, which focuses on persistence and completion. On the accreditation side, there will be a site visit November 4-5, 2019. It is thus important for faculty to be knowledgeable about these processes, to be conversant with the university’s mission and vision statements and strategic plans and relay such information to students. Faculty should be prepared to attend information sessions and open forums in advance of the site visit.

G. Smith also mentioned the community engagement survey related to the university’s application for a Carnegie engaged campus designation.

S. Lippert thanked S. Turner for the presentation and expressed concern over the accreditation process as well as the need for transparency and accurate representation to site visitors. S. Turner replied that faculty will have access to the final report as well as a release draft of the assurance argument, though the latter depends on progress in sub committees and editing.
J. Sanders asked about the focus areas for the sub committees. S. Turner replied that the five focus areas are mission/vision, communication, teaching and learning, assessment, and finances, and that those criteria are broken down even further into sub points.

**Approval of April 6 minutes**

S. Borrego submitted the following amendments/clarifications:

1) The Chancellor is not unwilling to meet with FC regarding the survey. The Chancellor was not available at the 2 specific times offered by the FC chair, and the intensity of the Chancellor’s schedule prior to Commencement made it impossible to accommodate a meeting prior to April 6.

2) Regarding CAC/BSP attendance, the statement is misleading. In September the CAC/BSP found it necessary to change the dates of previously scheduled 2017-18 meetings from dates that had been on the Chancellor’s calendar to ones that did not work with her schedule. The Chancellor noted that she would not be able to make the rescheduled time that were selected to accommodate teaching schedules. This change was noted in the CAC/BSP minutes of September 13 https://libguides.umflint.edu/ld.php?content_id=40286559. Both the Provost and VC for Business and Finance would (and did) attend regularly as their schedules permitted and I continued to be in contact with the Chair throughout the year.

J. Lawand raised the question of quorum. E. Newberry replied with a presentation on authority and faculty governance. The rules governing an assembly are, in descending order: law, charter, bylaws, rules of order, standing rules, and custom. Code supersedes Robert’s Rules, which should only be reverted to if something is not present in the faculty code. The current language of the code states “regardless of the number of members present.” Until amendments to the code are introduced, discussion defaults to this understanding, which also led to the following resolution by Faculty Council at a May 2 meeting: “In light of ballot results regarding quorum and to encourage faculty participation in governing faculty meetings, Faculty Council interprets article 3, section 2, subsection c, as guidance for conducting business at governing faculty meetings.” Article 3, section 2, subsection c was approved by governing faculty in April 2017.

S. Lippert explained that headings for different procedures are descriptive to actual procedure, but also expressed uncertainty about derivation and suggested that hinging on Faculty Council’s interpretation may be counterproductive to faculty participation. J. Lewand stressed the importance of exercising due diligence in
careful reading and how that reading may provide something governing faculty can work with. M. Paroske commented that current language in the faculty code gives Faculty Council the right to act for governing faculty, but Faculty Council is also giving governing faculty a mechanism to have votes on the floor without actual quorum. E. Newberry revisited Article 4 of the faculty code as it relates to amending the code itself and suggested greater familiarity with the code among governing faculty and encouraged members to submit a motion to Faculty Council to establish quorum.

Minutes of April 6 approved as corrected

Update from GECC
C. Miller provided history and context, noting GECC’s review of both general education (GE) and first year experience (FYE) for continue improvement. Following report review as well as faculty fora and faculty surveys, Miller as GECC chair presented a range of motions for consideration. If general consensus/endorsement resulted, then there would be movement to unit committees for further review and GECC would follow up with assessment plans and a resubmission process.

Governing faculty asked about numerical data as well as the timeliness of the motions themselves. S. Lippert expressed support for a director/coordinator but also concern about the lack of detail (no list of duties or actual responsibilities or who this position reports to). M. Paroske agreed and expressed lack of support for a one-sentence motion, suggesting it might be premature at this stage. J. Lawand noted the agreement between governing faculty for some kind of FYE/GE director/coordinator. D. Abubakar stressed the need for clarity, whether a motion or a committee report, and that substantive aspects of what’s presented so far requires a long process. C. Miller added that GECC desired discussion and some agreement on what needs to go forward, perhaps recommendations.

Wanting to be helpful, governing faculty suggested a survey on individual motions, changing the motions themselves to recommendations, withdrawing the motions, and/or affording space at unit faculty meetings to present in greater detail the work of GECC. S. Lippert reminded governing faculty of following proper procedure in considering the motions, that one could suggest tabling but action is necessary regardless. T. Wrobel moved that the motions be amended to a report to the committee, that the report of recommendations be for the consideration of individual units. K. Hansen, M. Murray-Wright seconded. Further discussion ensued, and D. Lair clarified that C. Miller has the authority to change the motion,
even to withdraw it entirely. J. Lawand asked that governing faculty consider the original motions presented on behalf of GECC because the committee itself would like some substantive feedback.

C. Miller withdrew GECC motions. J. Lawand objected. T. Wrobel clarified that the reason for the amendment was to allow ideas to be discussed at different schools and colleges, to acknowledge the work of GECC, and that to withdraw the motions is consistent with the objection by J. Lawand. H. Laube moved that governing faculty have a conversation about the report. S. Roach seconded. Motion carried.

A. Lutzker clarified that a favorite part of the GECC motions is the appointment(s) of a director/coordinator, that having a structure first and then a director would involve a good amount of revision to the current way of doing things.

C. Tiernan expressed curiosity about the director appointment, raising questions of reporting, compensation, and release time as well as how to get the process moving while also stressing the need for faculty approval first.

S. Roach asked for an explanation of steps taken by GECC. C. Miller, as chair of GECC, started in 2016, discussing new courses and the lack of consistency in the approval process and thus proposing broader review, of which the provost was in favor. Ad hoc committees for FYE and GE met over twenty times and individual reports went to GECC for review. GECC organized faculty fora and surveys, which led to the development of documents that appeared to have broad consensus. The work is not done, however, with more complicated and controversial issues to be addressed by a director (or GECC). GECC will continue to work on finer details, but not without broader consensus.

J. Sanders commented that finer details might better incline faculty toward the approval of any motions. S. Turner spoke as a member of both committees, noting that FYE tries to do too many things and how it might be better to focus on a specific type of learning outcome, to focus on reading and writing skills, in order to avoid devolution into disciplinary pitching. Turner would like for governing faculty to seek development in which FYE courses themselves have more of a shared and common purpose. With GE, the committee’s work was based on better distribution definitions and considering a reduction in the overall number of courses available. M. Murray-Wright complimented GECC and FYE/GE ad hoc committees on their time devoted here and expressed certainty that we’re headed in the right direction as a result. S. Turner continued that FYE might be more of an academic
introduction, less of an extended orientation, but that it’s important to differentiate from something similar that student services was in the process of developing.

J. Alvey thanked S. Turner and GECC and also stressed that the latter might solicit information from teaching faculty, take reports to the units, and create more targeted feedback areas. R. Alfaro moved for endorsement of GECC recommendations, thanking GECC for its work, and then sending the recommendations to each unit’s curriculum committee.

J. Lawand commented that this motion represented a good compromise on two years of work that also allows GECC to work in broad ways on agreement and then proceed to greater detail. S. Roach noted in favor of unit curriculum committees looking at FYE/GE but also stressed the need to keep recommendations separate and that unit faculty rather than curriculum committees vote. E. Newberry called the question, noting that this motion would be an endorsement of next steps, including a report deadline of the September 28 governing faculty meeting. Motion carried.

H. Wehbe-Alamah requested an invitation be sent to CHS representatives for that same meeting.

Motion to adjourn by L. Svoboda, seconded by R. Alfaro, and carried.

Meeting adjourned at 307pm.