Governing Faculty Minutes of March 22, 2019

Location: 111 FH

Present: James Schirmer (CAS), Ricardo Alfaro (CAS), Cathy Miller (SOM), Judy Haefner (SON), DJ Trela (CAS), Jennifer Alvey (CAS), Jan Furman (CAS), Adam Lutzker (CAS), Aviva Dorfman (SEHS), Jeannette Stein (CAS), Daniel Birchok (CAS), Rajib Ganguly (CAS), Jacob Lederman (CAS), Mojtaba Vaziri (CAS), Matt Wolverton (LIB), Jessica Kelts (CAS), Mickey Doyle (LIB), Linda Knecht (SON), Sasha Drummond-Lewis (CAS), Ken Litwin (CAS), Donna Fry (CHS), Stephanie Roach (CAS), Emily Feuerherm (CAS), Charlotte Tang (CAS), Kazuko Hiramatsu (CAS), Charles Thomas (CAS), Matt Fhaner (CAS), Tariq Shamim (CAS), Quamrul Mazumder (CAS), Leslie Smith (CHS), Suzanne Trojanowski (CHS), Dauda Abubakar (CAS), Olanrewaju Aluko (CAS), Laura Smith (CHS), Karmen Hollis-Etter (CAS), Vickie Larsen (CAS), Beverly Dabney (SON), Otrude Mayo (SEHS), Jerry Sanders (CAS), Jamile Lawand (CAS)

Guests: Susan Alcock, Interim Provost; Stephen Turner, Interim Associate Provost

Meeting called to order at 1:05pm

J. Schirmer noted he would be chairing the meeting in absence of E. Newberry and called for additions to the agenda. K. Hiramatsu requested addition of IRB report.

Minutes of October 10 approved by acclamation

Discussion of associate provost positions

Interim Provost S. Alcock recommended searches for two Associate Provosts, one for AP and Dean of Graduate Studies (a position currently held on interim basis by S. Turner) and one for AP and Dean of Undergraduate Studies. The Graduate Dean would likely oversee the Office of Extended Learning, serve as an HLC liaison, and oversee Graduate Programs, while the Undergraduate Dean would consider undergraduate curriculum, general education and FYE, international education, and serve as liaison to Student Services. S. Alcock noted that this would be in many ways a reversion to a previous office structure and that these recommendations emerged from a sense of the Academic Affairs wing of university administration as sub-optimally organized and understaffed. These recommendations have been canvassed with Council of Deans, AAAC, Faculty Council, and other stakeholders on campus. S. Alcock also expressed a preference for internal searches and hires as well as three-year appointment terms. The
Interim Provost wants this plan to be as much of a financial wash as possible but cannot guarantee there won’t be some added costs. S. Alcock stressed the importance of strengthening curriculum and increasing enrollment and that these recommendations are also attempts to support the work of faculty.

J. Sanders asked about the meaning of “financial wash.” S. Alcock replied that there might be minimal, incremental costs increases depending on who holds the AP positions but that overall this is a good investment for the campus.

J. Alvey expressed excitement about the AP positions, noting the message of confidence and support in S. Alcock’s recommendations that excellent candidates exist among current university faculty.

M. Vaziri shared serious concerns about the necessity of both AP positions, suggesting that other administrators may already be doing much of the work. J. Lawand appreciated S. Alcock’s determination and commitment to improving university functions, but expressed concerns about shrinking enrollment, administrative expansion, the fairness and limitations of internal hires, and the paucity of faculty searches, particularly in the humanities. S. Alcock acknowledged these concerns and explained that a national search would be a budgetary strain and that a three-year term limit would allow university administration to evaluate the effectiveness of the AP positions.

S. Lippert observed the lack of hires in arts and humanities for several years, suggesting new hires in those areas should take priority. S. Lippert also stressed the need for a national search and that internal candidates should rise to the top, suggesting the possibility of a delay in the process or at least a robust faculty search committee. S. Alcock said that external hires at this point would be cost-prohibitive and that candidates need to be clearly vetted, agreeing that a solid search committee and clear process are essential.

1U
D. Birchok, J. Lederman, and J. Alvey presented on the One University coalition (1U). 1U is a coalition of tenure-track faculty, lecturers, students and staff across all three campuses of the University of Michigan that is attempting to address issues of equity between the campuses, especially when it comes to the amount of resources expended on students. There are a lot of different ways in which this is being done. Part of this is Lansing-facing, and involves lobbying the legislature to increase and equalize per student expenditures for all three campuses. Part of it is directed at Ann Arbor (i.e., President and Board of Regents) in an effort to get Ann
Arbor to share its resources more equitably through programs like a Go Blue Guarantee scholarship for Flint and Dearborn, money for programs like study abroad, a pot of money to cover lecturer salaries so that lectures can have true salary parity across the system, a re-organizing of transfer policies, etc. People can sign up for updates and/or to volunteer through the bit.ly in the attached PowerPoint presentation, and there is also an open letter written in the voice of governing faculty, but which anyone can sign. (It was passed out at the meeting and is also attached here to the minutes.) They will be submitting this letter to the Regents and president at the end of March, when it will also become electronically available to sign. Please contact D. Birchok (dbirchok@umflint.edu) if are interested in signing.

J. Stein asked if the transfer component of 1U duplicates other efforts, such as statewide articulation agreements, and suggested checking the Ann Arbor equivalency database. E. Feuerherm noted that transfers are not uni-directional (Flint to Ann Arbor) and that Ann Arbor students might want to consider Flint or Dearborn programs. J. Kelts observed that Flint has existing transfer agreements that have brought some excellent students, but suggested we should not want to advocate that our advanced students transfer in their junior/senior years. M. Vaziri commented on the 2+2 program in engineering and the negative impact seen when Ann Arbor lowered the transfer GPA from 3.5 to 3.0, also suggesting that admissions processes should be able to admit students to Dearborn or Flint.

S. Lippert commented that the Flint and Dearborn campuses bring greater diversity to UM enrollment overall and suggested that 1U check in with other university-wide committees to expand its message.

**HLC update**

Interim Associate Provost S. Turner presented a brief summary of ongoing activities in preparation for the upcoming HLC comprehensive re-accreditation site visit. UM-Flint follows the Higher Learning Commission's Open Pathway process, which is a ten-year cycle that includes a quality initiative in years 5-9 and preparation of assurance arguments in years 4 and 10. The assurance arguments are also associated with site visits, with a comprehensive visit in year 10. We are currently in year 10, and our site visit is scheduled for November 4-5, 2019. The assurance argument will be locked (no further modifications) on October 7, 2019. Additionally, there is a student survey that we administer on behalf of the HLC, which will also be used to inform the process.
The assurance argument initial draft was created in November 2018, and, based on feedback, it has been extensively modified since then. Several key groups have examined it and made suggestions for improvements: the Cabinet, the Council of Deans, and members of the HLC Steering and sub-committees. The intention is to provide a password-protected PDF copy of the report to the university community in the near future. A form assembly site has been created to receive feedback. Although S. Turner was not able to give a precise date that the draft will be released to the general university community, he stated that he would have that information by the April 12 university governing faculty meeting.

S. Roach asked if the time for faculty review will still be a time to contribute and make changes or only review. S. Turner replied that once accuracy of the document is assured, it will be made available for faculty comments. Corrections of factual errors can be sent to S. Turner or Deb White.

SA/SACUA update

S. Lippert reviewed institution-wide governance structures, noting that all governing faculty are members of the University Senate, but this body is on the unwieldy side and meets only once a year. The Senate Assembly has elected representatives from the three campuses and meets monthly. SACUA oversees the Assembly and institution-wide committees. Each campus has its own internal governance structure.

S. Lippert then shared two recent resolutions, one regarding due process and the other regarding governance at all levels. The former calls for a faculty appeal process in any investigation of faculty conduct; the latter calls for insuring faculty involvement in governance regardless of the type of structure in which they carry out their duties.

J. Lawand asked if Flint’s grievance process complies with the new due process policy. S. Lippert replied that broadly it does but that our campus does not cover investigations outside of the faculty grievance process.

C. Thomas asked if compliance with the resolution is mandatory or optional. S. Lippert replied that the vast majority of administrators should comply with the resolution in good faith.

S. Lippert then shared that SACUA is taking a watchful, waiting attitude toward the SPGs regarding sexual misconduct and the reporting of all felony charges. In particular, the SPG regarding the reporting of all felony charges could potentially
disadvantage people at the university as many felony charges are reduced to misdemeanors when working through the legal process.

S. Lippert also reviewed the institution-wide survey/evaluation process that was adopted in 2004. In addition, the Flint campus has the right to conduct its own internal surveys. The Flint campus has been out of compliance with the University-wide evaluation process since it was created. Faculty Council oversees Flint’s internal survey process. The institution-wide process is a matter for institution-wide governance bodies—it is the purview of the University Senate because that is the body that created it.

J. Schirmer commented that administrators to be evaluated were only informed of the institution-wide process on March 15th and stressed that Faculty Council is not opposed to surveys, but frustrated by the lack of prior communication about this process.

J. Haefner asked why this evaluation process was being implemented now. S. Lippert replied that awareness of Flint’s lack of compliance only became common knowledge recently.

R. Alfaro commented that S. Lippert was present at Faculty Council on March 13th and did not share this information. S. Lippert replied that it was not her responsibility to convey this information.

J. Lawand explained that governing faculty voted two years ago to carry on with our own internal process and that this was conveyed to SACUA. S. Lippert said that Flint does not have the right not to participate in a Senate-mandated process.

M. Mani suggested exploring what happened in 2004 when the new evaluation process was initiated on the Ann Arbor campus.

A. Lutzker observed that S. Lippert was asked to update Faculty Council on governance matters on March 13th but did not raise this evaluation issue. A. Lutzker then asked if S. Lippert did not present this information because Faculty Council invited her in the “wrong” capacity. S. Lippert explained that the evaluation process is handled through the AEC rather than SACUA.

R. Alfaro noted that governing faculty voted on this issue in 2017 and compliance was voted down, which was then communicated to Ann Arbor.
C. Thomas asked what compliance with this evaluation process meant. S. Lippert said that faculty are free to take the survey or to delete it upon receiving the email.

J. Schirmer shared that Faculty Council will be sending a memo to SACUA asking for an immediate halt to the survey process for this academic year.

**IRB update**

K. Hiramatsu reminded those assembled that the Institutional Review Board oversees human subject research and that changes to the Common Rule went into effect January 21, 2019. Also, a working group is reviewing the eResearch platform with the intent to update and discussions are happening about the reporting of neglect or abuse when conducting research with children.

K. Hiramatsu also shared that, in January, the Dearborn IRB was consolidated into the Health Sciences/Behavioral Sciences (HSBS) IRB in Ann Arbor. Flint IRB has been encouraged to consolidate as well but there is strong sentiment for maintaining an independent IRB on this campus. S. Turner has been charged by the Provost with collecting information that will guide conversations about Flint IRB and its staffing. K. Hiramatsu stressed that faculty should share their concerns and comments with S. Turner.

**AAAC update**

V. Larsen commented that AAAC has developed a mission statement for the next chancellor and has shared it with the chancellor search committee. AAAC has also engaged in discussion regarding merit scholarships with Vice Chancellor Kristi Hottenstein, who favors decreasing the importance of test scores and emphasizing high school GPA as bases for scholarship awards. This conclusion is in line with what research suggests as the most important indicators of future student success.

V. Larsen also noted that the Winegarden professorship call is forthcoming and that AAAC is reviewing the charge. For the current cycle, AAAC will serve as the selection committee. J. Lawand suggested that the Winegarden professorship and the Common Read could be coordinated or at least complementary. V. Larsen agreed that this is a good suggestion.

Meeting adjourned at 3:05pm