

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN-FLINT

Council of Deans Meeting  
Tuesday, April 26, 2016  
10:00 a.m. – Shiawassee Room

---

~ Minutes ~

**Members Present:** Doug Knerr, Bob Barnett, Donna Fry, Bob Houbeck, Scott Johnson, Susan Gano-Phillips, Vahid Lotfi, and Chris Waters

Doug called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

Doug indicated that he recently met with the Chief of Security Services for the University and they are in the process of tightening up third party authentication throughout campus. This will mean that an app has been developed in lieu of the normal token capability and implementation is planned for Fall.

Doug indicated that there is a need to change the rotation of future Council of Deans Meeting from the second and fourth Tuesday to the first and third Tuesday, at 10:00 a.m. An Outlook invite for future meetings will be sent making the change.

Doug announced that Gilia Smith, Associate to the Provost, was recently hired and is a new addition to the Office of the Provost. She will be introduced at the next Council of Deans Meeting. He indicated that she has expertise in diversity, adult education, has worked at Columbia University, and will be valuable in running connections on projects such as longitudinal studies, etc. She will serve as a support and in an operations role.

Doug explained that he will be meeting with executive committees, chairs, and departments. He indicated that his conversations will be reaffirmations about the kinds of things that he has discussed with the deans, will serve to reinforce some of the larger goals of the institution, and will establish more direct communication channels.

**Approval of Minutes – March 22, 2016** ► The Minutes of March 22, 2016 were approved as written.

**Budget** ► Doug indicated that we need to take an in depth look at the current budget model and see if it is meeting the needs of Academic Affairs and doing what we would like it to do. The Chancellor feels that the Model seems to make some initiatives out of reach. Doug said that the Council needs to take more of a leadership role in how the budget model works to ensure its efficiency within Academic Affairs. Much discussion took place. He asked whether there are areas where the Model is not serving us in the general interest of advancing the institution. Some of the highlights of the conversation were as follows:

- Some commented on how the old budget model did not work and did not enhance innovation, provided no reward and no punishment – just kept things stagnant.
- Vahid indicated that he believes that the current budget model has been responsible for the last ten years of growth.

- Donna indicated that the “new program” policy within the Model where new programs receive 80% for four years is essential to off-set start-up funds. She indicated, though, that because her school has a market that promotes the development of new programs and it has increased their funding levels, she understands how it would appear unfair from other college/schools that do not have the same opportunities. Vahid suggested that perhaps a review of the policy is necessary to see if a more conservative percentage slope could be developed without hurting a new program.
- Vahid suggested that a concept could be developed in Academic Affairs where a small amount could be taken off the top as insurance for the college/school and/or departments that may be experiencing a hardship. Doug suggested that if a contribution margin would be developed, he would want to see the Council have control over its use.
- Doug indicated that when new programs are conceptualized that we should make sure that the plan is mapped to a collaborative effort within Academic Affairs but also does not diminish the goal(s) of the program. He said that there is a responsibility for auxiliary units to understand their role of academic quality as well.
- Discussion centered on digital resources. Scott suggested that we should perhaps make more of an effort to include digital resources in new program proposals.
- Bob B. said that the reward and punishment concept is so simplistic but it does not capture how we should be thinking; we need to think in a more accountability mode. Sometimes it seems like the thinking is “everybody for themselves” rather than a more collaborative approach.
- Susan said that we need to be careful about redundancy and lean towards best practices more. She indicated that this is where interdisciplinary comes in and she feels that the budget model does not help to promote that. Doug indicated that as we look at the budget model we need to evaluate the things that we are not happy with and see to what extent the budget model is responsible.
- Bob H. asked to what extent is their incentive to bring third string dollars for growth of resources. Discussion touched upon development but the Council decided to discuss that at the next meeting.
- Incentive funding was discussed and some thought it should be implemented especially when tied to research. Vahid indicated that when the new Director of Research is hired, that is something that could be reviewed.
- The Council expressed an interest in having more influence in the university process of the budget. Additional discussion took place. A suggestion was made to meet with the Chancellor perhaps one or two times a year.

The final consensus of discussion was for the Council of Deans to develop a proposal to the CAC/BSP which would incorporate funding for innovation and incentive funds on behalf of Academic Affairs, with the Council managing those funds.

Doug closed by indicating that the next meeting will include discussion regarding development funds and he would invite Vice Chancellor Lindsey.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.