UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN-FLINT

Council of Deans Meeting

Thursday, July 12, 2012
3:00 p.m. – Shiawassee Room

~ Minutes ~

Members Present: David Gordon, Vahid Lotfi, D. J. Trela and Chris Waters

Gerard called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes from June 28, 2012 ► The Minutes of June 28, 2012 were approved as submitted.

SOM Policy Regarding Mixed Mode Courses ► Vahid explained that SOM has historically had online courses, face-to-face courses, and NetPlus which are mixed mode plus residencies. He indicated that both students and faculty are interested in mixed mode courses. He has been working with the Executive Committee to discuss how best to offer additional mixed mode courses with residencies in an efficient manner specifically regarding scheduling. They have developed a policy where all mixed mode courses offered will have one or two residencies per month and the prescribed schedule is that all residencies will occur on Fridays, for example, the first and third, second and fourth, etc. This does not interrupt the normal standard time schedule and are easy to schedule in terms of available classroom space. He indicated that the new policy will run as a pilot this coming academic year. Discussion followed.

Reassigned Time ► Gerard indicated that discussion on reassigned time was tabled from the last meeting and in the meantime he and DJ discussed the CAS Policy of Reassigned Time mandating that 1/9 replacement cost be standard in all reassigned time collaborations. Gerard indicated that he does not support it and thinks that it will be more difficult for CAS faculty to take on additional roles because of the cost to other units.

DJ noted that the study and subsequent proposal were undertaken so that the College could get a handle on the extent of course reassignments and their cost. The concerns growing out of the study include: 1) lack of clarity on what service responsibilities for faculty are part of their expected annual load, and what responsibilities warrant reassigned time: this seems to be creating a greater expectation of reassigned time than in the past; 2) individuals in different offices have negotiated reassigned time with faculty without involving the Department Chair or the Dean until after the fact; 3) under current policies the College is usually reimbursed for less than actual replacement costs; 4) when course reassignments take place, there are instances where the course reassigned is cancelled rather than taught. In these instances the College receives no reimbursement and loses any tuition that would have been generated by the course that isn’t taught. The proposal recommended a 1/9 charge for course reassignments, while DJ also expressed a preference for stipends to be negotiated in lieu of course reassignments. Gerard indicated that (2) was inappropriate and should not occur in the future, although he did not otherwise support the College’s proposal.

There was much discussion regarding what is a fair exchange for reassigned time and the difficulties that chairs sometimes have in finding replacements, the continuation of scheduling classes, and the cost involved. Establishing an average was discussed. Also, it was mentioned that if the regular faculty member is not teaching a said course, that enrollment may drop. A consensus was that the rescheduling because of reassigned time was a management responsibility rather than a budget problem.
Discussion took place regarding sabbaticals in that prior to 2004 all sabbatical replacement costs were covered by the Provost Office. Also, chair stipends were discussed and the problem that the University cannot afford to recruit chairs.

Gerard indicated that he would like to see all units agree on replacement costs. He cannot afford to pay 1/9 salary for reassigned time; however, he committed on behalf of the Provost Office to reimburse units for their true replacement costs rather than the general adjunct replacement costs, with the exception of paying for faculty overloads. He is expecting departments, however, to find the most efficient way to replace faculty when that occurs. He indicated that we will do that this year and see how it goes.

**Capital Campaign** ► Gerard indicated that he met with one of the external development committees, the Annual Giving Committee chaired by John Cherry and Libby Maynard. They basically see themselves as “stoking the fires” in terms of developing a theme that we would embrace for the Capital Campaign. He shared 15 themes with them and emphasized that we need a menu that we can work from.

Much discussion took place regarding the structure, budget, and work of the previous campaign. Discussion also included the concern regarding spreading staff too thin, the budget of the current campaign, and a problem that we are facing now with not having built the infrastructure of Development from the last campaign. A decision was made that the Major Gift Officers will be invited the first Council of Deans Meeting in August and the entire meeting will be devoted to the Capital Campaign.

**Budget Issues** ► Gerard indicated that we have three pillars within the University with two of them well budgeted and one that is not … engagement. He explained that we need more funding for engagement, specifically for University Outreach, despite their efforts in attaining grant money to run the department. Much discussion took place which involved faculty engagement outside of Outreach as well. Gerard indicated his concern and his desire to see faculty engagement generating revenue.

A suggestion was made to develop an inventory with a value on projects before anything else is done.

Discussion took place that perhaps the whole culture of the University should change in terms of recruitment, both students and faculty, and engagement should be the main theme and/or goals. Gerard indicated that perhaps engagement should be more imbedded within promotion and tenure and reviews. He said that SHPS and SEHS do a good job because it is part of their culture. Some did not think that expecting the majority of engagement to generate revenue was realistic here in Flint. Discussion involved what faculty are doing now and some felt that engagement is abundant among faculty.

Gerard concluded the conversation by indicated that he will develop a prospectus regarding what could be done in this regard.

**Matters Arising** ► No items announced.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.