Members Present: Doug Knerr, Susan Gano-Phillips, Scott Johnson, Vahid Lotfi, Keith Moreland, and Chris Waters

Guests: Tracy Wacker, Director/Thompson Center for Learning and Teaching
        Beth Manning, Director/Flint-Human Resources

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m.

Provost Announcements  Doug indicated that he has been working with the Chancellor’s Office regarding the academic calendar and rationalizing about events that compete with his time and that of the Chancellor’s in order to determine how to present the best leadership footprint.

He also mentioned that a comprehensive ask is being developed to present to the Mott Foundation. He stressed that in doing so, we have to make sure that there are not additional requests going there from other parts of the University that may deter the progress of the Chancellor’s Office. He said that it is important to align points of view especially externally.

Proposal for Systemic Peer Observation Process at UM-Flint  Tracy reported that she has developed a proposal for a systemic peer observation process that she initially discussed with the Council last year at its inception. She explained that the proposal stems from two things:

  • She is asked to do a large number of classroom observations, and although she is delighted that there is interest in doing them, she just cannot manage the number of requests anymore.
  • She has attended the LEO annual review seminars and find that there is a discord between the types of LEO reviews among units/departments.

Tracy explained that in November of last year, Dr. Virginia Hamori-Ota from Ann Arbor conducted a workshop showing how to conduct a peer observation. The positive comments were over-whelming and most said that every faculty member should attend the workshop. Tracy said that the idea is to have some of our own faculty trained so that they can train others. She said that it was based on the CAS/LEO observation model and they have found that there are benefits for both the observer and the faculty member being observed.

Discussion centered on the following:

  ➢ How often should workshops be held and would we always have Dr. Hamori-Ota conduct the workshops; some thought one each semester would be good.
  ➢ Initially having an inaugural cohort seemed liked the best idea but no decisions were made regarding who to invite.
The consensus of the Deans was that LEO’s should be included in the program and that a huge benefit would be if like ranks are paired for peer observation, i.e. assistants could review assistants, associate professors review associate professors, etc., with the idea of the program being a continuous improvement model.

Peer reviews have been built into promotion and tenure; however, the process does not count for anything in terms of a successful approval.

The number of faculty, including LEO, is somewhat problematic if plans are to have every faculty member attend a training. An emphasis should be placed on developing our own certified trainers.

The component of online teaching needs to be built into the proposal. Tracy will be working with Deb White in this regard along with consulting with Virginia.

Compensation for certified faculty was discussed and most felt that that was appropriate initially; however, the hope is that faculty will see this as a piece of the culture and an important factor of professional development. Tracy indicated that it takes approximately 6-10 hours per course for a peer review/report.

Although the consensus of the Deans was very favorable, all agreed that support should be sought by faculty. Tracy has developed a faculty survey for seeking their input.

Tracy concluded based on the input of the Deans, that she would be doing the following: finalizing a survey for faculty; contacting those in the POD network to see what other institutions are doing; working on the compensation piece; and working on what this first year would look like. She will report back to the Deans.

Faculty Grievance Procedure ► Beth explained that the charge in 2010, when the Faculty Grievance Procedure was developed by Ann Arbor, was that each unit was asked to review their faculty grievance procedures and/or make adjustments to make sure that they align with Ann Arbor’s. Beth indicated that Ann Arbor has asked us to again review our policies and report back to them. She further explained that there are a few differences from Ann Arbor, i.e., we do not send information to the President, and we have some latitude to vary from the 180 day limit. Beth indicated that the College and Schools’ do not have to be identical, but the idea is that they must mirror Ann Arbor’s policy for the most part. Discussion ensued.

Sue was asked to send a current copy of each of the codes to Beth. Beth said that she will review the codes to make sure that they align. If there are any codes and don’t have a Faculty Grievance Procedure component, then they would be mandated to follow Ann Arbor’s in the case of a grievance. She said that the goal is for her to be able to report back to Academic HR in Ann Arbor that we have reviewed our policies and they are in alignment with University policy.

The Deans noted that either not knowing when a new SPG has been added or that one has been revised and what the revisions entail has been problematic. Beth indicated that her office is working on a better communication plan in this regard.

Approval of Minutes from July 14, 2015 ► The Minutes of July 14, 2015 were approved as written.

Area Updates ► Doug provided an update of the CAS and SHPS Dean Searches indicating that they will be moving forward concurrently with the following timelines:

- Bio Reviews October 19
- Airport Interviews November 1 and 2
- Campus Interviews November 10 through 24

Doug indicated that he plans to meet/greet candidates at airport interviews. He explained that as a candidate, that was an important aspect of his interview process.
Keith reported that the Department of Nursing is going through its reaccreditation. They have done a lot of work, including using a consultant, so we feel that they are in good shape.

Scott reported that the external site visit from AASCB is scheduled for November 6-8, 2016. He also noted that the School has developed a policy for assigning vacated office space when someone leaves that seems to be working very well.

Susan reported that CAS is approaching the end of MSB renovations with faculty very anxious to move into their newly renovated classrooms and labs. She said that she is working with the chairs and Roy on a capital outlay proposal for MSB. Susan also said that they are working on a comprehensive professional development plan for chairs. They have been doing things such as sending chairs to conferences, having a few workshops, but they want to be much more intentional in developing the position of chair into a real leadership role.

Chris said that she, Aimi, and Jon are keeping an eye on enrollment. An unusual happening is taking place that they are trying to understand is that there are more students who are registered for orientation but who never show up. Transfers are up.

Vahid reported that the EOI Audit since 2011 has officially closed with no stipulations. Also the $415,700 grant from the Mott Foundation has been received as well.

Vahid reported, in terms of Graduate Programs that all scholarships administered through his office have been distributed and that any applicant who was eligible received funding. The amounts varied from $500 to $1,500 and were distributed to 217 students plus 42 students from CSEP. He also said that all GSRA have been assigned and any faculty member who requested one received a GSRA. Total funding increased from $240k last year to $270k this year.

Doug concluded that our ACE Fellow, Steve Turner, is struggling with selecting a project that would be co-beneficial. His appointment will be at the Rochester Institute of Technology. Doug asked that if anyone had ideas to email him.

The meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m.