

UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES – MEETING TWO

September 19, 2007, 3 – 5 p.m.

Student Center

www.emich.edu/facultycouncil

rlarson@emich.edu

487-0196

**I. Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

**II. Approval of the Agenda**

The agenda was approved unanimously.

**III. Approval of the Minutes of September 5, 2007**

The minutes were approved unanimously.

**IV. Elections and Committee Appointments**

**A. V-P and Secretary of Faculty Council.** Matt Evett and Alida Westman were unanimously reelected as Vice-President and secretary, respectively.

**B. Appointments to Search Committees**

a. **Vice-President for Student Affairs:** Bob Winning and Daryl Barton

b. **Associate Vice-President for Academic Programs:** Mahmud Rahman and Ann Blakeslee

c. **Assistant Vice-President for Academic Human Resources:** **Two representatives are needed. If you are interested, please make this known.**

**C. Other Committees**

a. **Library Advisory Council:** Susan Booth

b. **Research and Sabbatical Leave Committee:**

COT: John Texter

COE: Kyung Hee Kim

c. **Education Environment and Facilities Committee:**

Margaret Crouch and Sandra Hines

d. **Security Advisory Committee:** Karen Schulte

e. **Parking Committee:** **Preferably one rep from each college.**

**D. Representation on the Ypsilanti Income Tax panel, 9-27-07, 6:30 p.m., Roosevelt Auditorium.** Mahmud Rahman will look for someone from accounting.

**V. University Faculty Council Input – Sally McCracken**

University Faculty Council gradually developed to take its current role based on the joint governance principles described by the national AAUP. It deals with academic issues which concern more than one college, whereas the EMU-AAUP deals with wages, hours, and working conditions. University Faculty Council is authorized by the union contract.

**A. Official Faculty Input.** Only faculty appointed by Faculty Council can provide official faculty input.

**B. Majority Vote** is used, because all departments/schools are represented.

**C. Discussion vs Action items.** If at all possible, materials are presented at one meeting for discussion and the next meeting for a vote. Representatives are expected to get feedback from the people they represent between the meeting in which there was discussion and the meeting at which there will be a vote.

**D. Representatives need to report back to their departments** in order to keep them informed.

**E. Editing** is not done during a meeting. Rather ideas are gathered during a meeting, and then a small group of people edit the materials.

**F. Reasoned positions.** Committees are expected to check the background and document positions.

**VI. Honors College – Jim Knapp**

Common readers have been used by the Honors College and by the Summer Incentive Program. The program now is to be expanded to the whole incoming freshman class. Faculty volunteers are requested to help select a text: 2 from CAS, 1 from the Library, 1 from each of the other colleges.

It was recommended that faculty in English dealing with literature may be able to assist. It is not clear why EMU has a program separate from the one cosponsored by Halle library for the Ann Arbor-Ypsi area and used by high schools in the area and incoming students at the U of M.

**VII. New Distinguished Faculty Award; Realignment – Bob Neely**

The new faculty award would be the result of splitting scholarly and creative activity, to create a separate Distinguished Faculty Award in Scholarly Activity and one in Creative Activity. University Faculty Council will discuss and vote on this issue.

Bob Neely asked for feedback on realignment. Faculty commented that realignment seems premature, because realignment is happening as a result of implementing the new Gen Ed program, and the new Program Review also may lead to realignment. Realignment takes a great deal of time and money. Moreover, it is not clear that it will save money, because the administrative tasks need to be done by someone. The disruption which realignment causes faculty is likely to disrupt students also and perhaps decrease retention. However, EMU has many more programs listed than other universities, and perhaps program realignment is feasible and worthwhile. Bob Neely will send to Russ Larson the website address at which realignment materials are available, and Russ Larson will forward the link to UFC representatives.

**VIII. Letter to the Chair of the Board of Regents about the EMU presidential search – Alida Westman**

A letter was written by a group of concerned faculty which indicates how successful search committees are formed. The EMU-AAUP had endorsed it. University Faculty Council rejected verbatim acceptance of the letter but unanimously endorsed (28-0-0) the principle of the letter about the composition of successful search committees. The letter is shown in Appendix A.

**IX. Letter to Governor Granholm about appointing an Academic to the Board of Regents – Alida Westman**

The letter indicates that there is a lack of knowledge about academics on the Board and requests that an academic be appointed to provide the academic perspective in discussions. The letter indicated a particular person who might be elected, but this section of the letter was not accepted and removed. The resultant letter was approved (22-0-1) and shown in Appendix B.

**X. Future Meetings and Locations.**

**A.** The other meetings during this academic year will be held in the Student Center Room 310B.

**B.** University Faculty Council minutes, documents, committee reports, etc., are posted on the website, [www.emich.edu/facultycouncil](http://www.emich.edu/facultycouncil)

## **IX. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alida Westman

**Present:** M. Rahman (ACC); C. Semmes (AFS); M. Reedy (ART); B. Winning (BIOL); L. Kolopailo (CHEM); S. McCracken (CTA); D. Chou (CIS); M. Evett (COSC); J. Rice (ECON); J. Texter (ENGIN TECH); R. Larson (ENG); M. Zinggeler (FLABS); C. Mayda (GEO/GEOL); D. Clifford (HEALTH SCI); S. Levine (HPHP); M. Crouch (HIS/PHIL); S. Dugger (L & C); L. Klopfer (Library); K. Banerji (MGMT); D. Barton (MKT); J. Jones (MATH); J. R. Smith (MUS/DANCE); G. Rubenfeld (NURS); E. Behringer (PHY/AST); A. Lottie (PLS); A. Westman (PSY); R. Orrange (SAC); L. Lee (SPED); E. Lowenstein (TED); P. Becker (TECH STUDIES).

**Ex-Officio:** D. Loppnow (PROVOST AND VP FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS).

**Guests:** D. Loppnow (INTERIM EMU PRESIDENT); R. Neely (INTERIM PROVOST)

**Absent:** SAC; SWK; WMST

## Appendix A

### Letter to Chair of the Board of Regents

To: Regent Thomas Sidlik

Date: September 14, 2007

From: Randal Baier, Peter Bednekoff, Howard Bunsis, Abby Coykendall, Jamin Eisenbach, Sylvia Sims Gray, Mark Higbee, Mike Homel, Lisa Klopfer, Russ Larson, Ethan Lowenstein, Elaine Martin, Sheila Most, Julie Myers, Lynn Nybell, Ken Rusiniak, Richard Stahler-Sholk, Joanna Scott, Jim VandenBosch, Alida Westman

Re: Presidential Search Process

As faculty members who organized and participated in the Faculty Assembly on September 4, 2007, we thank you for your attentiveness to the issues and concerns raised by the faculty. We have received strong positive feedback about the Assembly endorsing its central themes for this year at EMU: putting academics first, transparency, democratizing governance and reviving community. Your presence was an essential contribution to this effort.

We are responding to your invitation to communicate openly by expressing our views on the upcoming search for a president. As we all recognize, the search for a new president is one of the most significant moments in the life of a university. Following two failed presidencies, the stakes for EMU in the presidential search process could be no higher. The search process can be a moment in which the confidence in the University is restored; at the same time, the risk that a flawed process will further damage trust of faculty, students and the public is enormous. This search simply must succeed, both as a process and in its outcome.

Clearly, the Regents hold the legal responsibility to make this choice. However, the literature on university governance, acknowledged and supported by Vice President Loppnow at the Assembly, makes it clear that the faculty share in this responsibility. Both the Faculty and the

Board have a vested interest in selecting an individual whose leadership will enable us to fulfill our common obligation to develop, deliver and maintain high quality, viable programs that enhance the common good of our students and State. In a search process of shared responsibility, each constituency of the university must select representatives to a presidential search, and the numbers from each constituency should reflect “the *primacy of faculty concern* (italics added) and the range of other groups, including students, that have legitimate claim on some involvement” (AAUP Redbook 2006, p. 145). Models of search processes that reflect shared responsibility are available; throughout the SUNY system, for example, presidential search guidelines establish a committee consisting of four Regents, six faculty members, and five representatives of other constituencies.

Many universities, like SUNY, have policies and procedures in place that guide this cooperative presidential search process. In contrast, at EMU, the university is faced with devising a set of policies and procedures at this very critical juncture. Acknowledging that Faculty Council and the AAUP will be represented on the presidential search committee is a welcome positive step. However, there is already widespread concern that limited faculty representation will reflect neither the primacy of faculty interests nor the diversity of faculty concerns.

Therefore, we believe it is imperative that:

- Faculty participation commence immediately;
- Faculty representatives participate in developing the search process, the committee charge, and the search criteria;
- Faculty representatives participate in the design of the search committee structure itself;
- Faculty representatives participate in specifying the committee size, the number of faculty and other members appointed, the selection process for members, the role of the members, and the decision on retaining search consultants;
- The Board make public and transparent in a timely fashion to the faculty the process, timelines, and criteria to be used, as is appropriate for a public institution of higher education;
- The full faculty has the opportunity for review of the candidates and substantive input into the search committee in the search process.

It is clear that only through a cooperative effort of the BOR and the faculty will we achieve the open, transparent, and democratic search required to mark a critical turning point for the institution. We appreciate your leadership and stand ready to join you in restoring community and commonweal to the governance of EMU.

cc: Executive Vice President Donald Lopnow  
Regent Floyd Clack  
Regent Gary A. Hawks  
Regent Philip A. Incarnati  
Regent Francine Parker  
Regent James F. Stapleton

## Appendix B

### Letter to the Governor About Appointing an Academic to the EMU Board of Regents

Governor Jennifer Granholm  
Office of the Governor  
Capital Building  
Lansing, MI

September 19, 2007

Dear Governor Granholm:

In December of 2006 you needed to appoint five regents to the Board of Eastern Michigan University. At that time we sent a letter that raised the question of representation. Here is the relevant section of that letter:

In addition to the qualities necessarily shared by all members of the Board, there is a further requirement for a diversity of backgrounds that, as a whole, create a representative body. A diverse board is more competent to engage in meaningful dialogue and move the university forward in its mission of serving the people of Michigan. A board comprised of members with a range of perspectives prevents distortion or bias toward one view. Although the Board must act in unity, it should do so only after it has listened to and evaluated a range of options articulated by its members and those advising it.

When you selected regents, however, you did not include a regent with direct faculty experience. The Board of Regents would benefit greatly from the participation of someone who understands the University from this perspective. We believe such a person will add balance and depth to discussions of how to develop and maintain high quality programs under our difficult financial circumstances.

Sincerely Yours,

Russ Larson, President  
University Faculty Council