

Faculty Senate Minutes (approved 4/12/2023)

Session 13

3:30-5:15 pm March 22, 2023
(Hyflex - Room 124 Sill or Zoom)

Attendance: Corsianos, Carpenter, Suleiman, Barton, Elton, Millán Serna, Evett, Gray, Spragg, Baker (guest), Curran, Waltz, Neufeld, Brewer, Bavery, Welsh, Farrugia, Foster, Flowers, Judd, McCleary, Beilfuss, Simoes, Banerji, Graves, Pressley-Sanon, Barragan, Lovence, Walsh, Reedy, Braun Marks, El-Sayed (guest), Brock, Graves, Ferdousi, Pawlowski, Kovacs (guest), Mary in provosts; Carroll (guest), Proulx (guest)

- I. Call to Order 3:39pm
- II. Approval of the Agenda 03/22/2023 Moved by Carpenter, seconded by Barton. Passed 32 for, 0 against, 0 abstaining.
- III. Approval of the Minutes from 03/08/2023 . Moved by Barton, seconded by Suleiman. Passed 28 for, 0 against, 4 abstaining.
- IV. Appointments and Elections

A. FS Task force to investigate mechanisms to best support faculty –The vote was deferred for technical reasons.

B. FS Ad hoc committee on criminal/disciplinary disclosure

Patricia Henry, Management (COB)
Michael RJ Koscielniak, G&G (CAS)
Barbara Walters, Social Work (CHHS)

Motion to appoint all three candidates. Moved by Barton, seconded by Evett. Passed 30 for, 0 against, 0 abstaining.

V. Discussion

- A. Provost's Update (Baker)
 - i. There have been two SOARS sessions; we will keep you posted on enrollment
 - ii. New faculty hires - timeline (to be ranked and submitted by Deans by April 11)
input from FSEB May 26th
 - iii. Cluster hires (due by end of April). Provost believes this could expand in future years; two slots this year, depending on budget.

Q: How can this depend on budget if that is not determined until July?

A: The provost will have a better idea for budget once other hiring requests are in

Q: What is a cluster hire?

A: Provost has in mind hires that benefit more than one department; e.g. if two departments want to hire someone in DEI. We are thinking of a cohort of faculty.

Q: Can we alter the hiring timeline so that FSEB can review the proposals prior to May, starting next year?

A: Request noted.

iv. Provost response to FS's [Course Program Modality Definitions](#)

a. Provost would like clarification about the break points that would separate web-enhanced from hybrid, for example. HLEC uses 25% for hybrid. How does committee recommend employing these distinctions?

b. Is "web-enhanced" useful going forward? Is there a different term we should communicate to students?

v. Strategic planning workgroups - Working on the timeline for next steps. Waiting on one report.

vi. Department-provost office roundtables are going well. Common themes: marketing programs, graduate tuition, sustainability for small graduate programs, data tweaks such as disaggregating DFWI ; credit for dual majors (which do not show up always in the data); rewarding innovators; how to do interdisciplinary programs well; managing faculty workload.

VI. Guests:

A. Jim Carol, Associate Provost

i. Budget picture for the next academic year

a. Three main revenue inflows: State appropriation, tuition, and a miscellaneous category.

b. Performing worse in credit hours and state appropriation, and physical plant expenses

c. Performing better in academic affairs, student aid, debt and auxiliaries (all lower in cost)

d. Total students are down, but students are taking more hours, so we are in line with budgetary projections

Q: How is our graduation rate going to be affected?

A: In the next couple of years we will take a hit to our graduation rate due enrollment decline during COVID. Note our eight year (FTIAC) and 6 year (transfers) graduation rates are somewhat better.

e. Especially concerned about low number of graduate students. Retention is also very important.

Q: How are you contacting students to bring them back in?

A: Using Re-Up contractor. Costs 35% of tuition. Need to decide whether to renew this soon. Some students who were here before are no longer living in Michigan.

f. FY '24 forecast. \$300-315 million budget. Looking at 8.9% enrollment decrease, and tuition rise of about 3%. State appropriation is likely to increase, so we think the budget will balance.

g. Enrollment drops are most pronounced in CAS and CHHS. The other colleges are flat; COT is up slightly.

Q: Are other universities CHHS-equivalents down in enrollment? Could more online programs could help?

A: Don't know on the equivalents. There has been some movement to online programs at other institutions, such as in social work. This could be an opportunity to build.

Q: Any conversation about how to encourage growth in graduate programs?

A: There has been little discussion about initiatives. Our admissions process is too slow, so bringing in more apps is not the answer. Admission speed must be fixed – part of the problem is our information systems do not fit together well. Steve Pernecky is working on this. Also working to make tuition for cohort programs more reasonable. Working towards individual program pricing to reflect the market.

Q: How is Academic Programs doing?

A: Doing OK with leadership and cybersecurity; Nursing not so. But we are not getting enrollment residuals; suspect AP is getting the residuals and directing them to other institutions.

Q: Have they increased our geographical draw? Will we reinvest AP contract money into recruitment if we cancel their contract?

A: They have not. There are plenty of people in the region who could earn degrees. Again, AP probably has other schools in a wider geographic area. We have not discussed how to reinvest yet.

B. Tom Kovacs, President's commissions on Sustainability

i. The commission provides recommendations to President concerning sustainability, i.e. to make sure resources available today are also available in the future. We balance environmental issues, economic issues, and equity.

ii. The commission heard of the possible utility partnership at the end of fall semester.

iii. The commission was concerned it was not involved in housing contract—vendors need to address how their work will affect our STARS (sustainability rating) in proposals, but the commission did not get to review these.

iv. CenTrio is the only partner being considered. They are a leading “district energy” consultant, where power is generated in one place (as opposed to distributed power generation like solar). This does not sound like an alternative energy focus.

v. The partnership might prevent a shift from fossil fuels. Also the cost is a concern from an equity point of view.

vi. It is not clear who is providing feedback on the plan and this is a sustainability (equity) issue.

vii. The commission has met with CenTrio twice, about the STARS rating. We don't know what their financial incentives are.

viii. There is a large upfront payment, but could this go to alternative energy development?

ix. Commission will eventually provide a recommendation to the president. The inflation-reduction act gives 50% grants for alternative energy. We do not want the partnership to jeopardize this.

x. CenTrio plans to make the cogen plant more efficient, claiming they can reduce emissions 25%.

Q: Isn't the vendor reaping the benefits of the improvement in efficiency?

A: Their presentations have been narrowly about improving efficiency, but they have no expertise in alternative energy that we can see. CenTrio's incentives might discourage us investing in alternative energy, or it might improve things. We need to see details.

Comment: We need to understand the details. There is a \$120 million payment in play.

VII. Adjournment 5:30 pm