

Report of a Visit
to
GRAND VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY
February 15-17, 1999
for the
Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
of the
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

Evaluation Team:

Richard P. Butler, Associate Professor of Business and Management, Alverno College,
Milwaukee WI 53234
Juan N. Franco, Vice President for Administration, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces
NM 88003
Ben Greenbaum, Professor of Physics, University of Wisconsin-Parkside, Kenosha WI (Chair)
Peter J. Kasvinsky, Dean of Graduate Studies, Youngstown State University, Youngstown OH
44555
William J. Kermis, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research Administration,
Southwestern Oklahoma State University, Weatherford OK 73096
Stephanie Joan Quinn, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, DePaul University,
Chicago IL 60604
Elizabeth Scarborough, Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Indiana University-South Bend, South
Bend IN 46634
Michael Schwartz, President Emeritus and Trustees' Professor, Kent State University, Kent OH
44242
Faye N. Vowell, Interim Vice President for Student Affairs, Emporia State University, Emporia
KS 66801-5087
George H. Wallman, Vice President for Student Affairs, North Dakota State University, Fargo
ND 58105-5165

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| I. INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| Organization of the Report | 3 |
| Institutional History and Accreditation History | 4 |
| Structure and Scope of the Visit | 4 |
| The Institutional Self-Study Process | 5 |
| II. EVALUATION FOR ACCREDITATION | 5 |
| Institutional Response to Previous Concerns and Challenges | 5 |
| General Institutional Requirements | 7 |
| Criteria for Evaluation | 7 |
| III. STRENGTHS AND CHALLENGES: | 55 |
| Strengths | 55 |
| Challenges | 56 |
| IV. ADVICE AND SUGGESTIONS | 57 |
| V. TEAM RECOMMENDATION AND RATIONALE | 59 |
| Recommendation | 59 |
| Rationale | 59 |
| Statement of Affiliation Status Worksheet | 62 |

I. INTRODUCTION

Organization of the Report

This report contains five main sections. This introduction presents the institutional history and accreditation history, the scope and structure of the visit, and institutional self-study process. The second section describes what the team members learned from the self-study and from their observations and the documents made available during the visit. This section begins with a brief review of how institution addressed the concerns of the last NCA visiting team. The bulk of this section attempts to organize the team's observations according to the CIHE's five evaluative criteria; but in many instances the division has been arbitrary, since the facts and activities reviewed generally have implications for several of the criteria. This information forms the basis for the next following sections. The third section describes areas that the team considers institutional strengths particularly worth mentioning and areas of concern to the team that, if not attended to, could have negative implications for accreditation in the future. The fourth section offers advice and suggestions to the institution from the team members, acting in their role as consultants and not as evaluators for accreditation. The body of the second section contains additional observations of this nature. The final section sets forth the team's recommendation concerning continuing accreditation of the institution and presents the rationale for that recommendation and the Statement of Affiliation Status worksheet.

The primary purpose of this report is to present the team's observations and conclusions to the North Central Association's Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (NCA CIHE). However, it has a strong secondary goal, which is to give the institution the benefit of the view that a team of colleagues from other colleges and universities has gained of it during their

brief visit.

Institutional History and Accreditation History

Grand Valley State University (GVSU) was chartered by the Michigan State Legislature in 1960, began to enroll students in 1963.

GVSU was first accredited by NCA CIHE as a baccalaureate-level institution in 1968. It was accredited at the master's degree level by NCA CIHE in 1974. Its most recent comprehensive evaluation was in 1989.

The other salient historical point to be mentioned is that the institution's president has served in that capacity since 1968 and is approaching retirement. For much of that time, his Provost and Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs and his Vice President for Finance and Administration have been serving in those capacities. These officers are approaching retirement.

Structure and Scope of the Visit

This report presents the results of visit conducted as part of a comprehensive evaluation of Grand Valley State University for continued accreditation at the master's degree-granting level. The team met with members of the administration, faculty, staff, and student body, as well as with members of the Board of Control, Alumni Association Board, and Foundation. The team considered the self study and documents that were provided by the institution and held open meetings for faculty and staff and for students. Teams of three team members each visited the GVSU remote degree-granting sites at Muskegon and Holland, Michigan, each about an hour's drive from the main campus, and a team member consulted by telephone with a GVSU representative at the more-distant and smaller degree-granting site in Traverse City, Michigan.

The team's findings are presented below.

The Institutional Self-Study Process

The institutional self study process was directed by a steering committee and subcommittees on academic, administrative and public affairs. All committees were composed of key administrative officers, as well as representatives of the faculty and student body. They received information from operating units, shared drafts, and made the final product available on the campus. The team found that the self-study described the campus and its various programs and activities. However, there were portions in which more specific information, particularly relevant numerical data or additional analysis of program effectiveness, would have been helpful. When requested by the team members during the visit, information and documents were made available, except when data had not been collected or analyzed in the way requested. Throughout the visit all members of the campus community were cordial and most helpful to the team.

II. EVALUATION FOR ACCREDITATION

Institutional Response to Previous Concerns and Challenges

The NCA team that visited GVSU in 1989 identified seven concerns. The 1989 concerns and the present team's assessment of the current status of these situations are the following:

1. "Lack of a realistic plan for the L. V. Eberhard Center as an integral part of the overall institutional development." The Center has been integrated into the university's overall program and forms the first unit of the Grand Rapids campus, which also includes the Meijer Public Broadcast center, the De Vos Center that is now under construction, and soon-to-be-constructed

Engineering Laboratory building. Further plans for development of this campus are drawn and seem appropriate. This item is no longer a concern in the team's opinion.

2. "Inadequate and occasionally inappropriate office and classroom space for programmatic needs." GVSU has made major strides in expanding the space available for its programs. However, the growth in space has not kept pace with the growth of the university, and space problems continue to challenge the institution. Nevertheless, the increase in space over the past ten years and existing plans for future expansion indicate to the team that this challenge can be handled successfully by the institution. The team recognizes this as a continuing issue and has again identified it as a challenge, but it is one the university has been managing successfully.

3. "Lack of cohesive and strategic planning which accords with a shared vision of the long-range future of Grand Valley State University." The institution has done planning directed to specific questions, including questions relating to long-range and strategic planning. In addition, the development of the campus since 1989 has shown great evidence of strategic thinking. However, much of this planning and thinking has been in the minds and conferences of the top administrative officers, who are approaching retirement, or in ad hoc groups assembled by the administrative officers for specific tasks. A long-range plan was assembled by such a group for the 1989 review, and a similar exercise produced a set of goals in preparation for the present self study. The team questions whether a plan can really be effective for ten years and observes that the planning process has not been institutionalized. The team believes that this concern has not been adequately addressed and has included it in the list of challenges in this report. The team has also requested a progress report, since the concern is appearing for the second time.

4. "Need to provide for instructional resources such as media, computing and library

services for programs away from the Allendale campus." As discussed below, the team found strong evidence that this concern has been addressed well.

5. "Establishment and expansion of graduate programs without due regard to faculty loads, qualifications for faculty to staff them, and adequate instructional resources to support them." The team found that graduate programs appear to be adequately staffed and supported, though there is some lag in assigning budget to support new positions. This concern, however, appears to have been adequately addressed.

6. "Lack of coordination in the efforts to serve the needs of minority students." Services to minority students are still the responsibility of a number of offices, but the team believes that they are now appropriately coordinated.

7. "Limited and uneven scholarly activity by faculty." As discussed elsewhere in this report, there appears to the team to be a consensus about the place and definition of scholarship on the campus and a good amount of this scholarship seems to be going on. This concern, therefore, can be considered to have been addressed for the most part. However, implementation of the consensus lacks guidelines and consistency across campus, hence a related challenge still exists for the university, as discussed below.

General Institutional Requirements

The institution's self-study lists clearly the evidence indicating that the institution meets all of the General Institutional Requirements. The team's inquiries and inspection of documents support this conclusion.

Criteria for Evaluation

The remainder this section attempts to organize the team's observations according to the

CIHE's five evaluative criteria; but in many instances the division has been arbitrary, since the facts and activities reviewed generally have implications for several of the criteria.

I. The institution has clear and publicly stated purposes consistent with its mission and appropriate to and institution of higher education.

The evidence available to the team indicates that GVSU's mission and goals of the university are clear, publicly-stated, appropriate to an institution of higher education. The mission is very clearly stated and broadly understood and the actions and plans of the institution are generally directed very well toward this mission. The mission has its roots in the university's initial configuration as a federation of liberal arts colleges, intended to bring public higher education to the neighborhood of Michigan's second-largest city. The institution has now adapted its early idealism to the reality of student needs, which include a strong desire for professional education, without abandoning its original ideals. President and administration officers, faculty and staff share the ideal of GVSU as a student-oriented institution where teaching has primacy, the liberal arts occupy a prominent position, and scholarship is a necessary ingredient, but one that serves the goal of educating the students and serving the community. The team repeatedly was told that GVSU did not want to be a copy of any other school, that it sought to be neither a "conventional" comprehensive university nor a research institution, but rather to follow its own vision and perhaps be an example to others. To the team, these goals are not far from those of a number of other universities, although the particular mix and weighting of the goals may differ for each school. In any case, the team agrees that these are highly appropriate goals for an institution in GVSU's position.

One important feature of GVSU's vision is the emphasis on teaching and the students.

This emphasis seems to be shared at all levels of the university and to be an effective part of the decision-making process. Another important feature is the ambition to serve students with liberal arts and professional undergraduate programs and professionally-relevant graduate programs on two campuses in the Grand Rapids area, three remote sites, and a variety of other locations, using a single faculty and, where appropriate, a combination of in-person and distance education techniques. This emphasis also seems to be an effective part of the university's operational practice.

As noted elsewhere in this report, the way the mission is interpreted in terms of expectations of faculty, particularly when considering the role of scholarship, is not clear, is not the subject of any campus-wide guidelines, and therefore is apparently the source of some inconsistencies. The self study notes that the taxonomy of scholarship of Dr. Ernest Boyer has been discussed intensively and that his ideas have gained currency across the campus.

What does not seem to exist is a consensus concerning the sorts and amount of evidence of scholarship that might be expected. Should, for instance, there be a product of some sort? What sorts of products are suitable for various types of scholarship, under the Boyer taxonomy, in various departments? Should the product be peer-reviewed, and if so, should the review be external or internal to the department, the division or school, or GVSU? There does not seem to be a consensus to these questions. The team found some faculty and administrative officers who were uneasy about the possibility of these inconsistencies creating real or perceived injustices in faculty personnel actions, though the team did not detect any strong feelings that these injustices presently exist, primarily because of the leveling effect at the level of the Provost's office. However, with neither written guidelines that apply campus-wide nor a faculty-based campus-

wide committee, interpretations of departments, divisions and schools can drift farther and farther apart, even after the appropriate allowances are made for disciplinary differences.

II. The institution has effectively organized the human financial and physical resources necessary to accomplish its purposes.

The fiscal, physical and human resources and the organization of GVSU are appropriate and sufficient to enable the university to fulfill its mission and goals. The preponderance of the evidence gathered by the team strongly supports this assertion, in spite of difficulties that are discussed below, particularly difficulties in funding and facilities that are exacerbated by the rapid and continuing growth of the institution.

The Board of Control.

Under the constitution of the State of Michigan, the Legislature may authorize a number of public universities, all of which have a great deal of autonomy. Their boards are appointed by the governor, with the usual legislative advice, and their appropriations from the state budget are set by the governor and legislature. With few other exceptions, such as when state bonding (as opposed to bonding by the university itself) is involved in building construction, the universities act independently. There is no central official or body that specifically monitors, coordinates or controls degree programs, service areas, tuition and fee levels, and other activities, including buildings funded through private or university-generated funds. This system provides, on the one hand, remarkable flexibility in adopting and following a mission defined by the governing board. On the other hand, the system can become very "entrepreneurial," which is to say highly competitive, concerning service areas, programs and degrees, etc. The governing board is completely responsible for the control and direction of all expenditures, and no direct

legislative or executive control of the boards' supervision of their institutions is possible. However, issues such as tuition levels are sometimes subject to gubernatorial or legislative interest, "jawboning," or indirect influence, such as when the separate state appropriations for each university are considered.

The Board of Control at GVSU has eight members, each appointed by the governor for a term of eight years. Two new members are appointed every other year. This system provides substantial continuity in the governance of the institution; and while the board members are political appointees, members of the board initially appointed by a former governor of a different party are sometimes reappointed. The board seems to reflect the views of the governor who appointed it, however, as one would expect. Still, partisanship does not seem to govern the boards' conduct of the institution's business.

Members of the team met two members of the board, the vice-chair and the chair of the budget and finance committee. Both appeared very knowledgeable about higher education issues in general and about GVSU in particular, and both were very active in promoting the long-term best interests of the institution in the region. Both understood the role of the governing board to be to act in the interests of the public that provides the university for the use of the students and the faculty. That the board members consistently discussed the issue of the board's accountability to the public is commendable.

Board members are involved in university events of all types by invitation of the president, and they maintain informal contacts with university groups, faculty, staff and students. None of their activities seem to be of any concern to the administration, and the trustees are scrupulous about letting the administration know of these contacts. The publicly stated purposes of the

institution are clear and the trustees take the ownership of the mission statement, as they should.

The trustees are extremely well integrated in the political life of the state and are able to make the case for GVSU in appropriate ways in the legislature.

The board members were instrumental in paving the way in both the legislature and in the community for the 1998-99 mid-year tuition increase of about 16%. That increase had its roots in a substantial history of under-funding of the institution and a system of approving percentage increases in state aid. Over time, increases based on too-small initial amount, as is the case at GVSU, left the institution perennially at the bottom of its state peer group. In addition, while the state increases funding based on growth in enrollment, the increase lags the growth by two years. For GVSU, which has been growing steadily, the lag keeps its budget constantly below its state-acknowledged needs. In the past, extra tuition had not been used to close the gap, for Michigan legislation pressures universities to keep tuition growth at or below the inflation rate, by giving a tax break to students attending institutions that do so. As a result, GVSU has found itself chronically underfunded.

When the budget act of the summer of 1998 produced smaller state appropriations for GVSU than had been anticipated, the board members showed both political courage and some fiscal wisdom in endorsing the President's proposal for a substantial midyear tuition increase; and more to the point, they went to work to explain the necessity of the increase to the public. While not the only force at work to make the increase an acceptable event, even to the degree of earning a commendatory editorial in the Grand Rapids newspaper, it is clear that the governing board did not simply approve the increase and then disappear from the scene, leaving the hard political work to the administration. Its active participation at this difficult juncture indicates that GVSU has a

supportive, dedicated board.

The Administration

The President

The president of the university has been in office for thirty years, taking office about five and one half years after the founding of the institution. He is the second president that the university has known. He was previously president of a small college, after having been that school's development officer. Essentially, GVSU is a creature of his administration. He is nearing retirement and has had discussions with members of the governing board about the matter of succession. The board, in turn, has begun to think in earnest about the process of selecting a new president, perhaps its most important responsibility. One member of the board has engaged in searches for non-profit organizations. The matter of presidential succession, normally very important, becomes critical to the long-term welfare of the institution in the Michigan political environment. Institutional funding decisions are made in the legislature and are especially political matters. The president's political contacts, as well as his contacts within the Grand Rapids community with donors and business supporters of the university, are personal ones, and they may very well leave with him. There is no way to know how well the existing contacts and good will can be transferred to a successor.

GVSU is the product of the president's vision and his ability to forge a consensus around that vision among a variety of constituencies. As large as the university is, its mission has been to provide high quality undergraduate instructional environment with limited graduate and professional education, supported by a service effort that makes the faculty partners in the community. The vision states that research, in the tradition advocated by Ernest Boyer, is

important, and the preferred model of research includes faculty-student collaboration. This is the president's vision, and it is what he has successfully been able to sell in the legislature, the governors office, the community, the press, and to the faculty, students and alumni. He has found a receptive audience in each arena. And he continues as he began--fund-raising in the legislature and privately.

The president views the role of the Board of Control as first, to hire the president and second, to set policy. He feels fortunate that there are no members with independent agendas on the board. The president has a healthy appreciation of the need to maintain a low profile as emeritus president, particularly at the beginning, if he is to help his successor.

His relationship with his provost has been particularly good. The provost oversees most of the internal workings of the university, allowing an integration that separate academic affairs and student affairs vice presidents would not allow. The president feels that this particular provost has abilities and personality that allows him to perform his broad spectrum of work well. However, growth of the institution and other changes may lead to a changed administrative structure, either before or after the current president retires.

The university's position in the local community is much better than it once was. It had to build a reputation while competing with other Michigan public institutions that already were established. The president's hope is that at retirement he will leave an institution that will continue to be committed its present vision, with the liberal arts at its core. Multiple campuses are needed because the region needs an urban university for employed, non-traditional students, but it also needs the more calm and safe atmosphere of the rural campus for full-time, younger students. He believes the institution will continue to grow and, while doing so, to continue to

increase the quality of its student body. Growth has allowed support for growing professional programs, as can be seen in the new buildings in Grand Rapids that will house business and engineering. Growth also has supported initiatives like the current study of whether to establish a full-fledged classics department in the best liberal arts tradition.

The Senior Officers

The president's administration is lean; his senior cabinet includes only an executive assistant to the president and the three vice presidents: Provost and Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs, Vice President for Finance and Administration, and Vice President for Public Affairs and Development. They are busy. The president's prefers to have as few people as possible reporting directly to him. He also respects these officers, saying that each does his job better than he, the president, possibly could, and he tends to give them substantial autonomy. The high level of trust is not surprising since two of these officers have been in office for thirty years or more, and the most junior of them in office for a mere dozen years. The level of cooperation in problem solving is equally high.

However, some of the vice presidents do suggest that with growth the need to expand the senior administration has become quite apparent. In this regard, the vice presidents, the deans, and the president acknowledged to team members the need to appoint a dean of graduate studies, along with a suitable academic structure, and some sort of officer to manage grants and contracts for the institution. The president believes that student affairs should not be taken out of the provost's office, citing the need for an integration of academic and student affairs. The president and the vice presidents also suggest the need for a separate vice presidency for institutional advancement (development) or, at the very least, the growth of the development staff which

currently numbers one.

The vice presidents meet with the president in cabinet meetings twice a month or less frequently. However, interaction among these officers is quite informal and frequent, encouraged by all their offices being in close proximity to one another. Not much is done by memo or e-mail, and they know each other well enough that they are able to anticipate each other in many respects.

The deans uniformly praise the level of autonomy that they enjoy. This autonomy has its history in the origins of the institution, when it was established as a confederation of independent colleges. After the merger of those colleges into a university with a more traditional organization, the earlier tradition of autonomy of deans continued. Nevertheless, the deans characterize the upper administration as honest, thoughtful, and supportive. Deans cooperate among themselves in new program development, and that cooperation gets strong support from the provost's office.

There is a down side to the autonomy of the deans and their academic units. There is no institution-wide coordination or set of standards or guidelines for promotion and tenure decisions, opening the door to the potential for inequities. The decision to forego a cross-unit promotion and tenure advisory board originated with the faculty senate after long debate. This situation puts enormous pressure on the deans to be certain that the divisional-level decisions are especially sound. Deans are reluctant nevertheless to overturn the decisions of the departments. In a similar vein, different academic units award load adjustment for different activities, and real equity issues lurk in this practice as well.

If there is an administrative problem, it appears to be in the paucity of data available to the deans and in planning. Information such as cost-per-credit by program and by instructional level,

for example, are not readily available to them. The deans appear to be unclear about the basis for the annual allocation of institutional resources. Part of that lack of clarity seems to be a consequence of clear priorities that have emerged from a clear ongoing, rational planning process. The problem of articulating the institutional plan and establishing planning processes is one the team believes GVSU should address at once. Deans and chairs are concerned about this issue, but they do not complain very much because, at least in relatively good times, everyone gets something new each year. But when hard times arrive (as they most surely will) hard questions will be inevitable. They can be answered if decisions are based in an agreed upon, publicly stated, widely promulgated plan.

There is a danger that with the kind of independence the state of Michigan provides, the vision of a private liberal arts college, centralizing of power with the provost and the long-term tenure at many levels of the administration, GVSU could find it difficult to scan its environment, anticipate challenges for the future, and identify alternative ways to meet its mission. While physical change is very obvious at the university, there appears to be an internal set of processes that do not change and are highly connected to personalities, unwritten procedures and decisions with no record of the rationale. While this situation has certainly contributed to efficiency, it also lends itself to a lack of critical analysis of internal management processes and procedures. A lack of this kind of insight could contribute to a difficult time when the institution enters a phase of transition from one administration to another.

The Provost

The current provost has been dean or provost at GVSU for over thirty years, and he initially came to the university as an assistant professor. He and the president can anticipate each

other's needs and interests, and the president grants him substantial autonomy. The long range plan for the university is an amalgam of vice presidential sector plans, formed prior to the NCA self-study by an ad hoc planning committee that was chaired by the provost and was composed of the vice presidents, faculty, administrative and professional staff, students, and representatives from each campus. The provost also chairs the university's budget committee, as described below. The president has put the provost in charge of the institution's budgetary affairs as a way of reinforcing his concern for the primacy of the academic mission.

In line with presidential concern for that primacy of the academic mission, the provost further refines this concern. He sees himself as an advocate for undergraduate liberal arts instruction in the face of substantial growth in professional and graduate programs. He sees himself as advocating for the teaching mission over and against research. He promotes scholarship that involves students and has been very successful in this. Student scholarship day has become a celebration of student scholars and their faculty members. The provost appears supportive of the autonomy that the deans have historically enjoyed at GVSU. Still, he is, from time-to-time, frustrated by it as well.

The provost characterizes his relationship with the president as very good. The president is heavily engaged outside of the campus, but also likes to be involved internally, including learning what he can by walking the grounds. He gives the provost a great deal of freedom and flexibility. The provost handles his wide span of control by depending on his assistants, whom he feels are highly capable and motivated, setting them back on course when necessary without micromanaging them.

The provost clearly shares vision of the president and the mission statement and seeks to

focus the university on engaging the students in the life of the mind with an emphasis on attention to students, good instruction, and a high degree of accountability.

There is every reason to believe that the provost is effective and a highly valued and trusted colleague of the president. On matters of academic and student affairs, it is quite clear that the provost speaks with the president's voice. The provost's institutional memory will be every bit as sorely missed by the university as he retires as that of the president. The board of control must attend every bit as carefully to replacing the provost as they will to replacing the president when the time comes.

Vice President for Finance and Administration

The Vice President for Finance and Administration is also long-term officer of the university. The constitutional status of the universities in Michigan means that all institutions work independently with the various arms of government and the individual state agencies, primarily through this officer's units. Appropriations come through the Governor's Office and the Legislature. Building construction using any funds obtained through the state's capital outlay process, such as the current De Vos Center under construction in Grand Rapids, involve the State Building Authority. Projects using campus funds, whether donated or raised through bonds issued by the university, are only under campus supervision; such current projects include construction of the new Alumni House on the Allendale campus and the engineering laboratory building, soon to be begun on the Grand Rapids campus. The State Auditor General ceased to come to the campuses about 5 years ago; since then, only private accounting firms have audited the institution. Budget Process

The university's budget committee, which consists of the vice presidents and the assistant

vice president for business affairs and is chaired by the provost, meets with some regularity. This is the most important operating group on campus, since it both reviews and makes ongoing adjustments of the current year's budget and sets priorities when shaping the budget for the coming year. The committee begins in December to work with a model of the budget for the next fiscal year, trying to anticipate income and matching that against the expressed needs that are gathered together in each of the vice presidential areas. Preparatory work for this model begins in the early fall in the office of the Vice President for Finance and Administration and in the formulation of requests from each of the operating units and academic divisions and schools. Faculty positions that may be allocated for the next year are the clear priority, in keeping with the teaching emphasis of the institution, and in accordance with the needs of new programs that may have emerged.

The divisional and school deans give a prioritized list of needs to the provost late in the fall term. They learn the fate of those requests in the spring term. Budgeting is incremental and does not presently seem to include consideration of reallocation, program consolidation or reductions. During the spring budget process, the university budget committee interacts with the faculty senate's salary and budget committee with regard to priorities, salary amounts and distribution methods, and other campus expenditures. This is the route for faculty input into the administration of the budget. The university budget committee also meets regularly in a formative way to monitor expenditure reports, make adjustments to unit budgets, and handle other problems as they occur.

There is a fine sense in this administration that the budget it is not a static document. Budgets can be adjusted by this committee; but they may also be adjusted within the division and

schools by the deans, who have budget authority and are accountable for the management of those budgets. There is substantial flexibility; line items are not hard or fixed. Department chairs also have budget authority within limits that vary somewhat with decanal references. Salary lapse dollars revert to the provost's office, however, and are used to solve year end budgetary problems or for other academic purposes.

III. The institution is accomplishing its educational and other purposes.

According to the preponderance of the measures available to the team, GVSU is in fact accomplishing its mission. Its student body is growing, and the credentials of the entering students are increasingly strong. Its relationships with the region are strong, as evidenced by the collaborative arrangements for teaching students in the professional programs, donations for buildings and number grants of ties with local institutions, and public support for the recent mid-year tuition increase, to give a few examples. Its students and alumni are satisfied with their experience and their success after graduation. Assessment activities are also beginning to provide support for the proposition that the university is generally being successful, as well as indicating ways that improvements can be made.

Academic Programs

Assessment

The Assessment Committee has been in operation since about 1993, and progress has continued through the fall, 1998, reports made available to the team. Many of the recent assessment reports from academic programs demonstrate faculty review of student products to learn about the achievement of specified learning goals and use of the assessment information to change and improve instructional practice. The reporting system seems to have been sufficiently

institutionalized; faculty resistance seems to be minimal.

The committee not only monitors the process but provides assistance as needed. The committee members' analysis is that the departments now know how to do assessment, and the university is ready for the next step, which is to deepen the integration of the process into routine departmental practice. One step toward this end is the inclusion ex-officio on the committee of the director of the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning. The center assists individual faculty members and units in improving their assessment practices, as well as their instruction, through formal programs and informal consultation. The director is aware of the potential synergy between the center and the assessment program, especially in achieving the assessment plan's objective of making academic expectations more explicit for students.

The committee also anticipates that the process of unit self-study for program review and the units' work in assessment of learning, which now are mostly separate, will become more coordinated. That coordination can bring together the university's statistical information about students and the departments' information on specific academic performance, for a more comprehensive view of students' academic experiences and achievements.

Information exists throughout the university that can be valuable in understanding and especially improving the likelihood of students' success, although currently there is little systematic link among those information sources: assessment plans, unit self-studies, the CIRP and graduation studies done by Institutional Analysis, the FIPSE student expectations study in which the Academic Resources and Special Programs (ARSP) division is participating, information gained through the TRIO programs, and ad hoc studies such as the Women's Climate study. This link is needed for many reasons and could be provided through an expanded

institutional analysis or research function, student affairs personnel, or the ARSP, the division which currently coordinates general education.

The university's assessment activities to date and the prospects for the future satisfy the Commission's expectations. Although improvement is certainly possible, GVSU has institutionalized assessment, uses assessment results to improve practice, and is primed for continuous enhancements in this area. There is potential to enhance institutional knowledge about students' academic experiences yet further.

General Education

The university is embarking on a newly designed general education program that is ambitious and in some ways innovative. There appears to have been adequate planning for this significant change and realistic and thorough planning for its implementation. It also appears to have current faculty support. At present there is no program for assessment of student learning within the program, but plans are in place to create that component.

The planning for the new program was long and thorough. There was extensive research of general education programs at peer and other institutions, and surveys at GVSU analyzed the former program, confirming that it was more distributive than integrative. The old program was also concentrated in lower division courses and joined together the requirement for diversity and world perspectives.

The current program contains three segments: foundation categories, cultural emphasis requirements, and thematic groups. The foundation requirements include distribution among introductory courses in the arts, humanities, mathematical sciences, the natural sciences, and social sciences. The cultural requirements ask each student to select one course that emphasizes

an aspect of diversity in the U.S. and one incorporating world perspectives. The thematic groups are the most innovative component. Students will be required to select a broad theme from a roster of about 30 and to take three courses related to the theme. All three must be from different departments, and two must be upper division courses. Arrangements have been made to articulate the program for transfer students.

Commitment to the new program seems to be broad: The provost and several divisions expressed support for the program, both verbally to the team and in allocating the necessary university resources and faculty time. The committee reported broad acceptance among the faculty. The president recalled that the university's founding tradition is to the liberal arts, of which general education is the core.

The general education committee especially recognizes the challenges involved in implementing the new program, and an implementation plan has been developed. The previous, "cafeteria-style" program was easy to schedule, for both faculty and students. The new program, with greater structure, could present scheduling problems. Development, implementation and monitoring of the thematic clusters will be a big job, and plans are in place to address the task. The role of program coordinator may need to be expanded to address the expanded program. The potential exists, which the committee supports, for the program to increase interdisciplinary academic coordination with the deans and faculty throughout the university.

Division of Science and Mathematics

The Division of Science and Mathematics appears to have strong and active divisional and departmental leadership. Faculty appear to be actively engaged in scholarship and the division demonstrates significant funding activities, particularly impressive for a primarily undergraduate

institution. The Water Resources Institute and the Regional Math and Science Center provide outstanding opportunities for outreach activities, research and student research experiences. The Water Resources Institute, totally supported by grants, is funded at approximately \$1.32 million for FY 98. Other areas of the division have brought in an additional \$4.26 million in program funding and an additional \$2.5 million equipment grant from the Kresge Foundation to support new equipment for the Padnos Hall of Science. The ability of the faculty to compete successfully, both nationally and locally, attests to the level and quality of scholarship, energy, and ability of the faculty and leadership of the division.

The basic lab science departments offer up-to-date curricula typical of any liberal arts and science institution. The institutional focus on teaching and learning has served them well in this regard.

The School of Health Professions offers accredited master's programs in Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy and Physicians Assistant areas. Its organizational home in the Science and Mathematics Division has been congenial. It is supported by the Dean and by cooperation from the more "basic sciences" programs. However, there are currently plans to move the School of Health Sciences to the Cook Institute of Spectrum Health in downtown Grand Rapids. This is a well-researched decision which will improve the programs for students in these patient-oriented, practice-based programs in the community and will also improve links between the school and regional health care centers. The school's leadership believes that this move and the planned development of a number of new clinical practice-based programs, such as radiological technology, would favor the future separation of the school as an autonomous unit, similar to the Kirkhof School of Nursing. This issue deserves serious consideration by the

institution.

The Padnos School of Engineering (PSE), also an administratively housed in this division, offers an accredited Bachelor of Science in Engineering (BSE) degree with emphases in computer, mechanical, electrical and manufacturing engineering. It also offers a Master of Science in Engineering (MSE) with an emphasis on manufacturing engineering. Since 1992 the undergraduate program has been accredited by the Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) as a non-traditional engineering program with various options. The manufacturing option was separately accredited in 1997. ABET does not accredit master's programs.

ABET made a reaccreditation visit to GVSU in October, 1998. The results had not been announced to the campus by the time of the NCA team visit, but the PSE Director indicated that it had gone well. The university sought separate accreditation for the mechanical engineering program; it withdrew a similar request for electrical engineering (EE) when a late resignation dropped the number of full-time EE faculty below the level considered optimal. Once the currently-authorized positions are filled, EE accreditation will be sought. The computer engineering option is newly established and cannot seek separate accreditation until its first class is graduated.

The school operates relatively independently within the division. Its offices are in the Eberhard Center in central Grand Rapids, where the advanced engineering labs are presently located. The advanced engineering laboratories seem well-equipped and suitable for their purposes, but limited in space and somewhat incongruous in their upper-story location in a skyscraper building. The school's space problems will be nicely solved with the construction,

scheduled to begin this year, of the Engineering Laboratory Building between the Eberhard Center and the De Vos Center, now under construction to house business and other professional programs. At present, introductory engineering courses are taught on the Allendale campus; some are likely to remain.

The undergraduate engineering students take three semesters of "coop" experience in their last three years, during which they work full-time in industry. The program requires a minimum of four years, including most summers. However, in keeping with GVSU's liberal arts emphasis, many students take at least 5 years, adding extra liberal arts professionally-useful courses. Faculty work closely with the industrial firms to make coop terms a good learning experience; these associations also help faculty keep their courses consistent with industrial practice.

The manufacturing emphasis of the MSE offers practicing engineers in the region, most of whom were trained as mechanical or electrical engineers but are working in a manufacturing environment, an opportunity to broaden their backgrounds. It was begun after study of the needs and preferences of its intended audience, who are part-time students attending after working hours.

The Division of Science and Mathematics is located in the recently renovated Padnos Hall of Science, a remarkably attractive building for teaching and research in the sciences. For the laboratory science departments this facility has gone a long way in solving space issues identified by the 1989 NCA visit. Other departments in the division, particularly in the School of Health Professions, have not fared as well. Recent program expansion has led to severe crowding in the current space in Henry Hall. Moving the Physician Assistant Program to the Cook Institute of Spectrum Health in Grand Rapids will partially relieve the crowding; however, moving this single

program needs to be viewed as only temporary and should be followed by a coordinated move of both the Physical Therapy and Occupational Therapy programs. The later programs should move together because of the interrelated curricula.

Kirkhof School of Nursing

The Kirkhof School of Nursing (KSON) offers the BSN, RN-BSN degree-completion and MSN programs. The MSN is offered in nursing administration, nursing education or advanced practice as either a clinical nurse specialist or nurse practitioner. The programs are accredited by the National League for Nursing and are typical of such programs offered at similar institutions. Enrollment in the school is quite large with around 150 BSN graduates annually and another 20-30 at the MSN level. The MSN program requires a master's thesis or research protocol development as part of the degree requirements. Currently most students are encouraged to choose and to select the thesis option. This fact speaks to faculty support of the liberal arts and sciences tradition at GVSU. Even in the professional programs there appears to be strong interest in a fully educated graduate and less interest in mere credentialing.

The KSON is in the process of establishing at least two clinical educational centers. One will be on the Allendale campus and will serve students, staff and the larger community. A second site in Grand Rapids will provide nurse practitioner care for the uninsured, low income segment of the community. Both units will be well thought-out and well-connected to the educational mission and has received a major financial commitment of approximately \$600,000 from the Kellogg Foundation.

The Kirkhof School of Nursing, currently located in Henry Hall for only two and one half years, has already exceeded the capacity of its space. Plans to move the MSN to the downtown

Grand Rapids site and the establishment of the off-site clinical and educational centers may help to relieve some of the current crowding and fits well with the overall mission to make GVSU more connected with its service region and the community.

Social Science Division

The Social Science Division includes five academic units, six interdisciplinary programs, and two institutes. Students may major in nine subjects. The division adopted a clearly defined mission, has developed long-term and short-term goals, and is focusing on four major areas: teaching excellence, integration of professional education and the liberal arts, student learning, and diversity.

Efforts to improve teaching excellence are seen in two projects that originated in the dean's office. A teaching orientation for new faculty provides informal links between junior and senior faculty. Recently introduced procedures for implementing personnel policy includes peer monitoring and mentoring in addition to portfolio review and development of a prototype course evaluation form. The School of Public and Nonprofit Administration's professional education was lauded when this program was accredited in 1995. Internal reviews and evaluations along with new faculty and new labs have resulted in curriculum enhancement in professional programs as well as liberal arts offerings. Student learning in rigorous courses of study is thoroughly assessed with the goal of increasing student learning.

The division has taken advantage of the rapid growth of faculty (66.1% of the faculty have joined GVSU since 1990) to increase its diversity. With a faculty consisting now of 47.5% women and 16% minorities, the division exceeds the university's overall percentages. Hiring of new faculty has been directed toward attracting people who are both highly qualified in their

disciplinary fields and are also committed to teaching and show promise in that area.

Faculty expressed concerns to the team on several points: New positions and new programs are authorized without taking account of budget and resource needs to support them. Increasing faculty size requires increasing travel and expense budgets to avoid diluting resources on a per-capita basis. New programs may require not only new faculty, but also space and library resources in addition to the increased level of normal operating supplies. Support in the area of grants application and administration is important for faculty who seek to be active in research, and the ability to make even modest commitments in the way of "start-up" support may be important in recruiting. The team has recommended elsewhere in this report that GVSU take steps to ameliorate these problems. Faculty also commented that they perceived the high priority placed on teaching as discouraging active scholars. The team believes that this need not be consistent with GVSU's stated positions and recommends elsewhere that a more clearly articulated campus-wide set of criteria, possibly coupled with a campus-wide faculty advisory committee on promotions, may help ameliorate this perception.

Division of Arts and Humanities

The Arts and Humanities Division (A & H) comprises the following seven units: Art and Design, English, History, Modern Languages and Literatures, Music, and Philosophy Departments, the School of Communication, and related-area study programs in Middle Eastern studies, Classical Studies, East Asian studies and Group Social Studies. Like the rest of the university, the division has experienced significant growth since the last evaluation visit, including the addition of many new faculty members. As elsewhere in the university, there are space issues. In addition, despite new position allocations and aggressive hiring, the growth of the student body

has kept the relative number of courses taught by adjuncts relatively constant. The future will pose important issues of integrating so many newly-hired new faculty members into the university community. The division plays a large role in general education and supports that role, as well as the primacy of teaching.

The new Arts Center is a stunning facility, which supports the increased enrollments and surely in the future will attract talented and committed students and faculty. There is also interest in expanding the Center's community connections. The performing arts facility, used for music and theatrical performances, is also quite impressive. The diverse campus architecture and "campus gallery" of painting and sculpture throughout the buildings and grounds all produce an environment in which the arts are part of the community's every day experience.

For the future, the division anticipates increased community relations, greater coherence among the division's programs, and longer-range planning. There are also potential changes in the very large English programs, greater prominence for the arts programs, and the creation of a Classics department, a bold and exciting possibility.

School of Education

This school holds accreditation from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Assessment of the school's programs and its graduates appears to be current and continuous. The nominal faculty loads (9 hours for graduate faculty and 12 hours for undergraduate faculty) appear to be the practice and are in line with NCATE standards. All education students, including those in elementary and special education, earn a degree in an academic area. Although this degree requirement is atypical, it is aligned with the liberal arts mission of the University.

Educational outreach and cooperation with K-12 education appears to be extensive and ongoing. Ongoing partnerships exist with several urban schools in Grand Rapids and Muskegon. Currently the School has a Pew grant to assist with these efforts. The School is in the process of submitting a \$6.5 million grant to the Kellogg Foundation to expand its outreach activities. Faculty have a continuing presence in the local schools. The Dean and faculty meet with both an external advisory group, composed of local school representatives, and an internal advisory group, composed of students. Support for faculty development and scholarly activities from the Dean is well above average. Faculty were aware that the financial support for travel to conferences and seed money for scholarship was excellent. This assistance is especially evident, given the high priority placed on teaching across the institution rather than scholarship.

The ratio of regular faculty to adjunct faculty has not improved significantly in recent years. Results of the NCATE visit in 2000 should be reviewed when planning future staffing. Space requirements at the Allendale and Grand Rapids campuses will need continuing review when planning for any further growth. However, the permanent-adjunct faculty ratio and space needs appear to be an institutional-wide issue, not one limited to the School of Education.

The Seidman School of Business

The Seidman School of Business (SSB) delivers programs at the undergraduate and graduate level at a variety of locations. Bachelor's degrees are awarded in Accounting, Finance, General Business, International Business, Management, and Marketing. The General Business degree includes emphases in areas such as Human Resources and Operations. The graduate program offers two degrees, the Master of Business Administration and the Master of Science in Taxation.

The team met with the department chairs, assistant dean, graduate program director, the dean of the school, and the staff of the Small Business Center. The faculty and staff appear committed to the teaching mission of the university and to research activities that serve the community and support student learning and professional development.

The school was accredited by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) in 1997. This was a major external affirmation of the quality of work of the SSB faculty. The AACSB report identified several areas of strength that contributed to the decision to accredit, including SSB's commitment to teaching, quality physical facilities, strong community service focus, and ongoing continuous improvement activities. The accreditation report identified some challenges for the school to address before an interim report to AACSB is due in January, 2001. The key challenges relate to the MBA admissions process, ensuring full-time faculty coverage of all courses, developing strategies for balancing teaching and research activities, and ensuring that all faculty have the appropriate academic credentials and qualifications.

One of the immediate challenges facing the division is filling a number of open faculty positions. Team discussions with the department chairs indicated that open positions in each of the discipline areas have been approved and that recruitment and selection processes for filling these positions are operational.

Assessment activities in the school appear to be working effectively. The team discussed assessment activities with the assistant dean and is confident that SSB has a process that is operational and is providing feedback to improve teaching and learning. For example, data from student surveys has assisted the school in identifying new program areas such as Manufacturing and Economics and in improving the curriculum by adding a course on Business, Government,

and Society. Surveys of employers have provided the school with valuable feedback on improving the effectiveness of internships in the local community.

SSB delivers programs in several locations, including the main Allendale campus, Grand Rapids, Holland and Muskegon. The team visited the Holland and Muskegon facilities and was clearly impressed by the quality of the facilities and the support services available to students. Classes at these off-campus locations are primarily taught by full-time tenured or tenure track faculty. Both Holland and Muskegon offer programs leading to bachelors and masters degrees. The school has taken careful steps to ensure that the curriculum, support services, and quality of instruction are consistent for all locations.

The school has made significant progress in assisting the local and surrounding communities. The Seidman Business Services area has organized itself to provide a variety of critical business related services to Grand Rapids and the surrounding communities. The centerpieces of the business services are the Small Business Center and Center for Entrepreneurship. These areas combine to provide consulting to small businesses, market studies to support local economic development, and assistance to companies interested in foreign trade. The activities also provide opportunities for students develop their professional skills and to broaden their knowledge of economic development at the local level.

Graduate Programming

The administration of graduate programming at GVSU uses the distributed approach characteristic of the institution. While applications are sent to the admissions office, decisions are made and standards are set in the academic units. A final review for consistency of practice is performed by the University Registrar, who informs the divisional dean of any deviations from

published admissions standards. The published student procedures appear to be adequate to deal with graduate student issues of both a policy and academic nature.

The institution uses graduate policies and procedures similar to those for undergraduate curricular review. The approval process is initiated within the academic unit and undergoes review at the divisional level curriculum committee. University-wide review takes place in the Academics Senate Curriculum Committee where consistency issues are dealt with. Sample curricular actions at the graduate level that were reviewed, demonstrate sufficient consistency of process and active attention to the higher requirement for graduate level work.

As a group, graduate students and their interests are not apparently represented within the existing student government systems. As the graduate student population continues to grow, changes in systems may be needed that specifically incorporate appropriate graduate student input concerning curriculum, graduate assistant support, grievance processes and other areas of graduate student interest.

Pragmatically, GVSU's graduate-level effort has focused on accredited professional programs in support of regional needs. There is a special emphasis in the health professions, business, and engineering. While there are currently few unaccredited programs, there is some expectation that the number of these will grow in future years. The Van Andel Research Center, an independent biomedical research institution scheduled to open in Grand Rapids in January, 2000, with an endowment of \$2 billion, is expected to have great impact on the Division of Science and Mathematics. The Center's research focus on biomedical research is likely to attract a high quality research based work force familiar with molecular biology techniques and other high technology areas. This will likely require the restructuring of the current professionally-

based M. S. in Health Science into a more traditional basic science and research-based master's degree program and may even lead to future needs for other advanced technical degrees or even doctoral programs in the sciences, possibly in collaboration with other Michigan universities.

The focus of GVSU's mission on undergraduate education did raise some serious graduate education issues for the team's consideration. Rapid growth in graduate program development and enrollment leads to questions related to the importance of graduate education. When inquiries were made regarding this issue, the obvious most common comment was, "GVSU is primarily an undergraduate and teaching institution." In the light of high graduate enrollment, then the question would be, "Who speaks for graduate education and graduate students?" Graduate program directors and a number of administrators, including the Deans Council, do appear to be in favor of revisiting the issue of a university-wide structure for the administrative support of graduate programs on the campus. As graduate and some professional undergraduate programs are consolidated on the Grand Rapids campus and students and faculty are separated from their divisional administrative structure, a need and opportunity may develop for a new graduate-level administrative and support unit for this primarily graduate-level campus.

Library

The Zumberge Library has made definite progress since the 1989 NCA visit. Funding for both periodicals and books has improved. Currently, the library subscribes to over 3000 paper journals, supplemented by additional E-journals. There is good consultation with academic units to be sure purchases are targeted appropriately. Library staff are consulted when new courses or degrees are going through the curriculum approval process. Often the library and the division request supplemental funds for library resources to support the new offerings when they are

approved.

Access to the library is appropriate to the students being served. The library faculty deliver bibliographic instruction at both on-campus and off-campus sites. Student feedback about the library is solicited through focus groups and interaction with the President of the Student Council. The director himself works a shift on the reference desk, thereby maintaining a sense of student needs and concerns. An example of responsiveness to students is the installation of vending machines in the library and a policy allowing students to have food and beverages with them while they study. The entry has recently been remodeled to make computers more accessible and to give an more open and airy feel.

Space in Zumberge, which is cramped, will open up with the completion of the new library in the De Vos Center in downtown Grand Rapids. A number of the collections will be moved there to support the academic programs that will also be moved to the new facility. The new library features an innovative robotic retrieval system.

Efforts are made to support the students in the off-campus sites and in the distance-education programs equally with on campus students. The service is supplied in different ways at different sites. At Holland, there is a reference collection which does not circulate. Daily van delivery is available to shuttle needed books and materials. In sites such as Muskegon, arrangements are made with the cooperating community college. The Library has hired a librarian to be responsible for working with distance students. She works to make database resources available over the web and to facilitate document delivery and interlibrary loan.

The management of the Library is unique. Hierarchy has been minimized. Staff like and enjoy each other. An effort is made to include staff from all library sites in the weekly 1.5 hour

staff meetings. Creativity and flexibility are encouraged.

Academic Support:

Advising: The advising delivery system on the GVSU campus is fairly standard. The Office of Academic Services advises approximately 1400 undeclared/undecided and special population students with a staff of five. Students with disabilities account for about 200 advisees, around 400 students are a part of the EXCEL program (which is about 90% minority students), and about 800 are undeclared.

Students with declared majors are advised in their major. In general most faculty advise. Training sessions are offered by the Academic Services staff each fall, but relatively few faculty attend the sessions. Advising is supposedly an area that is part of faculty evaluation.

New students are advised by faculty in new student enrollment sessions, conducted in groups of 10 during the summer. Faculty who provide this advice are required to receive training and are paid \$200 per day. If they are willing to teach the one-credit Freshman Studies course, which is in addition to their regular load, they are paid \$600. Freshman Studies faculty continue as advisors of the students in their section for the duration of the course. It is difficult to recruit faculty to teach this course, which is not required and does not have a great deal of respect from the faculty.

In the team's open forum, students raised concerns were raised about faculty being too busy to advise and about the currency and accuracy of their advising skills and knowledge. Visiting faculty are not allowed to advise, although some students would like them to do so. The campus definition of advising seems to be limited to course scheduling.

The concern about advising difficulties with staffing freshman studies courses seems to the

team to indicate that faculty members are tending to concentrate their implementation of the campus' emphasis on teaching within their disciplinary courses. As the Allendale campus strives to create the environment of a small, liberal arts campus, faculty and staff will have to place more emphasis on the whole student, including advising as a developmental process. The team recommends that GVSU consider conducting a thorough assessment of these issues and, in the short term, to find ways to train advisors in the departments to broaden their outlook.

Tutoring: Tutoring is available free of charge on a drop-in basis for all 100 and 200 level courses and for students with disabilities. Tutors are qualified, primarily undergraduate students. Students come to use the services through faculty and self-referral. The tutoring program attempts to make tutoring as available in off campus sites as it is in on-campus ones.

Special Support Services: The campus possesses the full array of Federal programs to furnish special student support services. The university serves students well with the TRIO programs, which share office space with the Academic Resources Center. Career and counseling services are offered in an appropriate manner to both on- and off-campus students.

Student Services:

Overall Grand Valley State University is providing excellent student services with staff who are very focused on serving student needs. The new student services building is an excellent addition to the campus, and the one-stop service area appears to be efficient and staffed with people who are well informed and service-oriented. Students appear to value the convenience of this concept and the close physical proximity of other offices that serve students compliments the one-stop area.

The organizational structure at Grand Valley State University places the student service

functions under the Provost. The student affairs people are satisfied that this arrangement benefits them by placing them at the same table as the other academic services and with academic administrators. The concerns about fragmentation and inadequate space needs in the 1989 report have been addressed by the centralizing of services in the student service building. A wonderful opportunity exists for student services to develop a conceptual framework for their work that complements the academic orientation the university has created through its organizational structure. This conceptual framework could identify educational outcomes desired by the student service units as they interact with students and develop programs for students. It would also lend itself to evaluation and assessment.

The organizational structure and philosophy for student services at GVSU is more typical of a small private college more than a large state university with many commuting students. The structure seems consistent with the university leadership's vision of GVSU as a liberal arts-based institution, but its practicality must be assessed periodically as the institution grows.

The student leadership continues to seek a larger and more traditional student union facility, especially one which provides more meeting space for student groups and a larger place to buy items commonly found in a drug store or convenience store. Such an addition to the current campus space has the potential to increase a sense of community on campus and foster more interaction and student involvement in campus life.

Admissions: The admissions office serves the university's recruitment functions; application processing is done by the registrar's office. The physical space for admissions is new and contains state-of-the-art electronic equipment for use in presentations for prospective students. The space is well furnished, attractive and very impressive. The admissions office appears to be well staffed

and professional. The university has obviously identified student recruitment as a high priority.

Housing:

The university has a challenge to provide more on-campus housing, in spite of recent new construction, because of the growth in the student body. Students complained about the lack of housing on campus and the lines for sign-up. This lack was also identified by the vice-provost for student services as a priority. The problem is further magnified by what appears to be high local rental rates in Allendale, a small, primarily rural community, for students living off-campus. The housing program addresses the development of community. There is concern about providing safe and secure housing and policies and procedures seem to be adequate to address these needs.

Student Government: Student leaders expressed satisfaction with the university and feel their concerns are heard. They expressed pride in their relationship with the administration and were being careful to not damage that relationship. They expressed some disappointment in low student voter turnout for elections. Student government at GVSU uses a representational model, under which various student groups elect senators, and the senate elects a student government president and other officers. The senate collectively is considered to represent the student-body as a whole.

Office of Student Life: The Office of Student Life (OSL) is located in the Kirkhof Center, the student union. When the new student services building was built, many of the student service programs moved from the student union to the new building. Some of the vacated space, however, continues to be critically needed by student organizations. The Office of Student Life recognizes more than 140 student organizations. It is expected that this number will increase as enrollment increases.

Currently there are five fraternities and six sororities on campus. Although the Allendale campus is highly residential, it was surprising to find that no Greek housing is available on campus. The administration has had discussions with the Greek organizations about this, but at present there is no effort to provide separate housing for the Greeks.

The OSL coordinates several student programs, including the new student orientation at the beginning of the semester; it also coordinates some academically-oriented programs such as commencement. Like other units, this office is feeling the strain of tremendous growth in enrollment. At this time the office appears to be handling the added demands quite well.

As mentioned earlier, space for student organizations continues to be a problem. The NCA team of ten years ago also noted this concern. The students are so concerned about the lack of space that the Student Senate passed a resolution which proposes to raising student fees for full-time students, with most of the increase designated for expansion of the student union. The team understands why administration might not have added this increase to this spring's tuition increase. The proposal is still under consideration and deserves serious thought.

Registrar's Office:

The Registrar's office is large and well organized. It functions as a service center for other offices by providing mailing and records functions beyond those of a traditional records and registration office. The Registrar's Office processes applications for admission for both undergraduate and graduate students. Software is used that allows web-based services. The office appears to be well-managed and very service-oriented. There appears to be integrity in the records function.

Financial Aid Office

As the university's enrollment continues to grow, so does the number of dollars disbursed by the Financial Aid Office (FAO). In 1998, awards to students totaled \$12,753,790. In 1998-99 \$57,236,878 was awarded. This is accomplished with a staff of 13 (6.5 professional and 6.5 clerical FTEs). As is the case nationwide, the bulk of financial aid is in the form of student loans (\$2.2 million in 1998 and \$33.8 million in 1998-99). About 68% of students at GVSU receive some form of financial aid.

The university has a very good default rate, which has ranged from 3.1% to 5.2% in the last few years. The financial audit reports have not uncovered any serious problems. A review of the office's adherence to U. S. Department of Education rules noted a couple of minor problems in identifying students, but they have been corrected. Financial audit reports for the years 1992-1993 through 1997-1998 were provided for the site team.

Students were extremely complimentary of the FAO. They stated that the office staff was always very helpful. They were particularly pleased with the help the office provided the students when the university implemented a mid-term tuition increase.

All in all, the FAO is run very professionally and provides a good service to the students. It appears to be in compliance with all federal regulations.

Continuing Education

The Division of Continuing Education under the leadership of a very capable dean is doing a remarkable job in serving the needs of the institution and the citizens of western Michigan. Most of the offerings are credit-producing courses. The two-fold philosophy of the unit is begins with providing support for faculty and students in off campus programming that meets their needs without their having to take extra time to arrange the help. The other part of the philosophy is to

integrate continuing education into academic programs. There is a commitment to offering the same quality of instruction and student support off campus as on campus. For example, compressed video classes are automatically taped so that students who are ill can request a copy in order to make up what they miss. Each cohort of students has a graduation ceremony, attended by the GVSU administration.

As many, if not more, tenured faculty teach off campus as on campus. Faculty receive \$1500 to convert a face-to-face course into a compressed video format and earn a \$400 bonus each time they teach at an off-campus site. A typical class will have only three sites. Each site is well equipped with a fax, a phone and an on-site monitor to ensure that class goes smoothly.

Currently no programs are delivered completely by distance means. In the future, the dean believes that the current practice of using compressed video delivery and Internet delivery of courses as supplements to face-to-face deliver will prevail.

The structure of the unit is a strong one. Continuing Education is divided into three primary areas: a new initiatives unit, an operations unit and a unit dedicated to distance education delivery methods.

The Program Development or new initiatives unit conducts needs assessment research to determine where new courses or degree programs are needed. This unit also conducts assessment of its processes and services. It hosts new initiatives until they are stabilized and then it moves them over to the operations unit. Two such initiatives are the Grand Forum, a non-credit offering directed toward retired professionals in the Grand Rapids area, and the Institute for Training and Development.

The Regional Centers or operations unit is responsible for the day-to-day administration of

course delivery and support services at the institutions sites in Holland, Muskegon, Traverse City, and Petoskey. It is responsible for scheduling classes. A multi-year course rotation is made available to students at each site. With the exception of the Holland site, students are grouped into cohorts and go through their courses together. At Holland, the 1500 course enrollments in Spring 1999 are 60% general education.

The Distance Education delivery unit does a good job in supporting students and faculty and in evaluating its services. The unit works with academic divisions to schedule courses at least a year in advance. Once divisions have identified faculty who will teach using ITV or multiple-medium delivery (ITV/videocassette/on-line/telecourse), the unit offers equipment training, course design consultation, student orientation/information sessions, in-class technical assistance, and web resources including a listserv and/or web page. Distance Education surveys faculty and staff each semester and is beginning to look more carefully at results by subgroup and site in order to better refine its service. For example, student monitors keep a log of technology problems in compressed video classes. Because line problems were too frequent in Muskegon and Traverse City, the unit will install a hard-wired connection as soon as possible.

Off-Campus Sites

In addition to the variety of shorter programs offered at various locations, GVSU offers degrees at three sites: Muskegon, Holland and Traverse City, Michigan. The provost indicated to the team that there are no current plans to expand to other degree sites.

Muskegon Center: GVSU is a partner with Western Michigan University and Ferris State University in the Higher Education Center, which is located in the Muskegon Community

College, about 40 miles from the main campus. The university offers undergraduate programs in Business Administration, Criminal Justice, Education and Nursing at the Center. At the graduate level, it offers Master of Business Administration, Master of Education, Master of Public Administration, Master of Science in Nursing, and Master of Social Work degrees.

The facilities at the center are excellent. The building is new and well kept. Students interviewed were pleased with the instructors and with the services in general. There were, however, two concerns expressed. There is some concern that the computer lab is not open on Friday and weekends. In discussing this with the program director, it appears that the lab will be opened during certain hours on the weekend. This effort is supported by the team. A second concern expressed was the length of the MBA. While students apparently can take all the needed courses at the Muskegon Center, but to do so requires four years to complete the program. Students find themselves taking courses at other locations to complete their program earlier.

Other services at the center appear adequate. For example, students have access to library material through the Internet, or they can order material and have it delivered to their house within two days. Students can register by telephone and also receive assistance with other student services such as admissions, financial aid, etc., at the Center.

The university should be commended for working with other universities and the community college to provide needed educational opportunities for residents of Muskegon and the surrounding area.

Holland: The Holland site is an impressive new facility, built by GVSU, that is designed with an eye toward student needs. It is about 30 miles from the main campus. The classrooms are all equipped with an instructor's computer, data projector, Internet connection, and VCR.

There are state of the art computer labs as well as a fully-equipped distance classroom with a computer, projection units, cameras focused on the instructor and the class as well as a document camera, a phone, and a fax machine. The site has a full-time student affairs professional, who is trained to advise and assist with career exploration. She is supported by Allendale campus resources in areas where students need referrals, and main campus professionals come on-site to Holland.

Library resources in Holland are quite good. An outreach librarian is at the Holland site once a week. The reference collection was chosen on the basis of the specific courses that would be offered at the site. To supplement the collection, students have access to the web based Voyager system to access library databases and holdings. Books needed from the campus collection are delivered free of charge to the Holland site within 24 hours of the request. Students may have the books delivered to their homes for a small fee.

Traverse City: The visiting team talked by telephone with the GVSU coordinator of activities in Traverse City, which is about 125 miles from the main campus, and reviewed written materials. Areas discussed and reviewed included faculty quality, general education, student preparation, student services, registration and administrative coordination. Faculty who teach at the site go through the same review process and have appropriate quality as the full time faculty. The major of instruction is done by main campus faculty. Michigan has an articulation agreement that GVSU follows regarding general education. Students in Traverse City meet the same admission standards as students at the main campus. The students, who are mostly non-traditional, have clear future objectives and are motivated. Students are provided access to all services of the main campus. Registration and advisement are done in Traverse City as well as the

main campus. Administrative staffing is appropriate and well qualified. The coordinator was well informed about all aspects of the above activities and appeared to be able to represent GVSU and serve its students well in the field.

Overall, the team believes that the remote sites at which GVSU offers degree programs are adequate to the programs in facilities and services and that the programs students experience are comparable in quality to those on the main campus.

Grants Administration

The level of research funding at GVSU is quite significant, but administration of grants and support in the grant preparation process is lagging. Institutional authority for the submission of grants is divided. The Dean of the Division of Science and Mathematics signs for all grant submissions from his division, and the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs signs for all others. Federal certification requirements are the responsibility of the latter individual, and post-award administration, including implementation of Financial Accounting Circular A-21, and Federal audits are the responsibility of a grants accountant in the business office.

The total of grant activity at GVSU, as well as any further expansion, would appear to require better coordination and integration of research administration. Almost no one appeared to know the overall level of funding on the campus, and the proposal approval process policies described in the Faculty handbook are not widely known. An employee formerly had responsibility for grant development, including identification of resources, but with the retirement of that individual, the position was vacated. The team found many people concerned about the need for assistance or for an institutional role in contract and budget negotiations, sub-contracting, and post-award assistance, including budget revisions, final reports, etc. GVSU

currently appears unable to respond properly with the information needed in a Federal financial and/or programs audit, and the level of funding almost guarantees that such an audit will take place, sooner or later. The team strongly suggests development of a "one stop center" for grant development assistance and information, including help and oversight of compliance rules concerning animal care, human subjects, conflicts of interest, integrity, etc. Grants administration is likely to be most efficient if this center is combined with the grant accounting operations.

University Relations

Much of the work of the Vice President for University Relations is apparently to assist the resident in governmental relations and fund-raising. The development office is quite small, but the amount of private funding behind the buildings at GVSU, both existing structures and those under construction or about to be started, is impressive. The president has devoted a great deal of his time to developing relationships with both donors in the Grand Rapids community and with key governmental officials at the state and local levels. In the entrepreneurial environment of Michigan, these relationships are crucial. While the vice president shares in them, it is not clear to the team or to many people on the campus how much of the ties are personal ones to the president and how much is institutional and can be transferred to his successor with the help of the vice president.

Alumni Relations

With an institution that remains relatively young, the alumni association is a very active one. Currently it is in the midst of an "alumni only" fund drive to raise \$2.5 million in order to build a new alumni house on the campus. This is also a trial run to determine the viability of the alumni association as an important reliable partner in the university's development efforts. About

\$1.427 million of the goal is in hand, and about \$500 k was in hand when the drive was announced. While there is a separate development office, the two work hand in hand on such matters.

Currently, no GVSU alumni serve in the legislature, although in earlier years there have been a few. An alumni listing is kept for in-state alumni by legislative district of their current residence. Legislators are informed of each GVSU student who graduates and is a resident of that legislator's district as well. Interestingly; the recent major tuition increase at mid-year was not a topic of substantial interest to alumni and did not generate in increase in communication. The alumni affairs office was part of the "homework" that was done in explaining that event.

Charter Schools

In Michigan, GVSU and several other state universities are involved with charter schools. By law, the universities charter (or deny charters) to these schools and also may give them some management assistance. Each school is monitored by the university that grants its charter, and the university's governing board is part of that effort. The GVSU officer responsible for these schools is outside of the School of Education. The program appears to have standards that are enforced, according to what the team was told. However, it also appears that a school denied a charter by one university may, at least theory, seek and be given a charter by another. The team has no concerns about GVSU's administration of the program.

In any event, a number of GVSU alumni who are teachers in the public schools expressing concern to the alumni affairs office about the participation of their alma mater in the charter school effort, which they see as contrary to their own best interests. Major donors to the institution support charter schools, as does the governor and most members of the legislature.

Many alumni oppose them. The university chose to participate in chartering schools, alienating some alumni in the process. The alumni office that has had to manage the public relations consequences of the decision, and the issue seems to be well explained by the director of alumni affairs. The rest of the campus seems insulated from these questions.

IV. The institution can continue to accomplish its purposes and strengthen its educational effectiveness.

The team's evaluation of the preponderance of the evidence is that GVSU is clearly likely to be able to continue to accomplish its mission. The institution has strong, ingrained values and is strong in its present fiscal, human, and physical resources. It has built a good reputation and has good relationships with its region and in the political arena. This is not to say, however, that the university does not face challenges to its ability to continue its present successes and that the future will be easy. Like all public institutions of higher education, GVSU faces increasing competition from other schools for students and increasing competition for state budget dollars from other sectors. In addition, this university faces the peculiarly high level of competition between public universities that exists within Michigan.

However, the greatest short-term challenge for GVSU comes with the loss of its greatest sources of stability, cohesion and vision for the last three decades, the retirement in the next few years of its President and most of its senior Vice Presidents. So much of GVSU has been built upon these people, their abilities and their ideas, including most of the university's formal and informal operating procedures, its planning operations, and its local and governmental relations, that the transition will be more marked than in places where the senior officers have had shorter times in office. The team has recommended documenting and formally institutionalizing a number

of processes and establishing university-wide criteria for some actions before the transition occurs, in order to cushion the transition. Accepting and implementing these recommendations will also ensure that changes in direction are made consciously, rather than accidentally, once those who informally monitored and enforced the university's traditions have departed.

Nevertheless, the team members believe that the university's basic strength is more than sufficient to carry it through the transitions and that, whatever changes occur in the next will be consistent with institutional strength and continued accreditation.

The planned expansion of facilities in Grand Rapids will lead to a significant shift of professional programs away from the Allendale site. For undergraduate students and their programs in particular, the split location will lead to logistical problems. These problems have already been encountered to some extent with the opening of the advanced engineering laboratories in the Eberhard in Grand Rapids and with the clinical sites for the health professions programs. Movement of students, access to library facilities, and integration of faculty from the various sites are all issues that the campus is aware of. GVSU's experience with offering programs in Muskegon, Holland and Traverse City will help in managing these potential difficulties.

Planning

The document which appears as appendix 1 in the self-study purports to be the institution's long range plan. It is considerably less a "plan" than it is a statement of some goals. It does not establish a roadway for the future of the institution, and it fails to carefully consider and delineate the environments in which the university does exist and is likely to exist in the future. And although there is an all-university planning group, it does not seem to enjoy any

permanence. Task forces are developed ad hoc to deal with issues that arise or as ways to promote certain goals. But a permanent, regularized, and institutionalized planning process seems to be missing.

In a way, this state of planning is not surprising. The environment for higher education in Michigan is a highly political one, unregulated, and extremely competitive. The word "entrepreneurial" comes to mind. There is an enormous temptation to manage by opportunity in this environment, and administrative flexibility, a lean and nimble organization, is an advantage. Such environments lend themselves to valuing responsiveness more than to valuing seemingly constraining plans.

The familiarity of the President and his senior officers with the campus and the region has led probably to a great deal of the usual planning and environmental assessment occurring in their routine work with each other. Nevertheless, a plan as a statement of how the institution intends to achieve its goals, as those goals emerge from a clearly stated vision that in turn exists within the institution's broader mission, is perhaps more important now than ever. With the president and provost, as well as many other very senior people soon to retire, the university should not be left without a clear and agreed upon document that details both goals and the work that will be necessary to achieve those goals--a plan. The administration, which has made liberal and effective use of consultants in the past, might wish to consider the employment of consultants with regard to planning as well. The planning for physical facilities at Allendale is the product of such consultation. Similarly, given the seeming inevitability of administrative transition very soon, a very clear fiscal plan that supports a long range academic plan needs to be available as yet another road map to the future for the incoming administration. While it may be tempting to use a "plan"

to ask broad questions and then turn a task force loose on each question without some overarching body for oversight, such an approach potentially leaves the university without direction and vulnerable to management by opportunity.

The board of control should be emphasizing the development of these plans for two reasons. First, they are finally responsible for a smooth transition and the confirmed successful operative of the university. And second, a clear and direct set of integrated plans can be seen as the current president's most important legacy--an authoritative definition of the university and directions in a relatively uncertain future. If one asks, "can the institution continue to achieve its objectives?" the answer is that it probably can. But it is also vulnerable in an uncertain environment because its planning process is not well institutionalized. Solving problems on an ad hoc, task force-based basis is not the same as planning that acknowledges and tries to accommodate uncertainties in the future.

Finally, while it may seem obvious, the team notes that whenever it occurs, a transition of leadership after over 30 years of stability will be a challenge to the campus that the university currently may be underestimating. The team has confidence that GVSU will be able meet these challenges, but cautions that the university will find the effects of the change appearing in unexpected ways and at unexpected times. Nevertheless, the team members believe that the university's basic strength is more than sufficient to carry it through the transitions and that, whatever changes occur in the future will be consistent with institutional strength and continued accreditation.

V. The institution demonstrates integrity in its practices and relationships.

The preponderance of the evidence available to the team is that the university fulfills this

criterion very well. The publications not only describe the university and its programs fairly, but do so in a highly-attractive and generally in a very clear manner. As required by CIHE, the university advertised for public comment in preparation for this visit, but no such comments were brought to the attention of the team by NCA staff or the institution. While on campus, the team did not find concerns about this aspect of the university's activities.

Federally Required Monitoring:

Upon arrival on the campus, the team received a supplement to the self-study (appended) which presented evidence that the institution meets the Federal requirements that NCA is charged with monitoring in all but one minor respect, and the team agrees with this conclusion. The supplement noted that the institution properly states its affiliation with the Commission, but fails to include the Commission's address and telephone number in its publications. The institution has promised to correct this situation in future materials. The institution appears to be in compliance with Title IV, claiming a loan default rate of about 4 %. Financial Aid Office figures appear to confirm this statement.

III. STRENGTHS AND CHALLENGES:

Strengths:

The team believes that the following are important strengths of GVSU and encourages the institution to respect them in the future:

1. The remarkable progress of the campus, including its growth, community position, and its clear mission and shared vision, are a tribute to the long and very effective service of the current administrative team.

2. The loyal, well-qualified, dedicated, and experienced staff in all groups—faculty; administrative and professional; clerical, office and technical; maintenance, grounds and service; and public safety—share and strongly support by their actions the campus' mission, campus vision and commitment to students.
3. The institution has a very broad array of professional and liberal arts programs, which have the strength to achieve program accreditation in fields where it is offered.
4. The physical facilities are attractive and well-maintained, and the art and architecture provide an intellectually invigorating setting for the university, continuing space problems notwithstanding.
5. The way the institution has carried out its service mission has made it a real partner in the community.
6. Despite issues related to state appropriations, prudent management has left the institution in sound financial condition.
7. The quality of the student body is increasing, along with its numbers.
8. The whole aspect that the campus presents to its various publics through publications, public and legislative relations, off-campus programs, and buildings is crafted with care and quality.

Challenges:

The following are challenges for the institution. Failure to face any of these issues successfully has the potential to produce a situation that could affect the continuing accreditation of GVSU in the future.

1. The institution does not have a clear process for developing, disseminating and using a well-articulated strategic plan that can act as a guide for implementing the stated campus vision and

mission.

2. Once the process and plan mentioned above are developed, institutionalization of permanent, ongoing, regular processes for reviewing and updating the plan must be considered as an important source of continuing institutional strength, cohesion, and stability.
3. The campus lacks an institution-wide policy regarding evaluation of teaching, scholarship and service of faculty for personnel evaluation purposes. Such a policy should include clarification of what constitutes an appropriate product for the various types of scholarship—scholarships of teaching, application, integration and discovery.
4. The number and size of graduate programs is growing, and there will be increasing physical separation of these programs from the Allendale campus and each other as new buildings are completed. In addition, the volume of grants, contracts and other sponsored programs is growing at all levels. In both areas, the institution should very strongly consider appropriate high-level, campus-wide administrative structures to safeguard standards and protect institutional integrity, as well to assist in continuing growth in these areas.
5. Rapid growth of the campus has led to continuing problems, including space, staffing, funding and organizational issues. The institution must continue to address these, while also remembering that current growth will not always continue.
6. The quality of on-campus student life necessary to the overall campus mission seems hampered by the continuing shortage of space for student life and student organizations.

IV. ADVICE AND SUGGESTIONS

The team members offer the following advice and suggestions in their roles as consultants for the consideration of the institution. These comments are offered in the hope that they may

lead to institutional improvement. They are not considered by the team to be concerns that may affect the future accreditation of the institution.

1. The institution should seriously investigate how to link the multiple sets of data concerning students, particularly data concerning student learning, and to do more comprehensive analysis of this information, in order to improve the basis for conclusions in the assessment program and for making various academic and non-academic decisions.
2. As the faculty, staff and student body expand and change in makeup, the institution should consider ways to assess periodically and to address shortcomings in the climate for racial and ethnic minorities and women on campus. If both the immediate issues and some of their underlying causes are considered, potential or small problems may be prevented from becoming larger ones.
3. While commendable progress is being made in securing diversity among the faculty and staff, the team did not observe evidence of this progress among the officers at the highest administrative level.
4. The institution should investigate whether it is properly funding the full costs of new positions. In addition to base salary and fringe benefits, these costs may include supplies, telephone costs, equipment, support staff, travel or professional development, and the capacity of assistance units ranging from the health center or personnel division to the computer support, teaching development center, or research and development unit.
5. The institution should seriously review student perceptions and student needs for advising with a view toward including career development and student development in the process.

V. TEAM RECOMMENDATION AND RATIONALE

Recommendation

Team Recommendation: That the accreditation of Grand Valley State University as a master's degree-granting institution be continued and that its next comprehensive visit in ten years, that is, in 2008-2009.

Because planning was a concern in the previous comprehensive evaluation and institutionalization of the strategic planning process remains a concern, the team recommends that a progress report be submitted in two years concerning institutionalization of strategic planning processes. No other reports or focused visits are recommended.

The team does not recommend that the Statement of Affiliation Status be altered, as suggested by campus administrative officers, to remove the stipulation that the Commission be notified before new sites for offering degrees are established outside the state. The rationale for not changing the current stipulation is that the institution's mission and program emphasis is focussed on serving primarily the area of West Michigan and secondarily, the entire state. Its current strategic plan does not mention expansion outside the state. While the institution's intellectual scope and interests properly extend worldwide, broadening its service area beyond the borders of the state would seem to require an assessment of how the extension is related to the mission.

Rationale

The campus fulfills the General Institutional Requirements, as discussed in the main body of this report. The team found no difficulties concerning the items NCA is Federally-mandated to monitor, with one minor exception: GVSU's publications properly state their affiliation with NCA

and list the CIHE address, but not the telephone number. This oversight will be remedied in future editions.

With respect to the five evaluative criteria, the team found the preponderance of evidence strongly in favor of continuing accreditation. GVSU has a very clear, clearly-stated, and broadly understood mission, and the actions and plans of the institution are generally very well-directed toward this mission. President and administration officers, faculty and staff share the ideal of GVSU as a student-oriented institution where teaching has primacy and scholarship is a necessary ingredient, but one that serves the goal of educating the students and serving the community.

The team advises GVSU to clarify how the mission is interpreted in terms of expectations of faculty. In particular, the role of scholarship is not fully clear, is not the subject of any campus-wide guidelines, and therefore is apparently the source of some inconsistencies concerning the sorts and amount of evidence of scholarship that might be expected. The team found some who were uneasy about these inconsistencies possibly creating real or perceived injustices in faculty personnel actions, though the team did not detect any strong feelings that these injustices presently exist.

The fiscal, physical and human resources and the organization of GVSU are appropriate and sufficient to enable the university to fulfill its mission and goals, in spite of difficulties in funding and facilities that are exacerbated by the rapid and continuing growth of the institution. The academic programs are conventional and sound. There is a broad span of liberal arts programs, and the professional programs have received accreditation from the appropriate specialized agencies. The academic deans and senior officers work effectively together and with the faculty, and appropriate autonomy for administrators and shared governance seems to exist.

Assessment activities and other data convince the team that the university is generally being successful and is identifying and implementing ways to improve its effectiveness. Its student body is growing, and the credentials of the entering students are increasingly strong. Its relationships with the region, including collaborative arrangements for teaching students in the professional programs, donations for buildings and number grants of ties with local institutions, and public support for the recent mid-year tuition increase, are very strong. Its students and alumni are satisfied with their experience and their success after graduation.

The university does face challenges to its ability to continue its present successes and its the future will not be easy. In addition to the usual competition for students and increasing competition for state budget dollars from other sectors, this university faces the peculiarly high level of competition between public universities that exists within Michigan. The greatest short-term challenge for GVSU will come with the loss of its greatest sources of stability, cohesion and vision for the last three decades, the retirement in the next few years of its President and most of its senior Vice Presidents. These people have built much of GVSU and its ideals and goals, as well as most of its formal and informal operating procedures, planning operations, and local and governmental relations. The team recommends documenting and formally institutionalizing a number of processes, particularly planning and university-wide personnel criteria, before the transition occurs, in order to cushion the transition and to ensure that changes in direction are made consciously, rather than accidentally.

Finally, while it may seem obvious, the team notes that whenever it occurs, the transition in leadership after more than 30 years of stability will be a challenge that the university currently may be underestimating. The team has confidence that GVSU will be able meet its challenges, but

cautions that the university will find the effects of the administrative change appearing in unexpected ways and at unexpected times. Nevertheless, the team members believe that the university's basic strength is more than sufficient to carry it through the transitions and that, whatever changes occur in the future will be consistent with institutional strength and continued accreditation.

Statement of Affiliation Status Worksheet

The team's recommendations for the Statement of Affiliation Status Worksheet are shown on the next page.

WORKSHEET FOR STATEMENT OF AFFILIATION STATUS

INSTITUTION: GRAND VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY
One Campus Dr.
Allendale, MI 49401

TYPE OF REVIEW: Comprehensive

DATE OF THIS REVIEW: February 15 -17, 1999

COMMISSION ACTION:

STATUS *Accredited (1968-.)*

Institution *Recommended Wording:* RETAIN ORIGINAL WORDING

Team *Recommended Wording:* RETAIN ORIGINAL WORDING

HIGHEST DEGREE AWARDED: *Master's.*

Institution *Recommended Wording:* RETAIN ORIGINAL WORDING

Team *Recommended Wording:* RETAIN ORIGINAL WORDING

MOST RECENT ACTION: *June 23, 1989.*

TO BE CHANGED BY THE COMMISSION OFFICE

STIPULATIONS ON AFFILIATION STATUS: *None.*

Institution *Recommended Wording:* NONE.

Team *Recommended Wording:* NONE.

NEW DEGREE

SITES: *No prior Commission approval required for offering existing degree programs at new sites within the state.*

Institution *Recommended Wording:* RETAIN ORIGINAL WORDING

Team *Recommended Wording:* RETAIN ORIGINAL WORDING

PROGRESS REPORTS

REQUIRED: *None.*

Team *Recommended Wording:* 6/1/2001: A report concerning institutionalization of strategic planning processes.

MONITORING REPORTS

REQUIRED: *None.*

Team *Recommended Wording:* NONE.

CONTINGENCY REPORTS

REQUIRED: *None.*

Team *Recommended Wording:* NONE.

OTHER VISITS

REQUIRED: *None.*

Team *Recommended Wording:* NONE.

LAST COMPREHENSIVE

EVALUATION: *1988-89.*

TO BE CHANGED BY THE COMMISSION OFFICE

NEXT COMPREHENSIVE

EVALUATION: *1998-99.*

Team *Recommended Wording:* 2008-09.