

Grand Valley State University

Executive Committee of the Senate

Minutes of April 9, 2010

Present: Yatin Bhagwat, Matt Boelkins (for Ellen Schendel), Lawrence Burns (Vice Chair), Gayle Davis (ex officio), Roger Ferguson, Joe Godwin (ex officio), Cynthia Grapczynski (for Teresa Beck), Paul Keenlance (for Mel Northup), Sharon Leder, Nancy Levenburg, Kristine Mullendore (Chair), Tonya Parker (for Brian Hatzel), Chuck Pazdernik, Lynn Sheehan, Wanxiao Sun (for Robert Hendersen), Autumn Trombka (Student Senate President), Kathleen Underwood, Roy Winegar

Guests: Ed Aboufadel, Fred Antzcak, Alice Chapman

The meeting was called to order at 3: 02p.m.

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action / Decisions	
1. Approval of Agenda	The Agenda of April 9, 2010 was reviewed.	The agenda of April 9, 2010 was approved as submitted.	
2. Approval of Minutes	The Minutes of April 2, 2010 were reviewed.	The Minutes of April 2, 2010 were approved as amended at this meeting.	
3. Report of Chair	<p>a) The Chair reported that she received a reply from the Provost's Office regarding the FSBC request for data on faculty members assigned time and that she has also receive the memo with the FSBC recommendation on pay equity. Donijo Robbins, Chair of FSBC, will be reporting at the UAS meeting on April 23 to present an update of FSBC action taken this year, including the material in this memo.</p> <p>b) The Chair reported that if ECS is not able to complete the agenda for today's meeting, particularly the MA in Critical Studies in Education, a brief ECS meeting will be called on April 16.</p>		
4. Report of Provost	<p>No Report</p> <p>Provost Davis did query the body as to whether they thought another memo regarding salary adjustments and the change in health benefits would be beneficial to faculty. It was the consensus of the body that another memo would be helpful.</p>		
5. Report of the Student Senate President	<p>a) Student Senate President Trombka reported that they conducted the last business meeting of the year and cabinet elections will be held next week.</p> <p>b) Student Senate President Trombka reported that she is traveling to Lansing with President Haas and Vice President McLogan to speak before the House of Representatives.</p>		

	Ms. Trombka excused herself from the meeting due to a prior commitment.		
6. Report from the Standing Committee Chairs / Task Forces / Committee Representatives	No Report		
7. Old Business	<p>a.i) The Referendum discussion materials that were distributed earlier were discussed, including establishing graduated stages for tenure track faculty voting in unit personnel decisions. Various options were discussed at length.</p> <p>A <u>Motion was made and Seconded</u> to use the approval voting method on a menu of policy alternatives yet to be decided.</p> <p>A summary of the approval voting method will be presented to UAS members.</p> <p>In deciding which options to present to UAS for action, ECS members agreed that they had already reached a consensus that option 1 and option 4 should be included for approval voting:</p> <p><u>Option 1</u> (the current policy), states: <i><u>untenured regular faculty members</u> shall be eligible to vote in any unit personnel review action involving a periodic contract renewal, tenure decision, promotion decision, or sabbatical recommendation.</i></p> <p><u>Option 4</u> (Tenure only model without consideration of rank – subject of referendum), states: <i><u>untenured regular faculty members</u> shall be ineligible to vote and shall not be counted in the quorum in any unit personnel (it also excluded them from consideration of sabbatical recommendations).</i></p> <p>A <u>Motion was made and Seconded</u> to include Option 2 for approval voting. Option 2 (Two year graduated eligibility) states: <i><u>untenured regular faculty members</u> shall be eligible to vote and shall be counted in the quorum in any unit personnel action involving a periodic contract renewal, tenure decision, or promotion decision (but excluding from consideration sabbatical</i></p>	<p>MOTION: The Executive Committee of the Senate agrees to use the approval voting method on a menu of policy alternatives yet to be decided. APPROVED 12 Yes; 2 No</p> <p>MOTION: The Executive Committee of the Senate recommends Option 2 for approval voting. APPROVED Unanimously</p>	

*recommendations) only **after** they have **completed two years** (four semesters of full time uninterrupted service at Grand Valley under Chapter 4, Sec 2.7.2 – which contains the pausing the tenure clock policy) (regardless of their rank).*

A Motion was made and Seconded to substitute the language in Option 3 with language presented from the floor.
Motion Withdrawn.

A Motion was made and Seconded to make have the following language added as a separate option for approval voting:

- *Tenured faculty may vote on tenure and promotion discussions.*
- *Untenured faculty may vote on contract renewals after 2 years of uninterrupted service.
Faculty members in a terminal year of employment are not eligible to vote or participate in the personnel process.*

A Motion was made and Seconded to include Option 3 for approval voting. Option 3 (Vote only below status; recognizing graduated progress towards tenure by rank) states:

*untenured regular faculty members shall be **ineligible** to vote and shall not be counted in the quorum in any unit personnel action involving a tenure decision;*

*IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED THAT untenured tenure track faculty members shall be **eligible** to vote and shall be counted in the quorum in any unit personnel action involving a periodic contract, where all regular faculty, tenured and untenured, may participate and vote) only after they have themselves successfully completed a corresponding personnel action: i.e.
- untenured tenure track faculty members shall be eligible to vote and shall be counted in the quorum of a periodic contract renewal only after they have themselves successfully completed a periodic contract renewal;*

MOTION: The Executive Committee of the Senate recommends adding the following language as a separate option for approval voting:

- Tenured faculty may vote on tenure and promotion discussions.
- Untenured faculty may vote on contract renewals after 2 years of uninterrupted service. Faculty members in a terminal year of employment are not eligible to vote or participate in the personnel process.

APPROVED Unanimously

MOTION: The Executive Committee of the Senate recommends including Option 3 for approval voting:

APPROVED 12 Yes; 1 No

	<p>- a promotion decision to Associate Professor rank only if they hold Associate Professor rank; - a promotion decision to Full Professor rank only if they hold Full Professor rank.</p> <p>A <u>Motion was made and Seconded</u> to include Option 5 for approval voting. Option 5 (Tenure only model including consideration of rank) states: <i>untured regular faculty members shall be ineligible to vote and shall not be counted in the quorum in any unit personnel action involving a periodic contract renewal, tenure decision, or promotion decision (but excluding from consideration sabbatical recommendations);</i></p> <p><i>IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED THAT tenured faculty members shall be eligible to vote and shall be counted in the quorum only of a promotion decision at a rank to which they have already themselves been promoted: i.e.:</i> - only a tenured Associate Professor or Full Professor shall be eligible to vote and shall be counted in the quorum of a promotion decision to Associate Professor rank; - only a tenured Full Professor shall be eligible to vote and shall be counted in the quorum of a promotion decision to Full Professor rank.</p> <p>a.ii) The material distributed earlier for establishing a “conflict of interests” policy for personnel actions as proposed by the FPPC and revised at the April 2, 2010 meeting was discussed.</p> <p>A <u>Motion was made and Seconded</u> to forward the conflict of interest policy for personnel actions to the University Academic Senate, as proposed by FPPC and revised at this meeting, with a recommendation that the language not be amended further and approved as presented.</p> <p>b) The Prospectus for an MA in Critical Studies in Education that</p>	<p>MOTION: The Executive Committee of the Senate recommends including Option 5 for approval voting. APPROVED 8 Yes; 2 No</p> <p>MOTION: The Executive Committee of the Senate forwards the conflict of interest policy for personnel actions to the University Academic Senate, as proposed by FPPC and revised at this meeting, with a recommendation that the language not be amended further and approved as presented. APPROVED 12 Yes; 2 No</p>	
--	---	--	--

	<p>was distributed earlier and posted to the BlackBoard site was discussed. Since neither Dr. Roger Wilson or Dr. David Bair were able to attend the meeting to field possible questions, an email distribution of a memo received from Dr. Wilson was distributed with the intent of providing sufficient information to alleviate any concerns that ECS members may have. Discussion.</p> <p>A <u>Motion</u> regarding the prospectus for the MA in Critical Studies in Education was presented from the floor stating:</p> <p>Resolved, that the prospectus for the MA in Critical Studies in Education is referred to UCC, FSBC, and GCS for reconsideration at such time as the following questions have been explored and addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) What instructional possibilities might non-COE faculty in any of the relevant disciplines in the humanities or social sciences afford the program. (2) What courses offered by non-COE graduate programs at GVSU might compliment or duplicate proposed content in the program? What non-COE course might be employed in the program? (3) Inasmuch as the proposed program o the social foundation of education offers an inherently liberal education which draws upon various disciplines, how are the objectives of the program aligned with the distinctive missions of other GVSU colleges, and in particular those of the Brooks College of Interdisciplinary Studies and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences? (4) What projected impact might instructional co-operation and its attendant issues have upon the reallocation of resources envisioned in the proposal? <p>Upon further discussion, the <u>Motion was Seconded</u> and voted on.</p> <p>c) The proposal for adopting a policy regarding revising the <u>Faculty Handbook</u> language found at 2.01.A.4 regarding the consistent annual meeting schedule for standing committees</p>	<p>MOTION: The Executive Committee of the Senate supports referring the prospectus for the MA in Critical Studies to the UCC, FSBC, and GCS for reconsideration, and to address the concerns raised at this meeting. APPROVED Unanimously</p> <p>MOTION: The Executive Committee of the Senate approves the policy regarding consistent annual meeting schedule for</p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p>that was distributed earlier was discussed. The new language states: 4. <u>STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE UAS</u> <i>The following committees report to the UAS via ECS. Standing Committee meeting times shall be consistent over an academic year and be published on the faculty governance web site. Any changes to the set meeting times must be made in a timely manner and agreed to by the committee members in consultation with ECS.</i></p>	<p>standing committees as presented at this meeting and forwards it to the University Academic Senate with a recommendation to approve. APPROVED Unanimously</p>	
8. New Business	<p>a) The proposed revisions to the membership of the Faculty Personnel Policy Committee that were distributed earlier and posted to the BlackBoard were discussed.</p> <p>A Motion was made and Seconded to approve the proposed revisions to the membership of the FPPC as amended at this meeting.</p> <p>b) Discussion of process by which 2011 Health Benefits proposal was shared with ECS/UAS</p> <p>c) Request to have discussion of having the UAS Agenda for April 16, 2010 include a discussion of the March 19, 2010 ECS action on behalf of UAS annulling UAS's October 16, 2009 resolution on eligibility to vote.</p>	<p>MOTION: The Executive Committee of the Senate approves the proposed revisions to the membership of the FPPC as amended at this meeting, and forwards it to the University Academic Senate with a recommendation to approve. APPROVED Unanimously</p> <p>NO DISCUSSION</p> <p>NO DISCUSSION</p>	
9. Adjournment	The meeting adjourned at 5:00pm		