

Grand Valley State University

Minutes of the University Academic Senate

November 18, 2005

Present: Majd Al-Mallah, Charles Baker-Ciark, Doug Busman, Jay Cooper (for Claudia Sowa), Gayle Davis (ex officio), Kurt Fanning, Roger Ferguson, Rob Franciosi (Chair), Nancy Giardina (ex officio), Steve Glass, Linda Goossen, Rita Grant, Jodi Griffin (Student), Jennifer Gross, Julia Guevara (ex officio), Joe Helgert, Bill Hosterman, Jane James (Student Senate President), Jim King (Student), Brian Kingshott, Paul Leidig, Elena Lioubimtseva, Neil MacDonald, Jean Martin, Sue Martin (ex officio), Melissa Morison, Jean Nagelkerk (ex officio), Harvey Nikkel, Steve Nizielski, John Peck, Paul Plotkowski (ex officio), Avi Reichert, Jim Sanford, Ellen Schendel, Steve Schlicker, Harold Schnyders (for Ross Reynolds), Robert Schoofs, Mack Smith, Curtis Smith, Ted Sundstrom (for Karen Novotny), Kathleen Underwood, Jeroen Wagendorp

Guests: Jennifer Allard (AP Committee representative), Lawrence Burns (FSBC Chair),

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action / Decisions
1. Approval of Agenda	The agenda of November 18, 2005 was reviewed.	The agenda was approved as amended.
2. Approval of Minutes	<p>The Minutes of 9/16/05 were reviewed.</p> <p>The Minutes of 10/7/05 were reviewed.</p>	<p>The Minutes of 9/16/05 were approved as distributed.</p> <p>The Minutes of 10/7/05 were approved as distributed.</p>
2. Report of the Chair	<p>a) The Chair reminded the Senators that two Open Fora are scheduled for Monday, November 21 to discuss faculty workload. One is scheduled in Allendale at 8:30am and another in Grand Rapids at 10:30am in the Loosemore Auditorium. Objections to having the sessions audio taped should be sent to Chair Franciosi.</p> <p>b) The Chair reported that one more member is needed for the Research Center Group Task Force, preferably a representative from the creative arts/music area.</p> <p>c) The Chair reported that the Chemical Hygiene Policy and Lab Safety guidelines have been posted on the web.</p> <p>d) The Chair reported that he and the Vice Chair met with President Murray who identified the hiring of faculty, and updating facilities in Allendale, specifically the science labs, as priority items. The Chair reported that President Murray was appreciative of the tone of the meetings on Medical Benefits.</p>	

<p>3. Report of the Provost</p>	<p>a) Provost Davis reported that Assistant Vice President Nancy Giardina is conducting a survey of faculty, students and staff regarding advising.</p> <p>b) Provost Davis reported that the university is shifting to an online catalog and limiting the number of catalogs that are printed. The interactive format is expected to be online by Spring 2006.</p>	
<p>4. Report of Student Senate President</p>	<p>a) The newly-elected Student Senate President, Jane James, introduced herself and the other Student Senators present.</p> <p>b) Student Senate President James reported that Student Senate representatives from GVSU attended a weekend conference with Student Senate representatives from the other public universities in Michigan. A Resolution supporting the condemnation of hate groups on university campuses was passed.</p> <p>c) Student Senate President James reported that the GVSU Student Senate passed a Resolution to provide funding for the President's Ball and another Resolution to provide funding support for continuation of the Allendale Express bus service.</p>	
<p>5. New Business</p>	<p>a) Dr. Julia Guevara, Assessment and Accreditation Officer, distributed material regarding the self-study process in preparation for the visit of the North Central Accreditation team in fall 2008. Discussion.</p> <p>Faculty interested in serving on the steering committee can submit their names to Chair Franciosi and Dr. Guevara. Provost Davis will appoint a committee in the spring.</p> <p>b) <u>Development of a Retention Task Force</u> Dr. Jean Nagelkerk, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, is assembling a Retention Task Force and is recruiting a senator to serve on the Academic Rigor subcommittee.</p> <p>Dr. Jay Cooper volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.</p> <p>c) <u>ECS Recommendation on Claiming a Liberal Education Initiative</u> The Chair presented an overview of the ECS Recommendation on the Claiming a Liberal Education Initiative and the language of the ECS Motion recommending the creation of a committee. Members of the committee would be appointed by Provost Davis and the committee would report to the Provost's Office.</p>	<p>Faculty interested in serving on the steering committee can submit their names to Chair Franciosi and Dr. Guevara.</p> <p>Dr. Jay Cooper volunteered to serve on the Academic Rigor subcommittee.</p>

Discussion.

A motion was made and seconded to endorse the statement from ECS presented at this meeting supporting the work and goals of the faculty and staff who have been engaged in the Claiming a Liberal Education Initiative. It was further recommended that the Provost create a university committee—drawn from all parts of the institution, and with an ECS member as a permanent representative—specifically charged with working to more fully engage students with faculty expectations and with the goals of a liberal education.

MOTION: UAS endorses the statement from ECS presented at this meeting supporting the work and goals of the faculty and staff who have been engaged in the Claiming a Liberal Education Initiative.

UAS further recommends that the Provost create a university committee—drawn from all parts of the institution, and with an ECS member as a permanent representative—specifically charged with working to more fully engage students with faculty expectations and with the goals of a liberal education.

MOTION APPROVED

d) Promotional Increments Recommendation from FSBC
The Chair read a motion presented from FSBC, recommending an increase in promotional increments. Discussion.

A motion was made and seconded to increase promotional increments as follows: for a promotion from assistant to associate professor and increase from \$1500 to \$2500; for a promotion from associate to full professor an increase from \$2000 to \$3000.
Discussion.

After discussion, the above motion was modified as follows: for a promotion from assistant to associate professor an increase from \$2000 to \$2500; for a promotion from associate to full professor an increase from \$2000 to \$3500.

MOTION: The University Academic Senate recommends that promotional increments be increased as follows for a promotion from assistant to associate professor an increase from \$2000 to \$2500; for a promotion from associate to full professor an increase from \$2000 to \$3500. **MOTION APPROVED**

e) Recommendation on Salary Adjustments for 2006-07 from FSBC
The Chair read a recommendation from FSBC on Salary

	<p>Adjustments for 2006-07. Discussion.</p> <p>A motion was made and seconded recommending using the current year Consumer Price Index-Midwest annual value, plus at least 1.5%, as the basis for establishing the salary pool value for each year.</p>	<p>MOTION: The University Academic Senate recommends using the current year Consumer Price Index-Midwest annual value, plus at least 1.5%, as the basis for establishing the salary pool value for each year.</p> <p>MOTION APPROVED</p>
6. Old Business	No Old Business	
7. Ideas for Future For a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workload equity and enlarging regular faculty • The next level • Graduate versus Undergraduate • General Education Themes 	
7. Adjournment	The meeting adjourned at 5:00pm	

18 November 2005

MOTION: Two years of study have documented the need to strengthen undergraduate education at Grand Valley State University, particularly to more fully engage students with faculty expectations and with the goals of a liberal education—goals which are central to the university's vision, mission, and values.

The University Academic Senate strongly supports the work of the Claiming a Liberal Education initiative:

1. To develop a shared, accessible understanding of liberal education, which then informs decisions throughout the university.
2. To raise expectations of students and to foster a rigorous academic environment.
3. To emphasize student learning outcomes.

To help achieve these goals, ECS recommends that the Provost create a university committee—drawn from all parts of the institution, and with an ECS member as a permanent representative—specifically charged with working to more fully engage students with faculty expectations and with the goals of a liberal education.

Context:

After two years of discussion within the CLE Initiative, the time for policy changes is fast approaching. Because it is likely that faculty governance will have to approve many of these changes, it is important that UAS generally endorse the ideals and goals of the initiative.

Rationale:

Besides endorsing the work of the faculty and staff engaged in the CLE Initiative, ECS discussed the best means by which their efforts could be given a formal place within the university and agreed that a committee under the guidance of the Provost's Office, drawn from across the university, would be the most effective.

18 November 2005

MOTION: The University Academic Senate recommends to Administration that the promotional increments as outlined by the Faculty Salary and Budget Committee be implemented this year.

Context:

It has been over 16 years since GVSU updated its promotional increments and FSBC has made two recent recommendations (January of 2003 and December of 2004) to increase them. Currently, the increments for promotion to Associate and to Full Professor are respectively lower than those at every other university in the Michigan state system, with the single exception of Lake Superior State.

Rationale:

Although the cost of implementing the FSBC recommendation is rather modest (for 75 anticipated promotions in 2006-2007 the increase would be roughly \$75,000), the impact of inaction on faculty morale has been significant. Even with the increases proposed by governance, GVSU's promotional increments will still be lower than most institutions in the Michigan system.

Amounts of
1,000 added to each step

18 November 2005

MOTION: UAS recommends using the current year's Consumer Price Index-Midwest annual value, plus at least 1.5%, to set each year's salary pool value.

Context

In past years FSBC and UAS have often submitted salary adjustment requests in the Winter semester, well after the annual University budget process had been completed. Over the past two years, though, by researching both local and national trends, and by preparing reasoned and well substantiated requests, FSBC has enabled governance to speak up earlier, when other budget priorities are also under review.

GVSU is an institution with a long tradition of commitment to its faculty, yet governance feels the need this year to advocate unambiguously for an item of considerable significance—faculty salaries.

Rationale:

Our request is based on two crucial factors: historical trends at GVSU in comparison to other universities; and, the growing impact of inflation.

Analysis at the national level through 2004-05 indicates that real university salaries have increased an average of 1.47% over CPI across all ranks based on more than 30 years of data (<http://www.aaup.org/surveys/03z/zrep.htm>). Over a ten-year period GVSU salary increases have been mostly consistent with this number.

The recent spike in inflation (current estimate of 4.2%) has put further pressure on faculty salaries.

The larger regional and state-wide fiscal issues that affect the university and the citizens who support it cannot be ignored, of course, yet in linking this year's Annual Salary Request both to historical trends and to inflation's impact, faculty governance hopes not only to make a sound argument, but to set forth a principle that can be used in future years.

Grand Valley State University Self-Study Process
North Central Association Visit Fall 2008
Prepared by Julia A. Guevara, Assessment and Accreditation Officer, 9/28/05

Timeline - Work in Progress

As the GVSU community begins the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) of North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) self-study process the timeline may be adjusted as necessary.

Winter 2005

- University forums held to discuss Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) approach to the HLC of NCA accreditation.

Spring 2005

- University Assessment and Accreditation Officer (UAAO) attends NCA Annual Meeting.

Fall 2005

- UAAO appointed by the Provost as the Self-study coordinator.
- Provost announces Program to Evaluate and Advance Quality (PEAQ) as accreditation approach university will follow.
- Steering committee is appointed by Provost.
- Board of Trustees, Executive Officers, Faculty Senate, and Dean's Council briefed on self-study process.
- Notification of NCA regarding appointment of self-study coordinator and proposal of dates for NCA visit, preference for Fall 2008, October.
- Meet with Deans to review the five criteria and accompanying core components in relation to strategic plan.
- Draft set of institutional goals for self-study in consultation with Provost, steering committee and appropriate others.

Winter 2006

- Budget for self-study process submitted to Provost.
- Steering Committee determines process for carrying out self-study, develop a communication plan*, identification of data needed relative to the five criteria and accompanying core components, determine needed support and other assistance.
- Steering Committee members and self study coordinator attend April, NCA Annual Meeting in Chicago. All attend one day self study workshop. Meet with Dr. Robert Appleson, NCA staff liaison. All members review self-study documents and other information in resource room.
- Self-study subcommittee teams finalized.

Spring 2006

- Self-study steering and subcommittee teams meet.
- Self study plan submitted to NCA Liaison, Dr. Robert Appleson. Request feedback.

- Implementation of Communication Plan.

Fall 2006

- Invite NCA Liaison, Dr. Appleson to campus for University wide forum to kickoff self study. Liaison meets with steering committee and subcommittee members.
- Work plans submitted by subcommittees to self-study coordinator.
- Self study subcommittees begin to collect data, which may include interviews of appropriate individuals, develop and analyze draft reports to submit to the steering committee. Reports and information relative to five new criterion and core components for accreditation. Committee also addresses institutional response to 1999 NCA findings (concerns, challenges, suggestions).
- Self-study coordinator attends self-study subcommittee meetings to review progress, assist where needed.

Winter 2007

- (cont.) Self study subcommittees begin to collect data, which may include interviews of appropriate individuals, develop and analyze draft reports to submit to the steering committee. Reports and information relative to five new criterion and core components for accreditation. Committee also addresses institutional response to 1999 NCA findings (concerns, challenges, suggestions).
- Self-study coordinator attends self-study subcommittee meetings to review progress, assist where needed.
- Progress, analysis of findings and adherence to timeline reviewed by steering committee.
- Steering committee, selected working team members and self-study coordinator attend NCA HLC annual meeting, April.
- Self-study subcommittees write draft reports of five new criterion and core components. These reports will be submitted sequentially so that later sections can draw upon findings of earlier sections.

Spring 2007

- Steering committee reviews draft reports.
- Steering committee begins to prepare rough draft of entire self-study.
- Opportunities for improvement which emerge from the draft report, including modification of strategic plan where indicated, linkages to annual university budgeting process etc. are developed by the Provost office.

Fall 2007

- First self-study report produced.
- Draft self-study report distributed for comments by Steering Committee to selected administrators and faculty.
- Steering committee solicits and receives campus/community-wide feedback to draft report.

- Desired NCA Evaluation Team members sent to NCA by self-study coordinator; competencies/composition; dates of visit confirmed.
- HLC sends list of proposed team members for review and comment.
- Rough Draft of self-study report prepared by self-study coordinator and third party reviewer.

Winter 2008

- Steering Committee solicits and received campus/community wide feedback to draft report.
- Comments about proposed Evaluation Team sent to NCA by self-study coordinator.
- Comments and edits made by steering committee on latest draft of self-study.
- Implement plans for improvement relative to findings of self-study by the Provost Office and other appropriate parties.
- Actual and virtual resource room established.
- Final report written by self-study coordinator and reviewed by third party.
- Final draft of self-study report shared with campus community and other constituencies.
- Invitation to the public to send comments to NCA concerning the institutions qualifications for accreditation (i.e. third party comments).

Spring 2008

- Self-study report is provided to Steering Committee and NCA Evaluation Team.
- Communication with NCA Chair by self-study coordinator.
- Preparation by steering committee for campus visit by Evaluation Team.
- Preliminary meeting schedule prepared by self-study coordinator in consultation with the NCA Evaluation Team Chair for individual team members.
Transportation schedules, accommodations and other resources needed by the Evaluation Team.
- Steering committee communicates above to campus community.

Fall 2008

- Steering committee again communicates above information to the campus community.
- Preparation for Evaluation Team Complete.
- Site visit occurs, request for October.
- NCA Draft Team Report received by President, shared with Provost and steering committee and responds with correction of errors of fact.
- Institutional response to final Team Report and selection of review process (Reader's Panel or Review Committee).

Winter 2009

- President receives final commission action and recommendation for reaccreditation from NCA.

- Campus develops and begins to implement plan to address concerns and suggestions for improvement of team report and continues to implement plan to address issues identified in self-study.
- Commission action: notification of action one week after meeting.
- Action of commission communicated broadly.

The Self-study process will be carried out through the efforts of the self-study coordinator, the steering committee and the subcommittee teams. These bodies make up the self study committee.

Steering Committee

Criteria Subcommittees

Criteria One: Mission and Integrity

The organization operates with integrity to ensure fulfillment of its mission through structures and processes that involve the board, administration, faculty, staff, and students.

Core component -1a – 1e

Examples of evidence

Challenge

Opportunities for improvement

Criteria Two: Preparing for the Future

The organization's allocations of resources and its processes for evaluation and planning demonstrate its capacity to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its education, and respond to future challenges and opportunities.

Core component -2a – 2d

Examples of evidence

Challenge

Opportunities for improvement

Criteria Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching

The organization provides evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness that demonstrates it is fulfilling its educational mission.

Core component -3a – 3d

Examples of evidence

Challenge

Opportunities for improvement

Criteria Four: Acquisition, Discovery, Application of Knowledge

The organization promotes a life of learning for its faculty, administration, staff, and students by fostering and supporting inquiry, creativity, practice, and social responsibility in ways consistent with its mission.

Core component -4a – 4d

Examples of evidence

Challenge

Opportunities for improvement

Criteria Five: Engagement and Service

As called for by its mission, the organization identifies its constituencies and serves them in ways both value.

Core component -5a – 5d

Examples of evidence

Challenge

Opportunities for improvement

Web site for Higher Learning Commission: www.ncahigherlearningcommission.org
The Higher Learning Commission Handbook on Accreditation is available online.

***Essential points of the Communication Plan**

- Clearly articulate processes and dates of communication with Board of Trustees and Central Administration
- Clearly articulate processes and dates of communication with Deans
- Clearly articulate processes and dates of communication with Faculty Governance
- Clearly articulate processes and dates of communication with students and others