**Grand Valley State University**

Affiliate Faculty Advisory Committee (AFAC)

AY 2021-2022

Meeting #1: Friday, September 10, 2021, 7:15 AM – 9:00 AM, Synchronous ONLINE

CHAIR – Jennifer Cymbola, Affiliate (CLAS-Biology)

VICE CHAIR – John Lipford, Affiliate (CCPS—HTM)

Attendance noted at end of minutes. Appendix I with additional notes of discussion from Agenda Item 3a.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Topic / Responsibilities of Committee** | **Status / Follow-Up / To do** |
| 9/10/21 | 1. Agenda, call to order, Approval of minutes | Minutes approved. |
|  | 1. Introductions / Results of Committee Elections    1. Jennifer Cymbola – Chair    2. John Lipford – Vice Chair    3. Dawn Rutecki - Secretary | Members present introduced themselves. |
|  | 1. Review of Status of 2020/2021 Proposals | See in subsections. |
|  | * 1. Affiliate Faculty representation on ECS/UAS   Put forth proposal last year – in proposal put forth the question if we could be compensated for role and service to university  Proposed that the chair of AFAC sit on ECS | Guests: Charles Pazdernik and Courtney Karasinski from ECS  ECS commissioned task force to assess how to address proposal. ECS suggested that AFAC Chair be an invited guest at all ECS meetings but, at this time, not have a vote. Extensive discussion occurred. Charles Pazdernik agreed to share presentations shared between ECS Task Force and ECS with AFAC. Jen C. offered to attend ECS to explain the importance of vote, rather than only guest status. |
|  | * 1. Faculty Evaluation Procedures (SG 3.07) (Attachment B, C) | John Lipford submitted in April. Still waiting for it to be put on the agenda. |
|  | * 1. Impact of budgetary actions resulting from Covid-19 on Affiliate Faculty | Let’s keep aware of developments as things continue, and may be linked to assessment survey. |
|  | 1. Review and discussion of Standing Committee Obligations    1. The role of this Advisory Committee is to represent the needs and perspectives of all University Affiliate Faculty and to provide recommendations to University bodies on matters which may impact Affiliate faculty responsibilities, with the goal of providing an optimal teaching and learning environment as well as increased advocacy, visibility, retention, and development for all Affiliate faculty.   To Serve as a liaison between the GVSU academic community and University Affiliate faculty, and inform and advise UAS on factors that affect teaching and learning as well as advise on university-wide policies and procedures in regard to Affiliate faculty role, work load, etc.  The Committee will clarify the roles of an/or expectations for Affiliate faculty while increasing Affiliate faculty visibility at GVSU and maintain a collaborative relationship with Regular faculty. | Jen C.: Overview of standing charges, limited discussion. |
|  | 1. Review and discussion of Final Charges for 2021/2022 (Attachment D) | See in subsections. |
|  | * 1. Impact of budgetary actions resulting from Covid-19 on Affiliate Faculty | Jen C.: Hold working group for now |
|  | b. Affiliate Faculty needs assessment | Jen C.: Was from before, and put on hold last year due to Covid. We need to figure out from information on how to get information from the full committee. |
|  | c. Policy comparison (TT vs Non-TT) | Jen C.: Need to finish up the policy review that we started a couple of years ago to see what applies to us and get the full materials into a handbook. |
|  | 1. Leadership and succession planning | Jen C.: They are asking all of the committees to have succession in leadership policies, but we do have succession from vice-chair to chair. Jen C. waiting for sample language. |
|  | 1. Create Work Groups and Next Steps | Volunteers for different actions pending, GoogleDoc and see.  Current volunteers:  Amanda: Needs  Amy: Policy  Dawn: Policy or Succession  Eric H: Policy or Succession  Jen: Needs assessment  Meri: Needs assessment  Nancy: Policy |
|  | Adjournment: 8:58 am |  |

**Attendance**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Ed Aboufadel; Senior AVP - ***Ex Officio*** | Office of the Provost | x |
| Brandi Angelosanto; Affiliate | CLAS-Movement Science | x |
| Todd Aschenbach; Regular | CLAS-BIO | x |
| David Centers; Senior Affiliate | SCB-Accounting | x |
| Nancy Carlson; Affiliate | KCON-Health Sciences | x |
| Jennifer Cymbola; Affiliate - **Chair** | CLAS-Biology | x |
| Meri Goehring; Regular | CHP-PT | x |
| Wei Gu; Regular | CECI-Education | x |
| Eric Hoogstra; Affiliate | SCB-Finance | x |
| Jamie Langlois; Regular | CECI - Social Work | x |
| John Lipford; Affiliate – **Vice-Chair** | CECI-Hospitality & Tourism Management | x |
| Rodd Lowell; Affiliate | PCEC- CIS | x |
| Diane Maodush-Pitzer; Senior Affiliate | BCIS-IRIS | x |
| C.J. Mehall; Affiliate | CECI-Education | x |
| Jill Morris; Senior Affiliate | CLAS-Chemistry | x |
| Amanda Reddy; Affiliate | CHP-PA | x |
| Wendy Reffeor; Regular | PCEC-Engineering | x |
| Amy Rohn; Regular | KCON-Health Sciences | x |
| Dawn Rutecki; Regular - **Secretary** | BCIS-IRIS | x |
| Katherine Shomsky; Affiliate | CLAS- Physics | x |

Guests: Charles Pazdernik and Courtney Karasinski on behalf of ECS

**Appendix I**

This Appendix provides extended notes on discussion regarding Agenda Item 3a, related to the proposal for AFAC Chair to have a voting position on ECS and, related, UAS representation. These notes are paraphrase rather than transcription and should not be quoted as such, but rather used as information for future discussion.

Charles Pazdernik: Willing to full address questions and willing to continue conversation. Memo to ECS reached us in Feb. Decided to referred to ECS summer retreat – discussed in May. At that time to go forward established a task force to review steps necessary. Charles was chair of TF – 5 members and Ed. Various aspects kept coming up as part of ECS summer meetings. Not controversy on ECS, there is strong support for recognized support of ECS. Willing to pursue this to revisit this issue. Discussions over the summer, wanted to make sure we were on the same page. Principle of representation supported by ECS – want to implement that. Don’t want to rush it. We also have new members on this (AFAC) committee as well.

Courtney Karasinski: ECS values and supports representation from this committee on ECS

Ed Aboufadel: Between the TF and ECS several scenarios for how that might happen.

Charles: Anyone who would like to ask a question?

John L: What other models have come up? Running from affirming status quo to models that have been explored weren’t part of this proposal. The bylaws and charters of peer-institutions and organizations and range of solutions. One of the things we spent time doing and finding a way to present them to ECS to have consensus on TF before coming back. The proposal as written did attract concerns, both with workload commitment – single person on ECS would entail regular attendance at meetings, preparation, taking a stand, and ongoing commitment over the summer. Not for us to determine if a workload compensation – that is for the Provost. Another aspect of the proposal we anticipated the need to bring a permanent membership change before the BoT, if we went forward and would be a consequential undertaking so that it was workable and enduring. That gave us pause. We have other business in front of the BoT and the formula about representation on ECS. Wondered about the precedent of a committee chair as a member of ECS. Where we came down – one the specific scenarios- making a change at least initial not a BoT policy but to ECS/UAS bylaws – the effect of doing a standing place on ECS for a representative of this committee and that person occupy a position in which it would expected to attend ECS meetings, ensure that person fully copied on ECS information, and privilege of the floor of ECS in participating in discussions and policy development. A good way of trying out an arrangement and possible interim step so a BoT policy could emerge. This approach would embody much of the principle so there is an AFAC voice and an ongoing presence but would fall short of full voting membership.

Dawn R: can we have a report?

Charles: We do not have a report. We have several briefs, and share the various scenarios. Minutes wouldn’t reflect the full discussions. Slide decks that might be able to share. We want to be able to support the aspect of voting membership and take that into consideration we wanted to be careful of seeming like we would set anything in stone with that. It’s a part of discussion and we have come to final solutions. As candid and forthcoming about the discussions or a kind of negotiation, we would like to have continued discussions.

Eric: Thank you for all the work. If we go half-way, it will be forgotten and we won’t get the vote. A single person was for the consistency of that person and ECS. So that wanted to pass that along as a comment.

Charles: Can I ask more generally, but I think that carries a great deal of weight, it signals participation and inclusion. Voting is rarely the most consequential aspect of the things we do. We often reach consensus or near-consensus on the issues so its really being able to feel like we have a voice in those discussions. Close votes are very contentious issues that are consequential but are comparatively rare. We completely understand and appreciate the symbolic capital of a vote and on the other hand really have the ability to make a change. Anyone who would be in that role we would place that emphasis on that participation and one or more people that would be to this body to decide. We want a to be flexible to what would make things enduring. If we took a step to institutionalize it in the bylaws, then there would be a scope to assess at some point later. At the same time, we have a discussion we have deferred on how the colleges are represented on ECS/UAS and AFAC could be part of that discussion. It really opened up this larger set of questions and bring to BoT a reapportionment. It’s part of that makes us hesitant to bring this up to the BoT.

Jen: If you had said a year ago, having a voice on the floor was most important and I would have agreed. I think what really drove home the point was we had to shift policy for SG to AFF policy category, and that without a vote on ECS and UAS and that they are now voting on a policy that no one is effected by. So yes participating is important, but literally no one voting on it will be Affiliate, unless there happens to be someone who was an Affiliate is now TT. But when we aren’t getting a vote on that and we are the only ones effected and we don’t get to vote. There is a lot that goes into why we are asking for a vote. We recognize that one vote isn’t going to make a difference but to an entire faculty group that has never had a vote… it’s a lot.

Charles: We recognize a fundamental tension here. The reality of the teaching faculty at this university and a tension between the trad participation of fac in shared governance and the distribution of labor and effort in participation between tenure-line faculty and affiliates. I don’t want to diminish the importance, esp around this issues like this, and we also want to recognize the full commitments. We vote on policy that impacts the whole faculty. And we think this would be a consequential step. The vote is one step and we will take this back to ECS and we are really grateful to hear from people who have spoken.

Meri: I appreciate your work. I work all summer. Fall is supposed to be my light term and it’s never light. Having participating sum on ECS/UAS I would like to know if there is a timeline and I think you can do more.

Charles: We would like to come up something definite as well. IF there are other folks who want to weigh in as well, but we will take this back to ECS and report on it. And we will consider, may reconsider, what you told us and think about what we can do and come back on your agenda.

Courtney: Chair always an Affiliate?

Jen: Yes

John: Part of when I brought this forward, it was asked why should Affiliates allowed to vote on Tenure track matters? And back to Jen’s point, why should TT be able to Affiliates? I teach on prohibition and other topics, it is really disheartening. I have to agree with Meri, I would have hoped that this had gotten further. We also haven’t talked about UAS representation, where is that?

Charles: These are connected as they are both BoT changes. We thought that if we could solve the hurdle of ECS than UAS would follow. If it’s a matter and holding a vote, the symbolic weight of being able to cast that vote would apply, 2 votes as part of a much larger body. We never discussed one solution for ECS and one for UAS, I’m not sure that would carry us very far. We don’t see a way of solving one without the other.

Jen: In the interest of getting through agenda, what are the next steps? Can you send scenarios to send feedback? Do you want that? What would you like to happen, the appropriate, thing?

Charles: We have slide decks to the points of our presentation: interim report and one was the report that led to the charge that brought us here today. ECS is meeting this afternoon, I will request that this gets on the ECS agenda and, maybe as early as next week, we have heard, clearly, that the voting component is highly significant, not incidental to proposal, needing to be represented. We appreciate it, we understand it. It’s important information for us that this is an important piece of the puzzle and we will take that into account. We take this very seriously. We don’t want this to be an alienating conversation and can make at least incremental progress.

Courtney: You have made crystal clear the important of the vote. If the vote is really instrumental to this conversation, then that is important to know. And we have to consider the conversations and the size of ECS. That last thing we want to do is think that we don’t take Affiliate faculty serious. We really appreciate the time and knowing the spirit of the proposal.

Eric: Representation is better than nothing. We want a vote but representation is something,

Jen: May be helpful to know an actual timeline. And that representation as an interim step that it will move forward. We are consistently told “now is not the time,” but when is the time. I agree that something is better than nothing, but we have burned over and over again with now is not the time. And I am happy to be at that ECS meeting to help people hear from an Affiliate.

Eric: And we were told last year that now is the time.

Charles: I have been on ECS and the proposal made this actionable. When it came through in February was a no-brainer and that the job of this committee was to implement this proposal. We don’t want to come from a place of take it or leave it. Creating a change in the bylaws would be a consequential change and participation. One of the privileges of that role would be to suggest placing things on ECS agenda – a role of participation and advocacy, it is more of a speaking role. We aren’t approaching this as a kick-the-can down the road, but would put the ball in the court more than it has been because of that advocacy and participation would be crucial in that role. It is a piece of a larger proposal that we don’t want to lose track of and hope that this isn’t a high-stakes thing. That would be a conversation this body to have. If we get this on the agenda, we would like you, this body, to give input.

Meri: My concern is that if there is an interim agreement. Getting past that interim agreement takes so long anyway. Why we can’t just move ahead in the process. It would take years. I think we all need to think about that and let that interim process be limited.

Charles: We can think about how to bake that in and I think there’s every reason to think that we can create a trigger where this is reevaluated at a certain time.

Katherine: Is the issue related to the merger – could we tie in that timeline and our voting representation when that overall make-up of ECS, and that this could be an interim step until then?

Charles: If we have this representation, then Affiliates could be part of that conversation. And how big can ECS be while still being a functioning body? So concerns with function and size and need to re-evaluate how that appropriation is done. But need to have a bigger conversation about composition of ECS that hasn’t been done since 2004. And with this idea an interim solution, sooner rather than later, would allow participation in that conversation.

Jen: Thank you for sharing this information with us, engaging us in this discussion, and all of the work that this entailed, we know it is a big ask.

Courtney: Thank you for being candid with us and for discussing it with us. It won’t be the last you see of us.