1. The meeting was called to order at 12:00pm.

2. The Minutes of March 14, 2014 were reviewed and approved.

3. A memo regarding salary adjustments for next year was discussed and voted on (14 yes, 2 abstentions).

4. The new sabbatical handbook language proposed by the Research and Development Committee was discussed. The committee felt the language was in need of revision, but that there was not time to properly review it at present, thus we focused on a few key parts. The committee wanted to clearly see revisions to account for part-time faculty and accommodate 12 month faculty. There was considerable debate about the situation when sabbaticals were limited due to inadequate funding. The committee was concerned that the current policy seems to be moving from a policy where all faculty that met the necessary qualifications were given a sabbatical toward a system where sabbatical funding is the result of a competition where only the best sabbaticals are funded. The committee would like to avoid this situation and will advocate strongly that all worthy sabbaticals should be funded. The committee also believed that the language which directly stated that “no preference was given to sabbaticals that were not previously funded” should be removed; this allows the possibility that prior submissions may be considered.

5. The provost joined the committee to answer questions. Unfortunately there was not time for all questions. The question and a paraphrased response are presented below.

1. Given the initiative to promote fiscal efficiency of Units, what actions are your office taking to promote efficiencies and what incentives are being offered to encourage units to comply?
   The Provost referred to the summer workshop in 2012 on Smart Growth with guest speaker David Attis. The provost has asked Deans and Unit heads to follow the recommendations from the workshop and associated literature. Thus far the Provost's office has primarily served to educate faculty on the importance of Smart Growth and have asked Deans and Unit heads to take the leadership role and make changes at the College and Unit level that will strengthen the long term viability of the University. It was pointed out that most of the recommendations involve a cost to the Units that a Unit will directly feel, while the gains are felt by the whole University (in other words they are an example of the "commons" or "the tragedy of the commons"). The Provost asked for suggestions and the committee agreed to take this topic up next year.

2a. What steps are being taken to contain costs and are they being applied evenly across colleges? In particular:
2b. Why are units in COIS almost twice as expensive as similar units in CLAS?
   The administration is aware that COIS is more expensive and is taking steps to reduce costs such as restructuring courses, making units more responsible for costs, cutting assigned time, and in general using benchmarked departments to identify best practices.

2c. Are the costs of campuses in Holland, Muskegon and Traverse City sustainable?
   Not addressed.

2d. Are the newly formed Graduate programs within the Health Sciences bringing in the revenues anticipated?
   Not addressed.
3. What are your thoughts on imposing fees or differential tuition on high cost programs (or courses)?
Not addressed.

4. There has been a lot of discussion regarding assign-time, is there an attempt to standardize assign-time allocation across colleges? What steps are being taken?
The Provost has asked Deans and Unit heads to reconsider the current assign time allocation and defend current practices. There appears to be inconsistencies across units and colleges. Health professions were specifically identified as using more assign time than other colleges.

5. What is the status of revision to the Sabbatical policy and what role do you see FSBC contributing to this process?
The Research and Development Committee is proposing significant changes to the sabbatical handbook language. ECS has asked FSBC to form a task force to benchmark current practices at GVSU with similar institutions. The provost looks forward to the findings of the committee. The provost is also concerned that costs not be limited to inadequate funding but be applied more generally to the costs of not having students have access to faculty while on sabbatical and the implications of this on student learning and retention.

6. The meeting adjourned at 1:30pm.