

Grand Valley State University

University Academic Senate #7

January 16, 2004

Present: Majd Al-Mallah, Jeff Arbogast, John Bender, Yatin Bhagwat, Agnes Britton, Douglas Chung, Jay Cooper, Lee Copenhaver, Gayle Davis (ex officio), Kurt Fanning, Rob Franciosi (vice chair), Steve Glass, Robert Hendersen, William Hosterman, Cindy Hull, Hugh Jack, B. Kingshott, Harold Larson, Paul Leidig, George Lundskow, Sue Martin (ex officio), Jean Nagelkerk (chair), Steve Nizielski, Karen Novotny, John Peck, Allison Reynolds, Lisa Rigsby, Bill Rodgers, Jenn Rowe, Patricia Rowe, Ben Rudolph, Linda Rynbrandt, Ellen Schendel, John Seip, Ivo Soljan, Paul Stephenson, Ted Sundstrom, Anthony Thompson, Andrew Topper, Rachael Voorhees, Wendy Wenner (ex officio)

Guests: Priscilla Kimboko, Paul Plotkowski

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action / Decisions
1. President Murray	<p>President Murray addressed UAS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - He would like to see improved graduation and retention rates. GVSU rates are good in comparison with peer institutions, but he would like to see continued improvement. - The University is in the midst of a second round of budget cuts. He predicts there could be 2-3 more years of extremely tight budgets. Grand Valley is very effective in the management of its budget. - He would like to continue to build broad partnerships with other universities. - A target of 3000 FTIACs has been set for next fall to assist in establishing and maintaining GV's size at 23,000-24,000 students. - The top large-scale building project for the University will be a new Library. 	
2. Approval of Agenda	The agenda of January 16, 2004 was reviewed.	Agenda approved as submitted.
3. Approval of Minutes	No minutes.	
4. Report of Chair	a. ECS will begin discussion on academic governance representation in the new academic organization. John	

	<p>Constentalos will share ideas on the different types of representation. Send any ideas you may have to Jean Nagelkerk.</p> <p>b. Faculty Facilities Advising Task Force. Ron Garret, Harold Larson, Allison Adams, and Russell Rhoades will serve.</p>	
<p>5. Report of Provost</p>	<p>Nominations for members of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences Dean Search Committee were requested from faculty and staff in the Divisions of Arts & Humanities, Science & Mathematics, and Social Sciences. The Provost will announce search committee members soon.</p> <p>The next step in the CLAS implementation will be to seek nominations for Associate Deans. These Associate Deans will work with current division deans for the remainder of the academic year.</p> <p>Provost Davis has met with HRO representatives regarding COT positions in the reorganization. There will be assignments for current staff.</p> <p>Provost Davis and Wendy Wenner, Interim Dean of International Education, traveled to China to further relations with programs currently in place and to begin discussion with Fudan University.</p>	
<p>6. Report of Student Senate President</p>	<p>Student Senate is working on four initiatives this semester:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> First year experiance Voter registration Freedom of speech/civic discourse Wellness of students <p>Monday, January 19, is Martin Luther King Jr. Day. At 1:45 p.m. there will be a Silent March from Zumberge Library to the carillon tower. The campus community is asked to observe a moment of silence 2:00 p.m.</p> <p>Faculty are invited to participate in the Transitions program. Applications are available on line.</p>	

	<p>February 6th is the Presidents' Ball at DeVos Place. Jose Infante, Tim Selgo, and an outstanding faculty member will be honored.</p> <p>Student Senate meeting will be held next Thursday at 4:30 p.m. at the Eberhard Center.</p>	
7. Report of Standing Committee Chairs	No report.	
8. Old Business	a. Bylaws and Guidelines to Senate Practice.	No discussion.
9. New Business	<p>a. Electronic Copies of Agendas and Documents.</p> <p>b. FSBC Budget Recommendations. Discussion held on the FSBC budget recommendation regarding the Padnos-Henry Connector.</p> <p>c. Asynchronous Teaching Technology Task Force Report. The report was reviewed. It was determined that each recommendation included in the report would be considered and voted on individually.</p> <p>Asynchronous Teaching Technology Task Force Report. (continued)</p>	<p>Motion: UAS recommends that sections 1.3.4, 2.3.5 and 2.3.8 of the <i>Faculty Handbook</i> be updated to include the proposed changes (new language attached). Approved: Unanimously</p> <p>Motion: UAS recommends that the FSBC budget recommendation regarding the Padnos-Henry Connector be forwarded to the Faculty Facilities Advising Task Force for consideration along with other building initiatives. Approved: unanimously</p> <p>Motion: UAS supports the recommended guideline of 15 students per class for on-line courses. Approved: unanimously</p> <p>Motion: UAS supports the recommendation that the Faculty Salary and Budget Committee</p>

review and evaluate the compensation package for distance education courses.

Approved: unanimously

Motion: UAS supports the recommendation that administration annually evaluate the level of resources required in the academic computing department and library as well as other academic support areas based on the growth and development of on-line and web enhanced courses and programs.

Approved: Unanimously

Motion: UAS supports the recommendation that all on-line courses supported by IT use the University adopted course management software (i.e. Blackboard) as the web based learning environment to limit the cost and additional support needed to service multiple technology based learning environments and maintain commonalities across courses and programs.

Approved: Yes – 31, No – 1

Motion: UAS supports the recommendation that no member of faculty should be required to use technology (beyond the customary requirements of the discipline) without adequate preparation and training, and

Asynchronous Teaching Technology Task Force Report.
(continued)

	<p>d. Faculty Facilities Planning Advisory Committee.</p>	<p>without prior approval of courses and programs, by the divisional curriculum committee. Approved: unanimously Motion: UAS supports the establishment of the Faculty Facilities Planning Advisory Committee as a standing committee of the Senate. Approved: unanimously</p>
<p>10. Adjournment</p>	<p>The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.</p>	

Faculty Handbook 2003-2004 – Page 33 and 35

UAS Rules of Procedure

- 1.3.4 Agenda for Meetings: The agenda for each meeting is prepared by the Chair in consultation with the ECS. Electronic copies of the agenda accompanied by electronic documents relevant to agenda items are distributed to UAS members at least one week (five class days) prior to the meeting. The agenda is also published in advance on the Faculty Governance website and the Academic Governance bulletin board. If a motion is made to add an item to the agenda during a meeting, opposition by 10 percent of the members present is sufficient to block this action on the grounds of insufficient notice.

Rules of Procedure for the ECS

- 2.3.5 Agenda: The agenda for ECS meetings is prepared by the Chair. Electronic copies of the proposed agenda accompanied by electronic documents relevant to agenda items are distributed to ECS members at least one week (five class days) prior to the meeting. The agenda is also published in advance on the Faculty Governance website and the Academic Governance bulletin board. An item must be placed on the published agenda at the request of three ECS representatives.
- 2.3.8 Distribution of Minutes: Copies of the approved minutes are electronically distributed to ECS/UAS members and posted on the Faculty Governance Website and Academic Governance Bulletin Board. Electronic copies are also sent to the President, Provost, Vice Presidents, Deans, Associate Vice President for Human Resources, the Registrar, the Library Archivist, the Lanthorn, chairpersons of the governing bodies of the ECS constituencies, the President of the Student Senate, the Campus Ministry Council, and others as ECS may from time to time deem appropriate. This is normally within two weeks of the meeting.



University Academic Senate
Executive Committee of the Senate
Jean Nagelkerk, Chair 2003-2004
Rob Franciosi, Vice Chair 2003-2004

Memorandum

TO: University Academic Senate
FROM: Jean Nagelkerk, Chair, ECS/UAS
SUBJECT: Meeting of the University Academic Senate
DATE: January 13, 2004
cc: ECS/UAS Distribution

REVISED

Meeting Date: **January 16, 2004**
Time: **2:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.**
Place: **204 Kirkhof Center (Pere Marquette Room)**

2 :30 – 3 :00 p.m. Discussion and Reception with President Murray
3 :00 – 5 :00 p.m. UAS Meeting

Proposed Agenda

1. Approval of Agenda
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Report from the Chair
4. Report from the Provost
5. Report from the Student Senate President
6. Report from the Standing Committee Chairs
7. Old Business
 - a. Bylaws and Guidelines to Senate Practice (11/21/02) – *(Hold discussion until after Reorganization)*
8. New Business
 - a. Electronic Copies of Agendas and Documents (*attachment*)
 - b. FSBC Budget Recommendations (Tabled on 11/14/03) (*attachment*)
 - c. Asynchronous Teaching Technology Task Force Report (*3 attachments*)
 - d. Faculty Planning Advisory Committee (*attachment*)
9. Adjournment

MEMORANDUM

To: Jean Nagelkerk, Chair, ECS/UAS
From: Nancy Shontz, Chair, Faculty Salary and Budget Committee
RE: Budget Initiatives for the Academic Year 2004-2005
Date: November 7, 2003

FSBC request the ECS/UAS approve the following items as needing priority as the administration builds the budget for the upcoming year.

1. Classroom Upgrades *(Unanimously approved on 11/14/03 by UAS)*

This recommendation comes from FSBC with a vote of 8 yes, 2 no, 1 abstention

Classroom upgrades were put on hold for the current academic year because of the budget crisis. However, the problems needing to be addressed (e.g., lack of available technology, poorly placed light switches) impact student learning, waste instructional time and frustrate faculty. Some of the planned renovations should be addressed, even if they cannot all be done in one year. Faculty using the rooms in question should be involved in planning the renovations. A priority listing of renovations should be circulated to the faculty, so that interested instructors can see when their room/rooms are slated for renewal.

2. Padnos-Henry Connector *(Tabled at UAS on 11/14/03)*

This recommendation comes from FSBC with a vote of 6 yes, 4 no, 1 abstention.

When the Nursing faculty moved from Henry Hall to the CHS building, part of the Biology faculty and the Biomedical Science faculty were moved into the vacated space. Both of these departments are now split into two different buildings and separated by a considerable distance. Laboratories of both departments are also located in both buildings, with no convenient way to move materials from the main stockroom into the labs. This has created additional difficulties for the preparator and her students. With emphasis in many labs on experiments that require student to work outside of regular laboratory hours, faculty who oversee those labs are in the position of travelling long distances between their offices and labs to deal with student problems and oversee the use of potentially hazardous materials. Faculty in both departments now have offices at locations remote from their respective department offices. Anyone who has been in a split department situation knows the problems of interacting with colleagues in another building.

Students are also urging the completion of this connector because of the difficulty in finding instructors, advisors and mentors, or just finding the right person to answer a question. They perceive the Henry Hall offices as isolated and difficult to find, a problem exacerbated by the lack of appropriate signage. The connector would provide a direct link from the Biomed Science office to the Biology office. Given the closeness of these two subjects, there is frequent need to send students from one to the other.

If the connector could be completed, even without the accompanying proposed expansion of the Loutit atrium, both intra- and inter-departmental business would be greatly facilitated.

TO: Jean Nagelkerk, ECS

CC: Tim Schad, Finance and Administration
James Moyers – Facilities Planning

FROM: FTLC Advisory Committee; Rebecca Veltman, Chair

SUBJECT: FTLC Advisory Committee input into building decisions

DATE: November 18, 2003

The ECS asked the FTLC Advisory Committee to examine ways in which faculty input into building design could be improved. To investigate this matter, the committee asked Tim Schad and James Moyer to explore the current process with us. We were able to identify two key areas that need improvement.

One area of concern is a breakdown of communication between faculty and the decision makers at all stages of the building process. The process that goes in to remodeling and building new facilities is very complex. We believe that the planners take great pains to include faculty in decision-making. At times, decisions must be made quickly. Faculty, with limited time and availability, may have input at certain stages of the process, but lack continued feedback during the whole process. For example, at times decisions are made regarding the structure of a certain building. Due to financial issues, building codes, or other concerns, a change in plans occurs. This change (and the rationale behind it) may or may not be communicated to faculty. Consequently, changes that affect teaching may be made in this manner without sufficient faculty input.

A related area of concern is in the design of classrooms. Currently, the planners make decisions based on many factors, including numbers of students, proposed use of the classroom, and past experience in design. However, they do not take into consideration research and theory in classroom design. Nor have they been able to survey current users.

We were excited to learn that those responsible for designing and building at GVSU value and desire faculty input. They would welcome regular feedback from faculty, and support our efforts to improve this process.

We conclude that building and remodeling at GVSU is a continuous, highly complex process. In order to become effective resources, faculty must gain experience and knowledge about the process. We propose that a new standing committee of the senate be developed, which would be advisory to Facilities Planning. We suggest that faculty be elected to this committee and serve 3 year terms in order to become knowledgeable about these processes. The main goals of the committee would be to advise Facilities Planning in factors that affect teaching and learning – especially classroom design; and to develop and maintain a collaborative relationship with the planning committee in order to facilitate faculty input into decision making. We suggest that this committee have the initial task of reviewing existing classroom space, both old and new to determine what works and what does not. Then, when classrooms are

remodeled or built, they should provide input to the planning committee regarding options for classroom design. Further, we suggest that an administrator from Facilities Planning act ex-officio on the committee, in order to provide a mechanism for communication between faculty and building design. Further, we suggest that a member of the FTLC sit ex-officio on the committee in order to provide resources from this center.

Although we are proposing a new faculty governance standing committee, we feel that the building issues has a significant effect on teaching and learning; and it is necessary to provide an official means of communication from faculty. We have determined that a governance committee would be the best way to ensure the development of faculty "experts" to provide this input. Please let me know if you would like for me to present this feedback in any other forum, or if you have questions about our proposal.