

Grand Valley State University

Executive Committee of the Senate

October 17, 2003

Present: Yatin Bhagwat, Douglas Chung, Gayle Davis (ex officio), Rob Franciosi (vice chair), Richard Hall, Robert Hendersen, Harold Larson, Paul Leidig, George Lundskow, Jean Nagelkerk (chair), Lisa Rigsby (for Robert Beasecker), Gary Stark (for Ellen Schendel), Rachael Voorhees (student senate)

Guests: Agnes Britton, Paul Plotkowski

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action / Decisions	Log #
1. Approval of Agenda	None	The agenda was approved as submitted.	
2. Minutes approval	<p>The minutes of September 19, 2003 were reviewed.</p> <p>The minutes of September 26, 2003 were reviewed.</p> <p>The minutes of October 10, 2003 were deferred until the next meeting.</p>	<p>The minutes were approved as submitted.</p> <p>The minutes were approved as amended.</p> <p>The minutes were deferred to the next meeting.</p>	
3. Report of Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next Board of Trustees Meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 23, 2003 at 11:00am in the Board Room at Zumberge Library. • Robert Beasecker has accepted the position of Interim Director of the Library; Lisa Rigsby will be his replacement for ECS/UAS. • Jane Toot would like to thank the Faculty Governance committees for their comments, discussions and support of the Doctor of Physical Therapy Program. • The Provost extends her thanks to governance committees for expediting the Doctor of Physical Therapy approval process. • The Student Senate President reported that the money collected for the "Battle of the Valleys" was still being counted. • The Student Senate has set aside \$18,000 of its budget for programming. 	<p>ECS members are invited to attend.</p> <p>Welcome to Lisa Rigsby.</p>	
4. Report of Provost			
5. Report of Student Senate President			
6. Report of Standing Committee Chairs	No Report		

<p>7. Old Business</p>	<p><u>a) Strategic Planning Goals</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Advising</u> 2. <u>Freshman Seminar and orientation.</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussions occurred about the freshman experience offered at GVSU, including summer orientation, summer transition, and freshman seminar to help design the best program for incoming students. • There are many departments (i.e., admissions, student life) working on different aspects for the freshman experience. • There is a hidden core at GVSU. • Not all freshmen students are 18 and just out of high school. • Student input is needed for this discussion, as well as representation from the all the departments that work on Freshmen experiences. <p><u>b) Workload Equity</u></p> <p><u>c) Visioning the next level</u></p> <p><u>d) Crisis Preparation</u> Discussion on ways budget can be cut.</p> <p><u>e. Faculty Representation on Deans Council and Budget Committee.</u></p>	<p>No Discussion.</p> <p>FTLCAC is charged with examining the freshman experience & advising, as a whole, from the academic perspective and recommending ways to strengthen, integrate and coordinate these experiences. Motion: Passed unanimously</p> <p>No Discussion</p> <p>No Discussion</p> <p>Suggestions can be forwarded to the Chair of ECS/UAS and Provost.</p> <p>No Discussion</p>	<p>0304-7.1</p>
<p>8. New Business</p>	<p><u>a) Library Statement</u></p> <p><u>b) Asynchronous Teaching Technology Task Force</u></p> <p><u>c) Domestic Partner Benefits</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • President Murray reaffirmed his position. </p> <p><u>d. Admission Criteria</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bob Fletcher should be included in the admission criteria discussions. • Faculty need input into admission criteria to identify the impact of admission decision on programming. </p>	<p>No Discussion</p> <p>No Discussion</p> <p>The Domestic Partner Benefit Task Force will be charged to reconvene, and to continue monitoring the local, state and national legal, political, and community scene and bring back a recommendation to UAS when issues or events are favorable for Domestic Partner Benefit approval. Motion: Passed unanimously</p> <p>ASPC is charged with establishing a process for faculty participation and recommending admission criteria for freshmen and transfer students. Motion: Passed unanimously</p>	<p>0304-7.2</p> <p>0304-7.3</p>

<p>9. Ideas for Future Fora</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workload Equity and Increasing Regular Faculty • The "Next Level": What is it? • Compilation of Departmental Feedback. 	<p>No Discussion</p>
<p>10. Reorganization</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provost will send a notice to Faculty and Staff seeking individual feedback on the emerging model of reorganization. • Included in the model will be an internal structure of CLAS and levels of leadership, with their responsibilities delineated. • Provost will take Reorganization model to Board of Trustees on December 3, 2003. • The UAS process will include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) a review and discussion of the elements in the new model that the Provost is requesting input on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation of internal structures • Administrative responsibilities and level. • Transition process 2) Other issues 	<p>No Discussion</p> <p>Senators are to send department summaries to Chair, Vice Chair and Provost.</p> <p>Model will be presented and discussed at ECS and UAS meetings prior to presentation to the Board of Trustees.</p> <p>UAS will get feedback on the emerging reorganization model from their constituents and bring back to UAS for discussion. UAS will then forward recommendations to Administration.</p>
<p>11. Adjournment</p>	<p>The meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm</p>	<p>Adjournment at 5:00pm</p>

DRAFT

Executive Committee of the Senate

October 17, 2003

3:00pm to 5:00pm

Room 107D DeVos: Downtown Campus

Proposed Agenda

1. Approval of Agenda
2. Approval of Minutes (10/10/03, 9/26/03, 9/19/03)
3. Report from the Chair
4. Report from the Provost
5. Report from the Student Senate President
6. Reports from Standing committees
7. Old Business
 - a. Strategic Planning Goals: Steps to Enhance Quality Education
 - i. Advising
 - ii. Freshman Seminar and Orientation (input from student services)
 - b. Workload Equity - Release time equity - Accountability re: release time, unit projections, sabbaticals, administration promises
 - c. Visioning the "next level"
 - d. Crisis preparation to avoid "reduction in force": establishing a "rainy day" fund (being fiscally responsible)
 - e. Discuss faculty representation on Deans Council and Budget Committee
8. New Business
 - a. Library Statement
 - b. Asynchronous Teaching Technology Task Force
 - c. Domestic Partner Benefits Presentation at June 13, 2003 Board of Trustees meeting (4-4:30pm)
 - d. Admission Criteria (4:30-5pm)

Ideas for Future Fora

- Workload Equity and Enlarging Regular Faculty
- The "Next Level": What is it?

Reorganization

- Compilation of Departmental Feedback (3-4pm)
- Reorganization Activities & Process

Civility, Christianity, and Free Speech

Dear Editor,

I was raised in a Christian home wherein I was taught that one should treat people with kindness and respect and refrain from condemning others. The rule, in my house at least, was "Judge not, lest ye be judged." Needless to say, I was dismayed to see members of a student group, "Christianity on Campus," at the recent Coming Out Day celebration scrawling what I viewed to be rather hateful chalk messages, and carrying signs that read, among other things, "God says homosexuality is vile," and "God says homosexuals are under his wrath." These individuals cited passages from the Bible that they believe support their assertions.

I have no doubt that these students ardently believe in the content of their messages. I am a strong advocate for free speech and believe that people have the right to express their opinions. However, I have problems with the time and manner in which these opinions were expressed, and found the students' behavior to be inappropriate, uncivil, and disrespectful of the views of others. Because of that, in my personal view, their behavior was far from Christian.

The Coming Out Day events were organized by the student group Out & About and were intended to support gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered people, and to educate the community on some of the challenges that these individuals face. Coming out can be for many a long, painful and difficult process. When you add harassment to the mix, it makes the process that much more difficult. By creating these malicious signs and chalk drawings, these allegedly Christian students were apparently attempting to disrupt the event and potentially alienate those who would have benefited from it, both gay and straight students, faculty and staff. In my mind, this is a direct violation of the University's Anti-Harassment Policy that defines harassment as conduct that creates, "an intimidating, hostile or offensive environment," that affects an individual's "access to educational activities and programs."

Furthermore, the students used these signs not only to express their views but also to promote meetings of their group. Since when is hatred an appropriate marketing tool for a student group? What kind of student is attracted to a group that uses these messages to promote themselves? Does their faculty advisor condone this sort of behavior? If a group of student atheists decide to show up at meetings of this group with signs that read, "Christians are narrow-minded bigots," will the University support their right to do so? When Preacher Tom appears on campus and calls young women passing by "whores and harlots," is it free speech or slander and harassment? If the local chapter of the Ku Klux Klan (also a self-declared "Christian" group) decides that it wants to recruit on campus, will the University administration deem it an appropriate use of free speech to let them appear in white hoods with burning crosses? How about if

they show up at a dance sponsored by the Minority Student Union? Whose free speech are we willing to protect, in what context and at what cost?

I recognize that it is critically important that a college campus uphold the right of free speech, and that this right must be carefully balanced against respect for the rights of students to gather at an event without harassment. Had these allegedly Christian students decided to carry these signs and chalk their vicious messages in an isolated context, while I would have abhorred their actions, I would have supported their right to do so peaceably. However, when they did it in the context of another student group's event, their uncivil protest became harassment and they crossed the line. "Love the sinner, hate the sin" doesn't quite justify the action, for their actions seem not to have been motivated by love, but by hate and fear.

I think that it is vital that a dialogue occur on campus regarding this incident and its impact on the community. I call upon the Student and Faculty Senates to discuss the issue of free speech in the context of the rights of individuals to gather at a community event without harassment. While, in the end, many will come to the conclusion that these students have a right to protest in this way, it is my opinion that those who choose to ignore the behavior without thoughtful discussion are also condoning it. I believe that this incident should send a strong message to our Administration, particularly to Dean Merkle and President Murray, who have repeatedly stressed the importance of respect for all individuals on campus, that we still have a very long way to go. Perhaps it is time to reconvene a meeting of the GLBT Advisory Committee?

In the context of the beliefs of the members of "Christians on Campus," I would ask the question, "What would Jesus do?"

Jerrod Nickels