

# Grand Valley State University

## Minutes of the University Academic Senate

### December 10, 2004

**Present:** Majd Al-Mallah, David Bair, Charles Baker-Clark, John Bender, Yatin Bhagwat, Jan Brashler, Agnes Britton, Doug Busman, Gayle Davis (ex officio), Kurt Fanning, Rob Franciosi, Linda Goossen, Richard Hall, Paul Leidig, George Lundskow, Neil MacDonald, Kristine Mullendore, Paul Murphy (for Ellen Schendel), Jean Nagelkerk, Steve Nizielski, Karen Novotny, Charles Pazdernik, John Peck, Paul Plotkowski (ex officio), Avi Reichert, Allison Reynolds (student), Ross Reynolds, Lisa Rigsby, Bill Rogers, Barb Roos, Mack Smith, Paul Stephenson, Kathleen Underwood, Wendy Wenner (ex officio), Don Williams

**Guests:** Allison Adams, Teresa Beck, Tom Butcher, Maria Cimitile, Linda Nicholson Grinstead, Kim Ranger, Oliver Wilson

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action / Decisions
1. Approval of Agenda	The agenda of December 10, 2004 was reviewed.	The agenda was approved.
2. Approval of Minutes	The minutes of November 5, 2004 were reviewed.	The minutes of November 5, 2004 were approved as submitted
3. Report of Chair	<p>a) The Chair reported that the Human Resources Office has contracted with the consulting firm Advantage Benefits Group (ABG) to study the university's medical benefit package. Focus groups were held with ECS and FSBC.</p> <p>b) Kristine Mullendore is monitoring the situation on Domestic Partner Benefits state- and nation-wide for ECS.</p> <p>c) A lunch with the Board of Trustees, UAS, and standing committee chairs is scheduled for February 10, 2005 at Eberhard Center immediately following the Board meeting.</p> <p>d) The chair received memos from the Provost in support of the UAS proposals regarding Faculty Governance representation, Faculty Senate reports to the Board of Trustees, input into the Admissions policy, and approval of the new Campus Life committee for Fall of 2005.</p> <p>e) The chair reported that ECS is co-sponsoring a survey of minority faculty to gain information on their perception of the workload requirement for minority representation on department, college or university personnel committees.</p> <p>f) The chair reported that the Provost's office has scheduled two presentations on accreditation for January 13 &amp; 14, 2005. Faculty are encouraged to attend one of the sessions</p> <p>g) The chair reported that she attended the Board of Trustees meeting today. The Board of Trustees approved and provided funding for Grand Valley Research Corporation.</p>	

	<p>4. Report of Provost</p>	<p>a) Provost Davis reported that the Board of Trustees approved all three of the Professional Science Masters Programs, and the Department of Liberal Studies at their meeting today.  b) The search to replace the outgoing Assistant and Associate Vice President's position in the Provost's office is underway.  a) Allison Reynolds reported on behalf of the Student Senate President. The Student Senates is asking for faculty assistance in increasing the turnout for the 2005 Student Senate elections by encouraging the students in their class(es) to vote in the elections in the spring of 2005. It was reported that the President's Ball is scheduled for February 25, 2005.  b) Faculty are invited to present their research at the Student Scholarship Day.</p>	
	<p>5. Report of Student Senate</p>	<p>a) Allison Adams, chair of FFPAC, reported that the committee has met four times this semester and are still in the information gathering stage. They serve as a liaison between Faculty &amp; Administration on faculty matters and are conducting evaluations of classrooms. An annual report will chronicle decisions that are made on projects.  b) Maria Cimitile, chair of FSBC, presented a brief overview of what FSBC has been working on, distributed a summary sheet, and thanked her committee members for doing a fine job  c) Nicki Grinstead, chair of APSC, reported that the committee met three times this semester, and that the issues of diversity and climate were discussed with Nanette Reynolds.  d) Teresa Beck, chair of FPPC, presented an overview of their work this semester. Issues surrounding college personnel policy committees, faculty workload and guidelines for tenure are future agenda items.  a) Oliver Wilson, dean of Multicultural Affairs, asks for faculty support in encouraging students and faculty to participate in Martin Luther King, Jr. commemorative activities.</p>	
	<p>6. Report of Standing Committee Chairs</p>	<p>b) <u>FSBC Budget Recommendations</u>  ECS approved the FSBC 2005-06 budget recommendation and forwarded it to UAS for their action. A motion was made for UAS to approve the FSBC 2005-06 budget recommendation and forward the recommendation to Administration for their consideration. Discussion.</p>	
	<p>7. New Business</p>	<p>c) <u>Part-time Adjunct Pay</u>  ECS approved the FSBC Part-time Adjunct pay recommendation and forwarded it to UAS for their action. A motion was made for UAS to approve the FSBC Part-time adjunct pay recommendation and forward the</p>	<p>Multicultural Affairs Office will send a notice of events to faculty and will prepare a draft of a letter for the Provost's Office &amp; Faculty Senate to jointly send out.   <b>MOTION:</b> UAS approves the FSBC 2005-06 budget recommendation and forwards the recommendation to Administration. <b>Unanimously approved</b>   <b>MOTION:</b> UAS approves the FSBC Part-time adjunct pay recommendation and forwards the recommendation to</p>

	<p>recommendation to Administration for their consideration. Discussion.</p> <p>d) <u>Tenure-track Faculty Ratio</u> ECS approved the FSBC report on Tenure-track faculty ratio and forwarded it to UAS for their action. A motion was made for UAS to accept the FSBC report on Tenure-track faculty ratio and forward the report to Administration for their information, and support to maintain and increase the number of regular faculty. Discussion.</p> <p>e) <u>Medical Cost Proposed Increases</u> An overview of proposed Medical Cost increases was presented to UAS for their information. FSBC is working closely with Human Resources to provide input into the faculty salary and benefits program.</p> <p>f) <u>Joint Appointment Policy</u> The Joint Appointment Policy was reviewed. The University Council Office will finalize the document with the help of a subcommittee for review at a future UAS meeting. Comments or questions should be emailed to Jean Nagelkerk, Teresa Beck and Tom Butcher.</p> <p>g) <u>University Assessment Material</u> An overview of material from UAC was presented regarding the use of course grades and GPA as outcome measures for self-studies. A motion was made for UAS to affirm the position of the University Assessment Committee that the use of course grades and GPA not be used as outcome measures for self-studies. Discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Workload equity and enlarging regular faculty</li> <li>▪ The next level</li> <li>▪ Graduate versus Undergraduate</li> </ul>	<p>Administration. <b>Unanimously approved</b></p> <p><b>MOTION:</b> UAS accepts the FSBC report on Tenure-track faculty ratio and forwards the report to Administration for their information and support to maintain and increase the number of regular faculty. <b>Unanimously approved.</b></p> <p>Comments or questions can be emailed to Jean Nagelkerk, Teresa Beck and Tom Butcher.</p> <p><b>MOTION:</b> UAS affirms the position of the University Assessment Committee that course grades and GPA not be used as outcome measures for self-studies. <b>Unanimously approved.</b></p>
<p>8. Ideas for Future Fora</p>		
<p>10. Adjournment</p>		

**Compensation Methods for Adjunct Faculty**

About sixty percent of the respondents (60.8%) pay adjunct faculty a dollar amount per credit/course hour, and 29.7% pay a dollar amount per course. Only a small percentage of the respondents use one of the other methods of compensation.

**TABLE 18**  
**Which of the Following Methods Does Your Institution Use to Pay Adjunct Faculty? (Check all that apply)**  
*CUPA-HR 2003-04 NFS Survey*

N = 788	%	N
Dollar amount per credit/course hour	60.8%	479
Dollar amount per contact hour	9.0%	71
Dollar amount per course	29.7%	234
Pro-ration of appropriate full-time position per credit/course hour	4.6%	36
Pro-ration of appropriate full-time position per contact hour	0.6%	5
Pro-ration of appropriate full-time position per course	3.6%	28
Other	8.6%	68

**Compensation Rates for Adjunct Faculty**

As with full-time faculty, the mean dollar amount paid per credit/course hour is substantially higher than the median dollar amount, due to a few institutions with relatively high compensation rates. As such, assuming the median to be a better indicator, the dollar amount paid to adjunct faculty ranges from a minimum of \$667 to a maximum of \$882 for undergraduate instruction. For graduate instruction, the range is slightly higher at \$701 to \$1,000 per credit/course hour. The compensation rates for adjunct faculty are slightly lower than those for full-time faculty for overload and summer term teaching.

**TABLE 19**  
**What Are the Minimum and Maximum Dollar Amounts Per Credit/Course Hour You Can Pay Adjunct Faculty? \***  
*CUPA-HR 2003-04 NFS Survey*

	Minimum \$ Per Credit/ Course Hour				Maximum \$ Per Credit/ Course Hour			
	Mean	Median	Range	N	Mean	Median	Range	N
Undergraduate Instruction	\$950	\$667	\$25-8000	564	\$1351	\$882	\$25-9000	504
Graduate Instruction	\$983	\$701	\$30-7113	224	\$1466	\$1000	\$33-9000	380

\* Participants asked to respond in terms of \$ per credit/course hour to facilitate comparisons, regardless of compensation method actually used by their institution.

Grand Valley State University  
Adjunct Compensation by College: Fall 2004

College	Adjunct Compensation		Adjunct compensation for non-credit sections			Compensation per credit hour	% of adjunct budget spent on non-credit	Maximum compensation per credit hour	Median compensation per credit hour	Minimum compensation per credit hour
	Adjunct Credit Hours	Adjunct Compensation	Adjunct Compensation	for non-credit sections	for non-credit sections					
CCPS	108	\$ 90,252	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 835.67	0%	\$ 1,440.00	\$ 720.00	\$ 648.00	
CHP	39	\$ 41,170	\$ 9,396	\$ 9,396	\$ 1,063.82	23%	\$ 1,170.00	\$ 891.00	\$ 648.00	
CLAS	1,176	\$ 971,018	\$ 25,574	\$ 25,574	\$ 825.39	3%	\$ 2,400.00	\$ 720.00	\$ 486.00	
CUII	52	\$ 39,960	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 768.46	0%	\$ 1,152.00	\$ 720.00	\$ 648.00	
KSON	277	\$ 203,331	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 733.25	0%	\$ 1,080.00	\$ 656.00	\$ 468.00	
PCEC	26	\$ 20,844	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 801.69	0%	\$ 1,440.00	\$ 648.00	\$ 450.00	
SOE	609	\$ 413,995	\$ 30,132	\$ 30,132	\$ 679.79	7%	\$ 1,897.00	\$ 756.00	\$ 39.33	
SSB	171	\$ 155,520	\$ 155,520	\$ 155,520	\$ 876.76	100%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	
Grand Total	2,287	\$ 1,936,090	\$ 220,622	\$ 220,622	\$ 846.40	11%	\$ 2,400.00	\$ 720.00	\$ 39.33	

unknown

## University Assessment Committee Statement Concerning the Use of Course Grades or GPA in Assessment

“Because course grades and GPA tend to be aggregates of assignments measuring multiple student learning outcomes, the University Assessment Committee does not find the use of course grades or GPA acceptable for the purpose of evaluating a particular student learning outcome. It may be acceptable, however, to use grades of individual course assignments that measure a single learning outcome, provided that either the grade or the grading standard is collaboratively determined. Examples of this would be juried performances, writing portfolios, or final senior projects.”

### References and Examples of Assessment Policies:

The Higher Learning Commission of NCA states the following in its Assessment Matrix, Section II: a. Faculty, under Beginning Implementation of Assessment Programs: **“A few academic units have begun to expand assessment activities beyond teacher evaluation of student learning and grades awarded in courses.”**

(<http://www.ncacihe.org/resources/assessment/AssessMatrix03.pdf>)

The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) notes:

Course grades measure the students' mastery of a course topic taught by a specific professor. The course grade is an aggregate measure comprised of the students' performances on multiple exams, assignments, projects, homework, extra credit, etc. Even if professors teach from a common syllabus, a course grade is too aggregate a measure to provide an assessment of specific skills or knowledge. For example, a course may include an oral presentation assignment that is worth 20% of the course grade. It is possible for one student to get an exceptional grade on that assignment, and another student to fail that assignment, with both students receiving a "C" for the final course grade. The course grade provides no measure of students' demonstrated oral presentation skills or of the capacity of the curriculum to produce the desired oral communication traits in its students.

On the other hand, the grades on the oral assignment are an indicator of students' oral skills. If the faculty agrees on how the assignment is to be evaluated (including articulating its minimum performance standards), an oral presentation assigned within a course may be an appropriate program assessment measure. Thus, course products (cases, papers, presentations, exercises) may be used to meet assurance of learning standards, but course grades, by themselves, cannot.

([http://www.aacsb.edu/resource\\_centers/assessment/frequently-asked.asp](http://www.aacsb.edu/resource_centers/assessment/frequently-asked.asp))

In addition, Minnesota State University at Mankato writes:

The grade a student receives in a course is an important indicator of what a student knows and can do following the completion of a course. Course grades, however, are simply too broad and general in too many cases to function as effective assessment measures. Grades are often too broad in that they may take into consideration such elements as how much a student has improved over time in a course; how much effort a student has expended in a course; or even the attendance of a student. Grades are not often enough specifically tied to what a student was supposed to learn in a course based on the student learning outcomes of that course. Assessment measures, however, are more closely associated with specific student learning outcomes. Assessment measures are designed to be specific, with assessment solely concerned with the manner or degree to which a student can demonstrate knowledge, skill or disposition.

([http://www.mnsu.edu/acadaf/html/PRA\\_F\\_5.htm](http://www.mnsu.edu/acadaf/html/PRA_F_5.htm))

## Fall 2004 FSBC end of semester report

*on green paper*

This semester FSBC has addressed faculty concerns regarding and quality of university life, especially with regard to its commitment to providing an informed understanding with regard to the University's mission and goals, and in As is our task as an arm of faculty governance, we have information to faculty, but to proactively communicate a financial concerns of the faculty. The work of the comm: synthetic view of the University's overall financial situat areas of financial need. FSBC continues to engage in hea internally and with the Administration in regard to giving University. We have found the Administrative staff to be very neiptu in providing all requested materials. What follows is a condensed list of the activities with which FSBC has been engaged during the Fall semester:

- FSBC compiled data and made reports/recommendations in answer to charges from ECS: 1. gathering information on ratio of tenured/tenure-track faculty vs. all other category of faculty; 2. gathering information on part-time adjunct pay across the university, and in comparison to comparable local and state universities.
- In formulating budget recommendations, FSBC requested and synthesized data over a ten year period. FSBC determined the following to be relevant for assessing the budget allocation: 1. the average tenured/tenure track faculty salary increase; 2. student enrollment numbers; 3. student tuition increases; 4. total general fund revenues; 5. instructional budget with faculty salaries as percentage of budget; 6. faculty growth; 7. Cost of Living Adjustment and Consumer Price Index for Urban Midwest information; 8. allocation of increase revenue for 2004/05 budget; and 9. medical cost comparisons.
- Provost Davis met with FSBC to discuss faculty concerns regarding budget allocations. The Provost has communicated to FSBC her desire and commitment to provide clarity, transparency, and access of information to faculty governance. Administration has supplied FSBC with all requested information, lending their support to shared governance. In formulating our recommendations out of this shared commitment to faculty governance, we are pleased that the faculty perspective has been solicited for the construction of the 05/06 budget as well as addressing long-range faculty concerns, and hope the faculty voice will continue to impact future budgetary decisions.
- The committee met with Mary Warner from Human Resources, and ABG (on 12/3) consulting firm to assess current situation and learn of proposed changes for benefits, including changes in benefits and cost increases. FSBC has asked HR to provide monthly updates with regard to their work that affects faculty.

- Requested data for annual faculty salary letter, which will be sent to faculty in early Winter semester.
- The following memos were sent to ECS: 2005/06 Faculty Budget Recommendations; Recommendation with regard to process of implementing changes in HR benefits; Report on Part-time Adjunct pay; Report on ratio of tenured/tenure track faculty to all other categories of faculty
- In addition to addressing charges from ECS, our upcoming work will include evaluation of new programs on the 2 and 4 year schedule; assessing new program initiatives; and working with Human Resources in a shared commitment to control costs of benefits.

Please contact FSBC chair, Maria Cimitile [cimitilm@gvsu.edu](mailto:cimitilm@gvsu.edu), or your representative if you have further questions.