

Grand Valley State University

Executive Committee of the Senate

December 3, 2004

PRESENT: John Bender, Yatin Bhagwat, Jay Cooper, Gayle Davis (ex officio), Rob Franciosi, Richard Hall, Jon Jellema (ex officio), Paul Leidig, David McGee (for Bill Hosterman), Kristine Mullendore, Jean Nagelkerk (chair), Karen Novotny, John Peck, Lisa Rigsby, Bill Rogers, Barbara Roos (for Ellen Schendel)

GUESTS: Teresa Beck, Maria Cimitile, Scott Richardson

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action / Decisions
1. Approval of Agenda	The agenda of December 3, 2004 was reviewed.	The agenda of December 3, 2004 was approved.
2. Minutes approval	The minutes of November 12, 2004 were reviewed.	The minutes of November 12, 2004 were approved, as amended.
3. Report of Chair	a) Jean Nagelkerk reported that there will be a luncheon with the Board of Trustees, UAS Senators and Chairs of the Standing Committees on Thursday, February 10, 2005, after the Board meeting.	
4. Report of Provost	a) Provost Davis reported that she will present an update on Academic and Student Affairs on Friday, December 10, 2004 in 250 Kirkhof Center at 1:30pm.	
5. Report of Student Senate President	No Report	
6. Old Business	a) Strategic Planning b) Workload Equity c) Prospectus for a Master of Education (Chemistry Concentration) d) Prospectus for Major in Chinese Studies	No Discussion No Discussion No Discussion No Discussion

b) New Business

- a) Center for Excellence in Science Education
- b) Center for Excellence in Scholarship and Creative Activities
- c) Summer Add/Drop Policy (APSC)

No Discussion
No Discussion
No Discussion

d) FSBC Recommendations

Budget Recommendations for 2005-06

Maria Cimitile, Chair of the Faculty Salary and Budget Committee, presented the 2005-06 budget recommendations developed at FSBC. Salary & Quality of Life Issues are the two main concerns. The FSBC feels that increasing salaries is a top priority for faculty and should be considered when Administration sets the budget for 2005-2006.

A motion was made for ECS to approve the FSBC 2005-06 Budget recommendation and send the recommendation to the University Academic Senate for their action. Discussion.

Medical Benefit Costs

Maria Cimitile presented an overview of the medical benefit costs, distributed a memo that was sent to Human Resources, and reported that FSBC did not make a recommendation on the proposed medical benefit costs. A motion was made to send the Medical Benefit Cost material to UAS for their information. Discussion.

Part-time Adjunct Pay

Maria Cimitile presented a summary of the charge received from ECS, and reported that this information was difficult to compile as it is not comprehensively collected in a standard format. The FSBC recommends increasing the lower levels of Part-time Adjunct pay to equal to the national standard. A motion was made to forward the FSBC Part-time Adjunct Pay recommendation to the University Academic Senate for their action. Discussion.

Tenure-track Faculty Ratio

Data was presented on tenure-track faculty ratios covering a 10-year period. A motion was made to accept the FSBC report on Tenure-track faculty ratio and forward the report to UAS for their action. Discussion.

e) Joint Appointment Policy

Teresa Beck, chair of FPPC, presented a draft of a joint appointment policy for ECS review. A motion was made to forward the Joint Appointment Policy to UAS for their consideration and action. Discussion

- f) John Reynolds, Chair of UAC, presented a summary of material regarding the use of course grades and GPA as outcome measures for self-studies.

MOTION: ECS affirms the position of the University Assessment Committee that

MOTION: The Executive Committee of the Senate approves the FSBC 2005-06 Budget recommendation and sends the recommendation to the University Academic Senate for their action.
Approved Unanimously.

MOTION: The Executive Committee of the Senate approves sending the Medical Benefit Cost material to UAS for their information.
Approved Unanimously.

MOTION: The Executive Committee of the Senate approves forwarding the FSBC Part-time Adjunct Pay recommendation to the University Academic Senate for their action.
Approved Unanimously.

MOTION: The Executive Committee of the Senate approves forwarding the FSBC report on tenure-track faculty ratios to UAS for their action.
Approved Unanimously.

University Counsel, Tom Butcher will be invited to the December 10th UAS meeting.

	<p>A motion was made to reaffirm the position of the University Assessment Committee that the use of course grades and GPA not be used as outcome measures for self studies, and recommends forwarding the issue to UAS for their action. Discussion. A UAC member will attend the next UAS meeting.</p>	<p>the use of course grades and GPA not be used as outcome measures for self-studies, and recommends forwarding the issue to UAS for their action. Approved Unanimously.</p>
<p>c) Ideas for Future Fora</p>	<p>Workload equity and enlarging regular faculty The "Next Level." What is it? Graduate versus Undergraduate Programs</p>	
<p>9. Adjournment</p>	<p>The meeting adjourned at 4:58ap</p>	<p>The meeting scheduled for next week, December 10 is a UAS meeting, which will be in 250 Kirkhof Center.</p>

Executive Committee of the Senate

December 3, 2004

DeVos Center, 107D

12/3/04

Agenda

1. Approval of Agenda
2. Approval of Minutes - November 12, 2004
3. Report from Chair
4. Report from the Provost
5. Report from the Student Senate President
6. Old Business
 - a) *Strategic Planning – Global Issues from Retreat
 - o Visioning the “next level”
 - o Strengthening faculty governance
 - o Steps required to enhance the quality of education
 - Improving Faculty/Student Ratio
 - o Support of scholarship
 - o Evaluation Criteria
 - o Faculty Office space and resources when teaching off “home” campus
 - o Traffic flow & traffic patterns
 - b) *Workload Equity
 - o Release-Time equity and Accountability
 - o Will be addressed at 1/14/05 Retreat
 - c) Prospectus for a Masters of Education (Chemistry Concentration)
 - o At UCC Stage
 - o At FSBC Stage
 - d) Prospectus for Major in Chinese Studies
 - o At FSBC Stage
 - e) Prospectus for MS in Safety Management
 - o At FSBC Stage
 - o At UCC Stage
 - f) UCC role in prospectus and final plans
 - Resource Balance in graduate/undergraduate programs
 - o To be addressed at ECS Retreat 1/14/05
7. New Business
 - a) Center for Excellence in Science Education
 - Waiting for materials from Wendy Wenner & Ed Baum
 - b) Center for Excellence in Scholarship and Creative Activities
 - At Provost's Office
 - c) Summer Add/Drop Policy (APSC)
 - d) FSBC Budget Recommendations
 - e) Joint Appointment Policy (FPPC)
 - Discussion with Teresa Beck, Wendy Wenner and Scott Richardson
8. Ideas for Future Fora
 - Workload equity and enlarging regular faculty
 - The “Next Level”: What is it?
 - Graduate versus Undergraduate programs

Adjournment

from 12/13/04
ECS

From: Teresa Beck
To: Nagelkerk, Jean
Date: 12/1/2004 4:18:32 PM
Subject: joint appointment

attached is the most current form of the joint appointment policy and memorandum of understanding. revisions are minor. also attached are modified minutes from our last fppc meeting in which we discussed the issues brought up by ecs. you will note a brief discussion and then the decision. tom butcher joined us for that fppc meeting and he was the one who actually made the last revisions. t-

Teresa M. Beck PhD, CTRS
Associate Professor and Director of Therapeutic Recreation
College of Health Professions
Cook-DeVos Center for Health Sciences
Grand Valley State University
301 Michigan Street NE
Grand Rapids, MI 49503-3314
(616) 331-2735
(616) 331-3350 (fax)

CC: Haight, Lisa

Chapter 4, Faculty Personnel Policies

2.4.1 Joint Appointment. (New)

Because of the importance of teaching, scholarship, service at GVSU, it may be desirable in certain circumstances for faculty members to have joint appointments with departments in the same college, with departments in different colleges, or with departments and interdisciplinary programs in the same or different colleges. The formal policy and procedures outlined below govern joint appointments.

A joint appointment is a formal arrangement between two departments or a department and a program that specifies the terms under which a member of one provides service to the other. Terms to be negotiated include the length and frequency of the service, the specifics of the assignment, the mechanisms by which the faculty member will be evaluated and that information will be communicated back to the primary department, and the amount of compensation (if any) that will be paid to the primary department.

1. Joint appointments shall be made when a faculty member is teaching or providing academic service in two departments or programs for an academic year or longer. Providing academic service to a department or program for one course or its equivalent per academic year for multiple years shall not be considered a joint appointment for purposes of this policy.
2. The conditions of an individual joint appointment must be detailed at the time of initial joint appointment in a written Memorandum of Understanding between the primary and secondary departments and the faculty member.
3. The departments must agree on the proportion of time to be spent in each department and include this information in the Memorandum.
4. The Memorandum of Understanding must be approved and signed by the chairs of the involved units, the faculty member, the Dean(s), and the Provost before a joint appointment takes effect.
5. The department where tenure resides will be identified as the faculty member's primary department for purposes of reappointment, tenure and promotion, and annual reviews (the other department will be the secondary department). These personnel actions will be governed by the written procedures of the primary department; however, it is understood that the secondary department shall also be providing information.
6. A joint appointee is eligible to be considered for tenure, promoted, receive salary increases, be awarded a sabbatical, and receive grants and research funding in the same manner as faculty members not jointly appointed. The primary department is responsible for initiating and carrying through procedures leading to those changes in status; the department not designated as the primary department is likewise expected to give due and regular consideration to the appointee's qualifications for

- these advancements. Jointly-appointed faculty will have full voting rights in their primary department, regardless of the percentage of FTE in that department with regard to personnel matters.
7. Expectations for teaching, scholarship and service in each department to which he or she is jointly appointed, will be spelled out in the Memorandum of Understanding.
 8. A person on joint appointment shall in no way be disenfranchised from the faculty governance system because of the nature of his or her appointment. Representational rights shall be designated in the Memorandum of Understanding.
 9. Faculty members shall submit a Faculty Activity Report (FAR) to the chairs of both departments or programs involved in a joint appointment. Each chair must provide the office(s) of the dean(s) with summary comments on the FAR. If recruiting for a joint appointment the primary and secondary departments shall be represented on the search committee.
 10. The joint appointment will be reviewed periodically and is subject to renewal or termination by either the college or department at will. If not renewed, the faculty appointment will revert to the primary college and department. For tenure-track faculty, the appointment may not extend beyond the current contract length with the primary college.

2.10.7 Unit Personnel Actions. (Amended)

- B. Unit Meeting and Unit Vote.** The Unit Head or Designate will call a unit meeting for the purpose of addressing the personnel actions under consideration. Only unit regular faculty may attend and participate in the meeting. When the candidate is a joint appointee as defined by section 2.4.1, a representative from the secondary department or program may attend and participate in the discussion part of the unit meeting. The candidate being reviewed shall participate in the discussion part of the meeting unless the candidate waives the opportunity to participate by signing a waiver. Audio or videotape or other type of mechanical or electronic recording is not permitted during this meeting. However minutes shall be taken and shall include the date, time, place of the unit discussion, names of those who were in attendance, and the results of the unit vote. The minutes will also have the candidate's waiver attached if the candidate has waived participation in the meeting.

Instructions for Memorandum of Understanding:

Memorandum of Understanding is developed to ensure that all relevant views are expressed at the time of appointment, that effective communication is promoted between departments or with the faculty member, and that a clear orderly process is used for decisions affecting review, promotion, tenure and salary decisions for faculty members with joint appointments. Responsibilities and obligations of departments with jointly appointed faculty will be outlined in the Memorandum.

1. The Memorandum of Understanding describes the expectations for the faculty member at the time of initial appointment and is binding for the duration of the faculty member's joint appointment.
2. The Memorandum of Understanding shall clearly state how a faculty member's professional work will be evaluated, by whom that work will be evaluated, and the extent to which the faculty member's productivity will be evaluated differently from that of others because of the specific nature of the joint appointment.
3. Normally, the primary and secondary departments will divide responsibility according to the proportion of the faculty member's FTE assigned to each department. Specifically, three kinds of considerations need to be addressed in this determination: (a) the definition and weighing of professional performance factors (teaching, scholarship, and service to the university and to the community) that will apply to the individual on joint appointment; (b) the manner in which the evaluation of professional achievements will be divided among the units performing the evaluation; and, (c) for new faculty, how mentoring and other aspects of faculty development will be handled.
4. Clear assignment of work effort in both departments—for example, number of courses taught, obligation for advising students, committee work, expectation for attending departmental faculty meetings, etc.—must be included in the Memorandum of Understanding.
5. The Memorandum must state that the chairs of constituent departments or programs will confer at least annually to coordinate teaching and service responsibilities of jointly-appointed faculty, to insure that the overall load of teaching and service obligations does not exceed that of comparable faculty with appointments wholly in one department or program.
6. The Memorandum must deal with requests for various types of leave. Normally such decisions rest with the dean of faculty member's "primary department"; however, chairs and deans of all departments or programs involved with the appointment will provide assessments of the requested leave before the dean makes a decision.

7. The Memorandum must deal with voting rights on non-personnel matters (for example, voting on curricular decisions, allocations of department/program resources, etc.). Jointly-appointed faculty will have full voting rights in their primary department, regardless of the percentage of FTE in that unit with regard to personnel matters. Voting rights other than on personnel matters of jointly-appointed faculty in departments or programs other than the primary department will be decided upon by the departments or programs involved, and these will be clearly stated in the Memorandum.
8. The Memorandum must deal with rank and salary adjustment. Normally, jointly-appointed faculty will have the same rank and the same salary adjustments in both (all) departments they are appointed to. However, tenure will normally be held only in the "primary department."



JOINT FACULTY APPOINTMENT – MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
To be completed by the Primary College Dean, Approved by the Secondary College
Dean and Approved by the Provost.

Faculty Name:

Primary College & Department:
(Tenure granting College)

Title:
(e.g., Associate Professor of Art)

Specify teaching load and Work Assignment:
(# of courses, scholarship, advising, meetings and other expectations)

Secondary College & Department/Program:

Title:
(Faculty rank for the secondary appointment will be the same as rank in the primary
College)

Specify teaching load and Work Assignment:
(# of courses, scholarship, advising, meetings and other expectations)

Period of Joint Appointment:

(e.g., August 7, 2004 – April 30, 2006)

This joint appointment is subject to review at the end of this period and is subject to
renewal by either college or the faculty member at will. If not renewed, appointment will
revert to the primary college and department. For tenure-track faculty the appointment
period may not extend beyond the current contract length in the primary college.

Sabbaticals or other leave issues during the joint appointment:

Service to the University and the Unit: Faculty may serve on faculty committees in the primary
unit and on university wide committees. Specify any other arrangements:

Contract, Tenure and Promotion Reviews: Appointment and tenure are held in the primary college. The primary department and college conduct reviews for contract renewal, tenure and promotion. Appointment and tenure are not held in the secondary college. The secondary department shall forward its evaluation to the primary department at the time of review and it shall be included in the portfolio. If there is no reappointment in the primary department, the secondary appointment terminates on the same date.

Any other arrangements must be specified on an attachment approved by the Deans and Provost and consistent with the Joint Appointment Policy.

Annual Merit Evaluation and Salary Changes: Merit evaluation is conducted by the primary department and dean. Salary changes will be determined by the primary dean following the procedures of that college. The secondary department and dean will forward their recommendation for consideration to the primary dean.

Any other arrangements must be specified on an attachment approved by the Deans and Provost.

Contract and salary: The annual salary letter will be issued by the primary college dean.

Faculty Meetings and Voting: The faculty member attends and votes in meetings as a regular member of the primary college. For the secondary appointment the faculty member:

Attends meetings:	YES	NO
Votes on non-personnel issues:	YES	NO

Office Space and Support: Provided by the primary college/department. Additional support will be provided by the secondary college/department as needed for the specific assignment to reflect the faculty member's participation in the secondary department. Specify these arrangements:

Funding Sources for the Joint Appointment:

Approvals:

This joint appointment must meet the curricular needs of the colleges and departments. The chairs agree to confer at least annually to coordinate teaching and service responsibilities and to insure that the overall teaching load and service obligations does not exceed that of comparable faculty appointed wholly in one unit.

The faculty member, chairs and deans should attempt to resolve any disagreements among the involved units. If unable to do so issues will be taken to the Provost for resolution.

Faculty member:

Date:

Chair of primary department:

Date:

Dean of primary college:

Date:

Chair of secondary department:

Date:

Dean of secondary college:

Date:

Provost:

Date:

Faculty Personnel Policy Committee
November 23, 2004

Members present: Teresa Beck, chair, Douglas Chung, Suzanne Crampton, Ron Dwelle, Martha Golensky, Jon Jellema, Loretta Konecki, Linda Masselink, David McGee, Scott Richardson, Tim Strickler, Don Williams
Guest: Tom Butcher

Teresa distributed "Issues Brought Up at ECS" for our discussion on the Joint Appointment Policy.

The following are the issues and decisions from today's discussion:

1. *Some people even suggested that untenured faculty should not have joint appointments.*
 - We have programs without faculty and need to have a way to share faculty. Some programs may require a faculty expertise that is not currently on campus and need to recruit specifically for that program
 - The document was written to include tenure-track faculty and there are no legal impediments to including tenure-track faculty.

Decision: The policy includes tenure-track and tenured faculty.

2. *Can a faculty member change primary and secondary units? Does the primary unit have some say in this?*

Decision: No. The faculty member does not make this decision. This is a discussion and decision that would take place by all parties.

3. *Some people suggested using the word "alternate" rather than "secondary" since one might be working primarily in the secondary unit rather than the primary unit.*

- "Alternate" implies "instead of".

Decision: Use the word "secondary".

4. *Change merit increase to be proportional to the departmental effort as the \$\$ follow the individual.*

5. *Regarding salary recommendations – How will the final salary recommendation be arrived at by the primary dean? Suppose the primary dept. recommends only satisfactory, while the secondary dept. and dean recommend meritorious? Etc.*

Decision: Tom Butcher stated these concerns have already been articulated in the Memorandum of Understanding under "Annual Merit and Salary Changes".

6. *Should non-tenured faculty ever teach a majority of their course workload outside of their primary department? I believe there was a concern for continuity and communication in the primary department from which a faculty member would be seeking tenure and promotion. Some of the discussion sounded like 50% teaching in a secondary department would be the most in order for continuity and success of a non-tenured faculty member.*

- This works well with classes that are closely aligned. With departments it works, with programs it is more of a problem.
 - If an agreement is drawn up and agreed upon, this should not be a problem.
- Decision:** There is not a "maximum" for teaching outside the primary unit.

7. *What mechanism will secondary programs/departments use to make personnel recommendations? I believe that there was confusion as to whether there would be 2 personnel reviews (primary and secondary departments). If there are not 2 reviews, who or what documentation would be forwarded to the primary department? I didn't hear strong support for either, just more clarification regarding specifics. Someone wanted to permit a representative from the secondary dept. to attend primary meetings for tenure and promotion without a vote.*

Decision: Tom Butcher stated the joint appointment letter would get more detailed in specifics of how the review/evaluation works. It would set up expectations. Reference "Unit Notification" in the faculty handbook to be consistent with what the candidate has to do for personnel reviews. 2.10.7 B
When the candidate is a joint appointee, a representative from the secondary department or program may attend and participate in the discussion.

8. *Can new regular faculty be assigned to a program (as opposed to a department) as a primary unit?*

- A faculty member must be affiliated with a tenure granting department to get tenure.

Decision: No

9. *Can a tenured faculty member with a joint appointment negotiate to do most of their, if not all, teaching in the secondary department?*

Decision: Yes (Discussion would be among department chairs and deans.)

Would the primary department have veto power over this arrangement?

Decision: No. This is covered in the policy.

10. *Addition of "college" to department and programs.*

Decision: The policy covers "college". Leave the wording as is.

11. *If teaching in secondary unit and cannot get out of class to make it to primary unit's personnel committee, how does that impact the quorum?*

Decision: This is not an issue for this policy. This already happens when faculty are teaching during faculty meetings for personnel actions.

12. *Is the evaluation of a person from the secondary unit binding or advisory to the primary unit when making personnel decisions?*

The primary department should give due consideration to the evaluation.

Decision: No

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. [cut and paste from NCA and give the other 2 as examples]

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>)

For example, 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)

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)

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.”