

Grand Valley State University

Executive Committee of the Senate #14 - Retreat February 13, 2004

Present: Douglas Chung, Jay Cooper, Gayle Davis (ex officio), Rob Franciosi, Robert Hendersen, Harold Larson, Sue Martin (ex officio), Jean Nagelkerk (chair), Lisa Rigby, Ellen Schendel, Rachael Voorhees

Guests: Teresa Beck, Rita Grant, Lynn Mapes

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action / Decisions
1. Approval of Agenda	The agenda of February 13, 2004 was reviewed	The agenda was approved.
2. Approval of Minutes	The Minutes of February 6, 2004 were reviewed.	The minutes of February 6, 2004 were approved as submitted
3. Report of Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chair met with Robert Beasecker regarding memo on Library Task Force. b) Research Center Initiative - will be reviewed, revised and submitted to Provost. c) Discussion on voting for UAS representatives d) Reception with Board of Trustees and UAS members is expected to proceed. Tentative date of Thursday, April 22, 2004 has been set.. e) Chair will discuss stipends for summer work by ECS with the Provost at a future date. f) Chair attended Board of Trustees meeting and provided a brief report. Will request that regular agenda time be allotted for chair and vice chair of ECS to give reports to the Board. 	Copies will be distributed to ECS members.
4. Report of Provost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Provost Davis reported that the Board of Trustees do take an interest in Faculty and appreciate seeing their Sabbatical reports. Committee meetings of the Board are open; faculty and students are welcome to attend. b) Copies of budget pages from State of Michigan were distributed. c) Academic Affairs Division has a \$2 million gap to fill; new funding request(s) will be cut to zero and all other areas of budget are being closely looked at. Of the 28 new positions open eight will be forfeited.; hiring of 16 replacements will continue. No positions have been cut, nor have there been any across-the-board cuts and none are expected. e) Enrollment 2.1% below projection; 3200 FTIAC's expected for Fall 2004 f) Budget projections include raises; although not large ones. 	
5. Report of Student Senate President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Leadership senate was well attended b) President's Ball had 300 in attendance for dinner; 3,000 attended the dance. This year had the largest turnout of Faculty, Staff and Board Members ever. 	

	<p>d) Six student delegates attended the Governor's budget presentation in Lansing.</p> <p>e) The Student Senate funding denial of a request to bring Maya Angelou to campus stirred a controversy.</p> <p>See items below under "Standing Committee Representation"</p>	
6. Report of Standing Committee Chairs		
7. Old Business	<p>a) Workload Equity – Release time equity – Accountability re: release time, unit projections, sabbaticals, administration promises.</p> <p>b) Visioning the "next level"</p> <p>c) Discuss faculty representation on Deans Council and Budget Committee.</p>	<p>No Discussion</p> <p>No Discussion</p> <p>No Discussion</p>
8. New Business	<p>a) Reorganization</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Transition ii. Faculty Governance Representation Handbook Language distributed and discussed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Term staggered for Colleges with more than one member • ECS/UAS and Standing Committee Representatives shall serve their full term regardless of a decline in their college faculty count. <p>ECS REPRESENTATION Discussion on scheme of having 1 representative from each of the clusters and 3 members-at-large. A motion was made to have a Transitional representation scheme identified as 2 from each large cluster; 1 from arts and music.</p> <p>A motion was made that all standing committees will add a representative if another College is added.</p> <p>STANDING COMMITTEE REPRESENTATION Each representation scheme forwarded by standing committees was discussed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APSC Committee would like to keep membership small. The proposed FPPC model appealed to APSC committee members. Discussion. Recommendation that the proposed model is forwarded to UAS for their approval. • FPPC 	<p>Chairs of the Standing Committees are requested to send recommendations for changes to the Faculty Handbook Language to chair.</p> <p>MOTION: A Transitional Representation scheme, identified as 2 from each cluster and 1 from Arts and Music. Approved by consensus.</p> <p>MOTION: ECS and the standing committees will add a representative of the new college when another College is established. Approved by consensus.</p> <p>MOTION: ECS recommends that UAS accept the proposed representation model for APSC as presented. Approved by consensus.</p>

FPPC Chair presented changes to committee representation. Discussion. Recommendation that the proposed model, as amended, is forwarded to UAS for their approval.

A proposal was made to make change in representation so that committee membership would be limited to tenured faculty.

A proposal was made to amend the previous motion by changing "Tenure Faculty" to "Regular Faculty" and include "who have been through a minimum of 2 personnel reviews at GVSU." Discussion.

• FTLCAC

FTLCAC will use the representation scheme for standing committees that is developed by ECS.

• UCC

Committee feels all areas need to be represented, with a balance established between CLAS and professional schools, and that a General Education and Graduate Council representative is needed. Recommendation that the proposed model is forwarded to UAS for their approval. Discussion.

A proposal was made to amend the previous motion by adding, "if possible." Discussion.

• FSBC

FSBC will use the representation scheme for standing committees that is developed by ECS.

• GES

Email Paul Stephenson and Ted Sundstrom memo's discussed, and Paul Isely's memo was reviewed and discussed. After much discussion, it was agreed that the standing model be used for GES

MOTION: ECS recommends that UAS accept the proposed representation model for FPPC, as amended. **Approved unanimously.**

MOTION: ECS recommends that membership on FPPC is limited to tenured faculty.
2 Yes; 8 No FAILED

MOTION: ECS recommends that membership on FPPC is limited to Regular Faculty who have been through a minimum of 2 personnel reviews at GVSU. **APPROVED: 5 Yes; 3 No**

FTLCAC will use the representation scheme for standing committees that is developed by ECS.

MOTION: ECS recommends that a representative from each College Curriculum Committee serve on UCC.
3 Yes; 6 No FAILED

MOTION: ECS recommends that a representative from each College Curriculum Committee serve on UCC, if possible. **Approved unanimously.**

FSBC will use the representation scheme for standing committees that is developed by ECS.

GES will use the representation scheme for standing committees that is developed

<p>9. Adjournment</p>	<p>• <u>UAC</u> UAC will follow the APSC model for their committee representation.</p> <p>A proposal was made for ECS to develop a standing committee model that will be used unless a committee develops their own representation scheme. FTLC, FFPC, FSBC will use the standing committee model that is developed at ECS.</p> <p>A proposal was made to have the ECS model as the standing committee model, which is <u>Model 4</u>. The model has the following representation.</p> <p>CLAS (7) 1 each College (5) 2 SCOB (2) 1 Library (1) 1 Student Representative (1) 1 CUII (1) <i>n=17</i></p> <p>Discussion It was noted that an ECS member will always be UAS member.</p> <p>iii. Personnel Issues iv. Other Issues</p> <p>b) Administrative Manual</p> <p>c) Final Plan for Entrepreneurship i. UCC Recommendation</p> <p>d) Graduate Council Final Plan</p> <p>The meeting was adjourned at 4:55pm</p>	<p>by ECS</p> <p>UAC will use the same representation scheme as APSC.</p> <p>MOTION: ECS will develop a standing committee model that will be used unless a committee develops their own representation scheme. Approved unanimously.</p> <p>MOTION: ECS recommends accepting Model 4 as the Standing Committee Representation Scheme. Representation is as follows: CLAS (7); 1 for each College (5); 2 Seidman; 1 Library; 1 Student; 1 CUII for a total of 17. Approved 11Yes; 0 No</p> <p>No Discussion No Discussion No Discussion No Discussion No Discussion</p> <p>The next ECS meeting is scheduled for February 27, 2004</p>
-----------------------	--	--

Executive Committee of the Senate

Friday, February 13, 2004

215 A Eberhard Center

1:00-5:00pm

Proposed Agenda

1. Approval of Agenda
2. Approval of Minutes (Approval of Minutes 2/06/04)
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. Workload Equity - Release time equity - Accountability re: release time, unit projections, sabbaticals, administration promises
 - b. Visioning the "next level"
 - c. Discuss faculty representation on Deans Council and Budget Committee
8. New Business
 - a. Reorganization
 - i. Transition
 - ii. Faculty Governance Representation (*Bring handouts from 1/23/04 meeting*)
 - iii. Personnel Issues
 - iv. Other Issues
 - b. Administrative Manual
 - c. Final Plan for Minor In Entrepreneurship (*Please bring your copy of the final plan*)
 - i. UCC Recommendation
 - d. Graduate Council Final Plan

Ideas for Future Fora

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

TO: Jean Nagelkerk, Chair, ECS/UAS
FROM: John Bender, Chair, APSC
SUBJECT: Governance Representation
DATE: February X, 2004

UAS requested APSC to review faculty representation on APSC in light of the changes brought by the Reorganization.

APSC recommends that each college except CLAS elect one member to APSC, and that each cluster within the CLAS elect one member to APSC. Thus, CLAS will elect 4 total members to the APSC. The APSC also recommends that the Library, and the Student Senate, elect one member each to the APSC.

The APSC felt that this proposal balances representation of the various faculty constituencies, with a desire to keep the size small enough to maintain committee effectiveness. It was also felt that given the charges of the APSC, additional representation from the CLAS (proportional) would not significantly increase the diversity of views necessary for effective policy review.

CURRENT LANGUAGE

- 1.2.1 **Faculty Membership:** Faculty membership will be determined by a base for each Division/Autonomous Professional School, plus additional members reflecting the size of faculty in each Division/Autonomous Professional School. **Base Membership:** The Division of Arts & Humanities, the Division of Science & Mathematics, the Division of Social Sciences, and the Seidman School of Business will each have a base of four members; the Library, the School of Education, the School of Nursing, and the School of Social Work will each have a base of one member. **Additional Membership:** Each of the above units will have additional members based on the following formula: one additional member for each multiple of whole twenty tenure-track faculty as counted on the first class day of the Winter semester of the preceding academic year. That is, additional members would be added as follows:
- 1 - 19 faculty = no additional members
 - 20 - 39 faculty = 1 additional member
 - 40 - 59 faculty = 2 additional members
 - 60 - 79 faculty = 3 additional members
 - 80 - 99 faculty = 4 additional members, and so forth.
- Terms of office are two years, staggered, for divisional members.
- 1.2.2 **Student Membership:** The Student Senate elects five members, including the Student Senate President and four representatives--seniors, if possible--of the seven divisions. Student members serve one-year terms.
- 1.2.3 **Administration Membership:** The Provost, the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Deans of the instructional divisions are ex officio (non-voting) members.

REVISED LANGUAGE

- 1.2 **UAS Membership Formula:** The UAS includes members from the faculty, the student body, and the administration.
- 1.2.1 **Faculty Membership:** Faculty membership will be determined by a base of one for each college and the Library, plus additional members reflecting the size of faculty. **Additional Membership:** Each of the colleges will have additional members based on the following formula: one additional member for each multiple of whole twenty tenure-track faculty as counted on the first class day of the Winter semester of the preceding academic year. That is, additional members would be added as follows:
- 1 - 19 faculty = no additional members
 - 20 - 39 faculty = 1 additional member
 - 40 - 59 faculty = 2 additional members
 - 60 - 79 faculty = 3 additional members
 - 80 - 99 faculty = 4 additional members, and so forth.
- Terms of office are two years, staggered. Representatives must have Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty equivalence AND not be counted in another College. Formal joint appointment of at least half-time equivalency can be counted toward Tenure/Tenure Track representation totals.
- 1.2.2 **Student Membership:** The Student Senate elects five members, including the Student Senate President and four representatives--seniors, if possible--of the seven Colleges. Student members serve one-year terms.
- 1.2.3 **Administration Membership:** The Provost, the Associate Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, and the Deans of the Colleges are ex officio (non-voting) members.

dist. 2/19/04
ECS

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

MEMO TO: Executive Committee of the Senate

FROM: Rita Grant, UCC Chair

SUBJECT: Committee Membership

DATE: 2/5/04

The UCC has discussed the possible composition of the committee in light of the reorganization. Our recommendations are consistent with what we suggested last fall. We think that it is important that there be a reasonable balance between the CLAS and the professional colleges. We also feel that a voice at the table is more important than proportional representation for our committee. We recognize that the same may not be true for other standing committees.

We suggest the following representative membership:

CLAS	6 members	6 total	
Other Colleges	1 member each	7 total	<i>includes 2011</i>
Library	1 member	1 total	
Student	1 member	1 total	
Graduate Council	1 member	1 total	
Gen. Ed.	1 member	1 total	
Provost (ex officio)	1 member	1 total	
Total membership		18	

All members (other than the Provost) should be able to vote. It seems unreasonable to have the Graduate Council member and the General Education member attend and not be able to vote. The inclusion of a representative from each of those committees will aid in communication and coordination. We have had the benefit of the Assistant Dean of General Education participating as a SSB representative the last two years and it has proved to reduce duplication of effort between the two committees. We think that this relationship should continue by having a designated member rather than depend on an academic unit selecting such a person as their representative. The same argument can be used for the Graduate Council representative. The committee is large but we currently have a membership of fourteen and it seems to work well. We don't think four additional members will hurt committee operations.

We appreciate the ECS considering our input in this process.

To: Jean Nagelkirk, Chair ECS
From: Paul Isely, Chair General Education Subcommittee
CC: Rita Grant
Date: 10/27/2003
Re: GES Structure after reorganization

The General Education Subcommittee (GES) was asked to comment on 2 issues regarding reorganization.

1. What should the composition of GES be following reorganization given the current blueprint?
2. Where should General Education be housed?

In the October 6th meeting these issues were discussed and a week of discussion followed. Given that the overall structure (especially the sub structure of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences) is not defined, we have given a range of ideas. The results of this discussion are listed below:

What should the composition of GES be following reorganization given the current blueprint? We arrived at an answer after defining several basic ideas:

- a. All colleges should be represented.
- b. The composition should be representative (or nearly representative) of the entire faculty.
- c. That the size of the committee should be workable, but we should error on the side of larger if necessary to accommodate part (a) and (b).

These basic ideas resulted in the committee deciding that 8 to 10 reps from CLAS, 1 rep from each of the professional schools, a library rep, and a student rep would result in 16 to 18 members and would be workable and nearly representative.

Where should General Education be housed?

The committee unanimously felt that a dean of General Education/Interdisciplinary studies should be created and General Education should be housed under that dean. Because Gen Ed draws on all colleges, the program needs the ability to communicate on equal footing with the head of each of the colleges. However, if General Education must be housed in CLAS, then the structure of CLAS becomes important. Some discussions on the reorganization have revolved around creating sub-units within CLAS. If this occurs, GES feels that the head of General Education should be placed at or above the level of the sub-unit heads.

dist. ECS
2/13/04

Appointment of Faculty

>>> Ted Sundstrom 09/23/03 07:10PM >>>

Hello,

I would like to thank Paul for sending the message about representation this afternoon. I did not help him write the message since I had to leave around 4:30 so that I could be home in time for my daughter to go to her piano lesson. What Paul has written is accurate but I would like to add some explanation about the "apportionment method."

Fair representation or theories of apportionment have been studied mathematically, and there are several methods of apportionment that have historically been used (often to apportion the U.S. House of Representatives). Broadly speaking, there are two types of apportionment methods, those that use quota as the main idea and those that are based on a common divisor. Both types of methods first set the number of seats to be apportioned.

Without going into the details (which I can supply if necessary), and hoping this isn't too boring, it has been shown that "quota based" methods can have what are called "apportionment paradoxes." For example, it is possible for a state to have 10 representatives (for example) when the size of the house is 99. However, when the size of the house is increased to 100, and the apportionment method is used again, the state receives 9 representatives. This is called the "Alabama Paradox" because something similar actually happened involving Alabama using Hamilton's Method of apportionment (the most commonly used quota based method). This is why quota based systems are no longer used for apportioning Congress.

There are other types of paradoxes, and it has been shown that the divisor methods are the only apportionment methods that avoid all these paradoxes. Webster's Method, mentioned in Paul's message, is a divisor method. There are several other divisor methods (such as Jefferson's Method and Adams' Method), and it has been shown that Webster's Method is the only unbiased divisor method. This means that the method has no systematic tendency to favor large states over small states or vice versa.

I will be happy to provide more details about Webster's Method and other apportionment methods if necessary. I view the examples that Paul gave in his message as a starting point for discussion. It would seem that if we want each college to have at least one representative (say on ECS) and want "proportional representation," then we could use Webster's Method with 16 representatives. The assumptions in the model are the important issues and I believe, what needs to be discussed. In this case, I see three assumptions: at least one representative for each college, proportional representation, and the size of ECS. Change any one of these assumptions and we would have a different apportionment.

Perhaps these examples and ideas will give us a starting point for discussion and help us decide where compromises must be made.

Ted

p.s. Sorry this was long. Thanks for reading. I really did try to keep it short. It is interesting to note that many of the apportionment methods are named after famous Americans (Hamilton's Method, Jefferson's Method, Adams' Method, Webster's Method). There is some interesting history that goes along with this dealing with the political aspects of apportioning the U.S. House of Representatives. The House is currently apportioned by the so-called Huntington-Hill Method. This method was chosen over Webster's Method by Congress in the late 1930's. It was basically an argument over whether Michigan or Arkansas would get one more seat in the House. Arkansas received the "extra" seat when Congress selected the Huntington-Hill Method.

Ted Sundstrom, Ph.D.
Professor of Mathematics
Grand Valley State University
Allendale, MI 49401

616.895.2041
sundstrt@gvsu.edu

>>> Paul Stephenson 09/23/03 17:41 PM >>>
Hey all...

I just thought that ya'll might be interested in the following analysis (related to representation on university-wide committees). Besides I have asked so many questions related to this subject, I just thought I would try to be helpful in finding a solution. :)

Using Webster's method of apportionment (which is considered to be the most fair and unbiased method), one is able to derive the "best" apportionment for committees of a given size. Ted Sundstrom has written a spreadsheet that can be used to identify the "best" apportionment given the proposed model for reorganization. We played with his program and some of the results are presented below. As you review these results you will see that we did not address the Library, the College of Interdisciplinary Studies or the College of Continuing Education (all of which seem like special cases, and may warrant special consideration given their functions).

Assuming that ECS and other faculty governance committees consist of 16 members, then the best apportionment among the seven proposed colleges is:

- CLAS - 10 reps
- Seidman - 1 reps
- Education - 1 reps
- Nursing - 1 reps
- Health - 1 reps
- Public Affairs - 1 reps
- Engineering - 1 reps

Assuming that ECS and other faculty governance committees consist of 12 members, then the best apportionment among the seven proposed colleges is:

- CLAS - 7 reps
- Seidman - 1 reps
- Education, Nursing, Health, Public Affairs, and Engineering - 4 reps (Note: I combined these 5 Colleges because none of these individual Colleges was large enough to receive a representative without rounding. If you rounded up to allocate faculty Education, Engineering, and Public Affairs would each get 1 rep and Nursing and Health Sciences would share 1 rep).

Assuming that ECS and other faculty governance committees consist of 10 members, then the best apportionment among the seven proposed colleges is:

- CLAS - 6 reps
- Seidman - 1 reps
- Education, Nursing, Health, Public Affairs, and Engineering - 3 reps

Recommendation: I would recommend that we set the size of ECS and other faculty governance committees to be 10 members (regardless of the size of the faculty), then we use Webster's method to determine the best apportionment. This will result in a committee of a more

manageable size. Note that the 10 members do not include ex-officio members or potential members from the Library, the College of Interdisciplinary Studies or the College of Continuing Education.

Assuming that UAS will consist of 50 members, then the best apportionment among the seven proposed colleges is:

- CLAS - 32 reps
- Seidman - 5 reps
- Education - 3 reps
- Nursing - 2 reps
- Health - 2 reps
- Public Affairs - 3 reps
- Engineering - 3 reps

I would probably not recommend this apportionment of faculty to UAS. I would stick with the more practical method outlined in the Handbook and revise it for the new proposed structure.

NOTE: Ted and I used the following faculty numbers to create the apportionments (we are not completely sure of the "populations" for each college, but we think they are close):

- CLAS - 373 faculty
- Seidman - 58 faculty
- Education - 39 faculty
- Nursing - 28 faculty
- Health - 24 faculty
- Public Affairs - 33 faculty
- Engineering - 37 faculty.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Stephenson

P.S. I would like to thank Ted Sundstrom for writing the spreadsheet that was used to calculate the "best" apportionment.

draft 2/13/04
ECS



MEMORANDUM

GRAND VALLEY
STATE UNIVERSITY

TO: Jean Nagelkerk, Chair
ECS / UAS

FROM: Faculty Personnel Policy Committee
Dr. Teresa Beck, Chair

DATE: January 30, 2004

RE: Composition of FPPC

After discussion, members of the Faculty Personnel Policy Committee offer the following recommendation for the composition of FPPC upon reorganization:

- Seidman College of Business 1
- College of Community and Public Service 1
- College of Education 1
- College of Liberal Arts and Sciences 3 - 4
- College of Engineering and Computing 1
- College of Health Professions 1
- Kirkhof College of Nursing 1

Scott Richardson (Human Resources - ex officio)
Wendy Wenner (Vice-Provost - ex officio)

This composition adds two more members to the committee, making it a committee of twelve instead of ten.

We did not include the College of University-wide Interdisciplinary Initiatives. The rationale is that faculty in that college hold tenure or are tenure track in a "home" department in one of the other colleges. In addition, because of their joint appointments, they have representation from the second department that makes up their joint appointment.

Once this college has tenure granting departments, a change would be made to provide representation from that college.

met 4/12/04

MEMORANDUM

TO: Executive Committee of the Senate

FROM: Teresa Beck
Chair, FPPC

DATE: 2/12/04

RE: College Personnel Committees

The Faculty Personnel Policy Committee (FPPC) was given the charge to review and make recommendations regarding the personnel process in terms of the restructuring of the University. FPPC members established the following parameters to guide their work and consequent recommendations:

- To deviate as little as possible from the current personnel process.
- To maintain a two tier structure (unit/division which becomes department/ college).
- To keep the decision making at the department level. (This does not mean that the College Personnel Committee "rubber stamps" the department recommendation. The College Personnel Committee will continue to operate as the current Division Personnel Committees are supposed to operate. As stated in the Faculty Handbook (2.10 - 8A, page51), "If a unit has recommended a personnel action pursuant to a valid vote of the unit, whether in favor or against a candidate, the Committee will normally be expected to accept the recommendation of the unit."
- To maintain diversity and objectivity within the College Personnel Committee.
- To provide consistency in the makeup of the College Committees
- The College of University-wide Interdisciplinary Initiatives at this point does not have a department that grants tenure. Thus faculty in this college have "home" units where their tenure/tenure track is held. Thus, this College will not have a College Personnel Committee. Persons in this college will have personnel decisions made by their "home" departments and departments in which they have a joint appointment. However, as this college continues to grow and establishes autonomous departments which grant tenure, a College Level Personnel Committee will need to be established.
- This Committee (FPPC) does not make policy, only recommends policy.

Attached you will find recommendations supplied with rationale.

**Proposed Changes to Procedures for Regular Faculty Appointment Renewal, Promotion, Tenure, Sabbaticals, Periodic Performance Review, and Dismissal for Adequate Cause
(GREEN PAGES 47-48)**

Chapter 4, Administrative Manual, Faculty

2.10 Procedures for Regular Faculty Appointment Renewal, Promotion, Tenure, Sabbaticals, Periodic Performance Review, and Dismissal for Adequate Cause.

1. ~~Division/Autonomous School~~ College/Library's Personnel Committee. Each ~~Division/Autonomous School~~ College/Library will establish a Personnel Committee to recommend action concerning regular faculty appointment renewals, promotion, tenure, sabbaticals, and periodic performance reviews within the separate ~~Divisions/Autonomous Schools~~ College/Library. The Committees recommend to their respective Deans and shall not adopt policies or procedures contrary to the procedures contained in Section 2 of the Administrative Manual. Pursuant to Section 2.13.1, the Dean can initiate review of a case by the Personnel Committee regarding Dismissal for Adequate Cause.
2. **Personnel Committees.**
 - **Composition.** The Personnel Committee in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences will be composed of twenty (20) tenured faculty members elected from within the College, with not more than two (2) tenured faculty members being from the same department/school. The Personnel Committees in the ~~divisions of Arts and Humanities, Science and Mathematics, Social Sciences, and the Seidman School~~ College of Business and College of Community and Public Service, will be composed of five (5) ~~to seven regular~~ tenured faculty members elected from within the ~~Division~~ College, with not more than two (2) ~~regular~~ tenured faculty members being from the same school/department in the ~~Division~~ College. The Personnel Committees in the ~~Schools~~ Colleges of Education, Nursing, and ~~Social Work~~ Health Professions, and Engineering and Computing will be composed of five (5) regular tenured faculty members; two (2) ~~regular~~ tenured faculty members elected from the regular tenured faculty in the ~~school~~ College and three (3) ~~regular~~ tenured faculty members elected from and by the regular faculty of appropriate disciplines to be determined by the Provost in consultation with the Dean of that ~~school~~ College.

Rationale:

- Two factors were taken into consideration for determining the composition of the College Committees: number of departments and number of faculty.
- College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
 - A large committee structure must be put in place in order to process the number of contract renewals, and tenure and promotion nominations that will be in that college. A large number will also

- allow the Personnel Committee to break up into smaller subgroups to process personnel recommendations from the Departments.
- The college personnel committee can decide how to subdivide (by common disciplines or across disciplines) and which personnel recommendations the subcommittees will take action on.
 - The subcommittees will make recommendations directly to the dean of the college to maintain a two tier review process (department and then college)
 - Twenty persons on the committee will provide the opportunity for all disciplines to be represented if not by department, then at least by commonalities - please note this is no different than most current division personnel committees. A person from Writing may be reviewed at the division level by two persons from English, one from Philosophy, one from History and one from Classics. Currently, not all units across the university have a faculty member on their respective division personnel committees.
- College of Community and Public Service
 - This college is comprised of 3 schools and 2 departments and has the diversity and number of faculty for the personnel process to be completed with members all from the college
 - College of Engineering and Computing
 - This college includes one school and one department. While it may have an adequate number of faculty, it is felt that this college lacks diversity at the College level and an outside review of portfolios and department recommendations would add objectivity to the recommendations that would go forward to the Dean.
 - College of Health Professions
 - While there is diversity within the health professions (6 departments, the number of faculty within the college is small (27) with some departments having very few faculty (Occupational Safety and Health - 2, Therapeutic Recreation - 2, Clinical Laboratory Sciences -1). This would make it virtually impossible to have a valid vote at the department level before going to the college personnel committee. Thus, it is recommended that the College of Health Professions operate as one department (as they currently do) for a departmental vote and that the College Personnel Committee have representation from outside the College.
 - Siedman College of Business
 - Reduce the number of members from seven (7) to five (5) for the College Personnel Committee
 - Kirkhof College of Nursing

- Currently operates under above policy
- College of Education
 - Currently operates under above policy

Every effort will be made to have ~~At least one woman and one minority person must be a part of the~~ composition of each ~~Division/Autonomous School College /Library~~ Personnel Committee be balanced in race and gender. ~~If one woman and one minority person are not included, another election for the entire Personnel Committee should be held so that the final composition of the committee would include at least one woman and one minority person.~~

Rationale:

- The University has grown to the extent that women now constitute 44% of the faculty. It is felt that because of this, women are adequately represented in terms of university governance and need not be identified as such in the policy
- In regards to minority membership, it is felt that while we need to have minority representation on this committee, that our few minority faculty members can only serve on so many committees. The fact that minority members are being required to be on committees (whether elected or appointed) may be taking away time and effort they would prefer to spend elsewhere (teaching or scholarship).

All regular faculty members (Section 2.1) will be eligible to vote for members to their respective ~~Division/Autonomous School College/Library's~~ Personnel Committee. Each ~~Division/Autonomous School College/Library~~ shall decide if the Dean will serve as an ex-officio member of the Personnel Committee.

The Library's Personnel Committee will be composed of five (5) ~~regular~~ tenured faculty members; two (2) librarians elected from library and one (1) ~~regular~~ tenured faculty member each from three of the seven ~~Divisions/Autonomous Schools Colleges~~. Election of members from the ~~Divisions/Autonomous Schools Colleges~~ will be on a rotating basis. The chairperson of the Library Personnel Committee will be a librarian elected by the committee membership.

Rationale

- A statement above indicates that one tenured faculty member each from three of the seven Colleges will be elected to serve on the Library Personnel Committee. The University actually has eight colleges, not seven - the College of University-wide Interdisciplinary Initiatives was not included in this count of seven.
- The College of University-wide Interdisciplinary Initiatives at this point does not have a department which grants tenure. Faculty have joint appointments and hold tenure or are on tenure track in a "home"

department as well as have responsibilities in second department. While it is not the intent to exclude that College, it is felt at the current time that faculty who wish to serve on committees can do so out of one of the departments in their joint appointment.

- As the College of University-wide Interdisciplinary Initiative grows and has tenure granting departments, then changes will need to be made to this policy.

A committee member may be excused from a particular decision making process should there be a conflict of interest. The Chair of the ~~Division/Autonomous School~~ College/Library Personnel Committee, in consultation with the Dean, shall determine if a conflict of interest exists. If it is asserted that the Chair of the ~~Division/Autonomous School~~ College/Library Personnel Committee has a conflict of interest, the Chair of the Executive Committee of the Senate, in consultation with the Chair of the ~~Division/Autonomous School~~ College/Library Personnel Committee and the Dean, shall determine if a conflict of interest exists. However, the fact that a Committee member is from the same unit department as the regular faculty member being reviewed is not per se a conflict of interest.

Other issues pertaining to the committee membership and the selection of a chair will be determined by the respective ~~Divisions, Autonomous Schools,~~ Colleges and the Library.

- b. **Personnel Committee Meetings.** Electronic or Mechanical recording is not permitted at any time during Personnel Committee meetings. However, votes, date, time, place of the meeting, and names of who were in attendance. The following must be present and vote on the personnel action in order to constitute a recommendation of the Personnel Committee: four when there are five members and sixteen when there are twenty members. Should the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences divide into subgroups (four committees composed of five members, then four of the five members on that subcommittee must be present); ~~four when there are six members, and five when there are seven members.~~ (See Section 2.10.2A for composition of a Personnel Committee.) While proxy and absentee votes are not allowed, absent committee members may send their evaluations to all committee members. If the Personnel Committee is unable to carry out its responsibilities due to the absence of one committee member who misses three consecutive meetings, the Dean will be notified for the purpose of facilitating the designation of an appropriate replacement.

FPPC MEMBERSHIP

XXVII. OPERATIVE RULES FOR UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEES
(WHITE PAGES - 105-106)

FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE

Membership:

Faculty (elected by and from): 4 from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, 1 from each of the remaining tenure granting colleges ~~1 from Arts and Humanities, 1 from Science and Mathematics, 1 from Social Sciences, 1 from Seidman School of Business, 1 from each of the autonomous professional schools,~~ and 1 from the library.

not edit

Faculty (appointed): 1 untenured faculty member will be appointed by ECS.

TT

Divisional College representatives must be tenured and have served on a college (divisional or autonomous school) personnel committee for at least one year within the past six years.

If this group does not include at least one representative of a minority group, ~~one woman, and one untenured faculty member,~~ and one representative from each gender, the ECS will appoint additional members to ensure representation of these groups.

Assistant Vice President for Human Resources (ex officio)

Assistant to the Provost (ex officio)

Term: 2 years staggered; appointed members shall serve one-year terms (renewable)

Purpose: To review faculty personnel policy matters that extend beyond the division, as specified by ECS, and make appropriate recommendations.

Reporting: To ECS/UAS

*add ex officio
unclerked*

dist 2/13/04
ECS

Date: September 30, 2003
To: Jean Nagelkerk, Chair, ECS
From: Ellen Schendel, Chair, University Assessment Committee
Subject: UAC's Response to Reorganization

The University Assessment Committee met in August to read and discuss assessment reports; at that meeting, we also discussed reorganization and its impact on our committee's work. We noted the following:

First, the administrative structure of such a large College of Arts and Sciences will need to include a system for handling assessment-related issues. The administration will need to collect and read self-studies and assessment reports as well as manage any accreditation needs of the various departments within the College. This will be a large task for the dean (and/or associate deans), given the large number of departments and programs within the College.

Second, the UAC is currently working with the Rita Grant, Chair of the University Curriculum Committee, to devise a reporting schedule that will streamline and reduce the number of reports each unit must write. In constructing this reporting system, the UAC will do its best to avoid scheduling too many departments/programs within each College to have self-studies and assessment reports due at the same time—particularly in the College of Arts and Sciences, where the dean and UAC representatives from the College could easily become overwhelmed with reports from so many departments.

Third, we note that the most recent assessment report for Distance Education addressed issues of access and number of course offerings. The quality of the curriculum and instructional techniques as understood by student outcomes was not addressed in the report. This is in part because Distance Education does not have access to course evaluations. We're concerned that important issues connected to the program, such as the efficacy of offering courses online, are not being discussed in ways that allow for enough faculty input into ensuring quality courses. We hope that the final reorganization plan will include avenues for better communication between faculty and Distance Education.

And finally, we discussed the issue of representation on the UAC. It's important that there be enough representatives from the large College of Arts and Sciences to ensure the committee's makeup reflects the College's large range of disciplinary expertise and ways of understanding assessment.

TO: Jean Nagelkerk, ECS
FROM: FTLC Advisory Committee; Rebecca Veltman, Chair
SUBJECT: Proposed Reorganization feedback
DATE: September 12, 2003

The FTLC Advisory Committee met this week as requested by ECS to discuss the impact of the proposed reorganization. We discussed the pros and cons of the proposed plan in relation to the FTLC and teaching and learning at GVSU.

In regard to the position of the FTLC in the proposed plan, the committee supports the location and reporting structure of the FTLC. This organizational structure will allow the FTLC to continue to be a resource that is equally available to all faculty members and staff. In the past 5 years, the FTLC has been able to achieve significant visibility within the University, which has allowed programming to grow so that more grants, programs, and services can be provided. The proposed structure will continue to have a beneficial impact on teaching and learning at the University by allowing for continued visibility and access between faculty, staff, and the resources at the FTLC.

In regard to overall teaching and learning at the GVSU, the committee was supportive of the plan in many ways. The large Liberal Arts and Sciences College has the potential to increase the emphasis on liberal arts at GVSU, which we feel is essential for undergraduate education. Further, the decentralized model has the potential to facilitate decision-making and increase efficiency.

We feel it is important to emphasize that the success of the reorganization plan depends on continued communication and involvement between colleges and departments. There is a risk that the plan may alienate colleges rather than facilitate linkages. Furthermore, a well-thought out transitional plan is essential to creating a positive learning environment for students (and a positive teaching environment for faculty) during the change. Lastly, we feel that the Dean of the Liberal Arts and Sciences College must be carefully chosen, and must have a vision that allows for each division in that college to continue to be effective and adequately represented in University decision making.