

Grand Valley State University

University Academic Senate #9

February 27, 2004

Present:

Madj Al-Mallah, Lawrence Beery, John Bender, Yatin Bhagwat, Cheryl Boudreaux, Agnes Britton, Jay Cooper, Lee Copenhaver, Rob Franciosi (vice chair), Bill Hosterman, Rita Grant (for Kurt Fanning), Hugh Jack, Harold Larson, Paul Leidig, Neil MacDonald, Jessica McAuliffe (student), Kristine Mullendore, Jean Nagelkerk (chair), Alex Nesterenko, Steve Nizielski, Karen Novotny, John Peck, Allison Reynolds (student), Russell Rhoads, Lisa Riggsby, Senez Rodriguez (for Robert Hendersen), William Rogers, Barbara Roos, Ben Rudolph, Ellen Schendel, John Seip (student), Paul Stephenson, Joel Stillerman, Ted Sundstrom, Tony Thompson, Andrew Topper, Rachael Voorhees (student), Wendy Wenner (ex officio), Don Williams

Guests:

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action/Decisions
1. Approval of Agenda	The agenda of February 27, 2004 was reviewed.	The agenda was approved.
2. Approval of Minutes	The minutes of February 20, 2004 were reviewed.	The minutes of February 20, 2004 were approved, as amended.
3. Report of Chair	a. Senators are asked to RSVP to Lisa Haight for the April 22 luncheon with the Board of Trustees. b. FPPC proposal for personnel policy changes will be the next major agenda item for UAS, after ECS review.	
4. Report of Provost	No Report	
5. Report of Student Senate President	a. The Student Senate asks that faculty encourage their students to participate in the Student Senate elections that are coming up. Their long-term goal is to have 5,000 students that vote in any given election. Deadline for nominations is March 18. b. The Student Senate met with their counterparts from various public universities to discuss a per capita funding proposal.	
6. Report of Standing Committee Chairs	No Report	No Discussion
7. Old Business	a. Bylaws and Guidelines to Senate Practice.	No Discussion
8. New Business	a. Reorganization i. Transition ii. Faculty Governance Representation The Chair summarized discussions from ECS and guiding principles they followed while developing the ECS and	No Discussion

standing committee representation.

Executive Committee of the Senate Representation

Don Williams withdrew the motion he presented last week. Rob Franciosi seconded the motion.

The ECS representation scheme presented last week (see below) was reviewed. Discussion.

7 CLAS

2 Seidman

6 (1 each) from the other Colleges

1 Student Representative

1 Library Representative

Provost or designee (ex officio, non-voting)

n=17

- *Term of office for faculty members is 2 years (beginning at the end of winter semester)*
- *ECS members will also serve as UAS senators for their elected term*
- *Terms for members of colleges with two (2) or more representatives are staggered.*
- *If the number of representatives from professional colleges increase, the number of representatives from the CLAS will increase to match this number, based on a 50% principle (CUJl representative is counted in CLAS membership)*

A motion was made to halt further discussion to vote on the ECS representation model as presented.

It was moved to accept the ECS Representation Model as presented.

MOTION: The UAS recommends halting further discussion to vote on the ECS representation model as presented.
APPROVED: 26 Yes; 11 No

MOTION: The UAS accepts the ECS Representation Model as presented:
7 representatives from CLAS (one from the Art and Music cluster; and two from each of the other three clusters)*
2 Seidman
6 (1 each) from the remaining Colleges
1 Library
1 Student Senate President
Provost (or designee), ex officio non-voting
**to be used for the transition period during which time CLAS may develop their own internal representation scheme to send to ECS/UAS.*
APPROVED: 29 Yes; 11 No

The Chair summarized ECS discussions for each of the standing committee representation models.
STANDING COMMITTEES
All language regarding the internal representation of CLAS is transitional to provide CLAS time to develop their own internal representation scheme.

Faculty Facilities Planning Committee (FFPAC)
FTLCAC recommends that the standard model for standing committees be used for the FFPAC, with the amendment of term adjustment to 3 years.

It was moved to approve the representation scheme for FFPAC as presented, with the amendment of adjusting the term to three years.

University Assessment Committee (UAC)
UAC prefers to use a special representation scheme as outlined below:

- 7 CLAS
- 2 Seidman
- 6 (1 each) from the other Colleges
- 1 Library Representative
- 1 Service Unit Representative appointed by the Provost from Academic Resources and Special Programs, Academic Services, Continuing Education and Information Technology, or Student Services)
- 1 Student Representative
- Director of Pew Faculty Teaching & Learning Center (ex

MOTION: UAS approves the representation scheme for FFPAC as presented, with the amendment: of term adjusted to 3 years:
7 Representatives from CLAS
2 Representatives from Seidman
6 Representatives (1 each) from the remaining Colleges
1 Student Representative
1 Library Representative
1 Facilities Planning representative (ex officio, non-voting)
1 Faculty Teaching & Learning Center representative (ex officio, non-voting)
APPROVED: 38 Yes; 0 No

officio, non-voting)
Provost or designee (ex officio, non-voting)
- Term will continue to be 3 years for faculty members

It was moved to approve the representation scheme for UAC as presented.

MOTION: UAS approves the representation scheme for UAC as presented:

- 7 Representatives from CLAS
- 2 Representatives from Seidman
- 6 Representatives (1 each) from the remaining Colleges
- 1 Library Representative
- 1 Service Unit Representative (appointed by the Provost from Academic Resources and Special Programs, Academic Services, Continuing Education and Information Technology, or Student Services)
- 1 Student Representative
- Director of Pew FTLC (ex officio non-voting)
- Provost or designee (ex officio, non-voting)

APPROVED: 37 Yes; 0 N

Faculty Salary and Budget Committee

The standard model was proposed for FSBC as they did not put forth a specific model. FSBC felt a representative from CUll was not essential. Discussion.

After discussion, the UAS senators felt each college having representation should be maintained.

It was moved to have FSBC use the standard model for standing committees as their representation scheme.

MOTION: UAS approves FSBC using the standard model for standing committees as their representation scheme:

- 7 Representatives from CLAS
- 2 Representatives from Seidman
- 6 Representatives (1 each) from the remaining Colleges
- 1 Student Representative
- 1 Library Representative
- Provost or designee (ex officio, non-voting)

APPROVED: 38 Yes; 0 No

General Education Subcommittee (GES)

The standard model for standing committees was presented. Discussion. After input from General Education Subcommittee and Seidman representatives, it was determined that Seidman needs only 1 representative and that CLAS needed 2 additional members. The distribution (below) was discussed and a proportional transition scheme was developed.

- 9 CLAS
 - (3 Humanities, 3 Science & Math, 2 Social Science, 1 Art & Music)
- 7 (1 each) from the remaining colleges
- 1 Library Representative
- 1 Student Representative
- Provost or designee (ex officio, non-voting)

It was moved to approve the representation scheme for GES as amended.

MOTION: UAS accepts the GES

Representation model as amended:

- 9 Representatives from CLAS
- 7 (1 each) from the remaining Colleges
- 1 Library Representative
- 1 Student Representative
- Provost or designee (ex officio, non-voting)

APPROVED: 35 Yes; 3 No

UCC

Rita Grant presented the preferred UCC representation model.

The proposed model for UCC is:

- 7 CLAS
 - (1 Art & Music; 2 each from the other 3 clusters)
- 7 (1 each) from the remaining Colleges
- 1 Library Representative
- 1 Student Representative
- 1 General Education Subcommittee Representative
- 1 Graduate Council Representative (ex officio, non-voting)

Provost or designee (ex officio, non-voting)
* a representative from each College Curriculum Committee will serve on UCC, if possible.

Discussion. Senators discussed the merits of having continuity and having a college representative on UCC, but were concerned of heavy workload & the feasibility of this happening consistently.

Hal Larson moved that at least 1 rep from each College Curriculum Committee serve as a member of UCC. Paul Leidig seconded.

Discussion. Senators discussed the merit of having a link between the Graduate Council and UCC, and felt this was important. A discussion ensued about the merit of having a representative ex officio non-voting.

It was moved by Rob Franciosi that the Grad Council representative will be non-voting, ex officio. Seconded by Lee Copenhaver.

It was moved to accept the UCC model, with the amendment of the Graduate Council representative as an ex officio non-voting member.

Faculty Personnel Policy Committee (FPPC)

Teresa Beck presented the proposed FPPC model. She indicated that the original FPPC proposal included only tenured Faculty. She also indicated that non-tenure track faculty members are not involved in personnel issues at any other level within the university and their policies are handled by administration. FPPC members feel they should not be represented in an ex officio capacity. The proposed FPPC model is:

4 CLAS

MOTION: UAS recommends that a representative from each College Curriculum Committee serve as a member of UCC
FAILED: 8 Yes; 31 No

MOTION: UAS recommends that the Graduate Council representative is an ex officio non-voting member.
APPROVED: 25 Yes; 9 No

MOTION: UAS approves the representative scheme for UCC as amended.
7 Representatives from CLAS
(1 Art & Music; 2 each from the other 3 clusters)
7 (1 each) from the remaining Colleges
1 Library Representative
1 Student Representative
1 Graduate Council Representative (ex officio, non-voting)
1 General Education Subcommittee Representative
Provost or designee (ex officio, non-voting)
APPROVED: 39 Yes; 0 No

	<p>1 from each of other colleges (not CUII) 1 Library Representative Representatives would be Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty who have been through a minimum of 2 personnel reviews & served on a college personnel committee for at least one year. Assistant Vice President for Human Resources (ex officio, non-voting) Assistant/Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (ex officio, non-voting) - Term would be 2 years</p> <p>There was much discussion about the FPPC model. There was a concern that the provision of having to serve on a college personnel committee for at least 1 year within the past 6 years would be hard to enforce, and has been problematic in the past.</p> <p>A motion was made by Karen Novotny to amend the FPPC language to "...and have served on a college (divisional or autonomous school) personnel committee for at least one year." Seconded by Cheryl Boudreaux.</p> <p>Further discussion on the FPPC model ensued. Other items that were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tenured versus Tenure Track status to serve on FPPC • Whether a non-tenure track faculty member appointed by ECS (ex officio) be part of FPPC representation. • Should CUII have a rep on FPPC? <p>iii. Personnel Issues iv. Other Issues</p>	
<p>MOTION: The UAS recommends that the Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty on FPPC have served on a college (divisional or autonomous school) personnel committee for at least one year. APPROVED: 34 Yes; 0 No</p>	<p>The next UAS meeting is scheduled for March 12 at 250 KC</p>	
<p>9. Adjournment</p>	<p>The meeting adjourned at 5:01 p.m.</p>	

Memorandum

TO: University Academic Senate
FROM: Jean Nagelkerk, Chair, ECS/UAS
SUBJECT: Meeting of the University Academic Senate
DATE: February 24, 2004
cc: ECS/UAS Distribution

Meeting Date: **February 27, 2004**
Time: **3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.**
Place: **136 E DeVos Center**

Proposed Agenda

1. Approval of Agenda
2. Approval of Minutes (Minutes 2/20/04)
3. Report from the Chair
4. Report from the Provost
5. Report from the Student Senate President
6. Report from the Standing Committee Chairs
7. Old Business
 - a. Bylaws and Guidelines to Senate Practice (11/21/02) – *(Hold discussion until after Reorganization)*
8. New Business
 - a. Reorganization
 - i. Transition
 - ii. Faculty Governance Representation
 - iii. Personnel Issues
 - iv. Other Issues
9. Adjournment