

# Grand Valley State University

## Executive Committee of the Senate

### February 4, 2005

**PRESENT:** Yatin Bahgwat, John Bender, Jay Cooper, Gayle Davis (ex officio), Rob Franciosi (vice chair), Richard Hall, William Hosterman, Paul Leidig, George Lundskow, Kristine Mullendore, Jean Nagelkerk (Chair), Karen Novotny, John Peck, Lisa Rigsby, William Rogers, Ellen Schendel, Kathleen Underwood

**GUESTS:** Teresa Beck, Catherine Frerichs

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action / Decisions
1. Approval of Agenda	The agenda of February 4, 2005 was reviewed.	The agenda of February 4, 2005 was approved as amended.
2. Minutes approval	<p>The minutes of January 14, 2005 were reviewed.</p> <p>The minutes of January 21, 2005 were reviewed.</p>	<p>The minutes of January 14, 2005 were approved.</p> <p>The minutes of January 21, 2005 were approved, as amended.</p>
3. Report of Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The Chair reminded the committee that the lunch with the Board of Trustees is next week.</li> <li>b) The official faculty count for Winter 2005 has been received from Human Resources. Dean's offices will receive the information to prepare a slate for elections.</li> <li>c) The Academic Policies and Standards Committee has revised the Withdrawal Policy for review. Copies will be distributed electronically.</li> <li>e) A request for additional members for the Advisory Council was received.</li> <li>f) The Core Values from the Strategic Planning Retreat will be sent to ECS members electronically.</li> <li>g) A call for nominations to the Advisory Council was received. One ECS member and 2 Faculty-at-large are requested.</li> <li>h) The Dean of CUll will send a draft of their personnel committee composition to the Chair.</li> <li>i) An additional UAS meeting has been scheduled for 2/25/05. The location will be announced at a later date.</li> </ul>	

4. Report of Provost	<p>a) Provost Davis reported that she met with the Academic Officers in Lansing this morning.</p> <p>b) Monday, February 7 is the Governor's state of the state address.</p> <p>c) Provost Davis reported that an opportunity for a \$25,000 award for excellence in a commercialization project was announced by the state. Additional opportunities for awards include the Carter Partnership Award for successful public/private collaboration initiative.</p>	
5. Report of Student Senate	No Report	No Discussion
6. Old Business	<p>a) <u>Strategic Planning -- Global Issues from Retreat</u></p> <p>b) <u>Prospectus for a Master of Education (Chemistry Concentration)</u></p> <p>c) <u>Prospectus for MS in Safety Management</u></p> <p>d) <u>Prospectus and Final Plan Task Force</u></p>	<p>No Discussion</p> <p>No Discussion</p> <p>No Discussion</p> <p>Names of nominees to the Task Force are being compiled.</p>

7. New Business	<p>a) <u>Intergroup Dialogue Followup -</u> Catherine Frerichs presented an overview of the Intergroup Dialogue work. Focus groups and electronic surveys have been conducted. Three faculty members are requested to serve on the IGD committee; Kristine Mullendore volunteered to serve as the ECS representative for the stakeholder committee; nominations for 2 faculty-at-large should be sent to Catherine Frerichs, Lisa Haight in the Provost's Office, and Chair Nagelkerk.</p> <p>b) <u>Library Task Force Members</u> Paul Murphy has asked for additional faculty members for the Library Task Force.</p> <p>c) <u>College Personnel Committee</u> The FPPC College Personnel Committee recommendations were distributed. Teresa Beck presented an overview of the seven recommendations and how the recommendations would impact faculty.  After much discussion, changes were suggested and will be incorporated into a new document that will be distributed electronically.</p>	<p>ECS discussed recommendation #1 instituting a university personnel committee. ECS members commended FPPC in thinking out of the box. The majority of ECS members recommended the departmental and college personnel committee configuration.</p> <p>There was discussion of having a university personnel committee for promotion to full professor or for select tenure and promotion considerations.</p>
-----------------	---	---

	<p>d) <u>Honors Advisory Committee</u></p> <p>e) <u>Center for Excellence in Scholarship and Creative Activities</u></p> <p>f) <u>Intellectual Property Task Force</u>  A request for additional representatives for the Intellectual Property Task Force has been received from Charles Standridge. Senators are asked to send the names of faculty interested in serving on the Intellectual Property Task Force to Charles Standridge, Jean Nagelkerk, and Lisa Haight.</p>	<p>Teresa Beck will distribute a revised personnel document on Monday. Each ECS member is to query their constituents on the personnel recommendations for discussion at the ECS meeting on 2/11/05.</p> <p>No Discussion</p> <p>No Discussion</p> <p>Senators are asked to send the names of faculty interested in serving on the Intellectual Property Task Force to Charles Standridge, Jean Nagelkerk, and Lisa Haight by February 21, 2005.</p>
<p>8. 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 5:00pm</p>	

# Executive Committee of the Senate

February 4, 2005

DeVos Center, 138E

## Agenda

1. Approval of Agenda
2. Approval of Minutes - January 14, 2005 and January 28, 2005
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) Prospectus for a Masters of Education (Chemistry Concentration)
    - o At UCC Stage
    - o At FSBC Stage
  - c) Prospectus & Final Plan Task Force
    - o One member from each of the standing committees and one ECS rep
    - o John Peck , ECS representative. Standing committee chairs to send names to Chair Nagelkerk and Lisa Haight.
  - d) Prospectus for MS in Safety Management
    - o At UCC Stage
    - o At FSBC Stage
7. New Business
  - a) Intergroup Dialogue Followup
    - Faculty-Only Focus groups
    - Stakeholders from across the university
  - b) Library Task Force members
    - Adding one or two faculty representatives
  - c) College Personnel Committee
    - FPPC recommendations
  - d) Honors Advisory Committee
    - Committee Proposal
  - e) Center for Excellence in Scholarship and Creative Activities
    - At Provost’s Office
8. Ideas for Future Fora
  - Workload equity and enlarging regular faculty
  - The “Next Level”: What is it?
  - Graduate versus Undergraduate programs

Adjournment

## College Personnel Committee Recommendations

1. Issue: Should committees have members external to the college – which colleges? All of them? None of them.

Recommendation: Establish a university-wide personnel committee to replace the college personnel committee. This committee would review department (or in some instances college or school) recommendations for contract renewal, tenure, and promotion. Sabbaticals can stay within college.

The process would flow as follows:

Department review → University Personnel Committee → Dean → Provost

Make up: Follow the Senate Model or some variation of

### Rationale

- Allows second review to a “university wide” perspective
- Makes GVSU uniform with other universities
- Keeps the decision-making at unit level – makes the unit provide more clear communication as to rationale for recommendation

2. Issue: Who votes on contract renewal, tenure and promotions?

Recommendation: Tenured and tenure-track faculty only can vote at the department level for personnel reviews

3. Issue: Can tenure-track faculty choose not to vote and how does that impact quorum and valid vote.

Recommendation: Tenure-track faculty can choose not to vote through their first review and it will not affect the quorum.

### Rationale:

- Tenure track faculty should be given choice, however, if department is made up of majority of tenure-track and they all choose not to vote, then who is making personnel decision
- After their first review, tenure-track faculty will have sat through two reviews of their peers and their own.
- After their first review, they have the experience and knowledge of what constitutes the review and should more comfortable in their decision making
- If after their first review, they choose to not vote or participate, it will impact quorum and valid vote

4. Issue: Should the Dean be member of college committee and if so, the role of the Dean.

Recommendation: The Dean shall not be present at college personnel meetings unless the committee by majority vote annually determines that he or she may attend on a regular or occasional basis in an ex-officio non-voting capacity.

This attendance could range from just one candidate review, or could be to attend all meetings.

5. What should be the size of the college personnel committees?

Recommendation: Colleges must have a minimum of 5 members, some of whom may be external. College committee cannot have more than one person from any one department. Colleges must state the number and the composition of their committees in their by-laws.

6. How are faculty selected for these committees?

Recommendation: Tenured <sup>faculty</sup> and tenure track faculty will be nominated and voted on by the tenured and tenure track faculty of the college.

7. Should minority faculty be required on all college committees?

Recommendation: Waiting for report from Nanette Reynolds

# CLAIMING A LIBERAL EDUCATION INITIATIVE

## INTERGROUP DIALOGUE REPORT

WINTER, 2005

Prepared by Diana Pace, Donna Henderson-King, and Catherine Frerichs

During the fall of 2004, a series of three Intergroup Dialogues (IGD's) were held among three constituency groups: faculty, staff, and students. Eighteen intergroup dialogue groups, each consisting of 7 to 10 participants, were configured. Each group was made up of faculty and students, staff and students, or faculty and staff. A total of 55 faculty, 59 students, and 47 staff participated.

The meetings were organized around readings related to liberal education, student/faculty expectations, the results of focus group discussions on these topics last spring, diversity and inclusive excellence, and plans developed as part of the CLE initiative.

The participants provided written feedback at their last meeting, and their conveners also provided summaries of each of their meetings. The following recommendations are based on a preliminary analysis of that information. It should be noted that the constituency groups were surprisingly consistent in their recommendations.

### **Recommendation 1. Clear, consistent communication regarding liberal education and expectations must occur throughout the university.**

There were strong and frequent messages from all groups that **all members** of the university community must be able to define liberal education and articulate its importance. This emphasis must begin even before students arrive at Grand Valley, and must continue through students' undergraduate career. As one student said, "Explain to students before they even enroll here, what a liberal education is or what this university's idea of liberal education is."

Students do not know what a liberal education is; many faculty and staff are also unclear as to what liberal education means at GVSU. A faculty member noted, "GVSU needs to change its rhetoric. It calls itself a 'lib arts' college but doesn't enforce or support this idea in its advertising. Students think the faculty are at fault, and faculty think the students are at fault. We need to figure out what we want." It is up to the university to clarify the meaning of liberal education at GVSU and convey it to all of our constituents. Such a change has major implications for institutional marketing, admissions, orientation, and first-year experience.

- Marketing messages to prospective students and their parents must communicate the centrality of liberal education and high expectations.
- Marketing messages, orientations, and the first-year experience need to be seamless and consistent in delivering these messages to our students.
- University-wide and college-wide new faculty orientations must present the same messages that students receive.
- Current faculty must also be reminded of the centrality of liberal education at Grand Valley and the implications it has for their teaching.

- The role of General Education and Themes needs to be re-examined and clarified to students and faculty.

**Recommendation 2. The learning environment at Grand Valley must be characterized by high expectations.**

Many of the Intergroup Dialogue members stressed the importance of faculty having high expectations of their students. Some participants indicated that faculty thought they were being more demanding than students felt they were. Although some students expressed concern that faculty recognize the competing demands for students' time, students generally indicated a willingness to meet higher demands. One student commented, "I am not the only one frustrated, as a student, with the consumer mentality, i.e., there are others that want a change or shift in attitudes."

However, faculty need support and encouragement in this shift. ("Change the existing culture that pressures us to 'dumb down,'" said a faculty participant.) Faculty need more resources and support for professional development. They need to be held accountable for implementing high expectations, and they need to know that they will not be penalized for negative student evaluations based on the implementation of higher expectations.

- Faculty need to state expectations explicitly in all their courses.
- Increased opportunities for improving the quality of teaching must be provided; faculty should be rewarded for improving their teaching skills.
- The evaluation of teaching must be improved by developing an all-university form and by broadening the basis for evaluation beyond student evaluations.
- There needs to be greater consistency of expectations and assessment among sections of the same course.

**Recommendation 3. There must be greater emphasis on learning.**

There needs to be a shift at Grand Valley from a focus on teaching to a focus on learning and learning outcomes as reflected in the goals of a liberal education. Many of the IGD participants recommended a shift to active learning away from lecturing only. They noted that the skills associated with liberal education—critical thinking, problem solving, and appreciation for differences in others—are better developed through active learning than through memorizing information.

A better way of determining the extent and quality of student learning, aside from grades in each course, needs to be considered. A number of participants mentioned the value of assessing the overall learning of students. Several participants remarked on the significance of diversity among students, staff and faculty, and the need for the university community to value diversity, as a part of a liberal education.

- Faculty should be able to articulate how their courses meet the goals of a liberal education.
- There must be more intentional support from deans and department heads for teaching strategies that involve students in their learning.

- There must be a greater effort to integrate the curricular and co-curricular aspects of students' experience at Grand Valley, whether in Residential Life, service learning, internships, or study abroad programs.

**Recommendation 4. Intercultural awareness must be integrated into the fabric of the institution.**

Some of the IGD participants expressed the view that while lip service is paid to diversity, it is not truly valued at Grand Valley. They said, for example, that the administration should "mean what it says about valuing diversity. Students who know that they are not really "ok" because of sexual orientation, race, etc., can't be fully integrated into a learning community." Said another, "Our attempt to promote our "diversity" through marketing is seen as misleading and dishonest by our students." Participants called for greater substance in addressing issues of diversity.

- The work of the Office of Multicultural Affairs and the Affirmative Action Task Force should be supported and extended.
- More needs to be done on both recruitment and retention of minority students and faculty.
- There needs to be an emphasis on building intercultural awareness and skills among faculty, staff, and students.
- Opportunities must be provided for students to work with other students different from themselves.

**Recommendation 5. The importance of liberal education and high expectations must be fostered through ongoing dialogue.**

Participants in the Intergroup Dialogues stated repeatedly how valuable this process was. They particularly enjoyed the opportunity for dialogue, the chance to talk with others in the university community they didn't necessarily know, and the chance to explore specific topics they found useful and interesting.

Many of the participants pointed to the need for shared goals, and a stronger sense of community, across the university. They remarked on the need for crossing all kinds of boundaries, including those based on discipline, constituency (faculty, staff, and students), and curricular and co-curricular interests. In this regard, a staff member asked for "help [for students] in connecting all aspects of life and education together."

- Additional efforts should be made for continued dialogues among members of the university on issues such as the meaning of a liberal education, diversity, and increased expectations.
- Greater efforts to cross boundaries in a variety of ways need to be made: more cross-disciplinary work and discussion groups that include constituents from various university groups.