

**Grand Valley State University**  
**Executive Committee of the Senate #13**  
**February 6, 2004**

**Present:** Gayle Davis (ex officio), Kirt Fanning, Rob Franciosi (vice chair), Richard Hall, Robert Hendersen, Harold Larson, Paul Leidig, George Lundskow, Jean Nagelkerk (chair), Lisa Rigsby, Ellen Schendel, Andrew Topper (for Jay Cooper), Wendy Wenner (ex officio)

**Guests:** John Peck

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action / Decisions
1. Approval of Agenda	The agenda of February 6, 2004 was reviewed, as amended.	The amended agenda was approved.
2. Approval of Minutes	The Minutes of January 30, 2004 were reviewed.	The minutes of January 30, 2004 were approved, as amended.
3. Report of Chair	The Minutes of January 9, 2004 were reviewed.	The minutes of January 9, 2004 were approved, as submitted.
	a) The reception with ECS and Board members was successful. Board Chair, Dottie Johnson, would also like to have a reception with UAS members to get to know them better. A suggestion was made to have a UAS reception with Board members prior to their next meeting on April 22, 2004.	Senators will be polled on availability for an April 22, 2004 event.
	b) Priscilla Kimboko met with the ECS Chair regarding the Graduate Council Final Plan. Final Plan went to all standing committees of UAS and the DCC's.	Feedback to ECS Chair and Provost is requested by March 8, 2004.
	c) Entrepreneurship Minor -- currently on hold in Provost's office	ECS Chair will meet with Provost Davis to determine the status of the final plan.
	d) Memo from Robert Beasecker regarding the Library Planning Task Force was distributed. Discussion.	Chair will clarify intentions with author.
4. Report of Provost	a) A press release on GVSU's intent to comply with Governor Granholm's request for tuition restraint was distributed. Discussion. b) Provost Davis reported that given the new budget proposal there is a budget gap to fill; class section(s) and sizes will be reviewed and new, unfilled Tenure/Tenure Track positions will be carefully evaluated. c) The Implementation Plan for Reorganization has been distributed.	

5. Report of Student Senate President	No Report	
6. Report of Standing Committee Chairs	No Report	
7. Old Business	<p>a) Strategic Planning Goals: Steps to Enhance quality Education  i. Freshman Seminar and Orientation (input from Student Services.  b) Workload Equity – Release time equity – Accountability re. release time, unit projections, sabbaticals, administration promises.  c) Visioning the “next level”</p>	<p>No Discussion  No Discussion  No Discussion  No Discussion</p>
8. New Business	<p>d) Discuss faculty representation on Deans Council and Budget Committee.</p> <p>a) Elect Faculty Advising Committee Member  i. Faculty-at-Large  1. Sue Bosold, Assistant Professor of Nursing</p> <p>b) Reorganization  i. Transition  ii. Faculty Governance Representation  <u>ECS Discussion</u>  • Representative Model 3, (6 CLAS, 1 per College (5), 2 SCOB, 1 Library, 1 Student, ?CUII) was discussed.  • New Representative model, Model 4, was identified.  CLAS (7)  1 each College (5)  2 SCOB (2)  1 Library (1)  1 Student Representative (1)  1 CUII (1)  n=17</p> <p><u>CUII Representation on ECS</u>  It was agreed that CUII would have representation on ECS, and that while the UAS representative count is based on faculty numbers, the ECS will have a fixed number of representatives.</p> <p><u>STANDING COMMITTEE REPRESENTATION</u>  Recommendations from standing committees regarding representation schemes were reviewed. Discussion.</p>	<p>No Discussion  Sue Bosold was approved, by consensus, as the Faculty-at-large representative to the Faculty Advising Committee.  No Discussion  Representative Model 4 identified and was approved, by consensus.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UCC recommendations reviewed.</li> <li>• UAC recommends that the range of disciplines within CLAS is represented. Recommendation closely follows Model 4.</li> <li>• FTLC recommends that ECS develop a representation scheme for their committee.</li> <li>• FPPC model recommendation for representation on their committee was amended (increased from 3 to 4).</li> <li>• FSBC model not yet received.</li> <li>• GES proposal for representation received.</li> <li>• APSC requests additional information</li> <li>• ECS to develop a standing committee representation "model" for those not currently represented; i.e. Facilities, UAC, FTLCAC, etc</li> </ul> <p>iii. Personnel Issues iv. Other Issues</p> <p>c) FTLCAC Memorandum on Adjunct Faculty Salaries Memo of January 19, 2004 was discussed.</p>	<p>UCC Chair will be invited to 2/13/04 meeting.</p> <p>ECS to develop model for UAC.</p> <p>ECS to develop model for FTLC.</p> <p>ECS Chair to contact Chair of FPPC to see if amendment to increase CLAS representation from 3 to 4 is agreeable. FPPC chair will be invited to 2/13/04 meeting.</p> <p>FSBC Chair will be invited to 2/13/04 meeting.</p> <p>GES chair will be invited to 1/13/04 meeting.</p> <p>APSC chair will be invited to 1/13/04 meeting.</p> <p>ECS to develop a standard model representation proposal for use with any newly created standing committees.</p> <p>ECS to develop language for UAS/ECS and standing committees representation schemes for the Academic Governance ByLaws.</p> <p>No Discussion No Discussion</p> <p>FSBC to be charged with reviewing Adjunct Faculty Salaries.</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p>e) Administrative Manual</p> <p>f) Final Plan for Minor in Entrepreneurship  1. UCC Recommendation</p> <p>g) Graduate Council Final Plan</p>	<p>FSBC to review part-time Faculty Compensation. Agreed by consensus.</p> <p>No Discussion</p> <p>No Discussion</p> <p>No Discussion</p>	
<p>9. Adjournment</p>	<p>The meeting was adjourned at 5:07pm</p>	<p>The next ECS meeting is scheduled for 2/13/04 from 1pm to 5pm. Location to be announced.</p>	

4

**Executive Committee of the Senate**  
Friday, February 6, 2004  
107D DeVos Center  
3:00-5:00pm

**Proposed Agenda**

1. Approval of Agenda
2. Approval of Minutes (Approval of Minutes 1/30/04)
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. Strategic Planning Goals: Steps to Enhance Quality Education
    - i. Freshman Seminar and Orientation (input from student services)
  - b. Workload Equity - Release time equity - Accountability re: release time, unit projections, sabbaticals, administration promises
  - c. Visioning the "next level"
  - d. Discuss faculty representation on Deans Council and Budget Committee
8. New Business
  - a. Elect Faculty Advising Committee Member
    - i. Faculty at Large (1)
      1. Sue Bosold, Assistant Professor of Nursing
  - b. Reorganization
    - i. Transition
    - ii. Faculty Governance Representation (*Bring handouts from 1/23/04 meeting*)
    - iii. Personnel Issues
    - iv. Other Issues
  - c. FTLCAC Memorandum on Adjunct Faculty Salaries (*Bring previously distributed memo from FTLCAC*)
  - d. FSBC Charge for Winter 2004 Semester
  - e. Administrative Manual
  - f. Final Plan for Minor In Entrepreneurship
    - i. UCC Recommendation
  - g. Graduate Council Final Plan

**Ideas for Future Fora**

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

## Murray Will Ask GVSU Board to Support Governor's Tuition Restraint Plan

Grand Valley State University President Mark A. Murray said today he will recommend that the university limit its tuition increase for next year's in-state undergraduates to 2.4%. This move is in response to Governor Granholm's request in her State of the State address that universities cap any tuition increase at inflation.

Participation means that tuition would increase by only \$67 next fall. For example, a full-time Michigan resident freshman would be charged \$2,891 per semester.

"In these very challenging fiscal times, the Governor has shown that higher education is a high priority for her," said Murray. "While it will be very difficult for us to comply, I believe we owe it to our students to meet the Governor's request - it means more state support for Grand Valley and tuition relief for our students. Both are important outcomes."

The Governor has said that a university that agrees to hold its tuition rate hike to inflation (2.4%) in the 2004-05 academic year would receive a partial refund of the budget reduction that occurred last December. Under terms of the Governor's plan, the university's appropriation would be raised to \$57.9 million and held at that level during fiscal year 2005. The university began the current 2004 fiscal year with an appropriation of \$59.1 million; that was cut to \$56.1 million in December.

"If the Legislature passes and the Governor signs a higher education appropriation with these features, I will recommend to our Board of Trustees that Grand Valley participate," Murray said. "Grand Valley's participation would remain in force over the coming year so long as the state's financial support also remains unchanged."

Murray will discuss the matter with the Board of Trustees at its next meeting on February 13. Formal Board action would come later in the spring, or early summer as the state budget moves toward completion.

"It is particularly difficult for Grand Valley to adopt this plan because it receives the lowest state appropriation per student and has the state's second lowest overall cost of educating students," explained Murray. "Grand Valley also has fewer out-of-state and graduate students than do some of the other campuses that have so far indicated interest in the plan. Nevertheless, our students and their families expect us to go the extra mile," Murray concluded.

02/06/2004

GRAND VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY  
*Special Collections & University Archives*



M E M O R A N D U M

**TO:** Jean Nagelkerk, Chair ECS/UAS

**FROM:** Robert Beasecker, Interim Library Director

**DATE:** 6 February 2004

**SUBJECT:** ECS Memo of 11 January 2004 (Library Statement)

**COPIES:** Mark A. Murray, President  
Gayle R. Davis, Provost  
Wendy Wenner, Associate VP Academic Affairs

I have this week received a copy of your 11 January memo that charges the Faculty Library Task Force to reconvene and to actively participate in the development of the program statement for the new University Library. I believe that the Faculty Library Task Force (also known as the University Library Planning Committee), has already completed its original charge, and that its reconstitution is not necessary. The Task Force has issued its 15 July 2003 report, *Envisioning the Future Library at Grand Valley State*, in which a program statement is outlined and specific recommendations given for the new library.

It is my belief that we are now at a stage in the process where further development of the library concept and detailed planning should be done by a smaller group that is composed of library faculty, facilities services personnel, and architects. To make this committee larger with members not familiar with the technical, practical, and theoretical library philosophies and processes, would be counterproductive. The needs of a new library and its services are best identified by the library faculty who are intimately aware and involved with them on a daily basis; they are the resident library experts who would provide appropriate design concepts in accordance with recommended standards of the American Library Association and the Association of College & Research Libraries. It is now the responsibility of the library faculty to see that the plans for the new library provide for the curricular and research needs of students and faculty, consist of enough space for many years of expansion and changing technology, and build a facility that is not only welcoming but is also the true heart of the University.

The Library Faculty and I sincerely appreciate the continuing support of faculty governance in what has been a long quest for the new library building. Now with the interest and attention of the Administration, that quest is closer to fulfillment.

## PROPOSED ECS GOVERNANCE MODEL

The following model is proposed for ECS:

UNIT	FACULTY	REPRESENTATIVES
Seidman College of Business	68	2
College of Community and Public Service	41	1
College of Education	43	1
College of Liberal Arts & Sciences	394	6 or 7 (see below)
College of Engineering & Computing	39	1
College of Health Professions	23	1
Kirkhof College of Nursing	26	1
College of University-Wide I	0	1
Interdisciplinary Initiatives		
Library	18	1
Student Representation	N/A	1

### ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF THIS MODEL

This model preserves the overall representation prior to reorganization. While this is only a semi-proportionate model, it recognizes that units with significantly larger faculty should have a greater representation on ECS. Certainly any solution which is in between the case of equal representation for each college and total proportionate representation will be arbitrary to some extent. For instance, if we start out with a fixed group size then any allocation of this group will be arbitrary since it is based on an arbitrary constraint.

This model also allows for a provision that should any college (or library) grow sufficiently larger, an additional representative would be added to ECS. A rule such as when the ratio of the number of faculty per representative to the total number of faculty exceeds a certain percentage (say 8% to 10%), an additional member is added to ECS for that college. If 10% is used this rule would increase the representation from CLAS in the above model from 6 to 7.

It could be argued that this model allows for a larger group than the one for each college model (Plus one for library and student) of 10 representatives or the four for CLAS and one for the other unit model (a total of 13). However, since the ideal group size of 6 or 7 is exceeded in all cases, it is not clear that as we go into double digits that simply "smaller is better" should be an important consideration. The other factors relative to representation may be more important.