

University Academic Senate Grand Valley State University

September 7, 2007



PRESENT: Majd Al-Mallah, Kirk Anderson, David Bair, John Bender, Matthew Boelkins, Shawn Bultsma, Lee Copenhaver, Katie Cross (Student), Sigrid Danielson, Gayle Davis (ex officio), Roger Ferguson, Rob Franciosi (Chair), Julie Garison, Nancy Giardinna (ex officio), Joe Godwin (ex officio), Gabriele Gottlieb, Cynthia Grapczynski (for Linda Goossen), Jennifer Gross, Julie Guevera (ex officio), Brian Hatzel, Robert Hendersen, Josh Hilbrand (Student), Soon Hong, Paul Keenlance, Lara Kessler, Brian Kingshott, Sharon Leder, Paul Leidig, Nancy Levenburg, Jean Martin, Linda McCrea, William Morison, Kristine Mullendore (Vice Chair), Tonya Parker, Paul Plotkowski (ex officio), Ross Reynolds, Ellen Schendel, Steven Schlicker, Steven Smith (for Charles Baker-Clark), John Stevenson, Bob Swieringa (for Roy Winegar), Kathleen Underwood, Jereon Wagendorp, Deana Weibel

GUESTS: Marlene Kowalski-Braun

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action/ Decisions
1. Approval of Agenda	Following a short address from President Thomas Haas and a question and answer time with UAS members, the meeting was called to order at approximately 4 PM.	The agenda of September 7, 2007 was approved.
2. Minutes approval	The minutes of April 20, 2007 were reviewed.	The minutes of April 20, 2007 were approved.
3. Report of Chair	<p>a) The revised Guide to the Practice of the Senate and its Committees initially adopted by UAS on April 23, 1999 was distributed. Senators were asked to read it and use it this year and to notify the Chair if they identify there any elements that need to be further revised.</p> <p>b) The Chair thanked the Workload Review Committee, which consisted of himself, Ellen Schendel, and Karen Novotny representing faculty and Assistant Vice President Jean Nagelkerk and Associate Vice President Joe Godwin. He thanked the committee members for their work over the summer in reviewing the faculty workload plans documents that were submitted by the faculty in each college. Common principles that emerged were identified along with the larger issues still needing to be addressed and these have been presented to the deans in a written report</p>	

	<p>which was distributed in hard copy to the senators and will be posted to the governance web site. This document will also be sent to FPPC for further review.</p> <p>c) The Chair reported that the search for the Vice President for Equity and Inclusion is progressing well, with strong faculty representation on the search committee.</p> <p>d) The Chair reported that this year the FPPC is expected to issue a document on tenure standards which will be presented to the Senate for consideration as revisions to the Faculty Handbook.</p> <p>e) The Chair reported that work is still being done on a plan to revise the process for submitting Final Plans and Prospectus. The new guidelines will streamline the process with clearer distinctions between the Final Plan and Prospectus requirements including the rationale for these distinctions.</p> <p>f) It is expected that three or four Final Plans that are currently in progress will be ready for ECS and UAS consideration this year.</p> <p>g) The Chair reported that at the ECS retreat a decision was made to sponsor a forum each term this year and the topic decided upon for this fall is Academic Integrity issues for both faculty and students including such possible areas as plagiarism and the appropriate use of electronic resources.</p>	
<p>4. Report of Provost</p>	<p>a) Provost Davis presented the following enrollment statistics for 2007-08:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 23,464 students for 2007-08, which is up .7% from last year. - 3,528 of these were First-Time-In-Any-College (FTIAC) count, down 2.58% from last year when it was 3,632 - 63.7% are female. - 84.4% retention rate in students from last year's students with freshmen status staying at GVSU - the distribution of minority students only changed slightly. <p>b) Provost Davis reported that there has been no action in regard to the Michigan legislature setting the state budget for the upcoming year, which must begin October 1. She stated that the 9.9% tuition increase for Fall 2007 was based on the assumption that GVSU would receive the last payment from the state for the fiscal year, which was deferred. If that funding is not received, there is a possibility of an additional mid-year tuition increase. Provost Davis also pointed out that the GVSU tuition rate is 13th among the 15 Michigan public universities.</p> <p>c) Provost Davis asked for input on a preferred location to hold the Faculty Dinner for the Winter semester.</p>	
<p>5. Report of Student Senate President</p>	<p>a) Student Senators Katie Cross and Josh Hilebrand thanked UAS members for welcoming students to the Senate and stated that they</p>	

6. New Business	<p>are looking forward to a good year.</p> <p>a) Dr. Julie Guevara, Accreditation and Assessment Officer, presented an update on the status of the NCA Self-study and re-accreditation efforts. She reported that the first draft of the self-study has been produced and will be going back to the Steering Committee and she expects to have a document ready for review by the university community in mid-November. Several fora on this draft report are planned for Winter semester, after there has been time to read it to obtain input and comment. A second draft will be ready by mid-February for additional comment and the final report will be sent to NCA in June. The site visit is scheduled for October 13-15, 2008.</p> <p>For further information, go to http://www.gvsu.edu/ncaselfstudy/.</p> <p>b) Marlene Kowalski-Braun, who is co-chair with Nanette Reynolds, presented an update on the search for a Vice President for Inclusion and Equity. The new Vice President will be expected to provide leadership and embed diversity throughout the university. Candidates are expected to visit the university in mid-October.</p> <p>The position will remain open until filled. Everyone is encouraged to provide input into the process at the search committee web site. Brochures are available for distribution and further information can be found at http://www.gvsu.edu/vpincclusion.</p>	
8. Adjournment	The meeting adjourned at 4:40pm	

**Workload Planning Documents
Review Committee Report
August 15, 2007**

Teresa Beck – *Faculty Personnel Policy Committee*
Rob Franciosi – *Executive Committee of the Senate*
Karen Novotny – *Executive Committee of the Senate (Formerly)*
Ellen Schendel – *Executive Committee of the Senate*
Joseph Godwin – *Provost's Office*
Jean Nagelkerk – *Provost's Office*

After reviewing the materials that were submitted, the Committee noted a number of areas in which many units need to finish the work or rethink their plans to comply with the workload policy and to adequately detail the unit expectations.

A summary follows of many of the main principles with which units apparently had difficulty.

Baseline + Significant Focus = Total Workload

Grand Valley's former workload policy identified faculty workload in terms of teaching twelve credit hours with the possibility of approved release for other pursuits that was approximately equivalent in time to teaching a three credit hour class, while other duties for scholarship/creative activity (hereafter called "scholarship") and service were identified not in the workload section, but in sections related to personnel review expectations, etc. During their work on the new policy, FPPC referred to this as a "12 minus" philosophy.

The new workload policy uses as a starting point the former teaching load number -- twelve credit hours per semester -- but sets the expectation that faculty will normally have an equivalent of three credit hours of teaching reassigned to other duties and have a "baseline" expectation of teaching nine credit hours per semester along with baseline scholarship and service responsibilities. FPPC referred to this as the "9 plus" philosophy.

Faculty then would need to define the other activities they would complete in the trade for that three credit hour reassigned time. These other professional activities are called their "significant focus" in the policy, to be determined according to their individual interests and strengths and the needs and resources of the unit. The significant focus involves a small number of activities comparable in total time commitment to teaching a three hour class (8-10 hours per week is a common standard). A significant focus could be teaching an additional three hour class or it could be a level of scholarship or service beyond baseline expectations.

The baseline activities are each expected of everyone, the significant focus activity is flexible and individually determined, and the two taken together make up the total workload. (The significant focus area is not "overload.") The criteria for contract renewal, tenure, or promotion should include successful completion of both baseline and significant focus activities.

Other General Principles

1. First and foremost, the workload plans need to follow and use the language of the FPPC workload policy approved in 2007.

For example, some units got off track when they planned for teaching loads reduced below nine credit hours per semester (9/9); another unit specified that faculty would choose two areas from among teaching, scholarship and service rather than have responsibility for some contributions in all three areas; another allowed paid work (beyond nominal amounts relative to time commitment) to be considered part of workload.

2. Expectations need to be clear in the workload plans both as to the quantity of work and the expected level of quality. If units determine the "weight" or relative importance of different types of work, if expectations are based on rank, or if joint appointments are involved, expectations should be clearly detailed for each of these.

Dist 9/7/07
© UAS

Approved by UAS April 23, 1999
Revised at ECS 8 22 07

Note: Italicized portions and strike-outs indicate the language revisions of ECS discussed during their August 22, 2007 Fall Retreat

Guide to Practice of the Senate and its Committees

A. THE SENATE

1. Format and Presentation of Business

Senate meetings should be the place for final debate and consideration of issues that have been aired previously in the appropriate standing committee or other body. For most efficient use of Senate time, issues should also have been screened by the Executive Committee for obvious problems or omissions. Most business should appear in written form so that each Senator may have a copy for reference. Generally, the Chair of the Executive Committee verbally presents the motion, resolution or report to the Senate, adding any other information considered necessary to understand the issue. The Senate, following standard parliamentary procedure in Robert's Rules, then discusses the issue. Questions, doubts, criticism, support and additional information may be voiced at this time. Usually, substantive policy motions are held over until the next meeting so that Senators may solicit additional information and opinions and/or conduct Caucus discussion before the final discussion and vote in the Senate.

Once an issue has been ruled on by the Senate, it generally may not be brought up again in that Senate session. *The limited exceptions to this are governed by Rule 25 (concerning motions to rescind) and 27 (concerning motions to reconsider) in Robert's Rules of Order.*

The format of work presented to the Senate depends on the action needed. Among the possibilities are reports, resolutions, and motions. A report is merely a body of information communicated to the Senate on some matter of Senate concern. The Senate generally receives a report by having heard it, while adoption of, acceptance of, or agreement to a report would necessitate a vote which, if affirmative, means the body completely endorses all aspects of the report. A report on some major issue might be concluded with a resolution (supporting or condemning some policy or action of some other group or individual) or a motion (recommending some action on a matter of policy). The resolution(s) or motion(s) will then be presented for action to the membership.

Senate support of a resolution and Senate decision of policy is demonstrated by a majority vote.

2. Operating Procedures

The Academic Senate operates under the following procedures:

- a. Every meeting generally will be a business meeting.
- b. When a substantive (i.e., non-procedural) motion is made, it may receive initial discussion, following which it shall be referred to a committee (with or without a deadline) or postponed to a later meeting. Election to committees and receipt of reports are considered procedural motions. Motions should be in print, accompanied by supporting rationale. (Note: the rules may be suspended by a 2/3 vote at any meeting.)
- c. Committees are expected to communicate recommendations to the Executive Committee as soon as possible in order to facilitate prompt scheduling. A fifteen-day lead-time is considered normal, since this would allow for sufficient consideration by the Executive Committee and distribution to Senators ahead of the meetings.

- d. The Executive Committee is empowered to alter the Order of Business for the purpose of aiding orderly and effective action.

3. Parliamentary Procedure

Parliamentary procedure, properly used, provides the means whereby the affairs of an organization or club can be controlled by the general will within the whole membership. The "general will", in this sense, does not always imply even near unanimity or "consensus", but rather the right of the deliberate majority to decide. Complementary to this right is the right of the minority - at least a strong minority - to act according to its considered judgment after a full and fair "working through" of the issues involved.

Parliamentary procedure is not meant to intimidate the novices in an assembly or to provide any sub-group or individual within that assembly with any additional power or control. It will, however, ensure that a discussion will not wander into consideration of other issues without the original issue first having been resolved. By proceeding according to rules rather than by whim or personality, parliamentary procedure ensures equal rights among the membership of an assembly. For parliamentary procedure to make its proper contribution to constructive and democratic meetings, it should be followed from the beginning as a matter of course and should not be regarded as something to be resorted to only when trouble arises.

At the same time, there should always be flexibility. Under no circumstances should concern for parliamentary correctness be permitted to impose undue artificiality on a business meeting.

B. THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

1. Action on New Issues

Requests for Senate perusal of an issue may come from any constituency, organization or member of the campus community. In order to streamline Senate work, the task of determining the appropriateness of these requests is assigned to the Executive Committee. Decisions on these matters are based on the Executive Committee's interpretation of the statements of responsibility in the Senate Bylaws. *All items will be routed through the Chair, Senate Assistant and assigned a serial number for tracking.*

Standing Committees have certain responsibilities specifically delegated to them in the by-laws *and matters relating to these responsibilities these items automatically receive serial numbers from the Senate Assistant do not require referral from the Executive Committee.*

Once an issue is deemed appropriate for Senate decision, it is usually referred to an appropriate standing committee for research and recommendation. However if the issue warrants campus-wide discussion, the Executive Committee may schedule faculty forums, etc., before any further definitive action is taken. At its discretion, the Executive Committee may take up the issue itself.

If an issue is considered to be not under the jurisdiction of the Senate, the Executive Committee refers the issue back to the author with an explanation of why the issue was not considered Senate business and, if possible, suggesting more appropriate routes for action.

2. Action on Standing Committee Motions

Once a standing committee has reached a conclusion on an issue which has been referred to the committee, the resulting motion and rationale is communicated to the Executive Committee for its review. The Chair of the standing committee will normally meet with the Executive Committee to explain the motion in more detail. Chairs will check with the Chair of the Executive Committee as to the necessity of their presence.

The Executive Committee in its review will decide (1) whether or not the motion is a matter for Senate debate, (2) whether or not all aspects of the issue are properly expressed in the rationale and (3) whether or not the wording of the motion specifies precisely the action to be

taken. The Executive Committee will then take action on the motion as described in the by-laws.

If a motion passes Executive Committee scrutiny, the motion is placed on the next Senate agenda under new business. If the motion is found to be lacking or inappropriate, it will be routed back to the standing committee with additional recommendations on format, content or rationale.

C. STANDING COMMITTEES

Except for actions on matters specifically delegated to a standing committee, no action of a committee responsible to the Senate shall become operative until it has been reported in writing to the Senate, recommended by the Senate at a regular or special meeting, and approved by the Administration.

Items for Standing Committees are referred to them by the Executive Committee, with the exception of certain responsibilities specifically delegated to them in the by-laws. These items automatically appear as agenda items for the Standing Committee. If items are brought directly to a Standing Committee, ECS will be informed. A Standing Committee may identify issues it wishes to study. The committee will inform ECS that such projects are being undertaken.

Methods of Research & Preparation

The efficiency of the Senate depends heavily upon the quality of its standing committees' work; and only after sufficient preparation can a committee effectively discuss an issue or form a recommendation. ~~In order for this to be completed in the shortest possible time, a standing committee must organize itself without delay.~~ *At the conclusion of each academic year the newly constituted committee membership should elect a chair for the following academic year. If a new chair is not elected, then the outgoing Chair shall continue to serve as chair for the purpose of convening a meeting as soon as is practicable at the beginning of fall term and conducting an election for chair. The Chair of the Standing Committee is responsible for scheduling committee meetings at the Allendale and Pew Campuses and ensuring that the university community has access to committee meeting schedules, agendas, and minutes; conducting the meetings; and ensuring that the university community has access to the information about committees meetings and activities through the university governance web site. A Vice-chair may be elected to assist the Chair.*

When an issue is referred for study and recommendation, the standing committee should decide what information/input it needs in order to come to a conclusion and then devise specific procedures for securing this information.

It is often important to learn the past status of an issue or to ascertain what other groups/persons have done recently with regard to the same issue. Such background information may be secured from several sources:

1. The Senate Office, which contains records of any past Senate action or debate on an issue;
2. Any related joint committee of the faculty, administration and students;
3. Such offices of the University administration (Academic Affairs, Student *Life* (replaces Affairs), Financial Affairs & Administration, Admissions, Financial Aid, the various colleges, etc.) as might be affected by or involved with the issue in question;
4. Related departments of other colleges and universities that may have dealt with the same issue;
5. Local, state, or national publications with articles on the subject.

The above background sources will often provide information on the present status of an issue and ideas and recommendations for future change - all of which may be valuable in considering the alternatives before forming a final recommendation. Also, for some issues it maybe important to gather further data on campus/public opinion -possibly by means of surveys, open hearings, etc.

After deciding what information is necessary and how it might be attained, the committee (under the leadership of its Chair) should delegate the various tasks to specific members. The importance of doing this early in the consideration of an issue cannot be stressed too much. Subcommittees may be formed, or the Chair may appoint one or several ad hoc committees. (Membership may include persons outside of the standing committee). The Chair's leadership and organizational ability are of critical importance at this stage. He/she must be able and willing to tailor available human resources to the problem by: 1) delegating responsibility clearly and explicitly (so that valuable time is not wasted in wondering what was meant by a vague charge such as "research the background of this issue..."); and 2) setting a time framework for getting the job done (e.g., one or two members may be charged with soliciting campus background information; others might be expected to plan open hearings, conduct personal interviews, or collect related literature - all by a specific target date, after which the committee should plan to peruse all of the input and to work toward a final conclusion).

Needless to say, there are other sources and methods of information retrieval. Those mentioned above are intended as suggestions, rather than limitations for standing committee work.

Once an issue has been researched and discussed, the committee (or a majority thereof) should agree upon a conclusion or a recommendation. The form of the committee's action depends on the nature of both the issue and the conclusion. The committee may decide to change or uphold an existing policy; the committee may recommend guidelines for procedural changes; or the committee may make a resolution.

Motions and resolutions should be submitted to the Executive Committee in concise written form (both hard-copy and computer file) with a complete rationale that explains how and why the committee came to its conclusions. For instance, a proposal for a policy change should consist of:

1. An explanation of the present policy and why a change was deemed necessary;
2. A short discussion of the alternatives considered;
3. The motion itself, which should state the recommended action;

Elimination of ambiguous wording, confusing phrase construction, and misleading grammar helps avoid needless lengthy explanations ("What we really meant to say was...") during Senate debate - to the relief of all involved. However, more detailed information on an issue may well be requested by the Executive Committee and from the Senate floor, and committee members should be prepared to provide such information as needed.

There is some written background material on file in the Senate Office which often can be of help when a committee, constituency or individual wants to become familiar with the history of an issue. There are Senate minutes on file, as well as much material in the way of related Senate and committee reports and correspondence. Also, certain special reports are available.

Once a standing committee has reached a conclusion on an issue which has been referred to the committee, the resulting motion and rationale is communicated to the Executive Committee for its review. The Chair of the standing committee will normally meet with the Executive Committee to explain the motion in more detail. Chairs will check with the Chair of the Executive Committee as to the necessity of their presence. The Executive Committee may also require the Chair to appear at the Senate meeting when the issue is considered.

Chairs of standing committees are also responsible for submitting records to the Senate Assistant and preparing a year-end report to be presented to the Senate *in writing*.

D. THE SENATE OFFICE

The Senate Office is managed by the Senate Assistant, whose primary duties include:

1. Assisting the Chair of the Senate;

2. Compiling and distributing Senate and Standing Committee minutes, year-end summaries and any other reports considered necessary. The appropriate officers of the Senate, and all committees and groups created by them, shall promptly file with the Senate Assistant copies of the minutes of all meetings, and copies of all reports, recommendations, and proposals considered or adopted; such records shall be permanent records, and should be indelible. The Senate Assistant shall be responsible for preserving such records and for making them readily available to anyone who desires to examine them.
3. Ensuring that Senators are provided with material (i.e., copies of motions, agendas, etc.) necessary for smooth functioning of Senate meetings;
4. Assisting the Senate Executive Committee and Standing Committees in carrying out their functions;
5. Acting as an informal liaison between the Executive Committee and the standing committees of the Senate;
6. Ensuring that each year's new Senators are provided with sufficient background information to enable them to function efficiently;
7. Ensuring that any changes in any Senate-related University policy properly reflects the intent of the Senate;
8. Updating the Senate Handbook annually.
9. *Maintaining and updating information on the university governance web site.*

Senators may also request assistance from the Senate Office in 1) researching the (Senate) background of an issue, 2) editing reports, 3) editing motions, 4) helping establish communications between the Senate or a standing committee and other campus or off-campus groups or individuals; 5) retaining records for future committees' reference.