

---

Detailed Notes on the UAS Meeting of February 14, 2025

---

**Chair's Report**

- Chair Karasinski attended the ATAC meeting as they are working on their bylaws as they become a Standing Committee of UAS. At the end of this document you will find a diagram of the technology-related groups at GVSU, which was provided at the ATAC meeting.
- Vice Chair Sergeant attended most of and Chair Karasinski attended part of the Gray DI workshop.

**Provost's Report**

- The Provost encouraged UAS members to look at the email from VP Bernal that was sent on 2/14 regarding the COACHE Steering Committee's work with The Change Leaders. All UAS members were invited to participate in confidential group interviews with these external facilitators who are working with the COACHE Steering Committee around the areas of concern identified on the COACHE survey.

**Student Senate President's Report**

- The Student Senate President did not share a report.

**Old Business**

- The ECS meeting had been changed from a 2-hour meeting to a 1-hour meeting, due to the motion from UAS at the February 7 meeting to take an hour from the ECS meeting for UAS to meet as a committee of the whole to discuss strategies for participation in the upcoming discussions held by the COACHE Steering Team. The old business, which included appointments to the University Technology Council, Centers Evaluation Committee, and Multi-Year Taskforce on Teaching Evaluation (MYTTE) was tabled.
- **Clarification regarding the write-up from the February 7 UAS meeting:** The motion for ECS to create a group to determine action items and next steps related to the concerns identified in the COACHE survey and subsequent discussions was erroneously described as ECS creating a group to make a list, when the group will actually make a plan, and it was not clear that this motion was separate from the items that had been listed in the straw poll that was sent to UAS members last year.

**New Business**

- *On the Review and Discussion of the Test-Optional and Holistic Admissions Taskforce Report:* A robust discussion was held around this report, which recommended the following. "1. The university should expand the standing Holistic Admissions Committee to include at least two tenured faculty members who have experience analyzing student-success data and with teaching first-year students. The committee should be charged with recommending updates to the evaluation rubric and annually reviewing data from Institutional Analysis on the success of students who are admitted under the holistic process. 2. The university should establish a structured admissions offer model. This would provide a clear, structured pathway through the Oliver Wilson Scholars Program for students below a certain GPA threshold in order to help them be more successful at GVSU. Depending on their level of preparedness, students should be required to attend and be successful in the summer bridge program, attend regular advising meetings, and/or attend regular tutoring sessions. Other university resources<sup>4</sup> should be shared with students when offering this pathway, as deemed appropriate by the holistic review process. 3. The Divisions of Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Enrollment Development should annually and proactively plan for first-year students it expects to matriculate who have a higher than average need for support resources as indicated by incoming HS GPA and the metrics used in holistic review. The available resources need to match the expected number of students and the level of need they have. 4. The university should considerably improve communication and information about the incoming first-year class, especially during the months from January to April that precede the cohort's arrival. The work of the FTIAC Projections Group should be enhanced to include the distribution of a monthly summary of census projections with other forecast data (such as information about HS GPA and other factors related to preparedness) that will help the provost's office, deans, faculty, and support staff plan for the first-year class." Additionally, the *faculty members* on the

taskforce recommended “1. The Provost should appoint a group of faculty and staff with expertise in admissions or data science to study the success of students at GVSU who were admitted under holistic review from 2021-2023 and who have persisted at least into their sophomore year. Using the information we had for these students at the time of admission, the students should be compared to a random sample of students who were also admitted under holistic review, but not retained. The goal of this work is to identify measurable characteristics that correlate to greater success rates at GVSU, including but not limited to HS GPA, ACT/SAT scores (if available), AP/Dual Enrollment courses (both the number of such courses and their scores/grades in them), landscape scores, and other nonacademic markers such as years of work experience, number of leadership activities, etc. The recommended holistic admissions rubric should take into account the numerical value of the student’s HS GPA and ensure that the lower the GPA, the stronger the other holistic/mitigating factors must be in order to be admitted, especially for students whose HS GPA is below 2.50. This appointed group should make specific recommendations for a first version of an updated rubric to be used in holistic review starting in July 2025, with additional updates to possibly follow in 2026. The faculty involved should be compensated for their work with released time or a stipend. 2. Starting in July 2025 for the Fall 2026 FTIAC cohort, all students whose HS GPA is less than 3.00 should undergo holistic review. All holistic review scores should be saved and stored in an accessible format so that additional data analysis and continuous improvement will occur in the future.” The motion to support with recommendation to UAS passed unanimously.

- *On the Review and Discussion of the Faculty Salary and Budget Committee (FSBC) Memo on Budget Needs:* This memo had been sent directly to the Provost in April, due to the availability of extra funds. This is a moot point now, as these funds are no longer available. The motion to accept the report as historical information was unanimously passed.
- *On the Review and Discussion of the Faculty Salary and Budget Committee (FSBC) Memo on Adjunct Pay:* The Chair of FSBC noted that adjunct pay has been a perennial problem. This memo had been sent directly to the Provost in April, due to the availability of extra funds. The premise is still valid. The memo recommends that the minimum pay rate be adjusted annually hereafter based on the previous year’s increase in salaries (specifically the average Merit Increase), and that the annual increase happens without going through faculty governance in order to ensure timely adjustments. The motion to accept and support the memo and place it on the UAS agenda passed unanimously.
- *On the Review and Discussion of the Faculty Salary and Budget Committee (FSBC) Memo on Promotional Increments:* The FSBC Chair reported that the dollar amount for promotional increments historically has been adjusted every five years. The memo recommends increasing this amount a small amount each year. The motion to accept the memo and place on the UAS agenda passed unanimously.

