

**Ferris State University
Academic Senate Meeting
November 3, 2009
West Campus Community Center**

Minutes

I.	Action Items	
	A.	Moved (Sen. Sanderson), seconded (Sen. Thapa) and passed unanimously to approve the minutes of the October 6, 2009 meeting. (posted online)
	B.	Moved (Sen. Haneline), seconded (Sen. Alspach) and passed unanimously to support the Accelerated Nursing Track: RN to MSN.
	C.	Moved (Sen. Thapa), seconded (Sen. Skrocki) and passed unanimously to support the curriculum revisions to the Health Care Systems Administration major.
	D.	Moved (Sen. Alspach), seconded (Sen. Heaphy) and denied (13 aye, 16 no) to establish a Professional Doctorate in Community College Leadership.
II.	Open Forum	
	Sen. Thapa asked the Senate to observe a moment of silence in memory of the student who died in the car/pedestrian accident last week.	
III.	Information Items	
	A..	Reports
	1.	Pres. Griffin reminded Senators that the Executive Committee will meet on Tuesday, Nov. 10 with the Academic Program Review Council, prior to the APRC report to the full body on Tuesday, Nov. 17 at 6:00 pm in the West Campus Community Center.
	2.	Pres. Griffin announced that the Executive Committee will meet on Thursday, Nov. 12 to set the agenda for the December meeting. Senators wishing to place items on the agenda are encouraged to contact him.
	3.	VP Berghoef announced that, because there have been so many changes, the Committee Chairs lunch has been moved to later in November. He will ask committees to determine if they will accept new members and to report how they identify their chairmen.
	4.	VP Berghoef reported that he, Sen. Alspach and Paula Hadley had met with John Urbanick to discuss pending revisions in access to the website.
	5.	VP Berghoef encouraged Senators to attend General Education Task Force meetings. He noted that few Senators had attended these meetings and the Task Force members would benefit from our expertise.
	6.	Sec. Alspach solicited support for the formatting of the minutes. She thanked Sen. Sun for helping her proofread minutes so that official records are as accurate as possible.
	B.	Committee Reports
	1.	University Curriculum Committee: Chair Leonard Johnson presented the report of actions taken by the UCC in October (see attached). He alerted Senators to the three action items in New Business on the agenda. (see above)
	2.	General Education Task Force: VP Flickinger reported that the Task Force will meet twice this month to analyze the input from the two Town Hall meetings facilitated by Leonard Johnson. The focus of the Task Force at present is to address the Philosophy statement for General Education at Ferris. He anticipates that attendance will grow as the Task Force turns to Outcomes and Courses Meeting Outcomes. So far he reports about 40 people have participated in Town Hall meetings.

		3.	HLC Update: Assoc. VP Teahen reported that the report to the HLC is on track, focusing on what is different at Ferris since the last site visit. (see handouts) She thanked Sandy Balkema for editing the report and Dean Bill Potter for reviewing the documents from the last site visit.
		4.	Bill Knapp and Bea Griffin-M. Cooper made a PowerPoint presentation of the Quality Course Design Framework that is being disseminated to enhance faculty use of technology in teaching. (see notes) They will begin working with a Learning Community in January 2010, with consulting advice from professionals in the Quality Matters program.
		a.	Sen. Nash asked if there are courses we could see as models.
			Knapp answered that the Exemplary Course program currently serves as the best model, but that program is being modified for Spring. A key feature is that courses tap into different resources, for example, FLITE and Media Production. Some courses are in process of development now. He noted that it might be good to show what is <u>not</u> „exemplary’ or „quality’ in course design as well.
			Sen. Nash asked if this cohort would demonstrate exemplary courses across the curriculum.
			Griffin-Cooper offered to help any faculty member develop courses to meet the quality standards.
		b.	Sen. Boncher asked whether she could get support without being in the Exemplary Course cohort group.
			Griffin-Cooper responded yes, „we do house calls’, regardless of a professor’s desire to apply for the Exemplary Course award.
		c.	Sen. Haneline observed that it is a journey to „exemplary’, and there is no ending point; this goal doesn’t stand still. He asked if the Exemplary Course program and the new Quality Course program were aimed at starters or those along the road.
			Griffin-Cooper invited anyone who wanted to improve their instruction; she offered to „give you a drink of water along the way’.
			Knapp pointed out that the Exemplary Course awards program is different from but parallel to the Quality Course program. The goal for the Quality Course program is to develop capacity to be resources to support others „along the road’.
		d.	Sen. Nash inquired about the interface of faculty interested in development and faculty with resources to support. He asked who to talk to or to steer a colleague to, even if they can’t fit into the Learning Community time frame.
			Knapp responded that he and Meegan Lillis in the Faculty Center are available; they have „walk-in’ hours and are willing to set up appointments.

Attendance

Officers present	Pres. Richard Griffin, VP Michael Berghoef, Sec. Sandy Alspach
Senators present	Abbasabadi, Beistle, Brandly, Boncher, Colley, Compton, Dekoster, Dakkuri, Drake, Haneline, D. Hanna, Heaphy, Isler, Jewett, Klatt, Lashaway-Bokina, Liszewski, Lovsted, Luplow, McLean, Nash, Purvis, Rewers, Sanderson, Skrocki, Smith, Speirs, Sun, Taylor, Thapa, Topcu, Wagenheim
Senators excused	Cline, H. Hanna, Lukusa-Barnett, Prakasam, Jorsch
Ex-Officio Members present	President David Eisler, Provost Fritz Erickson
Guests	Paul Blake, Dan Burcham, Mike Cooper, Mike Cron, Don Flickinger, Kathy Girard, Don Green, Bea Griffin-Cooper, Ellen Haneline, Terry Harper, Leonard Johnson, Matthew Klein, Bill Knapp, Ron McKean, David Nicol, Marcy Parry, John Schmidt, Marie Sicklestill, Roberta Teahen, Greg Zimmerman

III.	New Business	
	A.	Sen. Haneline moved and Sen. Alspach seconded the proposal from the University Curriculum Committee to support the "RN to MSN" proposal. The motion passed unanimously.
	1.	Sen. Jewett asked if accreditation would be sought for this program.
		The representative from Nursing replied that the program already has accreditation.
	B.	Sen. Thapa moved and Sen. Skrocki seconded the proposal from the University Curriculum Committee to support the modifications to the Health Care Systems Administration program. The motion passed unanimously without discussion.
	C.	Sen. Alspach moved and Sen. Heaphy seconded the proposal from the University Curriculum Committee to support the proposal to establish an Educational Doctorate in Community College Leadership program. The motion failed; 13 aye, 16 no.
	1.	Leonard Johnson noted the concerns about this program from the University Curriculum Council. He reported that the University Graduate and Professional Council has been actively working with the proposers to address concerns as well.
	2.	Sen. Wagenheim asked if the appropriate Form B's for consulting on new projects with impacted areas had been received from College of Business and College of Education and Human Services (as noted on the Form A proposal).
		Johnson confirmed that the Form B responses had been posted yesterday.
	3.	Sen. Thapa asked how many students this degree would expect to draw since there are a limited number of community colleges.
		Mike Cooper responded that the proposers had identified an emergent demand due to projected retirements in community colleges in Michigan. Targeting this program to meet the need in the marketplace is a feature that makes Ferris competitive. The program expects to draw an initial cohort of 25-30 students.
		Sen. Thapa asked how this demand had been established.
		M. Cooper replied that due diligence had been used to make this assessment, led by proposal team member Lynn Ewigleben Hernandez. Proposers had attended a national community college conference where they were told to expect 2000-3000 community college leaders looking for doctorate-level degrees in the near future.
	4.	Sen. Haneline expressed concern about where the program would be housed. As proposed, it would report directly to the Provost, not a College where expertise and checks and balances are present; making the Provost a de facto College. He shared his experience in the Academic Affairs office in the '90-'91 academic year when a reduction of staff caused work to be postponed. He questioned the support structure for the program.
		Sen. Dakkuri asked for comments from a UGPC representative on this issue.
		Sen. Bokina-Lashaway reported that the UGPC had been meeting since summer to recommend revisions and adjustments have been made along the way. The UGPC's concerns have centered on support from the College of Education and Human Services and the emerging need for a Graduate College. She shared that UGPC appreciates the timeline for forwarding this program for Higher Learning Commission consideration and, with timing in mind, the Council had met with the proposers for 6 hours last week.
	5.	Sen. Abbasabadi shared his concern with the perception that too many administrators run universities.
	6.	Sen. Dakkuri probed for a threshold number of students actually enrolling in the first cohort before „we decide the program won't fly'. He specified that no Ferris students should be counted in the threshold number.
	7.	Provost Erickson explained how he had walked into an ongoing conversation that was innovative and interdisciplinary, so he had agreed to house the program in his office initially. He stated that one requirement for the program would be that it is financially

		neutral; there would be no cohort beginning the program until it can pay for itself. He expressed confidence in filling a first cohort, and predicted that a second or even third cohort would fill in short order, without draining any other program.
		Sen. Dakkuri pressed, "What if we don't get that number?"
		Provost Erickson confirmed that „we won't do it if it loses money'.
	8.	M. Cooper reminded the Senate of the timing constraints for launching the program.
	9.	Assoc. VP Teahen explained that only two courses were necessary for a 2010 launch. The main time pressure is making official contact with the Higher Learning Commission. She explained that a "Change Request" (to change Ferris' status by adding a doctoral degree) could take six months to process.
	10.	Sen. Abbasabadi reminded the Senate that „outsiders approached us, after Michigan State declined the opportunity' to host this program.
	11.	Sen. Alspach shared her concerns about the program at this stage in its development, and admitted to being resistant to the proposal initially. She agreed that her motion asked Senators to vote for a „moving target'. But she encouraged the Senate to allow the proposal to progress to the Higher Learning Commission; reminding Senators that review processes are in place (i.e. the Academic Program Review Council) to respond to the desire to monitor program integrity. She also noted that the Higher Learning Commission could reject the proposal, making these concerns „moot'.
	12.	Sen. Abbasabadi agreed it was time to move the proposal forward.
	13.	Sen. Nash said the proposal looks good, but he still had concerns about guaranteeing that the program will be improved, safeguarding that concerns are addressed.
	14.	Sen. Haneline opined that we need a Graduate College, so that this program doesn't drain the Provost's office. He asserted it would be good to develop a „graduate culture' at Ferris. His concern would be met by having a Graduate Program officer identified.
	15.	Sen. Abbasabadi noted that this proposal was the first example in his experience on the UGPC where the Council was being used appropriately to create a program.
	16.	Provost Erickson felt that it is premature to propose a Graduate School with this program. But he is open to structure discussions to support these kinds of innovative programs. As a former Graduate Dean, he is committed to working this proposal's structural support out.
	17.	Sen. Smith moved the Previous Question. The motion failed to reach the necessary two-thirds required to stop debate (18 aye, 12 no).
	18.	Sen. Purvis reported that the UCC discussion went beyond curricular issues, observing that structure becomes important too. Examples of UCC discussion included a graduate school framework that would specify issues like credits for dissertation and cognates to balance majors. He wondered what the program would do about students who don't measure up in the dissertation work.
	19.	Sen. Jewett noted that the proposers had suggested that they hoped 18 to 24 of the initial cohort would finish. He asked which of these students would be paying for credits and which would be using the tuition waiver benefit as Ferris employees. Costs to hire a person to direct the program would become problematic as tuition income declines. He wondered about a financial guarantee that once students begin the program they would be able to finish it. For him, questions of structure and financial support are left unanswered.
		Provost Erickson reminded Senators that „there are never any guarantees'. He wants to be ready for a cohort, assuming everyone pays tuition, separate from the tuition waivers for which there are separate resources. He affirmed that he will give careful consideration to the financial model presented.
	20.	Sen. Hanna expressed two concerns. First, he worries that one-third of the total required credits are in „dissertation', which he perceives to be „heavy'. Second, he observed the unusual coexistence of graduate and undergraduate programs at Ferris, opining that the program deserves to be housed in an academic unit rather than the Provost's office.
		M. Cooper explained that the program results in an Ed.D., not a research-based Ph.D.

			It is aimed at practitioners, using skills-based research. He pointed to the matrix of options for the dissertation, especially the project focus with real world stakeholders.
		21.	Sen. Boncher asked if the staffing in Academic Affairs continues to be stretched thin, as Sen. Haneline described. She opined that the program would require a full-time person, recalling discussion at the UCC of the need for a faculty member to be lead or champion for the program.
			Provost Erickson explained that a temporary placement in Academic Affairs makes sense because the program spans several colleges, is interdisciplinary and innovative. He agreed that Academic Affairs is stretched presently, justifying the appointment of Mike Cooper to direct the program. He offered to address issues of need as cohorts in the program grow. His concern is in hiring someone before we have a cohort in place, especially if that hire involves a tenure line. He offered to be amenable to discuss where the program is housed. He expressed concern that if we wait to begin the approval process, we „might lose our place’. He asked for Senators to allow for some degree of ambiguity.
		22.	Sen. Isler asked Assoc. VP Teahen how she thought the Higher Learning Commission would deal with ambiguity in the proposal.
			Assoc. VP Teahen affirmed that the proposal will „continue to get ready-er’, but she noted that it is currently as „ready’ as other proposals she has reviewed. She agreed that HLC might question the role of the Provost. She offered that the College of Professional and Technological Studies demonstrates that we have a network already unique to the market.
		23.	Sen. Sanderson asked how we could „go back’ if we wanted the program moved to another location other than Academic Affairs. She noted that Mike Cooper currently serves as a department chair in the College of Business, and questioned his availability to take on this program.
			M. Cooper expressed confidence in the proposing team’s strength to produce a quality program. Partnering with UGPC has been beneficial. His load is one-half release for chairing the Marketing Department and one-half release for this project. He reviewed the Marketing Department dynamics, pointing out that under Jeff Ek’s leadership the Graphic Design program is „self-directed’. He described other programs as evolving to self-directed work teams; faculty members currently have release time to work on this evolution. He claimed, “I have resources in the doctorate project and the good will of my Dean in supporting at the program level”. He said he has been promised a secretary to help manage the doctorate program. He reminded the Senators of our „opportunity to pounce”, because Ferris is uniquely positioned for this degree. He indicated three concerns he is working to address: time, resources, and scope; all of his efforts designed to produce a quality doctoral program.
		24.	Sen. Dakkuri asked about the use of the term „practitioner’ in the proposal, arguing that anyone with a degree and a job is a practitioner. He queried whether we would be minimizing research in preparing community college administrators. He worried that we would be advertising a degree with less rigor, and suggested that the term „practitioner’ be de-emphasized in marketing the program.
		25.	Sen. Jewett asked for a written plan for moving forward on the proposal, including some benchmarks to be met before advancing. He also requested some description of how accountability would be determined.
			Provost Erickson said he wouldn’t want to get a Graduate School ahead of this program, so he felt it would be difficult to say what we would need to make the move to adopt the proposal. Also, he clarified that he wouldn’t presume to take the role of the Senate here; but that he is willing to have discussions about Senate concerns.
			M. Cooper vouched for the quality of the dissertation work required. He directed Senators to look at the matrix of milestone points in the dissertation that had been provided by the developers. He argued that the dissertation process has quality control “go / no go” milestones. He cited Betty Stolarek’s guidance to embed critical thinking in the whole degree; and promised that there will be improvements as the program is

			polished.
		26.	Sen. Haneline reminded Senators of our role as advisors to the Provost and the President. He noted that, in terms of structural arrangements for this degree, the issue was how much ambiguity we should be tolerating. He described our debate as precedent-setting: either we are fostering innovation or we are making a decision that will come back to haunt us. He reflected on the other two curricular issues passed at the meeting and wondered if we would have passed them if we had had this many questions.

IV.	Announcements		
	A.	FSU President Eisler reported on several issues.	
		1.	Creation of a Task Force by VP Scoby to address pedestrian safety issues, following the tragic loss of a Ferris student
		a.	The Task Force aims to be a sounding board for the campus.
		b.	The question is what choices do we have: what streets can we or can we not control (MDOT).
		2.	Closing the parking lot near Allied Health in anticipation of the construction of the new Optometry building
		3.	Two bills moving through the Legislature that would permit community colleges to grant bachelor degrees
		a.	Pres. Eisler invited Senators to see the presentation he had made in Lansing relative to these bills; however, he reported that the Committee seems ready to report the bills out regardless of his testimony.
		b.	This legislation would produce 28 new competitors at the Bachelor's degree level.
		c.	Pres. Eisler views this as a „political' not an educational process, driven by the Chambers of Commerce in the community college areas; he recommends Senators review what relationships we already have with community colleges and reiterated our willingness to work with community colleges.
		4.	A budget bill was signed Friday that eliminated the MI Promise Scholarships and Challenge grants.
		a.	The Governor is planning Town Hall meetings and conference calls with university presidents.
		b.	Pres. Eisler will hold on announcing any response to students; but he vowed to find a way to meet costs to students for fall semester. An additional \$2.3 million would be needed for spring semester; but he plans to work with students to meet increases in expenses.
		c.	He observed that the budget is based on 4% growth in the economy; but there is no growth at this time. The state budget would require 20% cuts to departments in the state, but not to higher education.
		5.	He extended the invitation to pick up the tab for Senators to eat dinner at The Rock; on Nov. 17 at 5:00 p.m. prior to the APRC report.
	B.	Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Erickson reported on several issues.	
		1.	Kick off of "Degree Works" to provide self-serve student advising beginning with fall 2010
		2.	Continuing development of TracDat to assist in collecting and analyzing data helpful to departments and programs; thanks to faculty input. This software will provide data needed for the Higher Learning Commission visit.
		3.	Successful grant projects; including
		a.	Influenza study in Biology
		b.	Diabetes study in Optometry
		c.	Carl Perkins Grant for the College of Engineering Technology (Dean Oldfield)
		4.	Congratulations to the 20 faculty who had committed to participate in the six-session Learning Community
		5.	Congratulations to:

		a.	TJ Lakin and the Debate/Forensics Team for placing 4 out of 20 schools in sweepstakes at the Age of Aquarius tournament at Ball State University
		b.	Steve Fox and the Torch for earning 12 awards from the Michigan Collegiate Press Assoc., including 3 rd overall design
		c.	Susan Hastings-Bishop and Recreation and Leisure Studies for continuing accreditation; one of only two accredited programs in Michigan, recognized as a student-centered faculty
		6.	He will be pleased to present the B.S. in Architecture and Sustainability program to the BOT on Friday.
		7.	Robin Hoisington will serve as his administrative assistant.
	C.	Questions	
		1.	Sen. Dakkuri asked Pres. Eisler how the budget compared with last year.
			Pres. Eisler said that he had made cuts in July and directed Economic Stimulus money to be used to meet shortfalls in the fall.
		2.	Sen. Jewett observed that he had seen students cross against lights on campus; he opined that we should consider ourselves lucky that more tragedies have not happened.
V.	Open Forum		
	A.	Pres. Griffin reminded Senators to plan to attend the APRC report on Nov. 17 at 6:00 pm in West Campus Community Center.	
	B.	VP Berghoef thanked Provost Erickson for the Degree Works program, hoping that it will help students keep on track in their programs.	
	C.	Sen. Sun followed up on his concern with the Admissions process. VP Burcham explained that the system had been adjusted to allow applicants to go back in the online application process.	
	D.	Student Government Pres. Claire Gould made several announcements:	
		1.	She thanked the Senate for support of the Readership Program which provides newspapers to students at various locations around campus.
		2.	Her goal for the Holiday Food drive is 10,000 pounds of food for local pantries; boxes will be placed across the campus.
		3.	Student Government has met with DPS to get the rules for pedestrians out to students.
VI.	The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 am.		

Sandy Alspach, Secretary

Richard Griffin, President