

**Ferris State University  
Academic Senate Meeting  
Special Session with the Provost  
December 14, 2010  
West Campus Community Center**

**Minutes**

I.	President Haneline called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM. He reminded Senators that there would be no official business conducted at this meeting. He reminded Senators of the next regular meeting of the Senate in January and invited their suggestions for agenda items. He relinquished the floor to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Fritz Erickson.
----	--

**Attendance**

Senators attending	Alspach, Berghoef, Lashaway-Bokina, Brandly, Compton, Dakkuri, Daugherty, Drake, Fox, Gillespie, Griffin, Haneline, Hanna, Heaphy, Isler, Jewett, Klatt, Liszewski, Lukusa-Barnett, Luplow, Maike, Marion, Nash, Rewers, Reynolds, Sanderson, Skrocki, Sun, Taylor, Wagenheim
Senators absent with cause	Thapa, Colley, Cook, Joyce, McNulty, Nagel, Prakasam
Senators absent	Abbasabadi, Boncher
Ex Officio and Guests	Erickson, Teahen, Flickinger, Burcham, Cron, Hill, Johnston, McKean, Nicol, John Schmidt, Steve Durst, William Potter, Mike Cairns, Susan Hastings-Bishop, Julie Coon, Fred Wyman, Clayton Rye, Carol Quigley

**Narrative**

Provost Erickson opened the session by referring to the opportunity to review the organizational structure of academics at the University, prompted by the unique situation of having five interim deans. He focused on the importance of a process for addressing this opportunity, with respect to the history of the institution. He reported several responses from his visits to all of the colleges to gather ideas about this process. (See handout: "Reviewing Our Academic Organization: A Suggested Process")	
I.	Goals need to be clear and precise. He offered four goals for our academic structure:
a.	Provide the best opportunity for student success
b.	Promote a climate that enhances opportunities for cross-disciplinary collaboration for all
c.	Support and maintain a commitment to the University's mission, vision and core values
d.	Maintain the financial health of the University
He articulated six Driving Principles to achieve these goals:	
a.	No predefined outcome
b.	All ideas are welcomed, valued and fully considered
c.	Open and transparent
d.	Respectful
e.	A focus on student success
f.	Iterative with ample opportunity for engagement
He laid out four elements of a simple process:	
a.	Identify a Core Review Team
b.	Define the Core Review Team Charge and Outcome
	1. Target for reporting is April 15
	2. A single proposal will be forwarded; the default position is staying the way we are
	3. Every college weighs in
	4. Importance of deliberation by the Academic Senate
c.	Establish the Core Review Team Commitment to meet the timeline
d.	Establish the Rules of Engagement

		1.	Begin with a SWAT-type retreat
		2.	Aim for consensus but vote as needed
He opened the floor for discussion. Many Senators engaged in lively deliberation on three elements of the proposal.			
II.	Identifying the Core Review Team		
	a.	Discussion of selecting the College representatives and other members of the CRT led to several "straw votes".	
		1.	The Senate was split on whether to include a representative from the FFA.
		2.	The Senate agreed that the proposed number of representatives was appropriate, but could be expanded as necessary.
		3.	The Senate agreed that Provost Erickson should chair the Team, but were split on whether there should be a co-chair.
		4.	The Senate agreed that the head of the Non-tenure Track Instructional Faculty Union should not be on the Team.
		5.	The Senate agreed that the head of the Clerk/Technical Union should not be on the Team.
		6.	There was confusion about how to prevent disproportional representation from the same College.
	b.	The following suggestions for populating the CRT were made:	
		1.	Academic Leadership Council (Chairs and Department Heads) should select at least one representative.
		2.	The FFA president will be invited to participate.
		3.	Student Government will be invited to participate and to select a representative.
		4.	Provost Erickson will explore a process for including at least one non-faculty academic staff member.
		5.	It was agreed to use the SPARC as a resource rather than including a representative on the Team.
		6.	The Senate requested that each college elect a faculty representative. The faculty representative should be a full time faculty member.
		7.	The Senate agreed that all units within Academic Affairs should be represented, but not Kendall School of Art and Design.
III.	Defining the Charge and Outcome		
	a.	The Senate supported the idea of letting the CRT decide whether to forward a single plan or multiple plans.	
	b.	The Senate agreed that April 15 should be considered a working target; but the CRT should update the Senate regularly and announce when they are ready for a Senate vote.	
		1.	Pres. Haneline reminded the Senate that there are three scheduled Senate meetings in April: April 5, April 19 and April 26; where a Senate vote could be taken.
IV.	Defining Rules of Engagement		
	a.	Voting	
		1.	The goal for the CRT is to reach consensus; but any vote is advisory. The Provost will look for a preponderance of agreement in any vote. He wants the standard for recommending a change to be high.
		2.	Team members will be asked to "go on record" with their positions, unless the Team agree to take a "closed vote". The Team will weigh the desire for transparency with sensitivity to potentially "politically charged" issues.

The meeting adjourned at 7:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

December 29, 2010

Sandy Alspach  
Secretary

December 29, 2010