**SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE** **MINUTES**

**April 19, 2016**

**2:30-4:30 pm 110 Olscamp Conference Room**

**Present:**  Allen Rogel (FS Chair), Rachelle Hippler (FS Vice-Chair), Robyn Miller (FS Secretary), Peter Blass (A&S), David Border (TAAE), Tim Brackenbury (HHS), Mariana Mitova (EDHD), Stephanie Walls (Firelands), Arne Spohr (CMA). Chris Rump (CBA), David Border (CAA), Victor Senn & Amanda Dortch (USG), (GSS),

**INVITEE: David Border (CAA), Rob Obey (AFC), Christina Gunther (BGSU-FA), Alex Goberman (Graduate College)**

**PRESIDER:** Vice Chair Rachelle Hippler

**APPROVE MINUTES:**

*MOTION: (Arne Spohr) Move to approve minutes from April 12, 2016. (Second: Tim Brackenbury). Minutes approved unanimously, one abstain, with editorial changes.*

**OLD BUSINESS**

Grad College Grade Replacement Policy- Alex Goberman the Associate Dean of the Graduate College clarified some questions concerning the policy from the last SEC/Provost meeting. The classes that can count for graduate courses are modeled after the undergraduate policy which is only replacement a replacement of D or F. The policy currently reads:

**GRADUATE COLLEGE GRADE REPLACEMENT POLICY (DRAFT AS APPROVED)**

**Approved by GPS subcommittee vote**

**Approved by Graduate Council vote**

1. All graduate courses taken at the University count toward a student’s cumulative grade point average, including course retakes with the following exception;

* For one course retaken at the University, the credit hours and quality points for the original registration will not be used in computing the student's cumulative grade point average. For this course, the credit hours and quality points for the retake registration will be used in computing the student's cumulative grade point average.

1. A student must complete the “Graduate College Grade Replacement Request” form for a grade replacement to be approved.
2. No grade is removed or erased from a transcript by retaking a course.
3. Any punitive grade as a result of an Academic Honesty case may not have the retake policy applied to it, but both grades will be used in the calculation of the cumulative grade point average. In cases where the punitive grade is "U," students may retake these courses and it will have no effect on the cumulative grade point average.
4. Transfer credit is not eligible for grade replacement.

Note:  This is a new policy to the Grad College, but it is modeled after a longstanding policy at the undergraduate level.  The graduate college policy would allow only one grade replacement, while undergrad policy allows two.

*Discussion:* Students need to make the request before the semester starts. Departments can decide, we probably need to include this. Should also possibly add an approval step by having a coordinator sign off. There are usually dismissals if the student’s GPA falls below a 3.0. If the student is already on probation the department decides whether to dismiss or not. This is for students who have one bad test that will negatively affect their GPA. One bad test in a class in a 30 hour graduate program can significantly hurt the student. Grades of “B” or “C” could be retaken which is different than the undergrad policy. Concluded that any grade that is part of academic honesty cannot be retaken, will adjust policy to reflect this. GSS was a little concerned with damaging rigor.

*Motion: To approve policy with edits (Motion: Rachelle Hippler) Second(Kerry Fan). Motion carried.*

**NEW BUSINESS**

* HB 48 Committee Report- SEC received results from the ad hoc committee for HB 48. The committee decided not to seek a resolution based on the campus wide survey.

*Discussion:* Allen Rogel will present the summary on the floor of Senate. It is concerning that there was no resolution, no unified consensus. This is a good base for actions, if needed in the future. The revision of the introduction was changed, their charge was to determine if there needs to be a resolution from Senate which was not mentioned in the first draft. Only 28% responded that is not a representative sampling. Not sure floor of Senate is a good place to discuss this, could be a lot of political grandstanding, should we wait until it passes at the State level? Could we ask why there was no resolution? There are no qualitative responses from grad students or staff, why? This has not been released beyond SEC, we could request modifications, and can we get the raw data? Allen will express to Ian and see if we can get something revised. The majority of the committee members opposed HB 48 but did not come out with a resolution, the committee was very balanced. This is ultimately a trustee decision, they will take it up next year. There is close to 50% of faculty responses why are we not doing a resolution? We would need to set up another committee for a resolution because this committee is out of time. Almost half of the staff responded, the response rate was dragged down by the low response rate from undergraduate students. We could bring up a resolution under issues and concerns, but there would have to be 2/3 of senate there and we would have to have a draft instantaneously.

*Conclusion:* Allen will ask Ian for more clarification

* A&B
* SEC reword of Standing Invitations to SEC- Rewording Charter change to include all standing committees from faculty senate, plus BGSU-FA.

*Motion: Motion to approve rewording (Motion: Peter Blass). (Second: Mariana Mitova). Motion carried.*

* Hierarchy of authority in the Charter- We need to reword this Charter change to state applicable law instead of federal law and then state, because in some cases federal law may not supersede state law; then CBA then Charter.

*Motion: Motion to change wording in Charter (Motion: Tim Brakenbury). (Second: Peter Blass). Motion approved.*

There will be a full Senate vote for both of these Charter changes.

**ISSUES AND CONCERNS**

* VPN- Kerry Fan sent an email before the meeting discussing this issue. Recently BGSU’s VPN use is being changed to a two-step logon process. I was wondering, from a standpoint of shared governance, whether a decision of such significant change that effects the entire campus is made solely by ITS. I remember some time ago the Senate discussed the issue of My File, which was IT related; but I don’t recall the VPN logon change has been discussed in Senate. For curriculum change, there are clear rules for what kind of change going through what kind of approval, but I was wondering if there are any rules of discussion and approval for IT related changes. Could I request adding a brief discussion of what I outlined above into “issues and concerns” for the next SEC meeting if it is not too late?

*Discussion:* People are trying to hack the University computers. We have not reached a solution on the Senate standing committee for the CIO. Senate needs to be part of these policy changes. Could John Ellinger come to Senate and discuss these issues, because students are struggling as well with e-campus.

* Dr. Cooms informed Allen that there will be a webinar on June 7th on issues of concealed carry. Should we distribute this information on FACTLISTSERV?
* Can we find out about law room? Allen did not know if federal law got involved or not, will ask Barbara Waddell.

**SENATE AGENDA ITEMS [APRIL 26, 2016]**

* Charter Amendments
* New Program: Master of Social Work
* HB 48 report

**ADJOURNMENT:**

*Motion to adjourn (Arne Spohr) Second (Robyn Miller).*

Meeting adjourned 4:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Robyn Miller, Secretary: April 26, 2016