

**SEC/VPAA JOINT CONFERENCE  
MINUTES**

February 27, 2007  
2:30 p.m.

Senate Conference Room  
140 McFall Center

Present: Bernhard, Currie, Hebein, Lee, Orel, Pauken, Pinto, Vatan Woodhouse, Williams

Absent: Engebretsen, Little

Faculty Senate Vice Chair Pauken called the joint conference to order at 2:30 p.m. Pauken noted that we were holding the SEC/VPAA Joint Conference on this date (February 27, 2007) from 2:30-3:30 in order to make up the SEC/VPAA joint meeting that had been scheduled for February 13, 2007 but was canceled due to inclement weather.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**Sanctions Policy**

**Pauken:** I am not quite sure where we stand relative to the status of the Sanctions Policy.

**Gromko:** The SEC has been provided a packet (Attachment #1) which includes current Charter Language relative to Sanctions as well as well as a Draft of recommended Sanctions Policy changes dated (11/9/06) and further revisions dated February 1, 2007.

**Pauken:** Then it is our purpose today to review the Draft of the Sanctions Policy dated November 9, 2006 as well as the most recent revisions dated February 1, 2007. **Hebein:** I am looking in the Charter where I see B-I.C. page 10 of 10. Let the record show that there appears to be some confusion on the exact location of where the Sanctions Policy should be located. **Gromko:** I believe that the location is not on page 10 of this section but rather on page 2 of this section. **Williams:** For the purpose of clarification, the Sanctions Policy would be found on B-I.C.1.e) on page 2. Is this correct? **Hebein:** Yes, that is correct. **Pauken:** I do have a question regarding the proposed revisions dated 2/1/07.

**B-I.C.1. e). Suspensions by the University**

(1). In the event that a Dean initiates a temporary suspension, with full pay and benefits, of a faculty member within that Dean's academic unit in order to facilitate the conduct of any investigation and /or to maintain calm, order, and safety in the unit, such a temporary suspension shall not be considered, and shall not be documented in any personnel file as an adverse personnel action or discipline.

(2) Any suspension of a faculty member without full pay and benefits taken in response to allegations or complaints of conduct or omissions in violation of this Charter, policies or procedures of the University, or any law, rule or regulation, shall be considered disciplinary action. A faculty member who contends that such a disciplinary suspension has been unjustly imposed may initiate a grievance pursuant to B-I.E.

(3) Upon request, the VPAA will share with the Faculty Senate any guidelines of general instructions offered to academic administrators that

the VPAA, in the exercise of her/his discretion, deems appropriate for the implementation of a faculty suspension. The VPAA shall receive and review recommendations from the Faculty Senate with respect to such guidelines and /or instructions as may be issued.

**Pauken:** I question whether or not section (2) line 1 should read “Any suspension of a faculty member (**with or**) without full pay and benefits...” **Gromko:** If the sanction is a result of a disciplinary action, then I would think that the suspension would be without full pay. **Hebein:** What about having faculty input into the types of sanctions that are imposed? **Gromko:** We don’t want to tie the Deans’ hands in imposing or carrying out these sanctions. **Hebein:** While the Deans should have the authority to conduct these sanctions activities, I believe there should be opportunity for faculty to respond to these sanctions. **Gromko:** There is opportunity through the Grievance Procedure. **Hebein:** That puts the situation into an adversarial relationship. Why can’t the Dean consult with faculty prior to determining what the final sanctions might be? Why can’t there be some level of conciliation prior to bringing it to a Grievance Procedure? I would also like to discuss section (3) of the 2/1/07 revisions. The last sentence seems unclear... “The VPAA shall receive and review recommendations from the Faculty Senate with respect to such guidelines and/or instructions as may be issued” Does this mean that Faculty Senate will be allowed input into each individual case of suspension? How would this be implemented? **Gromko:** I don’t read section (3) in the same way. It doesn’t say that the VPAA will review recommendations from Faculty Senate on any individual suspension case. Rather, I interpret this sentence to mean that the VPAA will receive any recommendations from Faculty Senate relative to the Suspension Guidelines that have been issued. **Pinto:** I think there has to be some level of checks and balance in terms of administrative power. So, I think there should be opportunity for faculty input into this important matter. **Gromko:** The Grievance Procedure is a check and balance system. These sanctions policies are addressing serious safety or disciplinary instances that call for swift administrative action. **Hebein:** I agree with what you are saying, but I also believe that there is a place for faculty consultation prior to pronouncing final sanctions. **Lee:** I just don’t see how this would operationalize. I don’t see how a single faculty member could be consulted on an informal basis by a Dean to determine faculty sanctions. It seems to me that if you are going to build in having faculty input that it would have to involve a specific committee that would be identified in the process. You can’t throw in an informal process in the middle of something as formal as a sanction. **Vatan Woodhouse:** Perhaps, the faculty member who has been sanctioned could be asked if they want a faculty colleague involved in providing input to the final sanctions. **Williams:** Could I ask us to return to some form of order? We have been discussing a variety of issues related to these revisions, but it seems that we have not arrived at any conclusive changes. Could we go through the 2/10/07 revisions and determine if there are any changes that need to be made that this group supports. There appear to be no changes to Section (1). In Section (2), sentence #1 would read: “Any suspension of a faculty member **with or** without full pay and benefits taken in response to **a confirmed** ~~allegations or complaints~~ **instance** of conduct or **omission** (§) in violation of this Charter, policies or procedures of the University, or any law, rule or regulation shall be considered disciplinary action.” **Currie:** I would like to recommend that in the 11/9/06 draft of “Guidelines and Perspectives for Academic Administrators” relative to Pre-Disciplinary Suspensions, that under Section 1.A. “Talking with the Complainant and Respondent Individually” a second bullet be added at the bottom of page 1 that would read: **“In addition, the faculty member may invite a faculty colleague to attend this meeting.”** **Lee:** I would concur with this. **Gromko:** I would also agree to this. **Currie:** I also think that **it should be the responsibility of the administrator bringing charges to inform the faculty member being accused that they have the right to invite a faculty colleague to attend any Pre-Disciplinary Suspension meetings.** **Pauken:** I would agree. **Gromko:** I don’t see any problem with this being included in the guidelines.

## NEW BUSINESS

**Pauken:** I am open to have any of the items under New Business reordered in case we run out of time.

### Administrative Review Resolution

**Williams:** Some of the items, like the Administrative Review Resolution will only take a minute or two to report on. **Pauken:** Then, let's start with that item. **Williams:** The following Resolution for Administrative Review was passed by Faculty Senate earlier this year. The Faculty Senate recommends and requests that BGSU conduct a comprehensive Administrative Review, analogous to the Program Reviews undertaken by BGSU's academic units, to include an internal needs analysis; external reviewers; and input from students, classified staff, administrative staff, and faculty; to be completed every seven years with the first review to be held during the 2007-2008 academic year; the purpose of the review being to identify strengths and areas needing strengthening in the BGSU central administration at the Dean level and above.

We did have a meeting to discuss the Administrative Review Resolution passed by Senate. Those in attendance included: Rich Wilson, Gary Lee and me. **Lee:** We spent some time refining what was meant in this resolution. From the strictest interpretation, every administrative unit from the President's Office down to the Deans' Offices would undergo an administrative program review. The outline which we were provided by the administration really outlined what should transpire in a Program Review, not an Administrative Review. **Gromko:** May I say that this has taken a direction different than I imagined. I thought that the committee would determine the types of data that was being requested. I, in the meantime have attempted to meet with Bill Knight to gather data that I thought might address some of the concerns put forth in the resolution. **Williams:** And this is where we are Mark. We have a meeting scheduled with you, Linda Dobb, Gary Lee, Rich Wilson and myself to try to come up with a plan to meet the intent of the resolution and at the same time meet the needs of the administrative offices here at BG. If you want to invite Bill Knight, that would be fine.

### Severe Weather Closing Policy

**Pauken:** The Severe Weather Closing Policy and Procedures (From *A Handbook of Commonly Shared Employment Policies for BGSU Faculty, Administrative and Classified Staff*) is found in Attachment # 6. **Williams:** Closing the University due to inclement weather can be a touchy subject and I believe that you will meet with mixed reviews regardless of the decision you make. There were some concerns and issues raised about the recent closings. Could there have been earlier notices of the closings? If Wood County is at a Level 3 "Snow Emergency", should the University be closed? What happens if Wood County is at a Level 3 but Bowling Green City is at a Level 2 "Snow Advisory?" **Gromko:** On the Tuesday that we closed, we consulted with the Wood County Sheriff's Department by 6:30 a.m. and determined that we would remain open. It wasn't until conditions rapidly deteriorated that we decided to send staff home on Tuesday morning. On Wednesday, the determination was made to close by 5:25 a.m. **Williams:** But, what about the evening classes? The policy states that "in the event of an evening closure, Marketing and Communications will attempt to notify the campus and media by 4 p.m." **Gromko:** We intended that the day and evening classes would both be canceled. **Vatan Woodhouse:** But the policy does say that there would be a determination about evening classes by 4 p.m. So, I think it could be confusing for students if they were waiting for another announcement after 4 about whether or not evening classes would be canceled. **Lee:** I would

think that if the University were closed for the day, that it would also be closed for the evening. **Williams:** But, that isn't what the policy says. Students in my evening classes had read the policy and were waiting for an announcement after 4 p.m about evening classes closing. So, I do think there is some confusion on interpreting the procedures for closing/ canceling evening classes. I have another issue that was raised. Does everyone who is classified as "essential personnel" know that they are classified as such? **Gromko:** Anyone considered as "essential personnel" receive cards from Human Resources at the beginning of the academic year. **Vatan Woodhouse:** Another problem that I saw was that students were not notified by email of the university closing. The Policy states: "Faculty, staff and students will be sent an email announcement, and information related to the emergency will be posted on the University web site." **Gromko:** These are all valid suggestions.

### **Process for Review and Approval of Curricular and Programmatic Changes**

**Pauken:** Our next topic is the proposed Process for Review and Approval of Curricular and Programmatic Changes (Attachment #2). Following a list of concerns voiced about losing track of the status of academic-related proposals as well as a lack of direction for authors of such proposals, the Faculty Senate Office was asked by the Provost Folkins to develop a check list for transmittal of various proposals. In attachment #2, you will find check lists for the following:

- Creation of a New Department
- Creation of a New Undergraduate College
- Creation of a New School
- Creation of a New Degree (Graduate and Undergraduate)
- Reconfiguration- that affects two or more colleges
- Succession of Approval Review for a New Major

The purpose of these check lists were to make it easier for proposers to properly route their proposals and to make it easier to keep track of the status of the proposals. **Gromko:** My concern is that we need to come to a common agreement as to which groups need to be included in this routing and approval process. Of particular concern is the last check list for Approval for a New Major. My concern is that we have slowed down the process of approving new majors by getting bogged down in a review by Senate bodies such as Committee on Academic Affairs and Senate Executive Committee and oftentimes Faculty Senate. These new majors are formally taken to a Departmental Curriculum Committee for approval, perhaps to a School Curriculum Committee, followed by a College Curriculum Committee, followed by a review from Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council. So many of these new majors go through four levels of faculty review. I do not understand the need for further levels of faculty review through Faculty Senate. I am asking for relief. I am asking that the approval review for new majors not go to CAA, SEC or Faculty Senate. **Hebein:** I would think that Committee on Academic Affairs (CAA) should be informed that a new major has been proposed and approved. I agree that CAA is not to approve or disapprove these academic matters. Rather, they are to inform SEC and Faculty Senate about new academic programs, majors, etc. **Gromko:** I believe that CAA is in violation of the Charter, because they vote on whether or not to support these academic proposals such as a new major. **Williams:** I take issue with your interpretation, Mark. CAA is aware of their role to review and disseminate academic proposals/information to SEC and subsequently to Faculty Senate. CAA is very aware that their role is not to approve or disapprove academic proposals. **Hebein:** I would agree that CAA would not be in a position to approve or disapprove any of these academic proposals. But, I do agree that CAA should be informed. **Pauken:** So, it would appear that CAA should not be included in a review of new majors. **Hebein:** I would defend the right of CAA to take up any academic issue that they feel is important. However, it appears that CAA might have fallen into the pattern of reviewing all academic proposals, including the development of new majors. **Lee:** I think that giving Senate the power to approve new majors would not be

prudent. It could add years to the process. **Gromko:** I just don't want to slow down the process of academic review. I don't want to add to the bureaucracy. **Williams:** Would you or someone from your office be willing to sit down with the Senate Officers and Secretary of Faculty Senate to see where there are bureaucratic problems in the check lists and approval procedures for academic proposals? **Gromko:** I would be glad to. But, I would recommend Steve Cornelius, who has been working on check sheets in the Provost's Office. **Hebein:** I would suggest that we get the Senate Officers together with someone from the Provost's Office to tweak these check lists. Perhaps, we don't need to bring them back to SEC. **Williams:** Should something be mentioned to CAA about not calling in faculty to present proposals for new majors? **Hebein:** I believe that is an issue between the Provost and CAA. **Lee:** The problem with self-governance is that sometimes we can be very bad at it.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Vice Chair Pauken adjourned the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen U. Williams  
Faculty Senate Secretary  
April 10, 2007