

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING

July 22, 2008
3:00 pm.

Assembly Room
McFall Center

This meeting was called by petition from a group of Concerned Faculty to the Senate Executive Committee under IV.D.1 b). The purpose of the meeting was to discuss a series of questions posed in the petition and VPAA Shirley Baugher's answers to them. The petitioners asked Baugher to make her answers to the questions available in writing in advance; she agreed. The questions and her response are available at <http://www.bgsu.edu/downloads/bgsu/file52546.pdf> . On the morning of today's meeting, the Concerned Faculty published a response to the VPAA's answers, which is referred to as the Response to the Response. It is available at http://docs.google.com/View?docid=dhh2vz27_20g83v68cv .

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Ellen Williams called the meeting to order and asked the secretary to take the roll.

ROLL CALL

Present: Faculty Senators Judy Adams, Pavel Anzenbacher, Candace Archer (substitute David Jackson), Keith Bernhard, Vibha Bhalla, Kristine Blair, David Border, Robert Boughton, Alden Craddock (sub. Robert DeBard), Jude Edminster, Tori Ekstrand, Nora Engebretsen (sub. Per Broman), James Evans, Radhika Gajjala, Dwayne Gremler, Christina Guenther (sub. Geoffrey Howes), Arjun Gupta, Emily Hinnov, Daniel Klein, Molly Laflin, Daniel Madigan, Trinka Messenheimer, Montana Miller, Benjamin Muego, Timothy Murnen, Mary Murray, Nancy Orel, Nancy Patterson, Patrick Pauken, Hassan Rajaei, Amy Robinson, (sub. Federico Chalupa), Arthur Samel, Ronald Shields, Edward Weiland, Philip Weinsier, Daniel Williams (sub.), Sara Worley, Arthur Yeh, Michael Zickar, Guy Zimmerman, Richard Hebein-Secretary
Ex Officio Interim President Carol Cartwright, **VPAA** Shirley Baugher, **VPSA** Edward Whipple (sub. Jill Carr)
Graduate Student Senate Emmanuel Guillory
Parliamentarian Patrick Pauken

Absent: Faculty Senators Nina Assimakopoulos, Margaret Booth, Donald Callen, Amelia Carr, Elaine Colprit, Beth Griech-Polelle, Terry Herman, Neocles Leontis, Monica Longmore, Srinivas Melkote, Rekha Mirchandani, Thomas Muir, Peter Pinto, Lee Rockett, Roger Schupp, David Stott, Ruben Viramontez-Anguiano, Haowen Xi, Jingyun Zhang, Opportune Zongo

Retiree Representative Robert Clark

Ex Officio EVP Linda Dobb

Graduate Student Senate Sarah Lafferty

Undergraduate Student Government John Waynick, Sundeep Mutgi

The secretary announced that there was a quorum.

COMMUNICATIONS

Chair

Williams asked new senators to stand and be recognized. Williams welcomed Interim President Cartwright to the University. She replied that she was glad to be here and observed that good communication was important. Williams thanked Howes and Leontis for leading their group and Baugher and her staff for answering the questions. Williams observed that it was essential to keep the dialogue flowing between the faculty and the administration. She announced that the format of the meeting would be to take the questions one at a time, allowing Baugher to speak and then to take questions and comments from the floor.

NEW BUSINESS

Baugher said that she appreciated the opportunity to be here because communication was very important.

Question 1

When will the administration involve faculty and staff in shared governance as provided by the Academic Charter and the standing committees of the Faculty Senate and academic units? When will the administration provide for employee involvement in the selection of faculty and staff to ad hoc committees? Currently, committees are typically informed of decisions rather than involved in them. When will the administration work with employees to restore trust between the two parties, and give employees a legitimate place at the table?

Baughner said that she would not read aloud what she had already written in her response but that she would refer to it and make use of a PowerPoint presentation. She said that, as she pointed out in her response, many committees were cross-divisional and had cross-organizational representation. She said that some of them such as the Strategic Positioning Group and the University Strategic Planning Group (“Change Team”) had been appointed by the President. She said that Faculty Senate had been invited to nominate members and that some of them were appointed.

Evans observed that several administrators had appointed committees and side stepped the procedures as outlined in the Charter for the formation of committees, which “evades the prerogatives of Senate.” Howes said that he was aware of such committees having been established and that Evan’s comment was appropriate.

Baughner said that this needed further investigation and turned her attention to the committees listed in the Response to the Response. She said that there was no General Education Review Committee. She said that the First-Year Seminar Committee, the Schedule Grid Review Committee and the Co-op and Internships Review Committee were not committees in the usual sense but were meetings of representatives called on to make recommendations, sometimes as in the case of the last group, with short deadlines.

Muego observed that there has been a tendency over the years to constitute ad hoc committees whose functions are similar to standing committees. He advocated broader representation because frequently the same persons keep serving and others should be integrated into the process.

Weinseir noted the multiple committees that worked on non-tenure track faculty, flexible tenure and leave issues. Baughner said that one of them was constituted before she got here and she pulled together a few people to work with the Faculty Welfare Committee on flexible tenure and leave. She said that that they realized that the two issues had to be treated separately. Williams agreed that the former VPAA had established that committee. Williams suggested that Senate invite administrators to discuss the formation of new committees. Baughner agreed.

Anzenbacher asked how persons got on committees like the Change Team. Williams said that there were various ways. He advocated a more formal mechanism for inclusion on committees. Baughner said that deans, constituent groups and student groups had been invited to nominate persons for the Change Team.

Cartwright said that President Ribeau had asked the Change Team to set up a framework for discussion of documents and that she had to decide on a process. She said that this was an opportunity for us.

Chalupa said that he had been a member of a committee to cut funding for study abroad programs and that the committee was told what would be acceptable and that this was coming from the Provost’s Office. Baughner answered that the AYA programs were not cut this year and that we were working with a deficit and that she had asked for alternative models. She said that she had only recently received the report. Chalupa said that every time they suggested alternatives, they were told that the Provost’s Office required a cut in the State Share of Instruction going to the programs below a certain amount. Baughner said that we had to arrive at a model that would allow for some cost recovery.

Question 2

In recent administrative decisions, financial considerations have driven academic decisions, with possible permanent damage to legitimate and valuable programs. For example, the introduction to the BGeXperience program has been reduced by two thirds. Many summer workshops have been eliminated. Study-abroad programs

have had significant budget cuts. Across campus, open faculty positions remain unfilled as units deal with a wave of unanticipated resignations and retirements (see points 4 and 9 below). How can we restore a system in which our academic charge determines our goals, and these goals determine financial solutions?

Baughner said that the financial challenge was to invest in revenue-producing streams, support faculty productivity and quality programs while addressing reductions and reallocations due to economic challenges.

She said that the BGeX budget has not been changed but that the Success Challenge budget had been significantly overspent, which necessitated a change in the move-in date. Howes, quoting a statement by Leontis, said that that key figures had not been consulted and that we learned about this in a Marketing Update. Miller said that she had been on a committee that recommended a slight reduction in the program but nothing this drastic. Baughner said that they cut the stipends to faculty because they had come from the depleted Success Challenge account. She said that the discussion in the President's Cabinet focused on alcohol abuse and the free time that students had on their hands and that Whipple recommended changing the move-in day. Samel said that the Police Chief said that there was not an increase in crime during the longer move-in period. Samel said that the three-day move-in period was useful for students to adjust.

Chalupa said that the Academic Year Abroad programs did not run a deficit. Under the terms of an agreement with VPAA Middleton, they were not allowed to run a deficit. Baughner agreed that the AYA programs did not run a deficit but that International Programs did.

Question 3

How can the administration account for the fact that faculty grievances have been decided 100% in favor of the administration in recent years?

Baughner said that most of the cases referred to in the petition had occurred before her arrival. Muego, Chair of the Faculty Personnel and Conciliation Committee, clarified that she had received three recommendations from hearing boards. In one, the hearing board recommended for the grievants, and she approved that. In the other two, one board having found for the grievants and the other for the respondents, she accepted the recommendation of Legal Counsel who advised that the grievants did not have standing because they were no longer BGSU faculty members. [It has since been clarified in the recently approved Grievance Procedure that faculty do have standing to grieve after termination.]

Evans said that serving on the Faculty Personnel and Conciliation Committee was not fun and that people did this to help the University but that administrators seemed resistant to accept their recommendations. Baughner said that she had met with FPCC and appreciated their work but that the issue was not agreeing or disagreeing with the hearing board; it was about making the best judgment that she could. She added that she did not discuss pending cases with deans. Zimmerman said that it appears that recommendations by hearing boards finding for the grievant were not treated with the same respect as those finding for the respondent. Baughner said that she could not respond to prior practice but that she would continue to work with the committee. She suggested meeting with them more often.

Question 4

Regarding the wave of faculty and staff retirements and resignations over the past year, there is some perception and concern that older employees are being pressured by university administration to leave, in order to achieve reductions in wages and health care costs. What is the average age for faculty and staff (administrative and classified) who have left university employment over the course of the last academic year to the present?

Baughner said that the information in her written response showed that the retirement data seemed to be consistent over the years. Weinsier noted that there were a lot of people leaving in their 40s. Baughner said that we had lost faculty due to salary, market retention and personal reasons and that she was concerned about the numbers and age of those leaving. Weinsier cited the need for more data. Baughner said that we used exit interviews but that they were

voluntary. Madigan said that there had been a report on faculty retention a few years ago, and Baugher suggested that we take another look at it.

Question 6

For reasons both academic and practical, the Faculty Senate takes a keen interest in the Centers Of Excellence process. What is the definition of a Center of Excellence? How and why have such centers been chosen? What are the resource implications for those areas not included in, or chosen as, the centers?

Turning to Question 6, Baugher said that Dean's Council had worked on this matter and used the criteria including faculty accomplishments, economic impact, external recognition and regional support. She said that they arrived at four and that the process was still open. She said that it was necessary to distinguish between Centers of Excellence, which are cross-disciplinary, and Signature programs, which tend to be department based. She said that the Chancellor would choose the final Centers of Excellence and that we hoped there would be funding from the state for them. Howes asked what was the participation of Faculty Senate. Baugher apologized that she had not asked for their participation in this.

Question 5

The balanced and detailed information from program review can help the governing bodies of the university make informed and responsible decisions on how to deal with financial exigency within programs. Please explain why the program-review process was suspended and when and in what form the administration plans to reinstate it.

Baugher said that the process would be phased back in during 2008-09. Howes regretted that departments were told to stop the process but not what would happen in the future. He asked what form "consultation within the university took." Baugher said that she had shared the information with deans and that she learned to disseminate information through several channels simultaneously.

Question 7

What are the costs of the outside consultants (e.g. Noel-Levitz) being brought in to do university business? What is the cost, for example, of using Noel-Levitz for their enrollment management services? What is the source of the money for Noel-Levitz's services? Are cuts in areas of instruction and student services being used to fund the consultants? What results do we expect from these contractors, and how will their performance be assessed? Why is faculty expertise on campus in relevant areas not being used?

Muego noted that Noel-Levitz was advising competing universities and asked about possible conflict-of-interest. Baugher said that they had addressed the issue. She said that our mission is different from others' and that Noel-Levitz would help us reach our targeted groups, namely, students who are likely to attend, stay and succeed. Samel noted that our scholarship dollars have decreased. Baugher responded that we had to look more closely at who pays and how much they pay. Murnen asked whether the \$175,000 per year was the maximum we would pay them; Baugher said it was. Knight, Assistant Vice-President for Institutional Research, said that we were buying their analysis of data and not their academic advising software. DeBard asked whether \$175,000 per year for three years would be the maximum for three years; Baugher said it was. She added that we have lost \$6 million recently due to declining enrollments and that we have a goal of reaching an additional \$3 million with the help of the consultants. She said that she had called seven or eight institutions that used Noel-Levitz and was convinced that the expenditure was worth it. Cabinet discussed the matter and decided to hire them.

Question 8

How is the administration handling funds being brought in by grant recipients? Are principal investigators ("PIs") and grant-funded areas being allowed to use the money they have attracted to run their programs? Is university administration sweeping grant budgets to gain resources for the general university budget? There are reports that micromanagement of grants by administration has added steps and time, and thus hindered the ability to carry out

the grant programs effectively (e.g. by adopting PeopleSoft without providing resources to assist grant recipients and administrators in fixing problems in what has been characterized as a software program that is "not friendly to grants"). How does the administration intend to promote research and engagement grants without providing the means for grant recipients to meet contracted grant requirements? Is there a plan to allow grant recipients to retain their own faculty buyouts and at least some of the grant indirects? Is there any interest in improving incentives, resources and benefits for grant PIs?

Baughner said that the distribution is the same as it has always been. Anzenbacher asked about the results of the consultancy for FMS. Baughner replied that she had received the report on the "pre-grant" part of the process and Dean Snavelly was working on that. Faculty were consulted during the process. CFO Stoll said that the consultant working on grants accounting has completed their work. She said that over 900 old grants accounts have been closed out and that they were close to catching up with the rest. She said that there were still issues that need to be resolved especially on the "post-award" part of the process.

Question 9

What is the rationale for removing the control of faculty lines from the colleges and consolidating them in the provost's office? What is the administration's time line for filling open faculty lines? Unit planning has halted at BGSU because we cannot predict how we will meet our students' needs; the resulting damage to the academic reputation of some of our best programs may already be irreparable. Some colleges are so reduced in faculty that they do not know how they are going to provide instruction to their students this fall. Many classes, even at upper levels, are overcrowded in enrollment numbers and in terms of physical space. Some classrooms are perilously overcrowded. Beyond the obvious questions regarding our obligations to student learning and physical safety of all personnel, concerns have been raised about our accreditation status, should these inadequacies continue?

Baughner said that we had to deal with a \$3 million deficit last fall. The President imposed a hiring freeze. She said that there are currently \$7.6 million in staffing requests and only \$6.3 million to pay for them. In addition, she said that it was clear to her that we had an imbalance of tenure/tenure-track and non tenure-track lines; she is asking the colleges what the balance should be in their units. She used the early retirement fund dollars to pay for tenure track lines this year.

Question 11

What is the administration's time line for increasing faculty and staff compensation to parity with other universities in Ohio?

Williams suggested taking up Question 11 next. Baughner said that we had not achieved the goals of the Compensation Plan in place since 1999. She said that the Board of Regents had eliminated in-state peer groups and suggested a different group for us. Zickar said that we were supposed to be a "premier learning institution" and that he didn't see any institutions as "premier" in the proposed group of peers; he asked if we had given up that goal. Baughner said that she didn't think so. Murnen said that we were being compared to the four corners institutions and they should be on the list. Weinsier, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, said that they had looked at several groups and that we don't compare well with any of them. Baughner said that we needed to reduce costs, increase revenues and reallocate money to the salary base. Evans, Chair of the Faculty Senate Budget Committee, said that for years they used a list of eighty-eight institutions for comparison. We used to be in the fortieth percentile and now we were in the twentieth, but he predicted that we would look good on salary comparison with the proposed group. Baughner said that she had not yet done that comparison. Knight said that the proposed group was not put together for that purpose.

Question 10

Please document the cost of the recent reorganization of the Provost's office. What are the salaries of the two new Vice Provosts, the four additional Associate Vice Provosts, and the upgraded designation of "Chief of Staff." How have these been covered in a budget-neutral fashion?

Baughner said that the Provost Council identified areas that they needed to focus on: budgets, academic planning, capital planning, grants and contracts. She said that the question was: Where do we need to deliver service? She said that they were reorganizing but not increasing the size of the office. As explained in her written response, as of July 1, 2008, the annual personnel expenditure for 2008-09 was 2% over the annual expenditure for 2007-08. She said that she expected to be spending less in the provost's Office in three years than we are now. DeBard said that it appears that the size of the faculty has shrunk but that we are less rigorous in allocating administrative positions. Baughner admitted that it looked like that but that she was hoping to generate income and provide services. Evans said that he recognized the need to re-organize the Provost's Office and said that the major administrators should hold faculty rank. He asked her if she agreed; she said that she did although vice-provosts for enrollment management were not typically faculty.

FINAL STATEMENTS

From the Petitioners

Howes submitted this statement for inclusion in the minutes:

When Neocles Leontis and I sent out an open letter to the Provost on May 30, we were mainly concerned that the financial strictures being imposed on the rest of the University were not being imposed on the Provost's office. This concern, while still valid and in our view unresolved, quickly became immersed in the wave of faculty and staff dissatisfaction for which we had unwittingly become a point of focus. Although we had been keenly aware of an atmosphere of discouragement and fear, we were struck by the variety and intensity of the concerns we heard in person, by email, and by telephone. We responded by calling a meeting at the Wood County Public Library. We had no idea how many people would come on short notice in the summer semester, but approximately 75 faculty, administrative staff, and classified staff appeared. We spent the two and a half hours of the meeting hearing concerns that ranged from long-standing dissatisfaction with certain practices at the university to more-recent concerns about rapid, autocratic, and apparently arbitrary changes. We decided that the purpose of that meeting should be to call this meeting—to use the established governance processes of the university to respond to what many saw as departures from those processes. We thank the officers of the Faculty Senate for their cooperation, swift action, and patience, and we thank Provost Baughner for responding at length to the questions we gathered from our colleagues at that meeting. But we also have to say that we are not satisfied with many of these responses, which are sometimes selective, obscure, incomplete, or beside the point. I hope I have indicated why in my previous responses.

I would like to emphasize that our involvement in this is not chiefly personal—it is to a great extent a response to our colleagues' expressed dissatisfaction. Without intending to, we uncovered a great deal of unhappiness. Once we had taken that step, we decided we had to proceed to find out the reasons for it. At our meeting, we heard many of them, which were condensed into the petition. As of today, there are 87 names on that petition. We know that this represents only a fraction of those who would like to put their names down, but for various understandable reasons do not want to. This fear of consequences, which we have encountered again and again, is a symptom, we think, of a perception of lack of respect for established procedure, and of a fear of arbitrary and even punitive decision-making.

Aside from any of the particular points, it has become clear to us in our communications with our colleagues that the overarching concern is the lack of participation on the part of the people who make up this university in dealing with necessary change, by statutorily established means. Again and again, we have heard that committees and forums are not consulted, but reported to.

Neocles and I have experienced five provosts during our careers here. We know that the substance of what these provosts have managed is the engagement and commitment to the university of those of us who have devoted ourselves to it. We have also found out that many of these colleagues—much of the university itself—are being alienated from the university. This is absurd, and it is alarming.

What I would like to address now are the Core Values and the Academic Charter of the University, and I would like to ask the members of the Senate whether they are satisfied that these are being upheld at BGSU.

The Core Values as stated on the University web site are, as you know:

- Respect for one another
- Cooperation
- Intellectual and spiritual growth
- Creative imaginings
- Pride in a job well done

In our discussions with our colleagues, we have seen real damage done to the first two of these, respect and cooperation, which of course inhibits intellectual and spiritual growth, creative imaginings, and pride in a job well done. More than once we have heard people use the word “contempt” with reference to the attitude toward faculty. Colleagues have told us of a denigrating attitude toward the general idea of shared governance. We have heard from some that the Provost implies that the university we have contributed to building is a basket case (my words) in need of emergency treatment. Budget constraints and OBOR reorganization notwithstanding, I do not believe there was a general crisis at BGSU one year ago. Now I do, and it is a crisis of morale.

I know that I am reporting what others have said, but if we take the Core Values seriously, we must listen to these voices carefully, since the intangible value of respect is involved. Neocles and I have been hearing reports for almost two months now that back up my statements. I would ask the Faculty Senate to investigate further and find the facts.

I will now cite passages from the Academic Charter that we believe are relevant. We do not believe that these statutes of university governance are being fully observed. We would respectfully ask the Provost to take every measure to assure that they *are* being followed. And we would ask the members of the Senate to consider what will be necessary to restore to their body its due role and power in University affairs.

The *Academic Charter* states: “Essential to the atmosphere of a University is academic freedom, the full freedom of speech, freedom to teach, to learn, and to conduct inquiry in a spirit of openness necessary to the acceptance of criticism, the expression of differing opinions, and the pursuit of truth” (*I.A.*) and “Government in the University ... is best based upon principles rather than upon people” (*I.C.*) and “The primary responsibility for the development and maintenance of the University’s academic programs belongs to the faculty” (*I.D.*) and “There must be faculty participation within the governance structure of the University...for discussion of problems and policies at all levels within the University” (*I.E.*) and “the primary concern of administrators is...to assure the implementation of the policies and procedures prescribed by the governing councils and agencies of the University” (*I.G.*). The *Charter* empowers the Faculty Senate as “the representative body of the faculty” that is “obligated through its policy and standards framing authority and by other means to promote to the fullest extent possible a climate of academic freedom for all faculty” (*IV.C.1*) and states that “the Faculty Senate, through the SEC, is empowered to make the final determination as to the value and wisdom of studies and recommendations made at the request of a member of the administration” (*IV.C.2*).

The *Charter* further specifies that the faculty members elected to all University standing and ad hoc committees shall be nominated by the Faculty Senate (*IV.C.3a*) under the provisions of *V.B.1*, which detail the authority of the Committee-on-Committees (*IV.F.6b*), and it specifies that the Committee on Academic Affairs shall “monitor all curricular and programmatic matters as well as all major changes in academic regulations and policies (*IV.F.2b*)” in accord with the Faculty Senate’s policies and standards framing authority to promote an optimal learning environment throughout the University” (*IV.C1a*).

Thanks to those who participated in our initial meeting, to the Senate officers, to the Provost’s office and its response, to our colleagues who have helped us and given us information, and to you who are here today, we have brought these matters from their extra-parliamentary origins to their proper place before the Senate. We ask the Senate to regard this not as a closure of these issues, but as a step in the direction of their resolution.

From Chair Williams

Williams said it takes courage to raise these issues and courage to respond. She urged all to work for shared governance with open communication and mutual respect.

From VPAA Baugher

Baugher said that she appreciated being here. She said she learned from the dialog, enjoyed it and hoped we would do more.

ADJOURNMENT

Williams adjourned the meeting at 5:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Hebein
Secretary