

**SEC Meeting Minutes // September 12, 2023
2:30 PM – 4:30 PM // Zoom**

In Attendance: Robyn Miller (FS Senate Chair), Allen Rogel (Vice Chair), Emily Gerome (USG), Ken Borland, Montana Miller (FS Secretary), Walter Ryley, Christopher Witulski (left meeting 3:50 pm), Chris Fluckinger, Jenn Stucker, David Fisher (GSS), Chris Kluse

1. CALL TO ORDER // 2:30 // Chair Robyn Miller

Minutes from August 22, 2023: David Fisher moves to approve, Walter Ryley seconds. Approved unanimously by hand vote.

2. CHAIR REPORT: Robyn Miller

Still some vacancies on standing committees; academic honesty, ComCom etc.

Met with Chris Bullins about academic honesty policies which are outdated, need to change. Would like to reorder agenda and have guest Chris Bullins speak about that first.

Chris Bullins (guest), Deputy Chief Well-Being Officer and Academic Honesty coordinator. Getting the process off the ground, we need to get an ad hoc committee going. Previous two ad hoc groups made recommendations, but language lives in the Charter and we have completed most of the changes that can be made without changing the Charter. Allen asked me to come up with what ad hoc committee membership might look like, scope of work, timeline for work, and make sure the Provost is on board, then added a section on constituent feedback, we will need to go through various committees, engage the Board of Trustees.

Today I have proposed version of ad hoc committee composition.

Allen Rogel: This looks like a good summary of what we had last year, the two earlier reports from previous committees, I was on both of them. This looks good and I would endorse, move that we do this.

Jenn Stucker: Question – can anyone serve on this or does it have to be a Senator?

Allen: There is a list of suggestions for who could serve on it.

Jenn: Would like to suggest a name, an individual came and addressed this issue they are being challenged by at the dean's office hours today.

Allen Rogel: At this point it would be under Senate's control to formally pull the ad hoc together. We at SEC and ComCom would make the final recommendation.

Allen Rogel moves to form ad hoc committee, seconded by Walt Ryley

Allen Rogel: Chris Bullins' document can be the charge.

Robyn Miller calls the question; approved unanimously by hand vote.

Rogel: We should change the wording for the charge so it says "proposed membership"

Rogel (in chat): So replace the paragraph "This document outlines" with "The following is a proposed list of members; Com/Com may add one or more members if desired."

No other discussion

Chris Witulski moves to approve the charge with suggested changes, Jenn Stucker seconds

Robyn Miller calls the question, approved unanimously by hand vote.

Bullins thanks everyone for their time and support of this

3. OLD BUSINESS:

Graduate Research Policy Elimination

<https://bgsu.instructure.com/courses/1197449/files/110948209?wrap=1>

Allen moves to un-table the motion from last meeting, Chris Witulski seconds, approved unanimously by hand vote (Chris Fluckinger abstaining)

Chris Kluse moves to approve elimination of graduate research policy, Robyn seconds.

Allen: Why had we tabled it, just to remind everyone?

David Fisher: We had a question for the Provost about whether it was a duplicate policy, the Provost found it and sent it to us showing that it was a duplicate policy.

Robyn Miller calls question; motion carries. Approved unanimously by hand vote.

Leadership Proposal Change from Ed.D to Ph.D (Follow-up)

Robyn Miller: Chris Willis et al are working out kinks and this will be on the agenda next week. They were not prepared to come and discuss this this week.

4. NEW BUSINESS:

Firelands Committee Report

<https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/track?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:0b11a96f-0418-3ae0-9185-b1957e7bc49d>

Robyn Miller: Firelands committee report was sent to us by the Provost. This is the committee that reviewed Firelands and looking at their envisioned future of BGSU Firelands. I just wanted to share this report with SEC. I have reached out to the Firelands rep here, on Senate, Chris Fluckinger—do you have anything to add to this?

Chris Fluckinger: Nothing in here is terribly surprising, there is stuff about funding, about the transfer payment, would make the difference between being in the red and being in the black. What do Firelands reserve represent? Ongoing questions such as if there is growth of those funds or interest, what happens with them? Informally the result of this committee leading to this document has answered a lot of questions that perhaps have not been answered well before. It was good for folks to see how things have been categorized and what the definition of independently budgeted means. Personally the answers have made sense. There has been a lot of progress on these issues and it's led to more awareness in programmatic things. Issues of what kind of review does an Associate Degree fall under, is there any Gen Ed component to those? This summarizes some of the budgeting and program approval things.

Robyn Miller: We should look this over as a body and see if there's any actions that need to be taken.

Curriculum Software

Curriculog Training.pptx

Received from graduate dean an overview of what the software is. Dr. Jennifer Waldren is wanting to do training for Senate, CAA, SEC, committees that are directly involved in this. Sometimes the curriculum process gets lost a lot and it takes time for things to get approved, to stay relevant.

Jenn Stucker: Question about training—it would make sense to have her come to the full Senate, the more transparent we can be the better.

Miller: I agree. The training is an hour, she says. To me, it's looking like so far I'm aware of two discussions for next Senate meeting: the Green fund, a faculty member wanted to come discuss that, and then the new financial reps we have, Sandy Heck from HR wanted to come discuss that. We'll probably have the Ed.D to Ph.D I hope, and probably things coming down the pipe. I don't think we'll have a full meeting, as we're at the beginning of the academic year. It might be good to have a training at Senate.

Allen Rogel: We need to be careful, last meeting we had an hour or more of reports before we shifted away from the reports.

Jenn Stucker: Maybe just information, maybe not a training "session." Maybe just a 20-minute overview or something like that, would be what I would expect at a Senate meeting.

Ken Borland: Rabbit trail was already created here for me. Talking about the "parade of suits" that commenced our meeting. We're not struggling with the pandemic as we were, mental health is a huge problem, I'm not entirely sure that the health officer should have a regular place in our agenda anymore, and the assumption seems to have been that this would continue.

Walt Ryley (in chat): I think that update could be done as a newsletter

Montana Miller: [agrees with Ken yet thinks these discussions need to happen somehow so Batey gets pushback/questions]

Allen Rogel also supports maybe it should just be a written report from him

Robyn Miller: It could be attached to the agenda.

Rogel: Then if something arises the ire of the faculty we could invite him to the meeting.

Ken Borland: Or invite him to SEC, as the floor of Senate is irreplaceable opportunity for a lot of things.

Montana Miller: [agrees, as Batey doesn't always reply to emails people send him about his updates]

Allen Rogel: Have him send the written reports and if we see something we want to talk to him about directly, we do an as-needed invite to SEC periodically.

Robyn Miller: I'll contact him for a report the week before Senate.

No action item needed according to Rogel and Borland

Definition of "Broad Impact"

Allen Rogel: [recaps problem of defining "broad impact" (in reference to continued work of committee on curriculum review)]

Jenn Stucker: Are you saying there would be an FAQ checklist with multiple things?

Allen Rogel: Yes, any number of potentials that could make a course broad impact. If yes on any one of these, it's broad impact.

Robyn Miller: Where does it say "broad impact"—where is the verbiage?

Allen Rogel: Down at the bottom in the courses part, all of these stars for review by USG, CAA, SEC etc. that's "if determined to be broad impact"... this is in the curriculum review process, approved by SEC in October 2019 joint with the Provost. The committee's report is going to then be passed to Amendments and Bylaws so the intent is that this definition will become part of the Charter.

Jenn Stucker (in chat): Are accreditation issues considered in relation to broad impact, like faculty qualifications to teach a proposed course aligns within a domain ... [suggestion for questions that should be asked] ... I don't mind working on this but don't want to work alone on it

Chris Witulski: I was on a couple of Senate committees last year where this question came up, as a result I feel personally completely unprepared to have a conversation about what broad impact means. Is the committee's report available to us? I don't see it on the page. The broad impact conversation, to Jenn's point, would have broad impact, so there are a lot of stakeholders who would have opinions on this.

Allen Rogel: Correct, the committee is seeking this input to facilitate writing this report. I know the committee was planning to solicit USG's thoughts on this

definition and probably the undergraduate council (UGC) as well. It was the thought of the committee that there is no grad course currently that would have broad impact. We don't have gen ed grad courses that I'm aware of.

Jenn Stucker (in chat): Organizational change at the grad level. exists in EFLP and Biz... only stating there are impacts here at grad level too.

Ken Borland: We're barking up the wrong tree. The problem is the phrase "broad impact." It's problematic because while the academy may structure itself in a very modernist way everything is in its own silo, now everything is interdisciplinary or will eventually be utilized that way. Every program change has impact and I think the proposer should describe what is the perceivable impact both positive and negative, rather than put "impact" in a box. The deletion of a program does have impact, but it's important for us to talk about what the impact is no matter how broad, so people can respond to it. Before we commit to the phrase "broad impact," we should address how the phrase is too limited and has outlived its use for us.

When people are being asked to think about impact, impact's beauty is in the eyes of the beholder. People don't think about academic knowledge all the time, sometimes they think about loss of revenue, how many seats they will be able to fill in their academic unit. It's very difficult to sort out the fiscal from the philosophical and practical.

David Fisher: Some of the classes I take are taken by three or more different programs. At the grad level there are courses outside my program courses that get taught at multiple levels—like Finance 3000, Accounting 6000 etc. Based on what I'm hearing, I think grad courses should probably also be considered in terms of defining broad impact.

Chris Witulski (in chat): To concur with both of these comments, some programs and their courses are intentionally interdisciplinary in both the academic/content sense and the fiscal sense. I'm especially thinking of our own in ethnomusicology or programs in places like popular culture.

Allen Rogel: We need to ask what is the role of the review process and who needs to be looking at proposals.

Jenn Stucker: Maybe it's a framing of—the biggest challenge is the transparency of do we all know what each other is doing? Probably a lot of us are doing the same things but in different ways... so it's more about considering possibilities of collaboration and having transparent conversations. I wish we had more faculty show and tell, or public talks or something so we knew what others are doing in the classroom, but of course the university has to support collaborative teaching, I'm being very pie in the sky. How do we create a synergy instead of a blockade?

Chris Witulski (in chat): Can we get some clarity from the committee about the practical changes in the process that will be triggered by the distinction?

Allen Rogel (in chat): In the current system the practical change is if a course is not "broad impact" its approval process is shorter than one that is "broad impact":

Robyn Miller: What about if it's something with a lot of pre-requisites? Could something like that play into it?

Rogel: That could be a potential criterion if we're doing the checklist.

Chris Witulski: This is really tricky to talk about without having a whole lot more context. Having a conversation about broad impact inform the committee report is starting to feel really circular and that makes me uncomfortable. Is this part of the conversation that was surrounding the pilot course that went through, or does this come from something else? How does this fit into that and does that inform these kinds of changes?

Allen Rogel: The pilot courses, what review they should have, is the other major question coming down from the committee, but where this comes from, the key example of a course that was never reviewed but now is fairly universally regarded to be broad impact was the Math Emporium. That was done years ago and now hundreds of students a semester are taking it. It was a cascade of small changes as it grew and it never got large scale review and now it's a math requirement for a huge amount of other stuff. So that particular course is definitely a course with broad impact but never was reviewed as a broad impact course. In my mind we need to be trying to track for that, as the course has instructors who are helping the students but I think the curriculum is provided on computer and the teaching assistants are just helping? I don't know if that's even been formally reviewed. That's one that crept through the cracks and we're looking to fix the cracks that that one crept through. The proposed BGSU 1914 is another one we're looking at addressing in terms of making sure faculty are involved at a very early stage. It's a separate gateway into the process but by the time it gets into the unit faculty are on board.

David Fisher: I wonder also about the process for how the decision would actually be applied. Is that within our purview to discuss also? Whether it would be more inclusive or less inclusive would also be a big impact.

Allen Rogel: At this point, under the charge to the committee, everything is open as fair game for discussion and proposal to modify. Everyone along the chain would be able to know, whether this was broad impact or not.

David Fisher: To follow up, if we create a list of criteria long enough, potentially every course could be flagged as broad impact and then every course could be

under review and that's not necessarily what we want. It could be a very chaotic decision process if it's a quantitative thing.

Robyn Miller: I'll send out a Word document with some ideas, maybe we could have some type of rubric, something like that. We'll put it back on the agenda next week.

Exploring Undergrad Certificates

Robyn Miller: The Provost asked if we could explore undergraduate certificates.

Jenn: What is the driving reason and economic rationale that relates to this, are we going to be back to our conundrum of resources and people to teach these courses?

Robyn: I didn't get background on that – he just said this is something we're thinking about.

Allen Rogel: This is new, I never heard of this one, I'd be interested in hearing the context of this from the Provost, where is this coming from? Things don't usually come from out of nowhere.

Walt Ryley: That seems too broad for me to even start thinking about, and maybe this is just a knee-jerk thing but it's sensitive to the kind of funding we have available, so without commitments about that, what can you really say? That would be my thought.

Robyn Miller: I think this might be coming from the 1914.... Everything they do they want to consult faculty, that's just a guess on my part.

Walt Ryley: Who are these for? Internal students? Outside students? To have a practical discussion about it I would need to know a lot more.

Robyn Miller: Us, we have the "Google educator certifications" and it sounds like you have something similar to that... we need to look at are these BGSU certifications or are they offering for some of our graduate certifications, it's part of the curriculum to pass the course.

Jenn Stucker: Maybe from the minutes of this meeting you could throw a couple of these questions to the Provost before next week's meeting, because I feel similar to Walt, I want more information and he's going to dump a lot of information on us without time to process it. Maybe he could give us something to chew on before we meet with him next week.

Chris Fluckinger: The words stackable and modular have come up with regards to discussion about certificates like this at Firelands. The sales pitch is great because it brings in money, it can be an offramp for students who stay 2 years...

Walt Ryley (in chat): It could cannibalize demand for other programs as well.

Ken Borland: There is an upside to certificates, there are downsides as well. Whatever the proposal ends up being, it will all be debatable. There are a lot of people who don't think a Bachelor's degree is worthwhile anymore, they want to add certificates onto that. Revenue generators doesn't mean they cost nothing. Why struggle to get a minor when you can come close enough with a certificate? On the other hand students who don't have a lot of elective space can put something together. There are a lot of ways to talk about this. But I don't know what the intention of this or the desired outcome might be, and that knowledge will set us on a path of good conversation. Let's seek more specificity from the Provost if he can give it. Several mentioned these prepackaged certificates, sometimes from vendors... will they be homespun, and if so what is the market for them? What is the demand for them? There's all kinds of ways to think about this and I'm more excited for this conversation much more than I would be about [the conversation about] "broad impact."

Allen Rogel: Yes, undergraduate certificates would have to be slotted into the review process.

5. ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Robyn: Issues and concerns: is there anything we'd like to add to next week's agenda?

Ken Borland: I have an issue I'd like us to talk about. My issue is based on experience and reflection about the last Senate meeting. The feedback loop got resolved, about hybrid, but I noticed a lot of people using the chat function and expecting to be involved in the conversation while people in the room were not accessing that information. Sometimes Allen would point out something in the chat but it was selective and not something everyone was privy to. I'm wondering if hybrid is going to work for us. We need to debrief on the functionality of the hybrid process so far.

Robyn Miller: Maybe we should have someone, Matt Desmond maybe, designated to run the chat or I don't see why we couldn't have the chat on the screen.

Allen: I had tried to read almost everything that came up in the chat on the Senate floor, we had the agenda on the screen, we could switch to having the

Zoom up on the main screen instead. Everyone at the meeting should have had access to the agenda.

Robyn: We could put a link to the agenda in the chat.

Allen: We could have paper agendas for the people who come to the meeting in person.

Ken: We could also just turn the chat *off*. If we're going to do hybrid we need to delineate *how* we're going to do hybrid.

Jenn: I had concerns after the last meeting about its function and flow. I'm curious to see if at the next meeting there will be more people in person. I do think Ken brings an interesting point up, but if a person raises their hand in Zoom, will they go to the top of the queue to be called on? When we had the race and democracy issue the chat was a *chat*, not a formal part of the meeting.

Robyn and Allen both like that idea

Robyn: The first one was a test, we wanted to see glitches and kinks, there were definitely things we needed to tweak and fix. Let's talk about it more next week. I don't like knee-jerk reactions. It will be on the agenda for next week.

Walt Ryley: Practically speaking remotely it's going to be hard to do the hand raise thing if it's temporary

Robyn: No you have to click "lower hand"

Allen: Also it does pop the people who have raised their hand up to the top left, so they are automatically on the first page if they raise their hand, so that will help Matt keep track. I also like the idea of turning off the chat for the Senate meeting.

Allen: Maybe we should use Zoom polls for votes like approving minutes etc. And any other votes that would normally be done by show of hands.

[Several comment that is a good idea]

Montana: [question about program director/department chair change and whether that needs Senate approval or if it's under the purview of the dean to make those changes. Best for Senate Chair to approach the dean and ask what is going on.]

6. ADJOURNMENT

Jenn Stucker moves to adjourn, Walt Ryley seconds, meeting adjourned 4:25 pm