

# SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## MINUTES

January 30, 2007  
2:30 - 4:30 p.m.

Senate Conference Room  
140 McFall Center

Present: Bernhard, Currie, Hebein, Lee, Little, Orel, Pinto, Vatan Woodhouse, Williams  
Guests: Dave Border, Chair of Committee on Academic Affairs; Phil Wiensier, Chair of Faculty Welfare Committee

The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m. by Senate Chair Hebein.

### **CHAIR'S REPORT**

Chair Hebein requested a reordering of the SEC Agenda to accommodate for invited guest speakers at the meeting.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

#### **Check List/ Routing Slips for Transmittals of Proposals**

Hebein reminded SEC that the Senate Office had been working since Fall Semester, 2006 on developing routing slips or check sheets for transmittal of proposals that came through Faculty Senate. The purposes of such routing slips would be: to assist proposers in knowing what steps needed to be taken in transmitting proposals for approval through Faculty Senate; to follow the routing as suggested by the Faculty Charter; and to keep track of the status of proposals. Hebein noted that there had been numerous changes already to these routing slips and that there might indeed be additional changes needed as we come to use the sheets more frequently. However, it was suggested that we begin the process of using these routing/ check sheets. Hebein asked if the SEC was in support of using these check sheets and there was unanimous support for their use.

Hebein requested that the minutes show that SEC endorses the posting, distribution and use of these routing sheets: Creation of a New Department; Creation of a New Undergraduate College; Creation of a New School; Creation of a New Degree at Undergraduate and Graduate Levels; and Reconfiguration (that affects two or more colleges).

#### **Update on the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Work Policy**

Chair Hebein introduced our guests, Dave Border, Chair of the Committee on Academic Affairs and Phil Weinsier, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee. Both of these committees have been working on the Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) Work Policy. Hebein asked for Border and Weinsier to report on the progress that has been made on this policy. **Border:** CAA formed an ad hoc committee to work on this around Thanksgiving break this past semester. The ad hoc committee included the Dean of Arts

and Sciences as well as a representative from FWC. The committee restricted itself to working on only two areas of the policy. The first area dealt with the ranks of non-tenure track full time faculty. The second area dealt with the 25% rule limiting the number of NTTF hired by the university. The ad hoc committee made recommendations to CAA and the Provost's Office. The Provost's Office recommended yet another ad hoc committee to review portions of the policy again. The new ad hoc committee consisted of the Provost, Vice Provost and representatives from CAA. This committee worked on rewording the policy relative to the ranks of non-tenure track full time faculty. The Provost took the revised portion of the policy to the Council of Deans where it appeared to meet with approval with some minor changes. CAA made the appropriate changes. So, the following portion of the proposed policy on ranking for full time NTTF has been approved by CAA and also by the Provost's Office:

**Proposed Charter Wording: Nontenure Track Faculty (B-I.C.2 (a))**

“A continuing nontenure track faculty position has no limitation on the number of years of service. The appointee is not eligible for tenure. **Continuing nontenure track ranks are: Instructor, Lecturer, and Senior Lecturer.** Appointment to continuing full-time nontenure track positions may be terminated by action of the appointee or by action of the University as specified in B-I.C. (3).”

**Proposed Charter Wording: Evaluation and Promotion of Continuing Nontenure Track Faculty (B-I.D.5)**

**a) Renewal**

“Those faculty members who have held **continuing nontenure track** contracts for more than one academic year or who present themselves as candidates for reappointment are subject to the appropriate annual evaluation procedures and criteria for salary changes (merit) as outlined in B.I-D.1.b.”

**“b) Promotion**

- (1) **Criteria for Ranks- Persons in nontenure track positions shall normally hold Masters Degree or equivalent. A terminal degree is desirable, but not required. Additional qualifications are:**

**a) Instructor**

**None**

**b) Lecturer**

**A minimum of four years experience as an instructor or equivalent of significant and relevant professional experience as defined by the hiring unit.**

**c) Senior Lecturer**

**A minimum of four years experience as a lecturer or equivalent.**

- (2) **Procedures for Promotion:**

**Promotions may be allowed from Instructor to Lecturer and Lecturer to Senior Lecturer with the approval from the Dean and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Units must develop procedures for promotion that will require a vote of the**

**appropriate faculty, recommendation of the Chair, and approval of the Dean and Vice President for Academic Affairs. In some instances, it may be possible to appoint a new faculty member as Lecturer or Senior Lecturer if he or she has equivalent teaching experience at another institution of higher education.”**

**Proposed Charter Wording: Merit (B-I.D.1)**

**b) “Recommendations for salary changes (merit) for an Instructor, Lecturer or Senior Lecturer shall be in accordance with the criteria developed by the unit and approved by the college.”**

**Hebein:** Let’s turn now to Faculty Welfare and their role in this proposed NTTF work policy. **Weinsier:** Faculty Welfare has had this topic on the table for well over two years. The goal of FWC in the construction of this proposal has been to:

- Standardize full-time, NTTF titles across the University;
- Provide more equal opportunities for NTTF faculty;
- Reduce costs, faculty time and candidate apathy related to searches;
- Eliminate labels such as “temporary” used to describe NTTF faculty; and
- Generally make NTTF feel more a part of the University.

This document represents the collective thoughts of FWC and suggests minimum guidelines such that anyone applying for or currently working in such a position at BGSU can be assured of certain basic job-related conditions. In February of 2006, FWC thought they had an NTTF work policy proposal ready to present to Faculty Senate. However, there were additional comments and suggestions coming from within the committee as well as from outside of the committee that caused FWC to continue working on the policy. Then in Fall Semester, we began to work with CAA to streamline the policy. So now we have a streamlined policy proposal that would require minimal changes to current charter language. **Hebein:** What Senate could do ultimately is to vote on amendments to the charter relative to the NTTF proposals. Are the items in the FWC proposal compatible with items found in the CAA proposal for NTTF? **Weinsier:** They are virtually the same. **Hebein:** Could we also address the controversial issue of the 25% rule? **Border:** CAA has had major concerns over the 25% rule relative to the employment of NTTF faculty. It would appear that in comparison to sister institutions, Bowling Green State University is relying on a disproportionate number of NTTF to teach classes. Under this new policy, if we group all nontenure track faculty under the category of “continuing” as opposed to the old method of using two different terms of “fixed term” and “continuing,” we will still have to scrutinize the number of NTTF being employed at BGSU. Many units on campus could be cited for violating the 25% rule for hiring NTTF. The Provost’s Office assured us that they would monitor the numbers of NTTF being hired and would not “pass” units who exceeded the 25% rule. **Lee:** It seems to me that over the years, there have been changes in the definitions and categories of NTTF. I believe that the original 25% rule only applied to the number of lecturers who could be hired. Perhaps the 25% rule is a survivor of past practices. Do we need to review the appropriateness of the 25% rule in light of the changing categories and changing definitions of NTTF? **Weinsier:** What do you think is better for the University,

an increase in the number of Tenure Track Faculty (TTF) being hired or an increase in the number of NonTenure Track Faculty (NTTF) being hired? **Lee:** My preference would be to have a greater number of TTF hired. But, perhaps the economic reality might not permit this. My concern is that we develop a policy that would treat our NTTF humanely and in a way that encourages them to give us their best efforts. We want them to know that their services are valued here at BGSU. **Bernhard:** How will the Provost's Office deal with units who exceed the 25% rule? **Border:** The Provost's Office indicated that they would be reviewing the numbers of NTTF being hired by units annually. They indicated that there might be some units who are justified in exceeding the 25% rule for hiring NTTF. One example of this might be the General Studies Writing Program. If it is justifiable, the Provost's Office indicated that they might grant annual exemptions to such programs. However, if the Provost's Office feels that it is not appropriate, there might be corrective actions to bring the unit into alignment with the 25% rule. **Bernhard:** I am concerned about whether the rights and responsibilities of NTTF and TTF are being addressed in this proposal. **Border:** The rights and responsibilities of NTTF are not really addressed in this policy. **Lee:** I am a strong proponent of a "Local Option" approach that would allow each unit to determine all faculty rights such as voting. **Hebein:** I believe that there is strong and divided opinion among TTF regarding some rights of NTTF such as voting in the unit. I would recommend that even though all issues relative to NTTF have not been addressed, that we move this proposal forward to Faculty Senate. Is SEC in agreement? (SEC offered unanimous approval.) **Williams:** Which proposal will be presented to Faculty Senate, the CAA proposal or the FWC proposal and who will present it to Faculty Senate? **Hebein:** It would appear that the most appropriate proposal would be the revised CAA proposal. I would ask that Dave present the NTTF proposal and that Dave and Phil be present to respond to any questions regarding the proposal.

**Resolution Opposing the "Declaration Regarding Material Assistance/  
Nonassistance to a Terrorist Organization" Instituted by the State of Ohio and  
Implemented by Bowling Green State University for all Newly Hired University  
Staff as a Prerequisite for Public Employment**

**Hebein:** This resolution comes to us from the Committee on Professional Affairs. Are there any questions or issues? **Vatan Woodhouse:** There are several suggestions punctuation changes. Also, the resolution appears to speak on behalf of the staff at Bowling Green when in fact this is a resolution coming from faculty. **Currie:** I believe that the BGSU faculty might want to only apply this resolution to hiring practices at BGSU rather than throughout the state of Ohio. **Williams:** I also have some concern with the wording that calls for the University Board of Trustees to "reject" the use of this mandate. Since it is the law, can we ask the university to reject the law? **Bernhard:** Perhaps, it is more appropriate for the faculty to suggest that the Board of Trustees publicly oppose its use as a requirement for the employment of new faculty and staff. (The revised resolution would read as follows:)

“Therefore be it resolved, that the faculty of Bowling Green State University unequivocally oppose the *Declaration* emanating from the Homeland Security Administration and its local arm, the Ohio Department of Safety, and calls on the

University Board of Trustees to publicly oppose its use as a requirement for the employment of new faculty and staff at Bowling Green State University.”

**Hebein:** Is there consensus among SEC that we bring this resolution to Faculty Senate? (SEC voted unanimously to put this on Senate Agenda.)

### **Amorous Relationship Policy**

**Hebein:** This policy has been floating around for several months. There have been some disagreements regarding the wording on this policy. The Executive Vice President has asked for several changes in verbiage due to concerns voiced by the President’s Cabinet. Initially, the policy included a recommendation that alluded to operating in a consistent manner with AAUP Standards. Because of Cabinet concerns, that wording was removed by SEC. New wording was added by SEC that called for “Disciplinary actions regarding faculty are administered by the Office of the VPAA/ Provost, **and shall include consultation with a faculty committee.**” In the most recent review, the Cabinet response has removed the suggestion to include “consultation with a faculty committee.” I am wondering if we are not seeing a pattern where faculty voice seems to be eliminated from policies such as this and such as the proposed faculty sanctions policy. While I do not want faculty to be making final decisions on matters such as these, I believe that is why we have hired administrators. I do believe that there is a need to maintain faculty input and faculty voice in decisions such as these. If Faculty Senate does not continue to support faculty voice in decision making on this campus, we could lose any shared governance we have. I believe that we should leave the wording in this policy relative to “including consultation with faculty.” **Bernhard:** I concur with your concerns, Rich. Perhaps we could change the wording to “**and shall include consultation with faculty.**” **(Perhaps, faculty appointed by the FPCC)** This would eliminate a need for working with a faculty committee. **Orel:** In item #1 of the policy, I would recommend that the wording be changed to “Within the University community, supervisors and faculty are not to have a supervisory, evaluative, instructional, coaching, advisory or other formal role over students or others **with** whom they have **or have had** a consensual amorous relationship.” **Vatan Woodhouse:** I had a question about the reporting process. Does a third party have the responsibility for reporting an amorous relationship if they are aware of it? **Currie:** I also have a question about who is defining a “consensual amorous relationship.” **Hebein:** This policy will be held for consideration by Faculty Senate until the Sanctions Policy also comes to Senate.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### **New Bachelor of Musical Arts Degree**

**Hebein:** This new Bachelors in Musical Arts Degree has passed all necessary procedures and should be taken to Faculty Senate. We will be asking Allen Smith to present this at Senate.

## **BG Perspective Changes**

**Hebein:** This BG Perspective change calls for a 5<sup>th</sup> Domain for BG Perspectives.

**Williams:** The Fifth Domain would be called “Expanded Perspectives” and could include, but not be limited to, interdisciplinary, engagement, community-based & service learning, quantitative or information literacy courses that meet BG P learning outcomes categories. **Hebein:** We will ask Steve Langendorfer to present this to Faculty Senate.

## **Taking Attendance at Faculty Senate Meetings**

**Hebein:** A Faculty Senator asked if there might not be a different way of taking attendance at Faculty Senate besides Roll Call. This might be a way of cutting down on the amount of time spent in Faculty Senate. **Currie:** I would prefer to continue with the roll call method as that is how I get to put names with faces of the Faculty Senators.

**Vatan Woodhouse:** I think only about 3-5 minutes might be used for roll call. I think that there are other places where we could cut down on the time being used (being more efficient) in Faculty Senate. **Little:** What about having assigned seats? **Bernhard:** Have you ever heard of the term “trying to herd cats”? **Hebein:** If you have any suggestions for making our Senate meetings more efficient, please let me know.

## **ISSUES AND CONCERN**

**Hebein:** Are there any issues and concerns?

## **Ad Hoc Committee to Explore the Administrative Review Resolution**

**Williams:** At the last Faculty Senate meeting, the Resolution to institute and Administrative Review was passed. In a subsequent meeting with Mark Gromko, there was discussion on setting up an ad hoc committee to work with the Provost’s Office in exploring how something like this might be implemented and for what purpose. Where do we stand on this ad hoc committee? **Hebein:** We discussed the inclusion of Rich Wilson who was the Senator who proposed the resolution. We have asked Committee on Committees to come up with other names for the ad hoc committee.

## **Suggested Readings**

**Bernhard:** I just wanted to share some suggested readings for Senators. There are three articles I would recommend that are in the Wilson Quarterly, Autumn 2006.

“The New Ivory Tower”

“Why the Liberal Arts Still Matter”

“Racing for Knowledge: International Comparisons”

## **MUO/ UT Merger**

**Williams:** Has there been any further activity to review the recent MUO/ UT merger and ascertain what impact the merger has on BGSU? **Hebein:** Not that I am aware of.

## **Bursarables Policy**

**Vatan Woodhouse:** There has been some student concern on whether or not they can use the Bursarable Account to purchase supplies from other than the University Bookstore. For example, could they use the Bursarable Account to purchase supplies from the Technology Store? **Little:** What about students in Architecture and the need to have designs copied? **Vatan Woodhouse:** What we are trying to do is to identify those purchases that are academically essential for students.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen U. Williams  
Secretary, Faculty Senate  
February 10, 2007