

## SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

### MINUTES

March 27, 2007  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Senate Conference Room  
140 McFall Center

Present: Currie, Hebein, Lee, Little, Orel, Pauken, Vatan Woodhouse, Williams

Chair Hebein opened the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

#### CHAIR'S REPORT

None

#### OLD BUSINESS

##### Administrative Review

**Hebein:** Is there a report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Administrative Review?

**Williams:** The Ad Hoc Committee consists of Rich Wilson, Gary Lee and me. We had a meeting with Mark Gromko, Interim Provost, and Linda Dobb, Executive Vice President to discuss possible ways to approach an administrative review. The conversation covered possible ways of reviewing our current administrative offices from Dean's Offices and above. Gromko suggested that he could work with Bill Knight's Office in providing institutional data that would indicate the number of administrative and classified support persons in each of the college offices. Those numbers could be compared with the numbers found in similar offices in our sister institutions in Ohio. Dobb suggested that there might be relevant questions added to the Deans' evaluations that would address how Associate Deans, administrative and classified staff were being used in the Colleges. Wilson reminded the group that the primary reason for the resolution for administrative review (which has already been passed by Faculty Senate) was to evaluate the effectiveness of the administrative offices on campus and to determine if they are appropriately staffed as well as to determine how they might improve administrative operations, especially during this time of tight budget constraints. Williams suggested that it might be good to bring in an organizational management consultant to evaluate these offices. Lee cautioned that any such review should not be so expensive that it would run counter to any attempts to provide cost savings. The group will meet again to further discuss this resolution.

##### Ethics Ad Hoc Committee Update

**Pauken:** Members of the Ad Hoc Ethics Committee had been hopeful that the recent Faculty Senate presentation from our new Ethics Officer, Dr. Paul Schauer would be informative in responding to several questions that the committee had composed relative

to the new Ethics Policy and to the role of the new Ethics Officer. However, it was felt that many of the questions asked were not answered. **Hebein:** It still appears that the language in the policy is somewhat broad and not clearly articulated. There still appears to be confusion about the jurisdiction that the ethics policy covers. Does your ad hoc committee wish to pursue further questioning on the policy this year or perhaps you might consider postponing it until this next academic year. **Pauken:** I believe that the committee would be willing to postpone further discussion of this until next year. Perhaps we might invite the Ethics Officer to address these questions with SEC or we might ask the President or the Board to respond to the questions.

### **Amorous Relationship Policy**

**Hebein:** Throughout this year, I have been arguing for a larger faculty voice on policies like the Amorous Relationship Policy. I would like to share an article with you about the importance of having a strong faculty voice in policy making on our university campuses. (Hebein disseminated an article “Faculty Autonomy and Obligation” from [www.AAUP.ORG](http://www.AAUP.ORG), January-February, 2007). **Vatan Woodhouse:** Is it possible to place this policy on the Faculty Senate Agenda for a vote at the April meeting. **Hebein:** Yes.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **Dunbridge Road Project**

**Hebein:** As you are aware of, the Dunbridge Road Project has been a point of discussion throughout this academic year. There has been much discussion about having the University engage in an agreement to use the Calderone property on Dunbridge Road to build a university structure that would accommodate student housing as well as some academic programs. To date, there appears to have been a housing feasibility study but there has been little to no commitment relative to an academic focus. This project has not come to Faculty Senate Budget Committee or to the University Budget Committee yet. **Vatan Woodhouse:** Both Undergraduate Student Government and Graduate Student Senate have been involved in discussions on the Dunbridge Project. There have been a lot of questions that really haven’t been addressed, such as transportation, removing students from the central part of the campus, and what the academic focus will be. USG and GSS are both opposed to the project at this point in time and we are in the process of writing position papers on it. We would like the Faculty Senate to consider supporting our position papers. **Hebein:** You could bring your position statements to the May Senate meeting.

### **Undergraduate Council Withdrawal Policy**

**Hebein:** Attachment # 2 is a copy of the Revised “Withdrawal from the University Policy”. This policy was approved by the Undergraduate Council on November 1, 2006 and the revisions were approved by Undergraduate Council on January 22, 2007.

## **Withdrawal from the University Policy**

If a student leaves the University without proper notice and permission, a mark of “WF” is recorded in all courses for which the student is currently enrolled. Such a student is not entitled to any refund of fees.

A student who wishes to withdraw from the University in good standing must obtain the permission of the dean (or dean’s designee) of the college in which the student is enrolled. A partial refund of fees may be possible; see Office of the Bursar. The following rules apply to these situations:

- A student who withdraws with permission from the University will have all courses from the semester withdrawn; the withdrawals will be recorded on the academic record as a grade of “W” with a date of withdrawal.
- Courses in which a grade of “D”, “F” or “WF” has been or will be assigned due to violations of the Academic Honesty policy may not be withdrawn or dropped under any circumstance; such grades will remain as part of the official record.
- Withdrawal from the university is only permitted before the final exam period of the fall or spring semesters, or before the last two days of any summer session.
- A student who withdraws after the designated dates in a semester (i.e., during the last five weeks of a 16 week term; during the last two weeks of six or eight week terms; or during prorated periods for courses of shorter duration) may not return until at least one intervening semester (fall, spring, or summer) has passed, except by special permission of the dean of the college in which s/he is enrolled. Short duration courses follow the readmission pattern of the general term in which they are taught.
- Retroactive withdrawal (that is, a withdrawal granted after the final exam period of the fall or spring semesters, or after the last two days of any summer session) may be granted in extraordinary circumstances, if the student is unable to complete classes or contact the university to initiate a withdrawal. A student who suffers a hardship should carefully consider whether withdrawing from the university is an appropriate option as detailed in this policy. Students who complete the semester after suffering a hardship will not be granted a retroactive withdrawal. Furthermore, students will not be considered for a retroactive withdrawal if they have received a grade of Incomplete for the appealed semester as part of an agreement with the faculty member to complete the required work, as such an agreement is an appropriate means for providing flexibility in case of hardship. Retroactive withdrawal must be requested within three years from last day of classes for the semester for which a withdrawal is requested.

- Students seeking a retroactive withdrawal must do so in writing to the college in which the student was enrolled during the semester being appealed. The college dean or dean’s designee has the sole authority in the decision to grant the retroactive withdrawal.

Most withdrawals from the University are initiated by the student. However, when, in the judgment of the medical staff of the Student Health Service, the physical or mental condition of a student might be a Danger to the health or welfare of that student or others on the campus, the University may require the withdrawal of the student from the University. Courses in which a grade of “D”, “F” or “WF” has been or will be assigned due to violations of the Academic Honesty Policy may not be withdrawn or dropped under any circumstance.

This policy revision is brought to SEC for information purposes.

**NTTF –BGSU Faculty Headcount**

**Bernhard:** I have compiled a graphing of the headcount of Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty hiring practices from 2002 to 2007. This is what the totals look like ( Keith disseminated a handout that was part of Attachment #3).

BGSU Totals	<u>02-03</u>	<u>03-04</u>	<u>04-05</u>	<u>05-06</u>	<u>06-07</u>
Tenured Faculty	396	396	415	429	453
Tenure Track	229	235	195	186	163
NTTF	214	230	274	280	302
<b>Total</b>	<b>839</b>	<b>861</b>	<b>884</b>	<b>895</b>	<b>918</b>

My question is “What does this data suggest about the future of the faculty at Bowling Green State University?”.

**NTTF- New Faculty Totals**

**Hebein:** Mark Gromko has also provided us with data regarding the NTTF hires over the past five years. Since he is unable to be here today, I would think it prudent to wait until we have the opportunity to hear his presentation of the data on NTTF hires as well.

**Faculty Senate Evaluation**

**Hebein:** I would like SEC to spend some time looking over the Attached Faculty Senate Evaluation Survey. This is a survey we could send out to faculty to determine the effectiveness of Faculty Senate as well as the potential issues Faculty Senate should be

addressing. This is a 24 item survey. What suggestions do you have for modifying the survey? I will ask the Faculty Senate Secretary to keep track of the suggested changes. Perhaps we will disseminate the survey in the Fall of this next academic year.

## **ISSUES AND CONCERNS**

**None**

## **SENATE AGENDA**

The following items were placed on the Senate Agenda:

- Amorous Relationship Policy
- Elections
- On line elections
- Update of the Provost Search Process
- Replacement for Chris Dalton
- Update on People Soft

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Hebein adjourned the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen Ursula Williams  
Secretary, Faculty Senate  
April 24, 2007