

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MINUTES

September 26, 2006

Senate Conference Room

2:30-4:30 p.m.

140 McFall Center

Present: Barnes, Bernard, Currie, Englesten, Hebein, Lee, Little, Orel, Pinto, Vatan Woodhouse, Williams

Meeting was called to order at 2:30.

CHAIRS REPORT

Hebein reported that he had met with Phil Weinsier, Chair of Faculty Welfare. Weinsier indicated that his committee wanted to review the Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) Work Policy again. I also met with the Committee on Academic Affairs and they reported that they were working on reviewing the NTTF Work Policy. I suggested to Faculty Welfare that if there was more need to gather data related to the policy, that they might consider contacting Bill Knight of Institutional Planning to obtain the data.

OLD BUSINESS

Update on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Work Policy

Hebein continued on the status of the NTTF Work Policy. Hebein: The best work that I have seen thus far comes from Faculty Welfare Committee, which has produced a set of Charter Amendments. The Committee on Academic Affairs is not ready to recommend that these amendments move forward to SEC. As you know, SEC sets the agenda for Faculty Senate. There was a resolution last year from Senator Ted Rippey, acknowledging that there was a need to move on this NTTF Work Policy. In the resolved section of this resolution, it was resolved that the NTTF Work Policy come before Faculty Senate this October. Rippey withdrew his resolution and CAA agreed to move the NTTF Work Policy forward expediently. Now, it appears that CAA wants more time to study it, as does Faculty Welfare. Williams: What is the reason that Weinsier gave for wanting Faculty Welfare to review it again? Hebein: Some of the issues included: The amendments coming up from Faculty Welfare granted NTTF full voting rights in the unit. Most of the Chairs have said that they don't approve of that, but some units like General Studies Writing have always given NTTF full voting rights. So, maybe we just put this to a vote and see what happens. Lee: The Arts and Sciences Chairs have a new List Proc and we debated this issue last week. There was a lot of variation of opinions and practices from unit to unit. There were compelling arguments on both sides of the issue on voting rights/practices for NTTF. Perhaps we need to decentralize this procedure and leave it up to individual unit / local option. I don't think one size fits all.

Hebein: The issue of voting rights in the Charter is a murky issue. I, again, remind you that one of the jobs of SEC is to set the Faculty Senate Agenda. You have the power to decide what you want to do with the NTTF issue. Faculty Welfare wants more time to review the NTTF Work Policy. Little: Can we ask them to specify how much time they will need? Hebein: Let the record reflect that there is interest in knowing how much more time Faculty Welfare needs to review the policy. Vatan Woodhouse: Could we get an interim report from the two committee chairs (CAA and Faculty Welfare)? Hebein: Yes. Lee: The rank issue for NTTF and voting rights seem to be two different issues. Williams: Can we invite both chairs to the next SEC meeting? Hebein: I think we could ask them both for a written report. Little: I'd like to have them come to SEC to hear what they have to say and also be able to ask them questions. Hebein: Is that the consensus of the group? Williams: So, we will invite them at the next SEC meeting on October 17.

Recall of the Chair (Article XI-E)

Hebein: Keith Bernard has some changes he would like to suggest for the Recall of the Chair policy in the charter (Article XI-E). Bernard: The changes are made in response to the issues that Dr. Folkins brought up in our last meeting. The following changes are recommended for Section E of Article XI of the charter:

Hebein: Is SEC ready to forward these proposed changes to the Faculty Senate? Hearing no objections, we will put the following proposed charter changes on the next Faculty Senate agenda:

Article XI-Section E: Recall of the Chair of a Department

A special evaluation of the Chair's administration may be undertaken at any time with a view to recall for cause, upon the initiative of the Dean or by petition of **AT LEAST** two-fifths (2/5) of the eligible **TENURED AND PROBATIONARY** faculty of the department. The petition shall clearly state why the recall is desired.

When a recall procedure is begun, the Chair shall be informed at once by the Dean, who shall provide the Chair with a written statement of the reasons for the proposed recall. When recall is initiated by petition the petitioners shall participate in such efforts at negotiation and reconciliation as the Dean, **IN CONSULTATION WITH ALL PARTIES**, may deem appropriate. If the petitioners' desire for recall persists, and also in those cases where recall has been initiated by the Dean, the Dean shall **EXPEDITIOUSLY** call and chair a meeting of the **ELIGIBLE** tenured and probationary faculty members of the department. After the issues have been discussed, the Dean shall put the matter of the Chair's recall to a secret vote. **THE CHAIR OF THE DEPARTMENT SHALL BE ELIGIBLE TO VOTE IN THIS MATTER.** Recall shall be recommended ~~to the VPAA~~ when at least ~~two-thirds~~ **THREE-FIFTHS (3/5)** of the eligible **TENURED AND PROBATIONARY** departmental faculty vote in favor of recall.

Amorous Relationship Policy

Hebein: The next item under Old Business is the Amorous Relationship Policy. Let me bring you up to date on where we are on this policy. Where there seems to be some level of disagreement on the policy is in the reference at the very end of the policy that refers to the AAUP.

Disciplinary actions regarding administrative staff and classified staff are administered by the Office of the Executive Vice President; disciplinary actions regarding faculty are administered by the Office of the VPAA/Provost, and shall adhere to the principles of the AAUP.

The reason that the reference was made to the AAUP was to ensure that if a faculty member was involved and that disciplinary action was in order, that there would be a faculty group involved in the decision making. But it would appear that the administration is not comfortable with the reference to the AAUP. Little: Would anyone be opposed to having the reference to the AAUP taken out? Hebein: What if we changed the wording to the following:

4. Disclosure is the responsibility of those who engage in, or are about to engage in, amorous relationships within the University community. Failure to abide by this policy may result in disciplinary action taken against any negligent party. Disciplinary actions regarding administrative staff and classified staff are administered by the Office of the Executive Vice President. Disciplinary actions regarding faculty are administered by the Office of the VPAA/Provost and shall include consultation with a faculty committee. The range of disciplinary actions would depend upon the circumstances and culpability of those involved. Disciplinary actions may include, but are not limited to, a verbal warning, a letter of warning, temporary reassignment, temporary suspension, or other measures, as the case may warrant.

Little: Since the President's Cabinet wants to review the policy, I suggest that we send this draft to the President and that we suggest that there be a timely response. Hebein: I would ask that the Faculty Senate Secretary send a draft of the revised policy to the President's Cabinet and that the President's Cabinet be asked to provide a timely response.

NEW BUSINESS

None

ISSUES AND CONCERNS

GPA for Good Standing and for NCAA Requirements for Athletes

Hebein: Is there any new business? Little: Has there been any discussion regarding the name of our university? There is a rumor that we might be taking "State" out of our university name. Hebein: I don't believe there is any validity to that rumor. Little: In regard to our policy on good standing, there has been some discussion at Undergraduate Council. It appears that athletes might be allowed to play with a GPA of 1.8 while our BGSU policy states that good standing rests with a GPA of 2.0. Lee: I believe that athletes must meet the GPA required by NCAA as well as the GPA required for Good Standing at the athlete's home university. There is concern that we will be lowering our good standing GPA of 2.0 to a GPA of 1.8 to meet the NCAA grade requirements. Hebein: Could we ask the Secretary to record this concern in the minutes and that we discuss it at our next meeting with the VPAA. Williams: Should Mark Gromko be invited since he seems to be knowledgeable about this issue through Undergraduate Council? Hebein: That would be fine.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Hebein adjourned the meeting at 3:50.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen Williams
Faculty Senate Secretary
October 12, 2006