

**SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

November 14, 2006  
2:30-4:30 pm

Senate Conference Room  
140 McFall Center

Present: Barnes, Bernhard, Currie, Hebein, Lee, Little, Orel, Engebretsen, Vatan  
Woodhouse, Williams

Absent:

Guest: Pat Pauken

Faculty Senate Chair Hebein called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm.

**CHAIR'S REPORT**

No Report

**OLD BUSINESS**

**Current Status of the Ethics Code and Ethics Officer**

**Hebein:** We have asked Pat Pauken to meet with us to help sort out some questions that still remain relative to the Ethics Code and the Ethics Officer. There seem to be some inconsistencies in President Ribeau's remarks concerning these two items. The Ad Hoc Ethics Committee has reconvened itself and has come up with a list of questions they would like to pose to the President. Pat Pauken will be telling us about those questions.

**Guest: Dr. Patrick Pauken (Ad Hoc Ethics Committee):** Before I begin, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Senate and Senate Officers for my selection for the Faculty Service Award this year. We wanted to share these questions with SEC to get any needed feedback on the questions. We are planning on sharing these with President Ribeau prior to the Senate meeting he would address the topic of the Ethics Code and the Ethics Officer. The following questions have been proposed:

How have the relevant terms of the policy and the scope of the policy's application been defined? e.g. ("Public trust" – Part VI. a.); ("External constituencies" – VI. e.); ("Diversity and Respect" – VI. f.); and ("Affirmative obligation" - VI. k)

Why is individual private and personal conduct included in the code?

How does this code work with other existing codes and policies governing Faculty, staff, and students at BGSU? e.g. (Handbook of Commonly Shared Employment Policies for BGSU Faculty; General Rules of Conduct/Code of Ethics Policy; Administrative and Classified Staff)

[www.bgsu.edu/downloads/execvp/file8118.pdf](http://www.bgsu.edu/downloads/execvp/file8118.pdf);

Code for Students- see

<http://www.bgsu.edu/offices/sa/studentdiscipline/page13832.html> )

The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 was enacted specifically to cover governing Boards and fiduciary responsibilities. Why does this code attempt to cover populations outside of governing boards (students, faculty, staff, and trustees) and not cover other boards such as the Foundations Board and the Alumni Board?

How will the role of the Ethics Officer mesh with the roles/responsibilities of other offices on campus that are responsible for compliance? (e.g. Office of Equity and Diversity; SPAR; Athletics Department; International Programs, etc.)

Would the Ethics Officer be involved in cases such as the most recent embezzlement case at the university?

The Ad Hoc Committee is willing to amend these questions. **Vatan Woodhouse:** Should we send comments to you about any revisions? **Hebein:** I would ask that all comments be sent to Pat by November 17<sup>th</sup> for any revisions. Then, I would ask the Senate Secretary to send these questions to Sidney along with a cover letter that we are taking him up on his offer to address Senate to clarify these issues and respond to these questions. We would attach all records of prior commentary from the President and General Counsel regarding the Ethics Policy and the Ethics Officer. We would ask him to speak at the December or January Faculty Senate meeting. **Williams:** One of the major problems appears to be the discrepancies in the statements that are being made by administration about the Ethics Policy and the role of the Ethics Officer. I think that by providing Sidney with these questions in advance (along with the record of prior commentary made on the topics) it should help to point out these discrepancies as well as provide a framework for Sidney's remarks to Faculty Senate. **Hebein:** General Counsel also told us that the Ethics Policy not only applied to activities on campus, but that it would also apply to behaviors off campus. **Vatan Woodhouse:** Does this Code/ Policy also cover the Board of Trustees? Or does the Ohio Revised Code apply to the Board of Trustees? **Pauken:** Yes, it would also apply to the Board of Trustees. Please send any suggested revisions to me so I might modify the questions. I will be inviting the members of the Ad Hoc Committee to the Faculty Senate meeting when the President addresses this topic. Our committee will continue to meet electronically.

### **Check Sheet Routing**

**Hebein:** As you recall, we have been working on this check sheet routing form to make life easier for faculty when they are proposing new programs, new colleges, new departments, reconfigurations, etc. The problem with coming up with a form is that it is difficult to come up with a form where "one size fits all." Should we provide charter citations on this form showing where the process is outlined in the charter? The other question I have is whether or not the faculty member should be responsible for ensuring that the proposal is moving along to the next appropriate committee/ administrator? Or should it be the responsibility of the faculty senate committee to send the proposal along

once they are finished with it? **Vatan Woodhouse:** It would sound reasonable that the committee would send it along when they are finished with the proposal. **Hebein:** It would be helpful if the committee would include the status of the proposal in their minutes. It might also be helpful if the committee notified the faculty senate office and also the proposer. **Lee:** A routing sheet could facilitate this. The routing sheet should accompany the proposal. **Barnes:** The intent of the routing sheet is for tracking the proposal so it doesn't get lost in some committee or on some administrator's desk. The routing sheet could also educate the proposer on what's required by the Faculty Governance Charter. **Hebein:** The Provost's Office has a type of check sheet that they use for proposals. So, we are also working also with John's office on this routing sheet. **Barnes:** Let's state that it is the responsibility of the approving body to forward the proposal to the next reviewing group/person and also to notify the proposer. **Currie:** I would suggest including the name of the proposer on the top of the routing sheet. **Vatan Woodhouse:** I think you also need to include the nature of the proposal and the title of the proposal on the cover page or routing sheet. **Pinto:** So, this seems to be like a UPS tracking form. Who, then, should be ultimately responsible? Which office should have the central responsibility? **Barnes:** I think that for our first attempt at using routing sheets, we should leave it decentralized. **Bernhard:** Maybe all of the approved proposals should be forwarded to the Senate Secretary (Barb Garay) at each step of the way. **Hebein:** I think we want to avoid that and leave the responsibility for moving it along to the proposer or to the committee that just approved/reviewed it. **Engebretsen:** I think that the proposer would seem to have the greatest interest in following the tracking process. **Currie:** I wonder if these forms would apply to Firelands Campus? **Hebein:** If the forms don't meet the needs of Firelands, then let us know. We will share all of this information with Faculty Senate Secretary (Barb) and ask for a clean copy of the routing sheet to be made.

### **Status of the Amorous Relationship Policy**

**Hebein:** I think it is more of a question than an answer. We met with Vice President Dobb and asked what the status of the Amorous Relationship Policy was and she seemed unsure. **Vatan Woodhouse:** In a meeting we had with President Ribeau, he indicated that it is in the hands of the cabinet right now. Once reviewed, it will be sent back to the Senate. President Ribeau indicated that this policy would be compared with other such policies from other universities. Graduate Student Senate will continue to ask about the status of this policy.

### **Status of the NTTF Proposal**

**Hebein:** As you recall, this issue on a Non Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) proposal is being addressed by both Faculty Welfare and by Committee on Academic Affairs. Both committees will be making reports. Faculty Welfare may come up with their report (which focuses on a career ladder and voting rights of NTTF) prior to CAA. CAA is focusing on the amount of hiring of NTTF vs. Tenure Track Faculty. **Williams:** I believe that CAA would like to see both proposals/reports presented at the same time to provide

a more complete picture. **Hebein:** Others don't see the need for having both reports/proposals presented at the same time.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **Attendance Policies for Senators**

**Hebein:** Who would like to address this issue of attendance policies for Senators? **Lee:** I would propose that the Charter be amended so that Senators who are absent and arrange for having a substitute are not counted as absent. **Hebein:** What is the sentiment of the group toward this? **Little:** Undergraduate Student Government does it. We have proxies. **Vatan Woodhouse:** Graduate Student Senate also does it. **Lee:** The Faculty Senate seat is occupied by a substitute who becomes a voting member of Senate. **Currie:** I think that Departments with lots of faculty have an easier time to get someone to substitute for them. How many times would this be allowed? **Hebein:** I would think that it would be allowed no more than two times. **Williams:** So, if you were allowed to have two missed Senate meetings with a substitute and two missed Senate meetings without a substitute that would excuse a Senator from 4 meetings a year. **Hebein:** The Charter refers to Senator Attendance policies in IV. E and B-III.H. **Lee:** I believe that the current policy diminishes the motivation for a Faculty Senator to get a substitute. **Currie:** What is the policy regarding attendance at SEC meetings? **Barnes:** The attendance policy for SEC is covered in the Charter under attendance at committee meetings. **Hebein:** I believe that policy is under Article V. B 2. It does depend on how frequently the committee meets. **Barnes:** I think that committee chairs are responsible for establishing attendance policies, but many of them do not. **Hebein:** I would recommend that our Faculty Senate Secretary (Williams) send a memo to Amendments and Bylaws Committee to ask them to draft a clean proposal for allowing Faculty Senators to have two missed meetings without a substitute and two missed meetings with a substitute.

## **ISSUES AND CONCERNS**

### **Update on the Dunbridge Project**

**Vatan Woodhouse:** Graduate Student Senate has sent a letter to General Counsel Trimboli to ask for an update on the status of the Dunbridge Project. Trimboli is chairing the Dunbridge Project Committee. There is supposed to be a report on the project at the December Board of Trustees meeting.

### **Campus Security Issue (Interruption of Classes)**

**Williams:** Will Faculty Senate be continuing to look into the recent Campus Security issue where one of the classes was interrupted?

**Hebein:** Faculty Senate will continue to pursue this issue. Provost Folkins indicated that CAA should discuss the circumstances under which the police might interrupt a class to

find a student. We plan on asking someone from Student Life to address this issue in the near future with SEC or full Senate.

### **Student Voting in the National Election**

**Williams:** One of my colleagues, Alden Craddock, voiced some concern about the low turnout of college students who voted in Bowling Green during this last national election. I know that there were a number of efforts to increase voter registration among our students. **Little:** Undergraduate Student Government was actively involved in voter registration. I had heard that the student turn out nationally was high. **Vatan Woodhouse:** Graduate Student Government was also active in encouraging students to vote. A lot of our graduate students voted absentee. Many of them are not from this area, so I am not sure how you would be able to count them relative to their voting. **Williams:** It might be helpful for USG and GSS to contact Dr. Craddock to discuss the student voting figures and to discuss how more BGSU students might become voters in the national elections.

**Hebein:** The meeting adjourned at 3:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Williams  
Faculty Senate Secretary  
December 5, 2006