SEC/VPAA JOINT CONFERENCE
MINUTES

November 28, 2006   Senate Conference Room
2:30 pm   140 McFall Center

Present: Barnes, Bernhard, Currie, Engebretsen, Folkins, Hebein, Little, Orel, Pinto, Vatan Woodhouse, Williams
Absent: Lee
Guests: William Knight, David Border, Mark Gromko

Faculty Senate Vice Chair Barnes called the joint conference to order at 2:30. Barnes asked that the agenda be reordered to allow for the guest speakers to address the group at the onset of the meeting.

OLD BUSINESS (Agenda Reordered/ Reported Later)

NEW BUSINESS

Faculty Activity Database

Folkins: About two years ago, I appointed a committee to explore the best way of collecting information about what kind of activities our faculty at BGSU are involved in. We wanted to ensure that such a database would be secure. I invited Bill Knight, the chair of that committee, here today to provide an update from the committee investigating a faculty activity database. **Knight:** Our committee was charged by the Provost to develop a faculty activity database. We reviewed how People Soft might be used. We looked at the Inge Klopping database that has been used at BGSU. We looked at building our own database system and decided that perhaps it would be best if we examined software that has already been developed for universities to use in collecting faculty activity information. We have examined several pieces of software and have decided to go with the software called Digital Measures. The corporation that developed Digital Measures is out of Milwaukee. Digital Measures is being used in half of the largest 500 universities in the United States. The corporation provided a demonstration of the software for the committee and also provided a consumer list of universities already using the software. The feedback from consumers was extremely positive. **Bernhard:** What kind of criteria did your committee use in selecting this software? **Knight:** The primary criterion that we looked at dealt with the ability of the software to be customized to fit our particular academic database needs at BGSU. A secondary criterion was a proven track record reported by consumers using the software. Another criterion was assurance that the software would provide security for such a database. One of the features that we appreciated about Digital Measures is that they already have templates ready to go for a number of accreditation agencies (NCATE, etc.) that are used by BGSU. We also looked at the costs, which appears to be very reasonable. (Knight provided a handout to SEC that outlined the major uses of Digital Measures for developing a faculty activity

database.) The faculty activity database might be used in merit reviews and as previously mentioned, accreditation reports, etc. The types of information that might be included on faculty would include:

Biographical Information
Teaching Assignments and Evaluation Data
Advising Information
Scholarship Record
Service Record
Scholarship of Engagement Activities

(Knight provided a brief power point presentation showing how Digital Measures could be used to build and use a faculty activity database.) (Further information can be found at digitalmeasures.com) **Currie:** Who was the committee representative from Firelands? **Knight:** John Pommershein was the Firelands representative. **Folkins:** This new system should not be requiring faculty to provide new information for the database. We want to plug in existing data and data we typically request from faculty to use in compiling this database. We want to make it easier for faculty to get the credit for what they have accomplished. If certain units want more information on faculty activities, they could request such information from their faculty. **Vatan Woodhouse:** Could this system also be used for graduate students who are helping develop faculty positions? I wonder if TA's and RA's could use it. **Knight:** Yes, I think it would be very possible for graduate students to use this system. **Williams:** How will data be secured? **Knight:** Access to the database would require a most secure level for entry and retrieval.
Williams: Could the database system be used for resume building and merit documents? **Knight:** Yes, you could also use it for developing brief biographical data reports for SPAR and other offices on campus. **Bernhard:** Would the Ohio Board of Regents be driving some of the information or formats requested?
Folkins: I don't think so…but it might be possible that OBOR might be interested in collecting certain types of data on faculty in higher education in Ohio.

NTTF Report from CAA

Barnes: Our next guest speaker is Dave Border, Chair of CAA, who will provide us with an update on the status of the Non Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) proposal review by Committee on Academic Affairs.
Border: The most recent event dealing with CAA and the NTTF proposal was a discussion between representatives of CAA, FWC and some members of the old ad hoc committee (2004-2005) on the NTTF proposal. The group felt there were some discrepancies between the language used by the original ad hoc committee's proposal and the subsequent proposal offered by FWC. Consequently, a sub committee was appointed to look at those discrepancies and to seek ways of resolving those discrepancies. This group will be reporting back to CAA. **Pinto:** What are the major discrepancies? **Border:** The FWC write up makes significant changes throughout the document on the relationship between NTTF and faculty governance, and about NTTF and their career ladder. The 2004-2005 NTTF proposal appeared to be providing an opportunity for a career ladder for what we now call continuing Non Tenure Track Faculty. This would

allow NTTF to progress from instructor to lecturer to senior lecturer. **Folkins:** There was also a category of visiting instructor which was explicitly temporary. So, the original proposal was aimed at having a career ladder for NTTF and also to provide some consistency across colleges on how the terms/titles for NTTF were being used. **Border:** So, the work of this sub committee should help in resolving discrepancies in verbiage and intent related to this NTTF proposal. And we should be able to present it soon to Senate. **Folkins:** While there are a number of issues relative to policies related to NTTF, I believe that we need to move forward in changing charter language to implement a career ladder for NTTF. **Williams:** Dave, is the subcommittee also looking at the balance in numbers of NTTF and tenure-track faculty being employed at BGSU?
Border: The primary order of business of the subcommittee is to resolve the language relative to the NTTF career ladder. Once this is resolved, there might be time to discuss additional related issues such as the balance between the numbers of NTTF and tenure-track faculty being hired. **Barnes:** It seems like we are making some progress on getting the NTTF proposal to Faculty Senate.

New Drop Policy, Update on TAGS, Program Review, Undergraduate Council Business

Barnes: We have invited Mark Gromko to provide an overview of the new Drop Policy, an update on the TAGS and Program Review, and any other Undergraduate Council Business that SEC needs to be aware of.

New Drop/ Withdrawal Policy Changes

Gromko: There are three policy changes that Undergraduate Council has been dealing with. Once approved, these proposed policy changes will go on to CAA and then to SEC. All of these policy changes relate to late withdrawals and drops. The Registrar called attention to problems related to the current policies governing drops and withdrawals. According to the Registrar, the following problems were noted:

> 1. The policies are ambiguous, and can be read as either permitting or not permitting withdrawal after final exam week. The policy seems to be clearer in permitting "drops" only up to the 10th week. However, in practice, we have been allowing "drops" and "withdrawals" well after those time periods, sometimes years after the semester in question.
> 2. The grade of "W" does not persist on the transcript. Thus, the ultimate effect of a late drop or withdrawal is that there is no record that the student ever attended the class or classes for which late drops and withdrawals have been approved. Early in the semester, the University reports attendance for purpose of subsidy and financial aid, but the late change leaves us looking like we have falsified records or falsely reported our enrollments.
> 3. Decisions about late drops and withdrawals rest with the dean of the student's college (or their designees). There is no mechanism to promote consistency across colleges, with the result that students are held to very different standards for late drops and withdrawals in different colleges.

Thus, the proposed policy changes are offered:

Grading Policies: The grades of "W," "S," and "U" have been added to the list of grades given. This is just correcting omissions, but without the clear identification of these marks as grades, the "persistence" of the grade of "W" on the transcript cannot be achieved. "No Record" grading was also added.

Drop/ Add: The time frame for allowable course drops is confusing because the Drop/ ADD policy refers to a different policy (Grading Policies) for a statement of the timeline. Thus, we have added a table to the Drop/ Add Policy that summarizes the time line for course drops.

Withdrawal from the University: The proposed change is explicit that withdrawal from the university is only permitted before final exam week. However, it later notes that in "extreme circumstances" a student may appeal for a retroactive withdrawal. We used this approach to emphasize that retroactive withdrawals are truly exceptional. Significantly, the proposed change now states that the result of "Withdrawal" from the University will be a grade of "W" that persists on the student's record. We also made clear that grades of "D," "F'" or "WF" that result as a penalty because of academic dishonesty may not be withdrawn or dropped in any case.
Completely unrelated to the above, Undergraduate Council members noted that the Withdrawal from the University Policy included a complicated set of rules saying when a student may return following a withdrawal. Council noted that the set of rules was not internally consistent, and penalized students more or less depending on the semester from which they withdrew. Working on the interpretation that these dates were functioning to protect the student against a too-early return, rather than to penalize them for having withdrawn, Council recommended replacing the complicated set of rules with a single statement, giving authority to the dean to judge the appropriate time for return.

TAG (Transfer Assurance Guides) Update

Gromko: About three years ago, the Ohio legislature,through Ohio Revised Code 33-33-16 **,** mandated that the colleges and universities in Ohio develop a system of course equivalencies that would facilitate the transfer of courses among state-assisted universities. To date, Transfer Assurance Guides (TAG's) have been developed for 40 majors. Each TAG identifies courses- in general education and at the entry level of the major- that will transfer and apply toward the same major at any state-supported college or university in Ohio. Toward that end, each state-supported college and university has been matching its courses to centrally defined courses in the TAG's. Matching courses at each institution to the centrally defined learning outcomes has been more difficult than expected. Faculty panels have approved 63% of courses they have reviewed, to date. For courses that are disapproved or for "missing match courses", universities are confronted with two choices: 1. Fix the

course; and 2. Fix the TAG. **Folkins:** While the intent is understandable, the TAG's process is not without its problems. One of the problems is that many two year institutions are wanting more and more TAG's approved so that they can have students take more of their coursework at the two year institutions during a third year and take less coursework at four year institutions during a third year. **Gromko:** There is also a problem in the level at which transfer coursework might occur. At a two year college, a course might be listed at a 200 level, while at a four year college, the same course might be listed as a 300 or 400 level. So, the levels or depths at which courses are offered vary greatly. **Williams:** While I understand the rationale of having TAG's to facilitate the transfer of students from one Ohio institution of higher education to another, I do have a major concern about what appears to be a desire of two year institutions to become four year institutions. There seems to be more students wanting to take three years of coursework at community colleges or two year institutions because of the lower tuition costs. Then, they could come to BGSU and take 30 semester hours and receive their degree from BGSU, when in reality they have taken most of their coursework (90 hours) from a two year college.
Folkins: There is currently a phenomenon known as "swirling" where students shop to find out where they can take courses for the least expensive costs. So, they may end up taking courses from multiple universities and transfer them all into one degree.
Gromko: The real political problem is how we at BGSU, as a four year institution, maintain our values for quality instruction and curriculum, and at the same time, not appear to be hindering the transfer process of coursework being mandated by the legislature. How do we endorse the transfer of coursework for Ohio's citizens to ensure greater access to higher education and at the same time protect the integrity of our curriculum? **Bernhard:** There is another phenomenon connected with this issue that is called "virtual swirling". Students will take on line coursework to put together a patchwork degree. **Folkins:**   I want to commend Mark on his work on the TAG's, because he has been a real leader at the state level on this transfer issue.

Program Review

Williams: Since, we seem to be running out of time for today's meeting, I would like to suggest that we invite Mark back to discuss Program Review.
Barnes: We can do that.

OLD BUSINESS

Review of the School of Earth, Environment, and Society Reconfiguration Proposal

Barnes: SEC approves the inclusion of the School of Earth, Environment and Society Reconfiguration Proposal for the December 5, 2006 Faculty Senate Agenda.

Senate Agenda

Barnes: SEC members need to stay and assist in further developing the agenda for the December 5, 2006 Faculty Senate.

ADJOURNMENT

Barnes adjourned the meeting at 4:15.

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Williams
Faculty Senate Secretary
January 5, 2007