

## FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

April 7, 2009  
2:30 pm.

Assembly Room  
McFall Center

### CALL TO ORDER

Chair Ellen Williams called the meeting to order and asked the secretary to take the roll.

### ROLL CALL

**Absent:** Craddock, Ekstrand (substitute Cathy Bradshaw), Gerard, Gremler, Hinnov, Landry-Meyer, Leontis, Miller (sub. Jeremy Wallach), Mirchandani, Rajaei, Stott, Weiland (sub. Chris Miko), Daniel Williams, Xi

The secretary announced that there was a quorum.

### COMMUNICATIONS

#### Chair

Williams thanked Cartwright, Stoll and Gromko for their participation in the recent spring Open Forum. She said that Vice Chair Shields and she had been to Firelands recently as they had been in fall and found the meetings productive. These officer visits take the place of Senate and Senate Committee meetings, which had been held there once a year. The Senate officers now meet with the Firelands College Council to exchange information.

#### President

The President read the following report:

Good afternoon. I will have an opportunity to present the final draft of the Strategic Plan later in the meeting. Therefore, I will be brief in these opening remarks, touching on three topics: an update from Columbus; the status of internal budget planning; and information about key events to celebrate the successful conclusion of the Building Dreams Campaign.

Testimony about HB 1 (the budget bill) continues in Columbus. On April 2<sup>nd</sup>, President Ron Abrams of the Ohio Association of Community Colleges testified against HB 1 in relation to restructuring of OCOG; the Chancellor's authority to set tuition for community colleges; and SSI funding for community colleges over the next biennium. He noted that the amount of SSI for community colleges is not adequate, because significant enrollment growth is taking place at the community colleges.

Chancellor Fingerhut responded immediately with a letter to Chairman Sykes of House Finance, challenging Ron Abrams' data on SSI funding implications; and on issues related to redesign of OCOG and the impact on students and access to both two year and four year institutions over the next two years.

House leadership is meeting this week to discuss amendments to the budget bill and they are drafting a substitute version of the bill, with preparations for a full House vote the week of April 20<sup>th</sup>.

Included in the House Substitute Bill (as far as we know now) are several amendments related to higher education. Of special note is a revised higher education SSI formula amendment - which we are told includes stop loss language, and greater weight given to undergraduate courses for funding in order to offset the undergraduate tuition freeze during the first year of the next biennium.

This revised formula amendment was just made available to campuses on Friday, April 3<sup>rd</sup>, so we are still reviewing it to assess the impact on BGSU - and we are still waiting for a revised run of data from the Regents' staff to see what the revised formula delivers for the public four year campuses and our regional campus at Firelands.

Finally, it is worth noting that Rep. Ted Celeste (Chair of Higher Education Finance Subcommittee) has indicated support for a tuition increase during the second year of the biennium for four-year institutions. He notes that there is

no other pot of money to offset a tuition freeze during the second year of the biennium. Therefore, he acknowledged that we will likely need to raise tuition in the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of biennium.

As far as our internal budget planning is concerned, each division and college leader was invited to present priorities and requests for investments to the joint FSBC/UBC during the week of March 30th. The committees heard 15 excellent presentations. Ideally, we would have sufficient resources to fund all worthy requests, but that is not possible given the current economic climate and the likely revenues that we will have from tuition and SSI. Members of FSBC and UBC are now engaged in a process of prioritizing the requests as we continue to work to finalize the University's operating budget for FY 2010. The presentation of priorities and related budget requests in this public process is new for BGSU, and I want to thank VP Sheri Stoll for organizing the process and also thank all of the individuals who presented. We also appreciate the on-going work of FSBC and UBC. As we think ahead to FY2011, when state funding for four-year campuses will likely be flat or reduced, the process of determining where we selectively invest and divest will become even more important.

Regarding budget planning for FY2010, you are aware that we announced classified staff lay-offs last Friday. The final number of lay-offs is much smaller than originally projected because we have been working to place individuals on a case-by-case basis as vacancies occurred during the past several months. In December, we announced that 23 individuals would not have contracts renewed and that 47 individuals would have contracts revised. In all cases, the implementation of our decisions was driven by university policy and state law. We are aware that each person affected has his or her personal concerns and have worked to assure that a sensitive, personal approach was taken to the notices and to the follow-up steps. As I monitor campus conversations, it's interesting to note that many are suggesting other ways to save jobs. I want to assure you that we are looking at these suggestions and additional options that will not result in position elimination, but it is also important to note that actions taken to date are designed to reduce expenses and they are based on re-thinking how we do our work. The second purpose, re-thinking how we do our work, is as important as the expense reduction.

In closing, I want to draw your attention to two invitations that were made public yesterday. The Groundbreaking for the Wolfe Center for the Arts will be held on Saturday, April 25 from 1:30 p.m. – 2:15 p.m. Everyone is encouraged to attend and show support as this exciting addition to our campus begins to take shape. In addition, the entire university community is invited to celebrate the success of the Building Dreams Campaign. A gala, "Dreams Realized" will be held on April 25 and everyone is invited to participate. Tickets are \$45.00 each and can be obtained by contacting [develop@bgsu.edu](mailto:develop@bgsu.edu). The Campaign was truly a community-driven campaign and we hope to see you at the celebration of success. Speaking of community, I am pleased to note that this year's Family Campaign is ahead of last year in terms of the percent of our community who have stepped forward to contribute. With the emphasis on supporting student scholarships, your commitments to the Family Campaign are very much appreciated.

Thank you.

### **Vice President for Academic Affairs Enrollment Report**

Gromko reported that enrollments and registrations were slightly ahead of where they had been at this time last year, but that new freshmen and transfer students were down somewhat. He predicted that fall freshmen class would be about the size of last falls, namely, 3200. He thanked Alberto Colom, the new Vice Provost for Enrollment Management.

### **Compact Process**

Gromko said that this was the first time that the compact process was closely tied to the budget process. He said that it was necessary to identify the highest and lowest priorities and that he was holding retreats with the deans to discuss possible reorganization for a more efficient administration. He announced that the Senate officers would be coming to a meeting of Deans Council to review the *Charter*-defined processes for reorganization.

Samel asked about various problems that students were having with PeopleSoft. Gromko said that advisers have been made aware of the problems. Cartwright said that there would always be problems adapting to a new system. Gromko said that advisers should communicate any problems to Colom.

### **Graduate Student Senate**

Guillory read the following report:

1. Passed Legislation
  - a. Katzner and University Bookstore Awards
    - i. Due to advocacy efforts of GSS, the application process for professional development funds through the Katzner and University Bookstore Awards has changed. This change eliminates the graduate coordinator and allows all graduate students to apply directly to the selection committee.
  - b. Graduate Student Housing
    - i. Due to advocacy efforts of GSS, there will be on-campus housing in Founders for graduate students (27 spaces total).
2. Upcoming Legislation
  - a. Dental Option Resolution
  - b. Green Opt-Out fee
3. Dental Option
  - a. Due to advocacy efforts of GSS, Student Health Services has agreed to implement a dental option for graduate students beginning in August.
4. Graduate Student Recognition Day
  - a. April 16<sup>th</sup> is the day to recognize ALL graduate students at BGSU. GSS encourages all departments/programs to do something special for those hard-working graduate students on that day.
  - b. GSS will have gift bags for departments/programs to purchase for their graduate students at \$15 each. If you would like a bag, please contact Rebecca Christy at rachris@bgsu.edu before April 10<sup>th</sup>.
5. Shanklin Awards Ceremony
  - a. This awards ceremony takes place on April 24<sup>th</sup>. All graduate coordinators are invited and allowed two guests for each program they represent. Please contact Alice Cook at alicec@bgsu.edu to RSVP by April 9<sup>th</sup>.

### **Undergraduate Student Government**

Wu announced that election of officers was taking place today and the new officers would take office on Monday. Waynick announced that the recent student referendum had affirmed USG's resolution to support the construction of the Stroh Center and the concomitant student fee increase.

### **Retiree Representative**

Clark reported that the Retirees Association would be meeting with the University of Toledo Retirees Association.

### **Ohio Faculty Council**

Bernhard reported that they were discussing the effects of budget cuts on the campuses and announced that The Ohio State University was converting to semesters.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### **Officer Elections**

Williams reordered the agenda since the ballots have to be counted during the meeting. Blair is running unopposed for Vice Chair, and Williams, for Secretary. When the results were announced, Muego moved that the candidates be declared as having been elected unanimously by acclamation, which passed.

**Honorary Degree**

Ballots were distributed to vote on an honorary degree, which passed. By custom, the person is not identified in the minutes and will be notified through appropriate channels.

**REPORTS FROM SENATE COMMITTEES****Committee on Academic Affairs**

Border read the following report:

Albert Colom, Vice Provost for Enrollment BGSU, was the guest of CAA at its March 18<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Some of the items shared with CAA include:

BGSU's interest in developing sustained enrollment growth.

The creation of a participatory system where the admissions office, faculty, etc. are involved in recruitment and enrollment.

Examples were cited whereby admissions and enrollment personnel are continuing to make new contacts with high school students. One such example included the case where staff personnel visited with high school students who were on campus participating in a high school level chess match.

At its April 1, 2009 meeting the committee revisited the issue of ROTC grade report (pass/fail) dates for students that are scheduled for ROTC commissioning that semester. Currently ROTC requests an advanced grade report date from faculty so that the Military can block failing ROTC students from their commissioning. The commissioning weekend coincides with the graduation weekend.

**Amendments and Bylaws Committee**

Pauken reported that they were continuing to work and that they would have items for the May Senate meeting.

**Committee on Committees**

No report.

**Faculty Senate Budget Committee**

Evans read the following report:

Last week FSBC/UBC jointly presided over budget hearings. Because this is something new, I'd like to describe the process. The President, each of the four vice presidents, and the deans of the eight colleges each gave a 45-minute overview of their budget request for FY2010. The process was very useful for the participants as well as FSBC and UBC, and I would like to personally thank VPFA Sheri Stoll for organizing the three-day set of hearings. This was a very positive step for shared university governance.

The process of budget hearings raised many questions which might be of interest to the Faculty Senate. Basically, each of the colleges and operations areas told FSBC/UBC the budgetary implications of the recently completed compact process. The compacts are forward-looking documents containing proposals that will require new allocations of resources. If we take the word "compact" at face-value, it implies the University has a commitment to meet those resource needs.

This year, President Cartwright has asked FSBC/UBC to cut the budget \$6-12 million in anticipation of decreases in revenues. Yet at the same time, as an inevitable consequence of the compact process, the various colleges and units are asking for increases of \$ 25,021,894. This is mitigated to some extent because \$6,927,415 of that amount represents "internal reallocations" (mostly related to who pays for off-campus instruction and/or who pays for fee waivers). Whether or not these items are budget neutral remains to be seen.

The Faculty Senate might also be interested to know that \$6,171,000 of the total represented facilities or deferred maintenance issues. Some of the presenters called these requests "capital budgets" but that is not strictly correct. Capital budgets typically involves the University issuing bonds for the purpose of constructing new buildings or

occasionally gutting a building and essentially rebuilding it. In contrast, these requests were items such as classroom renovations, elevator repairs, classroom technology upgrades, or improving other academic space.

The other important question, of course, is who in the budget process speaks for human resources, such as salaries, benefits, and other aspects of compensation. When asked, at least one of the Deans agreed that the status of faculty compensation ranked as a higher priority than all of his college's requested budget increases. That was refreshing to hear, but in reality that comment has to come from the top to have any impact.

As always, FSBC would be grateful for any of your comments, advice, or insights as we start to prepare the FY2010 budget recommendation.

### **Faculty Personnel and Conciliation Committee**

Muego reported that there were two active cases with one going to a hearing shortly.

### **Faculty Welfare Committee**

Hebein read Craddock's message that they would report on faculty attrition, benefits, composition and salary at the on-call meeting on April 21.

### **Committee on Professional Affairs**

Hebein read Ekstrand's report:

CPA traveled to the Ohio State Legislature on March 10 during spring break. We met with Randy Gardner, Mark Wagoner, Teresa Fedor (a representative), Steve Buehrer, Brian Williams and John Carey (representative). We also attended part of Eric Fingerhut's presentation to the House Finance Committee.

We shared our support for the governor's proposed budget for higher education. The Republicans we met expressed concern about using the federal stimulus to fund the 6% increase in SSI. But they all expressed their support for higher education's role in helping to turn around Ohio's economy. They were all gracious and happy to receive us.

John Carey's representative told us there is an opportunity on May 14 to make public comments about the budget in front of the House Finance Committee. CPA will meet April 16 to discuss going to this, and I would like to encourage faculty senators to be involved and join us.

Many thanks to Jim Evans, Cliff Glaviano, Mike Zickar, Kathleen Close LeRoy and Patrick Reed Saunders for giving up a day of their spring break for this important trip.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **Strategic Planning Report**

Cartwright gave a presentation of the current draft of the report. She said that this was a living document, which could be revised as we go along. Phase 1, was Strategic Planning Readiness; this was completed in August 2008. Phase 2, Community Engagement, was completed in September 2008. Phase 3, Strategy Development & Prioritization, was completed in March 2009. Phase 4, Plan Execution and Monitoring, is the last phase, and it is currently being finalized. The six goals are:

1. Facilitate lifelong learning, critical thinking and personal growth.
2. Produce high-quality scholarship and creative achievements throughout the University.
3. Build a diverse community and a culture of inclusion.
4. Develop mutually beneficial relationships between all stakeholders.
5. Support faculty and staff performance and development.
6. Create an optimal fiscal and physical plant infrastructure.

Senate will vote on the adoption of the report at the May meeting. The Charting Our Future site is <http://www.bgsu.edu/strategicplanning/index.html> , and the report will be posted there.

Samel asked how we could aspire to grow programs in a discouraging budget climate. Cartwright said that we have to be realistic and will use the compact process to build programs. Programs will probably grow around the Centers of Excellence.

### **Evaluation of Senate**

Bernhard, principal author of the report, thanked Orel and Hebein for their work on the committee. The report is attached as Appendix A. A hard copy with tables and appendices is available in the Senate office.

### **ISSUES AND CONCERNS**

Muego reminded that the AAUP-Faculty Association was conducting its card campaign with the intention of holding an election on collective bargaining. He urged all to return their cards.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Williams adjourned the meeting at 4:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Richard Hebein, Secretary

## **APPENDIX A An Evaluation of Faculty Senate Spring 2008**

### **Introduction**

Periodically, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) conducts a formal survey of faculty perceptions of the performance and effectiveness of Faculty Senate. These evaluations provide a “reality check” and a basis for considering changes in direction.

In Spring 2008, over 200 of 636 faculty responded to a 32-item survey. This represented a response rate of approximately 32%. All seven undergraduate colleges were represented, plus university libraries. Over 50% of the respondents were from the College of Arts & Sciences; nearly 20% were from the College of Education and Human Development.

Nearly half of the respondents (47%) were current or former members of Faculty Senate. This is a higher proportion than in the population of the faculty as a whole.

This report summarizes the feedback from faculty along 5 major themes:

- Evaluation of the Senate as a Whole;
- Evaluation of the Committees of the Senate;
- Evaluation of Information Sharing;
- Evaluation of the Structure of the Senate; and
- Issues and Priorities

Within these themes, the results of both “selected-response”/“forced-option” (e.g., multiple-choice) items and “constructed response”/“open-ended” (e.g., short answer/essay) items were analyzed and are presented below. (Note: Compilations of responses are available in the Senate Office.)

Note: Because the respondents represented two nearly equal pools of those faculty with and without Senate experience (and those with Senate experience were almost evenly split into those with past experience and those

currently serving), it seemed worthwhile to examine item responses in light of Senate experience. A follow-up analysis was done and is described later in this report.

### **I. Evaluation of the Senate as a Whole** (Questions 1-10, 22-24)

Although the Senate is regarded as “very important” to shared governance (38%) (question 3), its effectiveness is somewhat in doubt (37% chose “neutral” and 29% chose “ineffective”, per question #7). The effectiveness can be further understood through analysis of responses to elements of question #24, which were also generally “neutral”. Perhaps this reflects the fact that >50% of respondents have never been members of Senate. (Faculty reported using a variety of sources to keep informed about Senate activities, with Senate minutes cited most frequently.)

The following are common themes submitted in response to question #22: What do you see as the most positive aspects of the current Faculty Senate?

- Voice of the faculty on university issues
- Healthy debate on issues
- Communicate with administration
- Leaders of Senate
- Keeping faculty informed
- Regular opportunities to work with upper administration (shared governance)

The following are common themes submitted in response to question #23: What do you see as the least positive aspects of the current Faculty Senate?

- No real authority in decision-making; advisory function
- Discussion instead of action
- Decisions not fully informed (not enough time to discuss)
- Domination of discussions by a few senators
- Not all faculty are represented
- Lack of communication with entire campus

The following are common themes submitted in response to question #2: Ideally, what other functions should be assigned to Faculty Senate?

- Serve as faculty voice
- Advocates, bargainers, negotiators, protectors, mediators, advisors, ombudsman.
- Collaborate with student affairs division to create seamless learning experience for students.
- Formal advisory role to the VPAA
- Tasks to complete: 1. Wage increases for faculty, 2. Provisions for stopping the tenure clock, 3. Campus-wide standards for merit, promotion, and tenure, 4. Facilitate strategic planning, 5. Evaluate the administration.

### **II. Evaluation of the Committees of the Senate** (Question 11)

The eight sub-items of question #11 addressed the effectiveness of the Senate Standing Committees. Generally, respondents were “neutral” about the effectiveness of these committees (and slightly more positive than toward the Senate as a whole). The Committee on Committees received a generally “effective” response (at 42%, per question #11C).

### **III. Evaluation of Information Sharing** (Questions 12-14)

Generally, respondents felt well informed about the activities of Senate (45%, per question #12), although over 25% declared that they are not well informed. Since nearly half of the respondents were current or former members of Senate, the awareness of senate activities by the faculty overall is in doubt.

### **IV. Evaluation of the Structure of the Senate** (Questions 15-21, 26-28)

The numbers of Senators and their mode of selection were addressed in questions #15 through #21. The numbers of senators, per college, was generally perceived as adequate, and allocation of seats according to college size was supported. Election of senators by department was supported, although that may be more complicated in smaller colleges. A minority (12%) of respondents advocated including both classified staff representatives and administrative staff representatives as voting members of the Senate (question #26). They also recommended that

representation be “two to three each” (question #27). Regarding inclusion of non-tenure track faculty (NTTF) as voting members of the Senate (question #28), respondents were divided, with 43.5% in support and 56.5% in opposition.

#### **V. Issues and Priorities** (Questions 25, 29, 30, 4)

A variety of approaches were used to understand respondents’ views about near-term and longer-term issues and priorities. In addition to selected-response items that polled a number of known issues, open-ended (constructed-response) questions provided respondents with opportunities to comment on a range of perceptions and suggestions.

- very important - faculty salaries; workload; enrollment, recruiting, advising, academic attractiveness of BGSU; relations between faculty and administration; review of administrative offices
- very unimportant – athletics (programs, functions, budgets)

Respondents to the open-ended questions also noted the following as important issues (in no particular order):

- Administrative bloat, administrative decisions, communication with administration
- Budget
- Buildings
- Communication issues (more written information)
- Energy conservation
- Enrollment caps
- Maternity leave policy, domestic partnership benefit
- Morale/climate at BGSU
- Non-tenure track faculty
- Salary and workload issues
- Tenure and merit review process
- Term limits for senators
- Unionization

Question #30 asked respondents to recommend Senate priorities for the next 10 years (in no particular order):

- Administrative issues (elimination of administrators; evaluation of administrators)
- Enrollment issues (caps; admission standards; quality of students; teaching effectiveness; articulation agreements; student/faculty safety; increase number of international students; on-line offering of courses)
- Faculty benefits (domestic partnership; stopping the tenure clock; sensible merit pay)
- Faculty Senate (clarify language of the Charter; true shared governance; better communication with administration)
- Faculty retention issues (salary; facilities; research benefits; faculty load; T&P issues; faculty morale)
- Other ideas (merger between BGSU/UT; faculty union; salary equity across race/ethnicity; repairing facilities & capital improvements)

Questions #3 and #4 asked respondents about the importance of Faculty Senate to shared governance and whether a faculty union might be as or more effective in representing faculty interests:

- 70% of respondents felt that the Faculty Senate is important or very important to shared governance.
- 58% of respondents felt that a faculty union would be as or more effective in representing faculty interests.

#### **A Finer Cut**

As noted earlier, the respondents represented two nearly equal pools of those faculty with and those without senate experience. And those with senate experience were almost evenly split into those with past experience and those currently serving. Consequently, it seemed worthwhile (and manageable) to examine item responses in light of senate experience. A follow-up analysis was done to see the effects of these conditions on response patterns.

On nearly every item, the 53% of faculty respondents without senate experience chose the “neutral” response. In contrast, those with past or current senate experience were less neutral in their responses. Former senators (about 28% of respondents) tended to be more negative in their responses; those currently serving (about 19% of respondents) were more positive. The overall effect, of course, was that the mean response to most items became “neutral”.

The following paragraphs describe those issues on which the views of those with senate experience were clearly not neutral: Regarding the importance of Faculty Senate to Shared Governance (question 3), responses among those with senate experience were somewhat bi-modal (with 20-30% indicating Very Unimportant or Unimportant), whereas 60-80% indicated Important to Very Important (and non-senators generally concurring).

Regarding the overall effectiveness of Faculty Senate (question 7) and the influence of senate on major policy decisions (question 8), past senators were decidedly negative, whereas current senators were generally neutral. Regarding the effectiveness of Senate Standing Committees (question 11), the “inside baseball” impressions of current or past senators sometimes revealed important differences. For example, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) was perceived as generally effective, as was the Amendments and Bylaws Committee (ABC), and the Committee on Committees (ComCom). Currently serving senators were more favorably impressed than past senators by the Committee on Academic Affairs (CAA) and by the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC).

Regarding how well informed respondents claimed to be about senate activities (question 12), not surprisingly 85% of current senators claimed to be informed or well informed. Past senators claimed to be nearly as well informed, although nearly 30% claimed to be less well informed. In this regard, the minutes of Senate, SEC, and other meetings were more heavily used by past senators (70%) and nearly as heavily used by those without senate experience (65%). But nearly 15% of those without senate experience claimed that they don't learn about senate activities (but nonetheless, responded to the survey).

On the effectiveness of senate regarding selected items of formal business (question 24), most respondents were neutral, with two exceptions. Current senators felt that senate actions pertaining to non-tenure track faculty (NTTF) and open forums were more effective than neutral.

Regarding issues for future senate consideration (question 25), most topics were considered important or very important by all respondents (with the exception of “ethics policy and ethics officer” and “sanctions policy”, for which the responses were largely neutral). However, current senators tended to rate some issues as more important for future consideration: “administrative acceptance of FPCC decisions”; “athletics (programs, functions, budgets)”; “conservation of energy”; “ethics policy and ethics officer”; “financial exigency and academic programs”; “flow of information from committees to faculty”; “FMS”; “maintenance of buildings”; “review of administrative offices”; and “sanctions policy”. Regarding representation on senate by Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) (question 28 in yes-no format), over 50% of current senators felt that NTTF should be represented. Conversely, over 60% of past senators felt they should not (as did nearly 60% of those who had never served on senate).

## **Conclusions**

This survey of faculty perceptions about the performance and effectiveness of Faculty Senate has generated data that should be useful for the Senate Executive Committee and for the Senate as a whole. Although many of the ratings on items were “neutral”, the analysis based on senate participation and the observations expressed by respondents clarified the meanings of those ratings. Few were contradictory.