

**SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

January 12, 2010  
2:30 pm

Senate Conference Room  
140 McFall Center

**PRESENT:** Judy Adams, Kris Blair, Michelle Brodke, Jim Evans, Dwayne Gremler, Terry Herman, Jacqueline Leclair, Judy May, Ron Shields, Carl Walling, Ellen Williams

**GUESTS:** Catherine Cardwell, Interim Vice Provost for Academic Programs  
Sean FitzGerald, University General Counsel

**CHAIR'S REPORT:**

Faculty Senate Chair Shields opened the meeting at 2:30 p.m. and reviewed the SEC agenda for the January 12, 2010 meeting. Shields indicated that he had no new items to call to the attention of SEC since the December meeting. He welcomed colleagues back to a new year and thanked them for their work on SEC. He noted that SEC would have two guests for today's meeting: Catherine Cardwell who would give an update on the progress of CUE (Connecting the Undergraduate Experience) Committee; and Sean FitzGerald, University General Counsel who would join SEC to discuss documentation of Senate meetings.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**CUE Update**

Catherine Cardwell, Interim Vice Provost for Academic Programs, was asked by Chair Shields to give an update on the progress of the CUE Committee. Cardwell reported that CUE is a Faculty Senate committee working on evaluating and recommending possible changes for the undergraduate general education program and experience. During the Fall Semester, the CUE Committee grappled with developing a theoretical or conceptual framework to use in reviewing and refining the undergraduate general education program and experience. During the last week of Fall Semester, the CUE Committee spent an entire day meeting with the General Education Committee (Bowling Green Perspectives Committee) to explore different general education models being used at different universities throughout the country. The BGP committee identified potential models that might fit at BGSU. They presented those models to the CUE Committee and discussions followed the presentations. In our spring meetings, we will compile potential practices, courses, and ideas to include in our general education program at BGSU. CUE will not come up with a finished product, but rather discussion ideas to share with faculty and administration. There will be a number of open forums to discuss these ideas in the spring. One open forum will be held with administration (Deans, Chairs and Directors). One open forum will be held at Firelands campus. The intent of these open forums will be to generate faculty input on what the future general education program should look like at BGSU. CUE will present their report at the Faculty Senate meeting on March 2, 2010. Hopefully, there will be a mechanism for getting response from Faculty Senators. Cardwell asked if there were any questions.

Evans commended Cardwell and the CUE Committee on the process they were using to gain a lot of faculty input, but he expressed concern over a possible lack of direction governing these discussions. Cardwell indicated that the conceptual model will be guiding the discussions. Shields asked how the college committees (like the committee from Arts and Sciences) on general education was interfacing with the CUE committee. Cardwell indicated that there is an Arts and Sciences college committee (headed by Dale Klopfer) reviewing how the A&S requirements for general education mesh with the university general education requirements. Cardwell indicated that CUE was aware that A&S requirements for a major sometimes double dip for university general education requirements since so many of the general education courses come out of the College of Arts and Sciences. She noted that sometimes that practice can lead to confusion and conflict. She indicated that the A&S committee was looking at that practice and trying to resolve potential problems relative to the A&S general education requirements. She also noted that other colleges really aren't facing the same dilemma since most of the general education courses come out of A&S. Blair commended CUE for the work they have done in getting input from faculty across all of the colleges, but questioned whether or not some colleges/faculty might have greater political clout in the decision making processes in determining a future model for general education. Cardwell indicated that the intention of CUE is that all colleges will have input into the decision making process for a revised general education curriculum. Shields asked what factors would be considered in any future general education curriculum. Cardwell indicated that the coursework would be more student-centered and would involve more active student engagement, that the courses would be more interdisciplinary, that there would be clear learning outcomes for the courses, that the learning outcomes would become part of an assessment program at the university, and that the content of the courses would have to tie into the Ohio transfer modules. Evans indicated that it appeared as though Cardwell was offering an "ends to the means" definition of a new general education model, but still had not identified the projected "end result." Shields indicated that it seemed to him that one possible model for a new general education program would involve having students identify interdisciplinary courses to take to accommodate a theme such as "global sustainability." Cardwell agreed but indicated that there might be multiple themes from which students could choose. Williams noted that it seemed that one of the motivations for looking at a "new model" for general education was to provide a strong liberal arts background without using the historical menu approach of selecting two arts and humanities courses, two natural science courses, one social and behavioral sciences course, one cultural diversity course, etc. She suggested that perhaps BGSU needs to break out of that historically-used mold and embrace more thematic and interdisciplinary courses. She further foresaw that the new general education curriculum could promote greater service involvement and more internship opportunities, more opportunities for study abroad, and more capstone experiences. Evans indicated that much of this still sounded like methodology rather than identifying a philosophy upon which a general education curriculum could be built. He noted that we had to market the philosophy we were using to develop any new general education curriculum. Evans stated that today's employers are looking for our students to bring a career resume to the table rather than a mere transcript. Shields closed the discussion by thanking Cardwell for her update on CUE and said that this had been an exciting discussion and that he looked forward to future dialogues on CUE.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **Documentation, Public Access and Retention of Public Records of Senate Activities**

Chair Shields indicated that we keep written minutes for Faculty Senate meetings, Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meetings, and Senate Executive Committee (SEC)/Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) meetings. There are several other meetings which are not recorded such as the Senate Officer's meetings which are held every Monday morning. There is a monthly meeting between the Senate Officers and the President and there are no written recorded minutes for this meeting. Tape recordings are made of the Faculty Senate meetings, the SEC meetings, and the SEC/VPAA meetings. These tape recordings are basically used as an assistive tool for the Secretary of Senate in developing the written minutes of these meetings. Shields asked Williams to indicate what needed to be included in the minutes. Williams indicated that there were no formal guidelines as to what should be recorded. She noted that some guidelines might call for only motions, seconds and recording of votes. She noted that past history of Senate minutes would call for more detailed information on discussions held on topics raised. Sean FitzGerald indicated that Parliamentary procedures would require minutes to include motions, seconds and votes. Anything extra is left up to the discretion of the recording secretary. Shields noted that including discussion information helps to provide the context of the motions and provides a "flavor" for what is really being discussed or voted upon. FitzGerald also noted that more detailed minutes also serve as a foundation for historical research that might be conducted at a later date on topics raised in the Senate meetings.

Jim Evans suggested that perhaps SEC needs to develop a list of minimal items needed to be recorded and that this list should be shared with any Senate committees. Evans further questioned whether or not the tape recordings being used at Senate meetings are a matter of public record and are open for anyone to request listening to them. FitzGerald indicated that you need to follow your internal rules (Charter and Bylaws) regarding what needs to be recorded for public documents of Senate activities. If these are open public meetings, then you have to follow compliance of the institution's Records and Retention Policy. So the minutes would be considered a public record. If the tape recording purpose is to provide assistance to the secretary, then the tapes are really not part of public records. Shields asked how long the tapes are kept. Williams indicated that the Senate office keeps the tapes for one year and then they are used over again. Sean also noted that it might be questionable as to whether Senate activities are really subject to open meetings and requirements for keeping minutes since Senate is really advisory in nature relative to shared governance. The Board of Trustees, however, is considered an open public meeting and must keep recorded minutes. For example, on Charter changes, Senate Executive Committee makes recommendations but ultimate authority belongs to the Board of Trustees. Sean raised the question of whether or not minutes of Senate and Senate Committee meetings are approved. Shields indicated that there is a 15 day waiting period to determine if there are any additions or corrections to minutes once they are disseminated. If there are no changes, they are considered as approved and posted on the Faculty Senate website. Walling indicated that in Graduate Student Senate, minutes are not considered as official public records until they are approved. Sean suggested that Senate might consider how their minutes are approved. Sean also noted that everything

included in the minutes are open to the public but “exceptions” such as personnel issues. These exceptions are considered as “nonproducible reports” and should not be included in public minutes or documents. Timing for reproducing public records calls for them to be released in a reasonable period of time. Shields asked if handouts from a guest speaker at a meeting are considered to be part of “public records.” FitzGerald noted that once it is disseminated, it likely becomes part of the public record. Sean closed his discussion by suggesting that if anyone had a question about records retention and dissemination, they should feel free to contact his office.

## **ISSUES AND CONCERNS**

### **University Early Separation Plan**

Kris Blair indicated that she had received several questions regarding the University Early Separation Plan. One question asked how current engagement in a grant-funded activity would impact faculty employment under the guidelines of the University Early Separation Plan. Another question was raised about the impact of participation in the University Early Separation Plan and its impact on benefits provided by the Charter under Emeritus Faculty status. These questions will be shared with the VPAA and he will be asked to address these issues at the next Senate meeting. Evans suggested that it might be helpful to go back to an old version of the Academic Charter that addressed some of these types of issues when the old Early Retirement Incentive Plan (ERIP) was instituted. Those provisions were removed from the Charter when the ERIP program ended. Evans suggested that it might be wise to include guidelines in the Charter to handle program implementation such as the Early Separation Plan or Early Retirement Incentive Plans.

### **Unpaid Furloughs**

Judy Adams brought up the issue of unpaid furloughs. She indicated that some faculty had raised the issue as to whether or not “unpaid furloughs” could/would be imposed on the same faculty who had already been placed on unpaid furloughs. Evans suggested that SEC get more information and consider developing a policy statement regarding unpaid furloughs. Evans also noted that if there is currently nothing in the Charter about unpaid furloughs, is there a question about who has authority to mandate unpaid furloughs. This topic will be brought up for further discussion at the next SEC meeting.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Shields adjourned the meeting at 3:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Ursula Williams  
Secretary, Faculty Senate