

## SEC/VPAA JOINT CONFERENCE MINUTES

November 10, 2009  
2:30 p.m.

Senate Conference Room  
140 McFall Center

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

### **CHAIR'S REPORT**

Vice Chair Blair called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

#### **CUE Update**

Williams reported that the CUE (Connecting the Undergraduate Experience) Committee has held university-wide forums to allow for discussion of the purpose and progress of the CUE Committee. One primary focus for these forums was to gain input on a conceptual learning model being developed by the CUE Committee to use in formulating the undergraduate general education program/experience. The next steps for the CUE Committee will be to: analyze data gained through these forums; identify a process for reviewing/revising the undergraduate curriculum/experiential development; identify a mechanism for gaining input on what the general education program should look like at BGSU. Williams indicated that there had been more than 200 participants attending the CUE forums. Shields indicated that it was his understanding that the CUE Committee would begin reviewing the general education curricula being used by sister institutions throughout the state. Borland concurred that he thought that there was a subcommittee that has been reviewing other general education curricula and that information would be shared some time during spring semester.

#### **Update on College Compacts**

Blair asked the Provost for an update on College Compacts. Borland indicated that the Deans are asking chairs and directors to revisit their compacts and update them. Institutional Research is available to assist in providing updated data to use in the compacts. Blair requested that the Provost work with Institutional Research to ensure that the data being supplied is current and accurate. Williams asked Borland if the committee working on the Strategic Plan Implementation was working with colleges to develop a consistent template to use in developing the compacts. Borland indicated that this committee was ensuring that each college would have internal meetings to discuss what should be included in the template to be used in future compacts.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Blair requested a reordering of the agenda to address the Print Responsibly Launch prior to the Reconfiguration Discussions between the Deans and SEC.

#### **Print Responsibly Launch**

Jim Evans disseminated copies of the SEC/VPAA minutes from March 17, 2009. Those minutes indicated that Evans had asked Interim Provost Gromko if there was a plan

underway to remove printers from faculty offices. Gromko had indicated that there would be an RFP to contract for network printing, copiers and faxes on a university-wide basis. Gromko further noted that faculty would be allowed to keep personal printers in their offices. Evans questioned if there had been an RFP and if a company had been selected. He also voiced concern that there seemed to be little to no opportunity for faculty to provide input on this issue and that it seemed to be a “done deal” from the Provost’s Office last year. Further, he noted that what was currently being rolled out for the Print Responsibly Program this academic year seemed to differ from what the Provost’s Office stated last year. This year, there is discussion about removing printers from faculty offices. Evans felt that such actions could negatively impact faculty productivity and further erode faculty morale on campus. He indicated that there were a number of issues/questions related to the removal of printers from faculty offices that had not been addressed. For example, what if the printers had been purchased by the department, through a grant or by an individual faculty member? Shields noted that Bruce Petryshak’s home page has details of the Print Responsibly Program. Blair further noted that Petryshak had requested a meeting with Senate officers to discuss details of the Print Responsibly Program. Borland indicated that he had learned about this program just a few weeks ago and that he was unaware if an RFP had been sent out or if a company had been selected. He also noted that he was unaware of the details of the Print Responsibly Program. Terry Herman indicated that there were members from ITS who came to her office earlier in the week and told her that they would be taking her printer out of her office even though the printer is one that she had bought through her grant. Williams asked if Senate should ask if Petryshak could come to SEC/VPAA to discuss the Print Responsibly Program. SEC members and the Provost concurred. Williams will extend an invitation to Petryshak at the next meeting. Jacqueline Leclair asked if we shouldn’t also be addressing with Petryshak the need for faculty development activities that might help faculty “rethink movement toward a paperless university.” Carl Walling indicated that he had met with Petryshak to discuss how the Print Responsibly Program would impact students. Walling noted that Petryshak said there was a tremendous amount of waste currently through printing in residence halls and the library and that there would be measures taken to reduce this waste. Blair noted that there still has been no opportunity for faculty input on the details of the Print Responsibly Program. Borland said he would welcome the opportunity to discuss the details of the program with Petryshak and SEC. Borland thanked the SEC for bringing these issues to his attention.

### **Reconfiguration Discussions (SEC and the Deans)**

Blair reminded faculty that SEC would be meeting with the Deans on November 16<sup>th</sup> to discuss the White Paper that the Deans had developed on Reconfiguration Discussions. Williams and Shields reported on potential “Talking Points” to use in the SEC/ Deans’ meeting. They indicated that some opportunity should be given to questions that SEC had raised regarding the White Paper (e.g. Why weren’t the following units included in potential redesigned college models...Continuing and Extended Education, Library, Graduate College, Firelands College?) The second talking point could address how the White Paper might be used in conducting discussions on potential reconfiguration. (What is the purpose of the White Paper? What are the next steps related to Reconfiguration Dialogues?) The third talking point could be how the Deans might be able to dialogue

with faculty members within their own colleges first regarding potential reconfiguration. Faculty Senate could devote the December meeting for College discussions on potential reconfigurations. The fourth talking point might be for the Deans and their colleges to discuss questions such as...Redundancies within the College? Redundancies across Colleges? Missed opportunities within the College? Missed opportunities across Colleges? If there is a need to cut programs/personnel due to financial constraints, what criterion should be used to determine those cuts? Blair opened up the topic for discussion from SEC. Wayne Gremler wanted to know what the original charge was to the Deans regarding reconfiguration. Borland indicated that the original charge had come from President Cartwright. She asked them to explore what could be done for the greater good of the greater university. Somewhere along the line, there appears to be somewhat of a shift in the focus of the charge to the Deans. Evans suggested that the Strategic Plan be used in all deliberations regarding any potential reconfiguration. Evans noted that the Deans' White Paper really doesn't address the Strategic Plan very well nor does it identify resources that might be saved or expended. Terry Herman thought that it might be advisable to hire an outside consulting agency to assist in carrying out this dialogue. Evans cautioned that we should have a purpose in mind and that reorganization for the sake of reorganization would not be productive or prudent and that it might add to negative morale. Borland agreed and stated that criteria have to be identified for any reconfiguration. Shields noted that there are several items that should be reviewed to identify appropriate criteria (Compacts, Program Review data, Centers for Excellence and the Strategic Initiatives Plan). Evans added that data from the FSBC/UBC Budget Planning Process used last year should also be considered in identifying criteria. Williams also cautioned that while we need to use viable and sound criteria in making decisions about future and potential reconfiguration, we also need to be proactive in making programmatic decisions in the event that we would face further financial constraints. She noted that "a wait and see" attitude may not serve us well and that sound decisions need to be made in a proactive manner rather than in a reactive manner. Borland indicated that he would be meeting with the Deans prior to the SEC/Deans and would be asking them what criteria and discussions should be used regarding internal/external college changes or what potential conversations should be held about reconfiguration. Borland noted that throughout these discussions, his position would be to protect those things that are central to the academic mission of the university.

## **ISSUES AND CONCERNS**

None

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Blair adjourned the meeting at 4:12 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Ursula Williams  
Secretary, Faculty Senate