

SEC/VPAA JOINT CONFERENCE MINUTES

December 8, 2009
2:30 p.m.

Senate Conference Room
140 McFall Center

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

CHAIR'S REPORT

Vice Chair Blair called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. Blair indicated that the primary topic for this SEC/ VPAA meeting would be focusing on reconfiguration information and discussions. She then turned the meeting over to Senior VPAA Borland to lead the discussion on reconfiguration.

OLD BUSINESS

Progress on Reconfiguration Discussions

Provost Borland stated that he had shared a report with Faculty Senate on December 1, 2009 on reconfiguration discussions held to date. This same report on reconfiguration discussion updates was shared with the Board of Trustees at their Academic Affairs Committee meeting. The Provost will meet with the Deans on December 9, 2009 to discuss what plans they have to roll out reconfiguration discussions with faculty within each of their colleges. Borland noted that part of the Provost's Reconfiguration Update Reports given had included a Draft of Criteria to Use in Reconfiguration Discussions. He was hopeful that each of the Deans would provide a roadmap for future reconfiguration discussions within their colleges and that those discussions would use the Criteria for Reconfiguration. Blair asked the Provost to discuss what timelines were being established for these discussions at the college level. Borland indicated that he saw this reconfiguration discussion process taking place over the next two years. He also noted that any reconfiguration proposals coming out of the discussions would follow the Charter guidelines. He also noted that any reconfiguration decisions would be utilized in establishing the budget for the next fiscal year. Borland expects that there will be some information regarding reconfiguration issues or possible changes within each of the colleges coming to him by the end of February. Williams asked for clarification on how the Deans would be including faculty in the reconfiguration discussions. Borland indicated that he would be asking the Deans for a verbal report on the roadmaps they would use for these discussions and that each college would have to implement these discussions using the Charter as well as their own college policies and procedures. In some colleges, this could mean that the Dean would be meeting with college councils or committees. Blair noted that in Arts and Sciences, Dean Simon Morgan-Russell had distributed the Academic Reconfiguration Power Point given by the Provost. Dean Morgan-Russell also has shared the Draft Criteria to be used for reconfiguration discussions with two Arts and Sciences College groups, including the Chairs and Directors and the Arts and Sciences Council. Blair indicated that she was curious as to what was happening in each of the other colleges. Jackson May and Williams were

unaware of any college-wide discussions in the College of Education and Human Development but noted that there might be some discussions being held between the Dean and the Chairs and Directors.

Adams said that this also seemed to be the case in her college, in Health and Human Services. Herman noted that she was not aware of any discussions on reconfiguration being held with faculty in the College of Technology. Gremler noted that the College of Business had held discussions on possible changes internal to their college. Williams noted that perhaps the term “reconfiguration” may not be the best choice of words to use in this discussion process in that reconfiguration would affect two or more colleges. She thought that the term “reconfiguration discussions” might inhibit faculty and administration from discussing what “changes” might be made at BGSU (within colleges or between colleges) to improve education and cost effectiveness. Jackson May agreed and indicated that the term “reconfiguration” may be somewhat threatening for faculty to discuss and that perhaps there does need to be a different term to use in these discussions. Evans noted that “reconfiguration” is certainly not a new phenomena at BGSU and that several “reconfigurations” have occurred over the past decade. However, Evans noted that BGSU has not had reconfiguration discussions or proposals that involved potential reconfigurations that would change the number of colleges at BGSU. Internal changes have also been made routinely by colleges and the Charter provides the guidelines for internal college changes. One difference between past and present discussions and actions on reconfigurations or internal changes is that in the past these activities have been viewed as positive moves to improve educational offerings, but with the current discussions, it seems that some people are fearful that these discussions might lead to them losing their jobs. Blair noted that there seems to be some misperceptions about what the difference is between “reconfiguration” and “elimination.” Other misperceptions seem to be about what funds can be expended on operating budgets for academic programming and what funds can be used for capital planning. Blair asked what role Faculty Senate might play in educating faculty on these issues and correcting these apparent misperceptions. Gremler asked what reactions came from the Board of Trustees members regarding the Provost’s report on reconfiguration discussions. Borland indicated that one BOT member asked what role the Charter played in these discussions. He felt that they seemed to be pleased that the university was engaging in these discussions and were hopeful that any discussion outcomes would result in improving the quality of education at BGSU. Shields noted that one member of the BOT did question when Capital Planning would address the needs of repairing Academic Affairs types of buildings on campus. Both Borland and Shields indicated that the current Master Plan has evaluated the current “health” of all buildings on campus and has developed a prioritized list for building repair/refurbishing. Blair asked if there were any further questions or comments regarding the reconfiguration discussions.

NEW BUSINESS

Undergraduate Firelands Representative’s Request to Report at Faculty Senate

Williams indicated that the Undergraduate Student Government Representative from Firelands had requested to give a separate report from Firelands USG at the Faculty Senate meetings. Discussion followed on whether or not the Firelands USG report should be given separately or whether it should become part of the USG report at Faculty Senate.

Adams moved that the BG campus and Firelands campus USG representatives present a unified report at Faculty Senate meetings. Leclair seconded the motion. Motion was approved.

ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Early Separation Incentive Plan

Evans asked about the new Early Separation Incentive Plan being offered at BGSU for faculty and staff. He asked if BGSU has a recruitment plan in place to respond to potential employee and faculty losses as a result of the separation incentive plan. Borland indicated that there is a commitment to preserving faculty lines. There seems to be more concern over the loss of classified and administrative lines. Evans asked if we would be replacing vacated Tenure Track Faculty lines with Non Tenure Track Faculty. Borland indicated that he was committed to replacing Tenure Track Faculty lines with Tenure Track Faculty. Blair asked if Borland had any thoughts about limiting the number of NTTF being hired. Borland noted that our Charter has a 25% cap on NTTF hires at BGSU. He agreed that this is a reasonable number and believes that BGSU has a disproportionate number of NTTF hires in comparison to our “four corner” sister institutions in Ohio. Blair recommended that the Provost be open to discuss exceptions to the 25% rule in cases such as the General Studies Writing program. Kurtz agreed that exceptions should be considered for Firelands. Shields noted that over the last decade, BGSU seemed to move from valuing more of an TTF faculty to a mix of TTF and NTTF faculty to currently viewing the need to keep the 25% cap on NTTF hires. Evans said that BGSU has always seemed to be somewhat schizophrenic in terms of “what we want to be...a research or a teaching university.” According to Evans, we haven’t decided and consequently we are in the middle about the need to hire more TTF or more NTTF. Blair raised the concern that in the past and perhaps currently, some retiring faculty seemed to be able to negotiate being rehired by BGSU after retirement. She questioned whether or not the Early Separation Incentive Plan would eliminate the possibility of negotiation. Borland indicated that he needed to follow up on this with the Deans and with the Chief Financial Officer.

ADJOURNMENT

Blair adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Ursula Williams
Secretary, Faculty Senate