

## SEC/VPAA Joint Conference Minutes

October 19, 2010  
2:30 – 4:30

Senate Conference Room  
140 McFall

### **Attendance:**

Blair; Borland; Brodke; Carothers; DeBard; Dinda, Edens; Folkins; Gremler; Herman; Midden

### **Absences:**

Leclair; Border

### **OLD BUSINESS**

#### **Connecting the Undergraduate Experience (CUE) Follow Up**

Blair: I'd like to follow up on recent announcements regarding CUE. We'd like to hear any additional information the Provost might want to add to the changes in the timeline and other implications for the CUE implementation calendar. Borland: The CUE committee has been working very diligently to purge the myths we encounter from people who may have left meetings part way through and didn't get a full report. Arts & Sciences are very concerned. Clearly, more frequent and certifiably accurate information needs to be communicated. The Implementation Team is working to get the learning outcomes completed and communicated. A few pieces have yet to be worked out. The deadline seems to have been addressed quite satisfactorily from what I'm hearing. The College deadlines are being revisited to see if they might be extended. There is some flexibility and timelines are being extended. Carothers: I was interested to learn that a special blue sheet will be developed for CUE courses. Would that fast track the courses? Borland: I understood that the blue sheet would have a special checkbox that would be checked if this were a CUE course. As it turned out a new blue sheet has been created for CUE courses.

Blair: As a Department Chair I feel less in the loop in the CUE process. We're not sure if we are going to be asked to modify our existing general education courses. Or, how we'll be asked to modify our existing general education courses. This is a big issue in the units. It's such an unknown. How does that get communicated – when and by whom? Whose job is it to initiate that discussion in a particular unit?

Carothers: I'll offer a small variation on that scenario. We will be told, "Here is the course that will be offered. Would you like to teach it and if not should we take it off your hands and have someone else teach it?"

Brodke: We have the same concerns at Firelands.

Borland: I'd like to address that but I don't know what the strategy is. I will find out and let you know.

Carothers: In the Math Department we have two individuals serving on the CUE committee so we trust them but we haven't had any departmental meetings or discussions about CUE.

Brodke: No one at Firelands is aware of what's going on either. We are concerned about the length of time we'll have to respond to these changes.

Borland: The only understanding I have is the intention is for the departments to generate the courses. I don't believe anyone will come to your doors and say here's the course, teach it or don't.

Brodke: The process at Firelands is different. We teach courses that need to transfer to main campus in some cases.

Borland: I believe the communication strategy is working well at this point.

Midden: I think the need hasn't been fully appreciated yet.

DeBard: The interesting thing is I believe they think they are communicating well in telling us what they are up to. The problem is departments need to know what *they* should be up to. The CUE implementation team is working very hard and that shouldn't be lost. Departments are concerned about curriculum. We're all in this together and we need to work together. The wider the loop can be the better.

Carothers: The next step will require lead time and buy in and we have had no discussion about that.

Folkins: Those courses will be offered in the second year.

Carothers: We need to know what's coming down the road so we can begin working on it. We don't want to be a service department that teaches freshman courses and nothing else. We'd like to be involved at the higher levels.

Blair: Part of the issue is that the Units are developing strategic plans that are supposed to align with College strategies but also University strategies including CUE. We're not sure what we're supposed to be doing. Despite the best of intentions there is a communication gap. I am getting phone calls from concerned people.

Borland: About one third of all of my conversations over the past couple of weeks has been about CUE and communication. We need to have the nuts and bolts articulated. We need to get the detailed information to people – the owner's manual. What's the process? The timeline? The themes? What do we need to get done first? When do we start work on years two and three? The committee was working with communication experts so we thought this was being taken care of. I think we'll see some headway soon. So many conversations revolve around CUE and I recognize that anxiety.

Blair: Do we have any information about pockets of CUE buy in? Is there any place where people are rolling up their sleeves and doing this work?

Folkins: I think rolling up our sleeves and doing this work is premature. What I do sense though is a lot of positive energy in this initiative. Overall there is a positive tenor that is there.

Gremler: In the College of Business we were already doing things that are consistent with CUE. Now we just need to know how to make it work within the guidelines as they are presented.

Folkins: The primary issue is what do we have to do and how do we have to do it? The flip side of that issue is what less might we have to do? How courses fit in with other courses may be changing. How this is going to play out in terms of courses that are introductory to a discipline and how those work in the new general education parameters we don't know.

Carothers: In our department most people don't know what's going on – they have no idea. We might have someone show up from Chemistry who wants to team-teach a math/chemistry course. If we don't know what to expect, we won't be ready to react.

Brodke: In Firelands we have a Learning Community and we've been asked to develop a report by December in regards to CUE related issues.

Borland: There are departments that are eager and even ready but without the learning objectives in front of them, that's difficult. Those things are being resolved. We need people to know the what and the how to get this initiative going.

DeBard: Sometimes people perpetuate the myths to stir things up in the hopes that the initiative will diminish or go away. Talk to the mythmakers; get them on board. Some people are quite proud of this initiative and that we may be doing something special here. An introduction course is different from a general education course.

Midden: There is some anxiety with how majors are going to cope with this situation. Disciplinarians want their students to be introduced to the subject in a different way than would happen in a general education course. In the past the intro courses counted and now they won't unless they are substantially modified.

Folkins: If they go from counting to non-counting you may have far fewer students in the introductory courses and that might be a good thing.

### **Graduate Stipends/Fee Waivers**

Blair: Could we have a follow up to a memo? The Graduate Council has passed the Graduate Stipends and Fee Waivers Policy.

Borland: I've seen the draft of the policy.

Folkins: This is the proposal that disconnects the fee waivers from the stipends.

Carothers: Yes.

Folkins: It gives individual units both more control and flexibility.

DeBard: It does and it doesn't. The devil is in the implementation in this case. You made the statement that the \$36,000,000 - the current level of assistantship support is unsustainable. How do we move from the intention of cutting back on the sheer amount of money allocated and still give the Colleges all the money they want and/or need in order to sustain our enrollments and support our curriculum? Am I wrong about the intention behind this policy? It looks reasonable but is that the only shoe to drop?

Borland: As far as I can look into the future it is an appropriate question. The initial proposal was brought to me very soon after I arrived at BGSU. The Deans brought this concern to me; primarily concerns about the assistantship dollars and the summer dollars. The Deans wanted to be able to control these funds to better carry out their missions. Eighty to ninety percent of the graduate funds were controlled by the Graduate College and the same situation happened with Continuing & Extended Education (CEE) and the summer budget. The Deans wanted this change and the decentralization of those funding sources. These were ongoing conversations. When we started looking at what was happening with the economic situation at the University it became even more important to address this concern. We have looked at how this money can be used more strategically by moving the control to the Colleges. Is there money that can be saved by configuring assistantships innovatively or differently? We've discovered some policies and procedures that send money somewhere else - other than the Colleges. Sometimes when you turn over a rock you find more than you expected. It's a discovery process. Apparently there are some practices that will be reviewed. The intent is to just about replicate the dollars that went into the Colleges last year. We're interested in the dollars the Graduate College was funding that weren't attached to any College. This in combination with a strategy for enrollment management will help us stay pretty close to where we are. It will take us a few years to realize any savings of these funds.

Folkins: Can I ask about the timing? It says at the beginning of each year. Is that right?

Borland: No, it means the year ahead. Folkins: Right otherwise how could we budget and plan for the coming year?

DeBard: Have we done a study looking at graduate student packages around the country? We're all in a market. If you move away from that market, that's not good. Some institutions are looking at more creative, innovative ways of handling the stipends. I think we need to look at what the programs really need to sustain themselves, grow, or shape themselves up. Students would not be here and in our programs if we were not providing assistantships - other fine programs are willing to give them an assistantship. Before policies are made based on strategies we need to be sure we know the effect the decisions will have.

Borland: Your points are consistent with the conversations we've had. There are national programs, regional programs, and local programs. We have masters and doctoral programs that are even international. What do you need to recruit students into those various

programs? The Deans must have those conversations. That's the spirit that is woven into this idea.

Midden: It seems so complex. We have a high array of graduate programs. We might have a program that is weak and the only way to attract students is to buy them. In some cases, students are accustomed to paying tuition. How would I know about my own area without research about other programs? Creative arrangements are possible as well. Strategic decisions will need to be made on how those funds are allocated.

Borland: What we're looking at is complicated from a functional sense, but empowering opposed to a one-size-fits-all solution controlled centrally. The fifth year funding issue was a difficult process. The value added here is to put the dollars closer to where the decisions can be made on the academics of the program and the direction of the program. The process was pretty uniform in the old scenario. This process allows much more flexibility.

Midden: Is it accurate to say that the expectation is that the same amount of money will be available this year as last year?

Borland: Let me refine that – what we are trying to do and are committed to doing is that we want each College to have, generally speaking, the same amount of money that they would have directly received from the Graduate College last year. The other money, that went elsewhere? That's another matter. That will have an impact but we must be sure we are using those dollars strategically and we're calling them scholarships now, not fee waivers.

Folkins: There's one other complication you may have already dealt with. Some students are graduate assistants in one department and they are in a different program. That creates an issue.

Carothers: I think this process could conceivably be better than our previous process.

Dinda: This is what a lot of people are unhappy about. Where the Graduate Student Senate is concerned, and the same holds true with CUE, these initiatives all seem to have happened very quickly. I don't want to make things worse but I need to know where the Graduate Student Senate fits in. This policy was proposed and approved in one or two meetings. We have representation on the Graduate Council but it would have been better to have had this presented to the Graduate Student Senate as well and give the GSS a voice. The freedom is good but we would like to have been more involved in the process.

Blair: I question whether some of the freedoms do benefit graduate students. The general fee is paid in the summer but it makes recruiting difficult when we have to tell students they will also have to pay all general fees and not very competitive stipends. There are lots of questions. What about international students? In-state students vs. out-of-state students? We can't raise the stipend to counteract the additional cost of the general fee.

Borland: We're working very diligently to move a review of policies along. What can we do to move a student here from out-of-state to resident status? We need to know if they are willing to follow through on the requirements so that by the second year they will have met the requirements for residency. International students test into a specific level in the English as Second Language sequence but there is no way for them to test out of the sequence. Some students progress very quickly through interaction with courses and other interactions. Their language skills improve to a point they could move out of the sequence but there is no process to allow that – and continues to cost the student. Deans can determine where the funds actually go – stipends or fee waiver side. There is a great deal of flexibility. The governance process is very important. The special meeting was announced ahead of time.

Dinda: Yes, there was an announcement. The policy was brought forward at the special meeting and the vote was taken at that meeting. This is a policy that has serious implications for the GSS and it happened so quickly.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **25% Rule for Lecturers**

DeBard: There is a problem with this memo's terminology. A lecturer is not a terminal appointment. An instructor is.

Folkins: It uses the classification very differently.

DeBard: The point is, the status of Lecturer was intended to be an instructor who was exemplary and rose through the ranks. A continuing appointment can only be accorded to a Lecturer.

Folkins: No, an instructor can work more than five years now. That was changed in 2000.

Blair: Instructors get different types of contracts and can be renewed.

Folkins: The intent of this was that if you needed to hire someone at the last minute to accommodate a spike in enrollment; it didn't impact the 25% Rule.

Blair: The 25% Rule is meant to apply to lecturers. Folkins: And instructors. Midden: That's how we interpreted it in Chapman. Those individuals expected to be renewed.

Folkins: In Arts and Sciences these terms were used very differently. It was about where the funds were held to support the position. The expectation was that it includes lecturers and instructors.

Blair: I understand the logic. But based on my experience I don't buy that. Many of our instructors have been with us for more than a decade.

Folkins: You can exceed the 25% Rule if you have cause, but you need to go through approval of the Provost.

DeBard: What was the original intent of this Rule?

Folkins: Arts & Sciences was very deliberate in taking large numbers of part time people and folding them into instructor numbers.

Carothers: The question is the terminology. What is temporary? It's not fair to the department to impose on them the need to make all temporary people instructors.

Folkins: If you're in trouble, you tell your Dean, he tells the Provost and gets permission.

DeBard: The reason for the 25% was that in no way and in no time would lecturers numbers exceed the tenured faculty. They wanted to protect tenure. If you were a Ph.D. you had to have a tenured position. Now those things have all changed. The whole purpose of the 25% Rule has been called into serious question.

Midden: Now that only refers to lecturers.

Carothers: This is the point I want to bring up. The Deans reported to the Provost and found that seven units are in violation of having more than 25% lecturers.

DeBard: The reason for the 25% Rule initially has been subverted now.

Folkins: If instructors have been employed on a continuous basis we have to give them a year's notice for dismissal.

Carothers: These individuals can and are let go if we have budgetary issues.

Folkins: I hope this is distressing to you. It should be. It really is a mess the way the different Colleges are interpreting this.

DeBard: The problem is that very few of those instructors, let's assume they hold a Ph.D. and are fixed, will thank any of us if we end their employment opportunity. The departments would also be in a horrible dilemma if that were to happen.

Folkins: What is our charge in regard to this policy today?

Blair: Clearly there is this variation. Is there a way to go back and look at this data? If this information is accurate VCT is at 33%.

Midden: What's the difference between a continuing instructor and a lecturer?

Folkins: As instructors continue through the ranks the instructor can apply for promotion from instructor to lecturer and six years later they could apply for senior lecturer.

Midden: Do any of these different levels carry any differences in job security?

Folkins: No.

Carothers: I suspect the intent of this was much different than it has evolved into. Is there anything we can do to address the intent?

Blair: In some departments we must have Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) to keep the department running. Sometimes we need to violate the 25% Rule.

Midden: This is an evolution of the Academy. This isn't just BGSU. This will not go away. We have the need to staff courses. It's considered differently than it was 10 or 15 years ago. We want to protect tenure for research but yet the instructors are used for teaching. What are the best ways to staff our Universities? What is the mix?

Carothers: Yes, a mix is necessary in some departments. I also think there is a myth that instructors teaching at the 1000 level free us up for lofty research. But, the impact of all the thesis committees, advising, etc. are important and that is taken care of by the tenured staff.

Folkins: When we looked at the numbers, even though there had been a huge increase in NTTF, there was a modest increase in the number of courses being taught by NTTF. The classes were being taught by TAs, part time staff, and so on. The shift in teaching was much smaller as we still used adjuncts.

Midden: Do we need to change the 25% Rule? We have many more than 25% instructors in many units. Many departments have continuing instructors – does this policy still work? Do we need to change it?

DeBard: I think this will continue. The issue is how do we treat NTTF not whether we have them or not? This is an untenable policy.

Midden: We certainly have injustices such as an instructor's contract comes up in a year we need to save money; he or she is the person to be cut. That's wrong.

Carothers: Another implication that is under the surface, it has also undercut the graduate student numbers. We have moved from graduate students to instructors to get our classes taught.

Blair: Are we bound by any state level mandates?

Borland: I doubt it. Unionized faculty may be bound differently. What we did out of our office was exactly what we were supposed to do. We needed to get this information and Deans needed to provide justification. I asked the Deans to provide a written document as to why this situation exists. I wanted the Deans to know that I was aware of the Charter and sensitive to the Charter. If it should be amended, that would be a stimulating conversation. We never want to do anything to diminish the quality of a program.



Carothers: A few years ago each department was supposed to find their optimum percentage. The goal was to reach the optimum percentage. Those actions never materialized. Those were great ideas.

Borland: This particular document strikes me as preserving tenure positions. It doesn't talk about the type of instruction, doesn't talk about graduate student instruction. This is largely about positions that are tenure-track being preserved. I think the 25% number is pretty good, but if that's not viable we should explore it further.

Folkins: I'm an advocate of looking at the number of courses being taught. Some units used to have a huge number of adjuncts.

Midden: Some adjuncts bring special expertise. I think we should change the policy.

DeBard: I trust that what we have attempted to do is to treat NTTF in a more professional manner. Perhaps we have carried it too far with those who have terminal degrees filling those ranks.

Carothers: My big concern is that it has gotten out of control.

## **ISSUES AND CONCERNS**

### **Video Recording of Lectures**

A Firelands faculty member is concerned about the rights of faculty and responsibilities of students in recording class activities. What are the legal rights? What is and is not allowed? Can a student use their iPhone to record the lecture and then post it on the Web? What are the student's rights? What are the faculty rights?

Gremler: What if the faculty doesn't want to be taped and the department says you will be taped anyway.

Folkins: The department is invading the classroom. It goes against the grain of scholarly values. When students take notes it is their expression of what the faculty said. You own your words; they own their interpretation of your words.

Carothers: But if you go into a nightclub and record an act, that is a violation.

Blair: The bottom line is – is there a policy about this matter?

Borland: I would imagine there is. Intellectual property law probably does apply. If there is something the Senate can do to point someone to that policy that is important.

Folkins: But still there is an academic principle in the Charter. The faculty member is in control of what happens in his or her classroom. They can deny the use of these devices in their syllabus.

Blair: We'll check the Charter language to point her to.

### **GSS Letter**

DeBard: An issue that came up recently was that the GSS sent a letter to the Board of Trustees. I have gotten feedback from some of our representatives that the letter was not particularly well received by the administration. Steve did bring this to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). We discussed the letter. We did not dissuade him from doing this in the name of transparency. Upon reading the letter I felt it addressed genuine concerns. You're dealing with good people, Steve and others, I'd like to have these young people respected. The letter was summarily dismissed and the individuals bringing the letter forth were criticized. That's wrong.

Blair: I agree. I don't get the idea that this would have been that much of a surprise. The constituent groups meet with the Secretary to the Board. Administrative Staff Council (ASC) and Classified Staff Council (CSC) also saw the letter.

DeBard: Shared governance doesn't just mean providing information but also means hearing feedback and input.

Edens: We want to act proactively. For instance, a new weather policy was just passed. You take a policy that is so important and essential to student life, and the students don't have a voice. That's not right.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

4:40 p.m.