

FACULTY SENATE  
MEETING MINUTES

October 5, 2010  
2:30 – 4:30 P.M.

Assembly Room  
McFall Center

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Kristine Blair called the meeting to order and asked the secretary to call the roll.

**ROLL CALL**

Secretary Terry Herman called the roll.

**Absent**

Callen, Carothers, Pinto, and Sohoni.

The Secretary announced that there was a quorum.

**MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS**

A memorial resolution was presented for Beth A. Casey, Adjunct Associate Professor Emerita of English who passed away on August 23, 2010.

The resolution was read by:

Dr. Simon Morgan-Russell, Dean of Arts and Sciences.

A memorial resolution was presented for Edgar F. Daniels, Professor of English Emeritus and former Chair of the Department of English who passed away on August 5, 2010.

The resolution was presented by:

Dr. Brett Holden, Assistant Professor of Theater and Film.

The Secretary of Faculty Senate will send a copy of this resolution to Edgar's son Scott Daniels and his family.

Chair Blair accepted the resolutions as part of the formal minutes of Faculty Senate.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

**Chair of the Faculty Senate**

Chair Kristine Blair offered the following report to Faculty Senate.

Good afternoon.

I want to thank you for your support of our September 21 forum on collective bargaining; we convened that forum not only in the spirit of collegiality and good will toward all constituencies but with the goal of sharing multiple perspectives of the topic of unionization and its impact on shared governance, faculty welfare, and institutional culture.

As you know, the Board of Trustees passed the same sex domestic partner benefits policy at its October 1 meeting, based in part from earlier resolutions passed by the Faculty Senate in 2005, calling for such recognition of same-sex partnerships, along with similar resolutions from other constituent groups. This is certainly an important way of

recognizing the diversity of our campus community, fostering inclusion, equity, and an ethic of care for all of our faculty and staff as well as connecting to specific initiatives within the Strategic Plan.

Today, our agenda includes the flexible tenure policy, itself connecting to issues of diversity, inclusion, and overall faculty welfare. Through conversation with the Provosts Office, the Amendments and Bylaws Committee, the Faculty Welfare Committee, and the SEC, we believe we have a clearer document that outlines the conditions, timelines, and overall procedures, and provides a consistent, equitable process across colleges for reviewing the ongoing requests made by faculty. This is an important policy that needs to be in place sooner rather than later.

As the work on this policy reaches conclusion, I plan to return to review of the faculty misconduct policy and will convene a meeting of the Faculty Welfare Committee, and representatives from the Offices of the Provost and the General Counsel so that we can reach some resolution about the appeals section of the document that proved so problematic when it was reviewed by this group last April.

Finally, just as the Senate must advocate for all faculty, we must similarly advocate for the students we serve, both undergraduate and graduate. With that important responsibility in mind, I wish to call your attention to proposed changes in stipend and fee waiver allocations for graduate students, as some of the decision-making processes for these allocations return to the Colleges (as discussed at the September 30 Graduate Council meeting) and the impact of proposed changes to the general instruction fee on the recruitment of new students.

I am hopeful that as the Graduate Student Senate begins to vocalize their concerns about these changes that the Senate can extend our support by publicly calling for transparency about how proposed changes impact the welfare of graduate students who are reliant on appropriate financial support from the university to successfully complete their degree programs and who play a vital role in the delivery of undergraduate courses across the curriculum and thus contribute to the strategic initiative #1 relating to Connecting the Undergraduate experience.

This concludes my report. President Cartwright conveys her regrets; she is in Washington DC interviewing candidates for President of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

### **President**

President Cartwright was in Washington, D. C.

### **Vice President for Academic Affairs**

Provost Kenneth Borland presented the following report to Faculty Senate.

#### **Who Will Develop Unit Level Strategic Planning?**

At BGSU, we have a University level strategic plan. Last year, college and division level strategic plans were developed to describe each college's and each division's unique contributions to the University plan and to its unique aspirations. Those plans informed the budget and allocation processes.

This year we are developing unit level strategic plans to describe what a department or office will contribute to the University level plan, to its College/Division level plan, and to its unique aspirations. Again, like the other plans, these unit level plans will inform the budget and allocation processes in the year ahead.

Some have asked, who will develop these department or office level plans? The best answer is this. Each unit level strategic plan is to be developed under the guidance of the unit leader (chair, director) with input from all members of the unit. An academic department strategic plan should be guided by the chair but constructed with the input of all members of the department.

**Who Will Lead Equity & Diversity?**

In the coming weeks, Marshall Rose will be retiring from his career with BGSU. The vacancy his retirement creates is one BGSU will fill in a manner that anticipates enhancing BGSU's future as an equitable and diverse place to work and learn.

Who will lead Equity and Diversity? The General Counsel will not be the director. Rather, the General Counsel will continue to provide administrative leadership to Equity and Diversity as has been the administrative structure for nearly two years now.

The recruitment of Marshall's successor will begin shortly. President Cartwright will, in the next weeks, appoint a diverse search committee for this position. Sean Fitzgerald will chair that committee. Please, share any ideas you have for nominees as search committee members.

Ideal candidates will have extensive experience in civil rights enforcement, training and programming and will have legal training and credentials. The President, Vice President Fitzgerald, and I are committed to making the search for Marshall's successor a model for the entire campus in terms of what an inclusive search should be. The goal is to obtain as broad and diverse a pool of qualified, excellent candidates as is possible.

As the person responsible to actuate our University strategy to increase inclusion and diversity, I will miss our friend Marshall even as I look forward to working with our new colleague.

In regard to inclusion and diversity, the academic year has already yielded signs of progress. The conversation has been broadened to include numerous faculty and staff and students who are helping to shape the Inclusion and Diversity Network. We welcomed an incoming freshman class that is nearly 21% diverse. We recently enjoyed a Diversity Day and several other events to inform and celebrate diversity. We witnessed the Board of Trustees approval of domestic partner benefits. I have charged the deans to develop the most diverse pool of applicants ever for all faculty and dean searches.

We are working to attract diversity, seeing some progress, and now we need to make sure everyone feels welcomed, valued, successful, and desirous of staying at BGSU.

What about the Budget Deficit?

You need to know the very bad news about public higher education funding in Ohio. BGSU had been preparing for a reduction in State Support of Instruction in the next biennium. As a result, last year and this, we exercised stewardship and looked for areas where there were expenditures that could be strategically reduced.

However, recent economic numbers indicate State Support is dropping to a critically low level. As noted in the *State of the University Address*, BGSU now has to prepare to go without \$25 million in State Support of Instruction in the next biennium. That biennium begins just nine months from now.

\$25 million is huge for BGSU, staggeringly HUGE! Further, without a totally unexpected turn-around in the State's economy, this loss of State Support is real, VERY REAL. Very real, tough choices are immediately ahead of us.

This is not a problem that will be solved by one person in elected or appointed office, be they in government or higher education. Here at BGSU, it is now our problem and we must all, together, boldly face it. The Board of Trustees, the President and her Cabinet, the Deans, the Faculty Senate and all faculty, all Classified Staff and Administrative Staff, undergraduate and graduate students and their governments, our Foundation and Alumni Boards, our friends; we must all bring to the table our best ideas, resources, and good will for the sake of BGSU and our students' education.

In the days ahead, our conversations will need to turn directly toward this end, the sake of BGSU and our students' education. Because we will work and sacrifice together, we look forward to being successful.

What Did I Hear about Graduate Education?

You probably did hear a great deal about graduate education this fall. Some was speculation. Some was born of uncertainty. Some was real opportunity and progress.

Graduate Dean Messer-Kruse is leading the Graduate College to better communication with and support for graduate students and program coordinators. He is engaging the Graduate Council with ideas that could significantly liberate the colleges to move their graduate programs forward. He is leading the network of staff in and beyond the college to better support the academic and transactional functions. He is leading conversations with the college deans, BGSU's chief financial officer, and the Vice President for Enrollment Management.

This kind of work takes time; but, when properly conducted, it will greatly enhance the near-future process of university-wide conversation to develop BGSU's strategic plan for graduate education. We appreciate your patience and participation as we gear-up to work with you for a terrific future. Please, let Tim know what is on your mind.

What Happened?

A processing mistake, made this fall within a good-sized team of people preparing a series of Administration internal communications, resulted in a drawn-upon statement being woven into that communication series and unintentionally disconnected from its bibliographic reference.

Immediately upon learning of the mistake, I asked that several steps be taken to avoid repeating it and that steps be taken to respect any sources drawn-upon in that series.

1. Discover how this happened and be forthcoming about the mistake.
2. Review all previous and pending communications in the series, correcting any similar mistake.
3. At the series' conclusion, publish references linked to all citations.

In fact, each of these steps was accomplished out of an always present commitment to integrity, great respect for the contributions of others, and deep humility.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kenneth W. Borland, Jr.  
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost

### **Graduate Student Senate Representative**

GSS President Steve Dinda presented the following report to Faculty Senate.

GSS looks forward to being an active participant in the conversations and changes to the graduate education through the strategic plan that are ongoing this year. In addition we have other campaigns going on. We have a rental car program we'd like to bring to campus to make available to all students including undergraduates and graduates. We are trying to bring students to health resources more quickly through the Health Center, Disability Services, and the Counseling Center. We're also working with Undergraduate Student Government on a few academic policies I'm sure they'll talk about further.

### **Undergraduate Student Government Representative**

USG Representative Kevin Basch presented the following report to Faculty Senate.

The USG is planning to do an anti-sexual assault campaign. As you are probably aware there have been a number of sexual assaults on campus during this first month in the semester. USG doesn't think this is acceptable and I don't think it is acceptable. USG will be taking a strong stand against this to educate the student body as to how to act in accordance with the values of this institution. Chairs of standing committees, if there is an undergraduate representative who is not attending, if you could please notify me, I'd like to remedy that this year. Please e-mail me at [kbasch@bgsu.edu](mailto:kbasch@bgsu.edu). For all those who participated in the homecoming the centennial was great!

### **Retiree Representative**

Retiree Representative Harold Lunde presented the following report to Faculty Senate.

So many things we could talk about. What would be of interest to you who are all working? You'll find a number of interesting things at the Retirees Association BGSURA at <http://www.bgsu.edu/offices/ohr/BGSU-Retirees/index.html>. Newsletters dating back to 2003 and the Retirees Handbook can be found at the site. At BGSURA we currently have 345 members living all over the country. However, most are in Ohio. We have 98 life members in addition to the 98 living life members we have 10 that are deceased. We had a convocation lunch that was held on September 15, which set a

record for attendance. Jerry Anderson was our speaker and it was excellent. How is the State Teachers Retirement System (STRS) doing? A couple of statistics... in 2007 STRS Ohio had a funding period for its pension fund 41.2 years exceeding the statues of regulation. The fund was funded for 41.2 years. July 2009 the liability had doubled to 36.6 billion dollars and the funding period was at infinity, running out of money. The STRS strategic plan is to maintain and hang on to two things: 1) to preserve the defined benefit plan and 2) to ensure the continuation of STRS Ohio health care program. Go to <http://www.strsoh.org> for all sorts of good information. K-12 teachers in Ohio also contribute to STRS. In 2009 STRS contributed to the Ohio economy, just in retirement benefits, 3.9 billion dollars. A total of 129,600 people were receiving retirement benefits – 109,000 lived in Ohio, leaving about 20,000 being paid outside of Ohio. A quick calculation – the average benefit was about \$36,000 a year in 2009. If we add in the people living outside of Ohio to the 3.9 billion we add in another 737 million dollars where STRS was contributing a total of 4.6 billion dollars in retirement benefits in 2009. It's a wonderful institution. It's a wonderful organization. It's having its troubles but it is working on a strategic plan. Overall, it's a well-run organization.

## **REPORTS FROM SENATE COMMITTEES**

### **Committee on Academic Affairs**

David Border, Chair of the Committee on Academic Affairs (CAA) offered the following report to Faculty Senate.

The main topic for the 9/15/10 meeting was academic affairs and the budget. CAA had guests VPAP and Graduate Dean Tim Messer-Kruse and also FSBC member Judith Jackson May. Meeting was meant to review the outcomes, if any, of past large-scale academic reorganization considerations as well as the outcomes, if any, of small scale program reorganization considerations. Our next meeting is tomorrow.

### **Amendments and Bylaws Committee**

Erin Labbie, Chair of Amendments and Bylaws Committee (ABC), provided this report.

Our first meeting for the academic year 2010- 2011 was held on 9/14/10. Dr. Kristine Blair attended to assist us in the development of our annual agenda. Since then we have, in conjunction and correspondence with Faculty Welfare Committee members and the SEC, finalized the Flexible Tenure Policy that we have before us for consideration today. Our next meeting will be held on Tuesday, 10/19/10 when in addition to returning to some other old business we will consider the resolution on the status of Emeritus faculty status for administrators; begin to draft changes we may want to make in anticipation of the domestic partner benefits policy; and we will continue our ongoing project to standardize the definitions of faculty in the Charter.

### **Committee on Committees**

Chair Daniel Williams presented the following report.

The Committee has met twice and we have made approximately 36 appointments, the majority were faculty in their first four years. We still have a number of vacancies that I'll talk about now that can be forwarded to the Faculty Senate office. The Broadcasting Advisory Committee has four openings – faculty from Journalism, College of Musical

Arts, Popular Culture and the School of Communications are eligible for these 1-year terms. The Committee on Committees has a vacancy for a Senator for a 3-year appointment. The Faculty Development Committee has a vacancy for a faculty member from the Faculty Welfare Committee to sit on this committee.

### **Faculty Senate Budget Committee**

Chair Cynthia Bertelsen presented the following report.

We have not received any additional information or clarification from OBR since the President's announcement to the campus last week regarding the possibility of the June 2011 state share of instruction payment being deferred.

The June 30, 2010 expenditures were shared with the University's Board of Trustees during the October 1, 2010 meeting. Overall, we ended the year reasonably well. Unrestricted expenditures for the year were less than the prior year expenditures. Actual expenditures were also below the amounts budgeted.

There is no new information on the likelihood of a capital bill being introduced after the November election. We remain hopeful, but not optimistic.

We are finalizing the calendar and schedule of meetings for the joint FSBC/UBC meetings. We are tentatively expecting our first joint meeting to be October 21 where President Cartwright will give us our charge and update us on the University priorities for the year. We will also receive an update on the most recent state of Ohio budget and what impact this may have on BGSU.

FSBC met on September 9<sup>th</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup>. Dr Kristine Blair, Chair of Faculty Senate, attended the September 9<sup>th</sup> meeting. She provided an update on several topics that have come before the Senate Executive Committee. One topic in particular is the parking services changes. FSBC included this topic in a memo to UBC on May 14, 2010 along with two other top priorities – faculty salary raises and a multi-year compensation plan.

Dr. Timothy Messer-Kruse, Interim Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Dean of the Graduate College, updated the committee on the proposed stipend and fee-waiver policy during the September 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting.

This ends our report.

### **Faculty Personnel and Conciliation Committee – Bullerjahn**

Chair George Bullerjahn presented no report.

### **Faculty Welfare Committee**

No report was presented.

### **Committee on Professional Affairs - Howes**

Chair Geoff Howes presented no report.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **Flexible Tenure Policy**

Chair Blair: We will return to old business from last May, the Flexible Tenure Policy to extend the probationary period at BGSU. As you can see from the chronology at the top of the policy this has been around for quite some time. To provide background I'll focus on activities since the policy was last discussed at our May meeting. The policy required some clarification particularly about the exact amount of time allowed to stop the tenure clock. That point has been addressed on the first page in Section A2 where the probationary period may be extended for one academic year. Changes were also made on page 2 in regard to the amount of time allowed for retroactive requests. Beyond that all other changes to the policy are simply those meant to clarify the approval process that ends with the office of the Provost and also shifting of language in the policy that it originally spoke about tenure delays in terms of semesters to now speak of it in terms of that one year maximum. Is there a motion to endorse this policy? Senator so moved; Is there a second? Evans: Second.

We have had a motion to approve and a second to endorse this policy. I'll now open it up for discussion. Questions? A Senator had two questions in Section B, page 2, part I. The first is the little bit of concern on the retroactive limit. For certain professions there might be a single event that happens at the end of the academic year defines your work for the year. Worst case, if a crisis happens at the end of the year. You have a presentation that you've worked all year to prepare for and you have a car accident prior to that presentation. You aren't able to present. And, you aren't able to do a proposal for a clock stoppage at that point. The timeframe is such that you have an issue at the end of the academic year, a single point event, and the language here says that you can't get it at all. Blair: Yes, and the SEC was citing similar scenarios. I'm glad Provost Borland is here to address these questions, as he was part of these conversations over the summer. Borland: The interest here is in making sure that we aren't going back multiple years to pose the request. A friendly amendment to tighten this language would be fine with me. The intent is to say within a reasonable amount of time. What is the definition of an event? An event can span several months and the person may not be able to address these concerns. We're talking about a reasonable amount of time. If the event occurred in April, we'd expect reasonable people to sit down and figure this out. A friendly amendment to that effect would be welcome. Senator: Could we then propose a 6-month time period after the event occurs for the proposal? That would seem to be in the spirit of the policy? Blair: Are you proposing a friendly amendment? Could you please state that in the form of a motion and provide the language? Senator: I'd like to make a motion that a retroactive request must be made within a period of 6 months after the event. A friendly amendment. Blair: There is a motion for an amendment that would allow the retroactive request to be made 6 months after that event. Is there a second to that friendly amendment? Senator: Second. Blair: Thank you. We can vote on that amendment. It will take a majority for that friendly amendment to pass. All those in favor – a show of hands please. Senator: Are we going to discuss this? Blair: Call for discussion. Senator: Six months seems tighter than what is already there because an academic year is already longer than 6 months. I'm not in favor of this change of shortening the amount of time we can go back retroactively. I'm going to vote no on this and I urge you to do the same. Blair: Was that the intent of your motion? Senator: No. The 6-month time frame was somewhat arbitrary the number could be one year easily enough. Would that address your concern? Senator: Yes. Edminster: I was going to offer some language that would



address both issues that have been raised. A written request to extend the probationary period shall be submitted within 6 months of the event. Delete the rest of that sentence and the sentence that says a retroactive request beyond the academic year will not be approved. Senator: I find that reasonable. Senator: Move to accept. Senator: Second. Blair: The motion has been further amended to provide clarification on the amount of time a retroactive request could be made and has been seconded. Further discussion? Edminster: It appears that event has been removed entirely. What is left is qualifying ground. I'd like some clarification on what qualifying ground means and how that is a viable substitute for event? Blair: Provost Borland would you address that point? Blair: My sense is that qualifying ground is simply the basis for what would qualify for an extension or a request for that extension. Evans: I would just like to stress that this is a friendly amendment so as not to delay a document that has been in the works for two years and has been carefully vetted word for word by legal authorities and others. It would be a shame to tinker with the wording further thereby delaying the policy for another year. Borland: Whatever brings clarity to this Policy is a good thing. As we're this close I think we should move forward with this friendly amendment. Blair: I think the Senate would agree. A Senator indicated they would like to move that we accept the friendly amendment therefore, I'd like to call the question. Blair: The motion was to accept an amendment that clarifies the language on retroactivity. We are now ready to vote on the suggested language. All those in favor, please vote by a show of hands. A vast majority has voted in favor of the revised language. The motion for approving the language on retroactivity passes. A second question was raised; we can address that before moving on. A Senator indicated the second question followed the next line. What evidence needed to be produced should there be a medical condition of a spouse or otherwise since it specifically says no medical information is to be given to the department, etc. If it's a faculty member it says what to do with medical records but not in the case of a spouse. Does this need to be in here or not? I'm not clear on the matter. Blair: I think with these cases there would be various forms of documentation that would be submitted at the unit level. Specific medical conditions of BGSU employees as well as their spouses, partners, and other immediate family would not be something that would be shared with the unit, department, or college but would certainly be shared with Human Resources. Evans: I think that's a misunderstanding of the statement. It's not saying that the faculty member's health condition should be provided. It's saying that the person who should be providing the information is the faculty member. Another Senator responded stating the information was to be provided to HR and he wasn't sure if that was medical in nature. Evans: That's the point. It's not talking about that. It's talking about who is the individual who is responsible for providing that information to whoever. Blair: Consistent with current practice, the medical condition is not reported to the unit but to Human Resources. A Senator indicated that this language comes from Human Resources directly and is a part of FMLA. It's meant to protect our medical records. The clause is meant to directly address the faculty member. Family members are not expected to submit their paperwork in that way. The faculty member's word is taken. Blair: I don't know that we will resolve that issue today. A Senator had one more small issue that would be a friendly amendment, only is in the wrong place in that sentence. "The faculty member should provide medical documentation supporting requests only to BGSU's Human Resource department." The only should say where the documentation is going. Blair: Would we view that as a friendly grammatical amendment that doesn't require a vote? Folkins: I think we need to be very careful with this particular sentence. It is clearly driven by HIPA requirements. It was crafted by a couple of committees.

They did the best they could to say you have some sort of expectation to explain what the problem is without violating HIPA. There is a fine line there and I don't think we'll be able to craft anything that's much better than this. Removing the "only" is fine but the rest of it we shouldn't try to mess with. Midden: My concern was it was dealing with a family member's medical condition and you didn't want to reveal your family member's medical condition to the unit. I thought if we change it to any medical condition. If you're basing your request on any medical conditions whether it's your family's or yours. Folkins: HR doesn't want that information on your family. Midden: So you have to report your family member's condition to your unit? Blair: No, you would not be required to do that. DeBard: I'd like to suggest that John Folkin's point is well taken and to urge us to move on with this without changing the language. Blair: I think some of this language lies beyond this body. Perhaps we should move on to other related issues. A Senator said he wanted to clarify a couple of points. For a non-tenured tenure track faculty member who has two emergencies within the probationary period, does this policy allow for stopping the clock a second time? And if not, what was the rationale for that? Borland: I imagine the question is coming from the statement regarding the probationary period can be extended for one academic year. We want to be careful about multiple events in one year. I think some individuals are looking at a stoppage for one semester or a six-month period of time. I think at this point the intention was to provide at least up to one year. The way we do tenure and promotion reviews here it is on a yearly cycle. It's not on a six-month cycle. The reviews are done once a year. Senator: I think what this particular person was thinking of was, for instance, someone with cancer, and then two years later have a relapse. Would that person be eligible for a second stoppage of the tenure clock taking them beyond the 8<sup>th</sup> year? Borland: The point here is to provide one year of stoppage. According to our Charter, if you happen to be on a leave, the clock stops anyway. I think the intention was not to allow this particular policy to take us beyond what we already have but to adhere to that 8<sup>th</sup> year which is something that is important to us. Senator: Yes, thank you. What about military? Are there other types of laws that protect our military who are called up and might need more than a one-year stoppage? Blair: I don't know that we can answer that question from a legal standpoint. Senator: Did you consider that? Folkins: When you are on active duty in the military you are being paid full time by the military that means you are not being paid full time by BGSU. This is for people working full time for BGSU and for whatever reason they still need an extra year without going on some type of leave. The military issue doesn't come in here. Blair: Can we return to the original question? Fan: My question is C3 the section reads, "...any scholarly activity produced during this extension shall be considered in the tenure review process." Are these two parts consistent? The first part is concerning time, the second part addresses scholarship. Blair: Faculty like no other group are multitaskers. It is conceivable that while you are ill or caring for someone who is ill you might still have ongoing scholarly activity. The spirit is to remain flexible. Faculty labor is ongoing. It doesn't happen between 8 – 5 or just during the academic year. We don't want to punish anyone for the need for a stoppage. We want to support them through this policy as much as we can. DeBard: I'd like to suggest in the spirit of moving this along that the good will behind the policy is quite apparent as well as the hard work of the committees involved. With that, I'd like to call the question. Blair: Thank you. Discussion? Remaining questions about the policy? Hearing none, I believe we are ready to move to a ballot. This is a paper ballot. To pass the policy we need a 2/3 majority of those present and voting. Please note that abstentions do not count in the total number. This is our only item of business today to

give the policy the attention it deserves. Blair called for the vote by paper ballot. (For = 53; Against = 0; Abstain = 4) Motion was approved. As the vote was being counted, Blair moved on to Issues and Concerns. Pauken: As Parliamentarian I'd like to tell you what I know about friendly amendments. Every amendment is an amendment. The reason we call it a friendly amendment is because there might be a couple of words that everyone can agree upon. The question of whether the amendment is friendly doesn't come up at the beginning. For example, for a wording change, sometimes that change may not seem small to someone else. In those cases we'll have discussion for the change. If there are no objections the change can be made but if you do have objections, please feel free to indicate that you feel the change is more substantive than editorial. Blair: Other issues or concerns?

## **NEW BUSINESS**

None

## **ISSUES AND CONCERNS**

Evans voiced concerns about the CUE process. Messer-Kruse was sympathetic with worries about the timeline but indicated the objectives and other relevant information would be provided in the next week. Dixon noted Spring registration begins on the 18th of October and expressed concerns about timelines and rushing the blue sheet process. The process is difficult enough, but if a new course needs to be created it seems ambitious. Messer-Kruse acknowledged the timeline is ambitious and he doesn't want to advocate hurry. The idea is to sketch out the broad outline of the course for a blue sheet and flesh out the course later in the months in between. Messer-Kruse hopes everyone will be tolerant of the compressed timelines. Terry-Fritsch requested a clarification of what exactly we are implementing. In the last meeting it was indicated the classes implemented would be levels 1 and 2. Are we now talking about implementing all levels? Messer-Kruse said a phased implementation plan, year-by-year as new students begin their freshman year, is the focus. The BGSU 1000 course on foundations and the Math sequence – what remains to be done are those inquiry courses. In the spring and into next year we'll work on the problem solving sequence. Again, the plan is to roll it out year by year as the cohort advances. Laird said what had been shared had not at all relieved his concern. Sometime later this week we'll see the learning outcomes and then have 3 weeks to submit a blue sheet. That doesn't seem reasonable for us as a unit, to meet, discuss, and then put together a well-conceived curriculum. Messer-Kruse: I think we can push those deadlines a little bit. But I'd like programs and faculty to begin these discussions and see what we can do. If we need to push the deadlines, we need to do that. If a program needs more time, we'll take that into consideration. There should be quite a bit of information to begin these discussions and filling out those blue sheets. We'll be very tolerant of outlines. Edminster: Blue sheeting and approval can take up to a year. Will the approvals be more flexible? They'll have to be really, really flexible given the number of blue sheets that will be in the system. I'm afraid this process may be somewhat compromised in comparison to other courses that were brought forward in the past. Messer-Kruse: I'm not saying it isn't a challenge. It is. I'm hoping for an honest effort. Edminster: I'm just afraid all these blue sheets will be rubber-stamped. Messer-Kruse: That isn't the intent. You may want to review the longer CUE report that already contains many of the learning objectives. Border: Are you referring to the themed inquiry? Messer-Kruse: I'm referring to the learning outcomes. Part of the first year foundations. Inquiry is the introduction into the discipline. Border: Themed inquiry –

and now I'm hearing foundations? Messer-Kruse: There is some slight variation on language. I don't think it changes the content. Evans: You're asking the sciences to change from large section laboratory courses that are focused on content to small section courses that focus on writing. We have no idea if at the end of the day we'll be talking about to what extent we can even call this a course in my discipline. We need significant personnel changes to make these changes. Messer-Kruse: The plan as it is does not mandate class sizes. Michaels: One of the things that is hardest is to address a moving target. Early on there were some themes that these courses were supposed to address. Will there be University themes that these courses will need to follow? Messer-Kruse: It has been pared down – there are still the ideas of themes in the courses. The implementation sub-committee will address this. Dixon: I was on Graduate College Curriculum Sub-Committee – you cannot do this within this timeframe. We'll have to make decisions on things that have not been addressed. These are times where mistakes become disasters within education. Klein: As Chair of the Curriculum Committee – working on these blue sheets for even minor changes is a lengthy process. Would it make sense to possibly postpone the implementation until Fall 2012 until we know what's going on? We're inviting disaster. Messer-Kruse: Our implementation team is well integrated with Undergraduate Council – and the plan has been widely disseminated – we don't want to short-circuit any of those layers of approval. We shouldn't abandon this project because it is difficult. We may reach the day when we have to reassess but I don't think this is that day. Dixon: The language was postpone, not abandon. We want to work with harmony. The more we rush, the more we make mistakes, the more people are unhappy. Blair: I think what you're hearing is our concern in the spirit of shared governance and how do we achieve these goals in light of these constraints? I hope you'll take these issues and concerns in the collegial spirit in which they were offered. Are there other issues and concerns about the CUE initiative? Are there other issues and concerns? Hearing none, the meeting was adjourned.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Lee Herman  
Secretary, Faculty Senate