

SEC/VPAA JOINT CONFERENCE
Meeting Minutes

December 14, 2010
2:30 to 4:30 p.m.

Senate Conference Room
140 McFall

Attendance:

Blair; Border; Borland; Brodke; Carothers; DeBard; Dinda (sub), Edens; Folkins; Gremler; Herman; Leclair; Midden

Carothers: I have a request as we get started. Blair: I'd like to request that we re-order the agenda to address new business before old business and discuss the impact of the Board of Trustees' Charter Amendments as our first order of business. Blair moved that we re-order the agenda. DeBard seconded the motion. Carothers: Any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor? Motion passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Impact of Board of Trustees Charter Amendments

Blair: In light of last Friday's unexpected changes to the Charter, we must address how some of those changes dictate how we proceed with other issues on our agenda such as the Misconduct Policy and issues of curriculum such as CUE. We need to have an open dialogue today to understand the relationship now between the Faculty Senate and the administration as well as some clarity for timeline, immediacy and some concrete answers to direct questions. I'm sure others have questions and concerns too. I'd like to start with one though. I'm curious about the elimination of the Faculty Personnel and Conciliation Committee (FPCC). We do understand that this normally would be the next step with regard to collective bargaining. However, until we have a contract with some sort of grievance structure in place, it would appear faculty no longer have right of due process. I'd like to get the Provost's view on this issue and any other related to the faculty grievance procedure. Folkins: We can start with that but I think we need to expand that to include everything that has been eliminated in the Charter. How do we proceed between now and the time we have our first contract? Blair: The grievance procedure is one but certainly we have other issues including standing committees. I understand Pat Pauken is fielding some of these questions but they are coming to me as well. One constituency, the Board of Trustees, has made these changes, we, the Faculty Senate, as the other constituency group, must answer to these changes. We need to know what's in place and what's not. Borland: Let me be general to start with. The changes brought forward and made by the Board of Trustees are in effect as of the first day of the Spring semester. If that is the date the changes become effective; what happens in the meantime and what happens between now and the first contract? I also know that the Bowling Green State University – Faculty Association (BGSU-FA) has received communication from the University to invite a conversation about these issues. Particularly in regard to grievances, it is incumbent upon the University and the BGSU-FA to have a conversation about what we do in the meantime. There are three or four grievances in the pipeline. We

want to be very sensitive to that. I know what our perspective is. I'm not sure how the BGSU-FA feels about it but they are part of this conversation now. We need to sit down and determine what happens next for the time being to ensure these individuals' have due process. It will be a process the FA and the administration will need to work through that will guide the process for these individuals and beyond. Folkins: Why was it necessary to make the changes in the Charter now instead of waiting until we have that first contract? It leaves us in this limbo. Borland: I can appreciate that concern. DeBard: My interpretation, as of now, when it comes to salary, benefits, and working conditions is the BGSU-FA is the legal entity to deal, through negotiation, with those issues. For example, in regards to the Faculty Misconduct Policy, it appears that the FA will be the body to advance that issue through negotiation or whatever, rather than us. However, I don't feel that the BGSU-FA is geared up to deal with filling the gap that the Board action has created within the governance of this University. Grievance procedures included. If we, the faculty, wanted an adversarial relationship, and I urge us not to do this... but all that would have to happen is the Chair of the FPCC would just say to the administration talk to the FA not me. Border: That's what has happened. DeBard: Is that really what's happening? Border: Unless the administration empowers the committee to do its work; that's what has happened. DeBard: At this point, is it true that the administration wants no feedback or input to the budgeting process from the Faculty Senate Budgeting Committee? Is it true that we have to take the Faculty Misconduct Policy, which has been carefully vetted, off the table and leave the BGSU-FA to deal with it? The timing seems very provocative; more provocative than effective. We need to be effective organizationally and economically. We need to recruit the best incoming class, faculty, and President we can. This may be in the letter of the law but it is certainly not within the spirit of shared governance that the administration professed was so important to it throughout this whole half year. It's the legal thing to do. I don't think it's the effective thing to do. Blair: I think part of the issue relating to effectiveness is a basic understanding on how to proceed with some of our existing governance structures. I'll give you a concrete example. I've had this conversation with Pat Pauken. We have these standing committees. One is the BG Perspective Committee. Does Steve Langendorfer call a meeting of that group on 1/11/2011 or not? Does John Ellinger call a meeting of the Information Technology Committee? Both of those committees are standing committees. We need a simple yes or no. What are we allowed to do and not allowed to do given these changes aren't transitional? They are immediate. We need to know how to proceed with our day-to-day business. Department Chairs are evaluated every Spring semester. According to the changes in the Charter we would not follow that process this year. Does that mean that the English Department distributes evaluations or not? Borland: There will be hundreds of questions like those and we will provide some working answers as we get going. The changes don't become effective until the first day of Spring semester. While there are communications going on with the BGSU-FA about the changes in the Charter, we will be working through these issues through our conversations. We have many questions that are very practical nuts and bolts kinds of issues that will need to be responded to, no doubt. To answer every question this afternoon is not possible. We are in a learning mode ourselves. We'll be meeting with Chairs and Deans to discuss the same things and respond to their concerns and questions. Midden: I understand that the BGSU-FA is the sole bargaining agent for the faculty. And, I presume the Board of

Trustees has the authority to alter the Charter. Border: I don't believe that is true. Kris?
Blair: The faculty can propose Amendments but the Board doesn't have to accept them.
Border: Does the Charter provide for direct changes without consulting with the faculty?
Blair: Yes, I thought that it did. Midden: If BGSU-FA is the bargaining unit for the
faculty, I'm surprised they weren't consulted as to how they would prefer to go forward,
in good faith. Folkins: This isn't about good faith. You take the upper hand if you have it.
This is a negotiation strategy driven by the lawyers. The first question that must be
answered is what is the overall plan for what we need to do between now and the first day
of the spring semester and what we do between then and when we have our first contract
which could be years? What do we do? Midden: Is there something that governs this
period? Are there any laws in the interim? Folkins: Well, it would be SERB regulations.
Midden: There must be something that governs this period. Blair: Does the absence of a
grievance procedure constitute an unfair labor practice? Borland: This is not a question I
can answer from a legal, technical standpoint. These things have been brought to BGSU-
FA's attention. That's the new relationship. Whatever the new process is, it must be
agreeable between the two parties. I have a feeling that a lot of these things are going to
be defined as we go through this process. Folkins: So the FA and administration will sit
down and come up with a transition plan. Borland: I imagine one of the first things that
will be worked out is the grievance process between now and when we finish negotiating
a contract. DeBard: BGSU-FA negotiates something to do with grievances. Doesn't that
product need to be approved by the members of the faculty or at least the members of the
FA? Would a President, Vice-President, or negotiating team need the approval of the
constituency they are representing? I'm not sure they would have the right to answer all
these questions in negotiations with the administration. They would have the right to
represent the faculty in with regard to these questions. The whole infrastructure of this
Academic Charter, some people like it, some don't but in some ways it is a superb
document of academic governance. I know it can slow Deans down but that's what it's
meant to do. To try to replicate that through negotiations will be very tricky. A contract
can take an incredible amount of time to negotiate the infrastructure intricacies of the
governance of this University to the satisfaction of the faculty and to the satisfaction of
the administration and the Board. I'm not sure you needed to do this in order to pose
these questions because I'm not sure the University is ready to answer them. I don't see
that the BGSU-FA is geared up to begin this process. How many faculty are involved in
committees right now? Just trying to replicate that will be extremely difficult and time
consuming. Carothers: That's why this was a brilliant strategy. Paint the Faculty Senate
the bad guys in this as competing negotiators. This is the injustice in this. The Faculty
Senate has become a scapegoat. It's strictly a tactic that catches the FA before they are
ready. The trouble is it is hurting all faculty. Everyday mundane business of the
University will not get done. Border: Do you know why Article 14 was struck? Folkins:
What is Article 14? Blair: Reconfiguration. Folkins: Yes, what does that have to do with
topics of bargaining? Borland: I think there are a number of items throughout the revised
Charter. According to the Charter I am no longer the University's Chief Budgetary
Officer. I can offer you my interpretation. I don't intend to speak for the Trustees in terms
of their justification or their rationale. Blair: It's true the Faculty Senate doesn't have
jurisdiction over wages, benefits, and working conditions. But we did have the faculty
oversight over curriculum or we did until last Friday afternoon. The revisions have gone

way above and beyond the wages, benefits, and working conditions to impact faculty oversight in regard to curriculum. I could point to issues to the faculty role in reviewing and approving programs and policies. When we see as faculty lines like that stricken from the Charter that causes concern. Those are not issues of wages, benefits, and working conditions. Our ownership of the curriculum has been vastly curtailed by the changes in the Charter. DeBard: I realize that we could go on and on which is not fair to you but it was not particularly fair to us either. When people say the Board in its wisdom, I'm sorry but Board's have incredibly little wisdom when it comes to things like this. I don't believe that any Board member struck one line of the Charter. This was presented to them a fait accompli. I doubt seriously they really understand what they have agreed to. The problem we're bringing up is there are some serious issues. Brodke: Can we have some advice from legal counsel about what puts the University in the least bad position? Is it better for us to have no grievance procedure and have an unfair labor practice? Or would it be better, even though the Charter has been changed, for the faculty to continue to represent grievances and the spirit of providing some kind of representation? Brodke: I'm wondering if the Senate Executive Committee should meet with legal counsel? Carothers: What counsel do we have? We're neither labor nor management. Blair: The Senate is not a participant in the grievance process. It would be between the BGSU-FA and administration. Nevertheless, because the Senate has this oversight of the current grievance procedures through the FPCC we need answers in regard to next steps. In my role I'd like to answer these questions collegially or redirect them. If we receive questions about grievance procedures do we send those on to Pat Pauken? Who answers those questions? Borland: I would say that in this matter Pat would be the person and we'll go from there to respond with the most thorough and thoughtful responses we can. Folkins: Can we go back to the question of the portions of the Charter that were eliminated that do not relate to the mandatory topics of bargaining. I don't think we got an answer to that question. It is a major concern of the Faculty Senate. Borland: There is a general answer to that question. It is important to remember that authority comes from the Board of Trustees. None of us have our own authority; it comes from somewhere. The Board of Trustees has responsibility for the University. Many of these matters may relate to authority as much as the labor issues. Folkins: What you're saying is the Trustees can void any part of the Charter and always could. That still doesn't answer my question in regard to the present situation. Borland: Help me understand that question. Folkins: You said, the Board of Trustees could amend the Charter and take anything they want out of the Charter at any time. Generally they don't do that. Why was it done here? Why are topics that are not mandatory topics of bargaining eliminated from the Charter? Borland: I think it has to do with authority. Folkins: They've always had that authority and just because you can do it doesn't mean that you should do it. DeBard: If the administration wanted to convince the faculty of this University of the need for a strong bargaining unit they have done it. Despite everything that was said in the fall and despite the reality that the main reason we have an FA now which is the number of non-tenure track faculty that make up the majority of contracted faculty at this University. That's the way the math worked. As a University community we have operated relatively effectively and it appears that now it has been thrown out the window. Every stakeholder at the University has points of power through constituencies. One of the great ironies over the past few days, you have possibly coalesced the faculty against the administration

far beyond anything the collective bargaining would have resulted in. Blair: And, not because of issues of wages, benefits and working conditions but because of issues of curriculum and due process. Borland: Right to due process is not gone. It is being worked out; but it is not gone. The role of faculty in curriculum is still there and fundamentally unchanged. The language has changed and it will need time to soak in. There are certain things about finances that are different. I think that is an administrative function. To ask for input and recommendations is a good process and still would continue to be sought from the Faculty Senate. I don't think that's gone. The recommending function is still there. You won't see words like authority in here. But engagement, perspective gathering, and listening are still there. Blair: Could you apply some of these changes to Connecting the Undergraduate Experience (CUE) in terms of next steps? Will the revised CUE proposal need to be revised in this new version of the Charter? Will Undergraduate Council and the Committee on Academic Affairs (CAA) continue to play a role? Is your sense that the process is the same as a result of these amendments or has it changed? Borland: I'm not sure it has changed. I think Undergraduate Council still has a function and a role to play. That body's input is still valued and will be sought after. Border: And CAA? Borland: I'll check to see if there is anything in particular there that will make a difference. I'm seeing a few things, the phrase non-binding recommendations to modify the phrase the budget. Page 18, number 7... arbitrating disagreements between colleges has been stricken. Border: Why would that have been stricken? How about the deletion about disputes between colleges? What does that have to do with labor negotiations? Borland: I think some are labor negotiations and others are related to authority and responsibility. Folkins: Why was that done without consultation? Borland: I understand the question. I don't know the answer. Carothers: I do. DeBard: I suspect your first response was very truthful. It's about authority and this is an authority grab. It has nothing to do with collective bargaining. It seems to do with Administrative authority at this University. Disregarding the faculty under the guise that they are now collectively bargained. How will this University be governed in the interim? There are elements that have been slashed and burned here that have next to nothing to do with a negotiated contract. Issues with faculty morale, cooperation, and initiative... this could be potentially very damaging to the leadership and to the faculty. Blair: I think there's always a gap between what the Charter says and how it is interpreted. Part of the issues, if you look on pages 36 and 41 respectively in regard to the role of undergraduate and graduate council does maintain aspects of the roles of both of those groups. But, when you look at programs and policies approval for graduate council and undergraduate council, item number 3 on both pages about what happens to degree programs or proposals related to academics, the role of FSBC, which has been eliminated and the CAA. Action can be taken on any academic curriculum. It needs to be reported but it doesn't have to be reviewed, commented upon or recommended by CAA based on these deletions. This is my interpretation and I suspect it will be the interpretation of others. LeClair: We rely heavily on faculty development office speed grants and improvement grants facilitates so much of what we do in bringing in expert guests. It's just gone and it will have a dramatic negative impact on our students. Is that really the case? Is it all just gone? We won't have those opportunities any longer. We won't be able to bring those people to our College. Borland: You mentioned the committee. The question is where are the resources? Will the resources still be available? The resources aren't gone; the

resources will still be somewhere. Folkins: But the faculty input as to the allocation of the resources is gone. LeClair: This seems like a well functioning body that's gone now. Blair: There are still inconsistencies in the Charter. For instance, Faculty Improvement Leaves (FILs) are reviewed by a committee that no longer exists. By the letter, that part of the Charter refers to a Committee that no longer exists. The Charter is in contradiction. Given the number of amendments that were made here this error is not surprising. LeClair: If those resources still exist how will those awards be made? How will we apply for them? Borland: I suppose that this is a subject of bargaining. Folkins: It's related to working conditions. Borland: It's possible this is a subject of bargaining. LeClair: I'm just pointing out that if these resources are no longer available to us it will have a significant negative impact on our students and our College. Lots of extremely valuable activities rely on this support. Folkins: The resources may not necessarily be going away. The point of pulling it out of the Charter takes the authority away from the role of those faculty committees. Midden: That's one question. What is the process to apply and distribute speed grants? How should Faculty Senate proceed? There are a large number of important questions that this raises that have important implications for how the University operates. What should we do? We may still have the opportunity to play some role in helping to clarify the issues this raises in a way that helps the University move forward. There are some legal questions. I'm still surprised that given we now have a bargaining unit that the administration to retain absolute authority and make decisions in this interim period. Can the Board of Trustees do anything at all? Folkins: I think the answer is that they can; the question is would that be wise? Midden: These are important issues that we need to address. What is the best way to proceed? Borland: You can delineate any process you find helpful. The reason we asked Pat Pauken to come work with us is that we knew there would be a lot of heavy lifting in the future during the course of negotiations in particular not just in any transitional period but after the contract as well with all these questions. The work in my office will be different and quite expansive. There is another constituent group with whom we now have to work. We'll continue to work with all the other constituent groups and now there is the BGSU-FA, the exclusive representative of the faculty. We'll be drawing heavily on Pat as a resource to help us with whatever responsive and responsible processes you put in place and try to dovetail with you and with the BGSU-FA. You may delineate whatever process you feel will be helpful. Pat will be the best conduit for us to receive and process these things. His experiences in University governance will help us a lot. His role as a faculty will certainly help us a lot. He has the nuance of many of these things. Folkins: Pat has a legal background too. Midden: That's great. He is a great representative of the administration. I think it may also be in our interest that we consult with BGSU-FA. They have a different perspective. While we have no authority, we do have the best interest of this institution at stake. How do we best move forward? Consulting with Pat and FA, they have legal representation available; we don't. I'm not saying we take either side. We work in the interest of moving the University forward. Carothers: It does need to be underlined that we are representatives of the faculty who have never been the individuals who negotiated labor issues. We are not competitors of BGSU-FA. We have always been here as a consultative body. It is unwise, imprudent, and disingenuous to paint us in any other color. Folkins: This has to be qualified by the knowledge that we cannot consult on labor issues. The FA is the exclusive bargaining unit. The administration cannot come to us to

seek advice on how they can. Our role is in everything that is not a topic of bargaining. The administration can't come to us to seek advice on how to deal with a specific issue they are negotiating with FA. What do we do between now and the first contract? It could be a couple of years. Blair: It's no secret that the BGSU-FA wants to meet with us. The Faculty Senate SEC will meet with representatives of the BGSU-FA in the Spring. And we've voted on to do that at our last meeting. That will happen. Brodke: Could we say when we meet with the BGSU-FA that we'd like to proceed theoretically as we have in the past? Could this order be rescinded? Blair: I don't have the answer to that question. There are legal issues. DeBard: The contract will have to include language that was formerly in the Academic Charter. Let me bring up another issue that has nothing to do with collective bargaining it has to do with authority and responsibility of a Chair of a Department or a Director of a School. It has to do with the workings of the Chair. The faculty no longer selects or recommends a chair – the Dean will do that. The faculty can no longer recall a chair. The Dean can recall a Chair. This seems to be a very bureaucratic rather than a collegial approach. The infrastructure of that department rests with the faculty not under the authority of the Chair. The Chair takes on a far more directive role through this language. The way we currently operate, there is no way that a bureaucratic Chair will succeed at BGSU. They might succeed in Dean's Council or Provost's committee of the whole but they will not succeed at the unit level where the work really gets done in working with students in good faith. This document runs counter to that. This did not need to be removed. It's made no great sense to me. Midden: This is the first bargaining position. They are grabbing as much as they can. Folkins: It has nothing to do with bargaining position to grab things that are not related to collective bargaining. Midden: Isn't it subject to negotiations? Can it include how Chairs are appointed? Borland: I think it's important to consider and you may want to go back to pages 2, 3, and 4 where you'll find definitions of faculty and administrators located. LeClair: Can you speak to the implications of that? Because at the beginning of summer, I will no longer be faculty but administration. Borland: There is reference to Faculty Senate. Pages 2, 3, and the top of 4 identify the criteria for who is faculty and who is management. We saw this working out when we were deciding who could vote and who could not. There needed to be a line between Chairs and Deans and labor. Folkins: That's understandable. There has to be a line between who is management and who is labor. LeClair: If someone has 10% of their load in a management position, they are no longer faculty but Administrative? Borland: We had to look at the type of work people do. Is it managerial work? Folkins: There are a number of areas that do not relate to collective bargaining that constitute red flags. But for your question, the administration has to define the lines. It's a topic for collective bargaining. Borland: That goes back to what Bob said about the perception of the role of his Department Chair. The definition of the Chair had to be decisive; the definition before was based on 50%. The perspective here is if you're doing this work, it's management work – you can't be both. John is also right. This is where we are today; we don't know where we'll be with the collective bargaining agreement. Midden: So how do we proceed? Blair: In some ways we are in the same boat. You have a communication issue. We have a communication issue. Even though the administration may be speaking to BGSU-FA about issues of wages, benefits and working conditions, the rest of the faculty needs to know what to do. What should Faculty Senate do and when? If we do nothing... we will get to the January meeting and I

ask are there any Issues and Concerns; there will be. How do we get those questions addressed? Borland: These are questions I need answers to. I have work to do on your behalf, on behalf of the faculty and on behalf of the students. I don't want to wait until the January Senate meeting to answer those questions. I want to respond to those right away. Border: The changes in the CAA section are a matter of authority. Do you see that there could have been a different approach? Could CAA been asked? Could Faculty Senate been asked about those changes? Borland: I think that question has already been asked and answered.

Blair: The benefit of the Charter in its old form was its consistency. It provided a roadmap for good stewardship. You might have one College where everything is very above board and faculty have a certain level of input. But, in another College it may be done quite differently. There is a lot of dangerous ground around this set of amendments. The document has taken so many procedures off the table and the BGSU-FA will have to put them back in point-by-point by point. Whoever those individuals are will have to hear from a range of faculty, not just Faculty Senate. DeBard: If someone were asking me what strategy the FA would take now because they are obviously behind, it would be to take the old Charter and photocopy it. Folkins: No. If that happens the Faculty Senate goes away entirely. The whole document is negotiable. DeBard: The point is, as they do that the administration has far surpassed the wages, benefits, and working conditions. Folkins: That doesn't mean they have to negotiate anything beyond wages, benefits, and working conditions. Everything else is lost. LeClair: How can we help? Can we identify functions of the committees that have been deleted? Can we identify their functions? Can we assist by identifying committees that are important and should have an interim committee to handle that work? Folkins: I don't want to give those up in the long run either. Those don't need to go to FA. They can stay with a Faculty committee that is not FA. I'm not sure the administration would put those on the bargaining table anyway. It's not the interim; it's the long run and determining what the role of Faculty Senate is and will be. We need a list of what Faculty Senate feels is important. LeClair: How do we prioritize that list? Folkins: I'm more worried about the long run than I am about next semester. LeClair: I'm worried about next semester. Border: I'm very concerned about Article 14. Why was that stricken? Borland: Any kind of reconfiguration would be discussed. Border: Can you give us an oral history of what you know about this decision? Borland: Let me put it this way. This is probably an answer to many similar types of questions. There is management and there is not management, call it FA who is the exclusive representative. There are responsibilities that management or administration has and there are those responsibilities that faculty have. There is a bright line between the two. If management has responsibilities for the fiscal, organizational, staffing, and they do, then to blend those two, officially blend those two is problematic. Whether it has to do with hiring a Dean, evaluating, etc. I hate the fact that we now have to work with certain constraints. That's what I tried to help us understand would not be a desirable thing. Reorganization, for example, is an administration / Trustee responsibility. To officially, tie those two bodies together as Article 14 did is problematic. Border: It's shared governance. This is a withdrawal from shared governance. Edens: Let me echo this from a student's perspective. I don't like to hear there is management and labor. This is not a Ford plant with products rolling off the line. We don't have a body that can work

where no shared governance exists. What does it mean for me and the members of my staff? Where do we go for advice, assistance? We don't have an FA in an environment where shared governance no longer exists. I'm crossing my fingers that what the faculty and administration come up with is in the best interest of students. I had hesitations with the union initially; overall what is most distressing to me, what is concerning me is that this is what it has led to. Moves by the administration to make these changes were made without consulting anyone. Folkins: It's reasonable to act on labor issues. Basch: What little power I had in my capacity to cast votes in Faculty Senate or on certain Boards I sat on; I made an effort to educate myself. What message does this send to our students about how to govern business in the future? I think it's irresponsible. It will create more problems than it solves. Blair: Just as the faculty feels disenfranchised through the elimination of University standing committees so do the students. Just a couple of weeks ago we voted to amend the constitution of the student health services committee to include another graduate student, an International student. That Committee appears to not exist. And, that was a committee that was meant to serve students. DeBard: What is it we do now? What is it that we can do now? Folkins: We can push on every one of those points but I don't think we go back to FA on the non collective bargaining points – we do that as Faculty Senate. DeBard: So we go point-by-point and take these non-collective bargaining points back to Board of Trustees. We know how that works. If the administration wants to push them they'll approve them and if not... Folkins: It brings the light of day to the whole process. DeBard: That will be a lot of work. Folkins: But it's worth it. Border: Isn't Article 14 worth it? DeBard: Yes. Carothers: I would like to hear from the Provost answers to some of these questions and we'd like to hear some of the administration's answers to those questions. We can't answer those questions. We can pose questions. Will your office, or any office, has plans for educational forums, town meetings, a listproc, anything to disseminate information about life after these Charter changes? Any plans at all to distribute information for the changes in the Charter. Borland: Yes, I've been working on that and moving in that direction. I'm an educator. I'm very interested in making sure we have opportunity to inform, interact, and improve. Midden: I only want to do things that will accomplish something. I don't think it's very likely the Board of Trustees will change anything currently in this document. Border: Do you know what the vote was? Blair: It was unanimous. Midden: We need to know how to move forward with important matters. DeBard: Given that this goes into effect at the start of the next semester how do we accomplish that? How do we generate that list? Can I ask how you are feeling right now? I'm wondering after this meeting will you go upstairs and carry on? Have we piqued your interest at all – maybe this was a bridge too far. Are you feeling like it is the way it is – management and labor. That's the way it is. Borland: The thing I'm taking away from this meeting is that there are some very practical types of things that need to be dealt with as quickly as possible. We need to identify those practicalities, Jackie's example is a very good one, and decide what to do now to be sure these issues are addressed. I'm not interested in much more than that right now. There are things that demand attention. They need to get that attention first. Your list of those practical things will be extremely helpful to me. If there are things that need to be worked out between administration and BGSU-FA we need to get moving on those. Everyone had an inkling changes with grievances were coming and that these would need to be dealt with equitably and in a timely fashion. Those things are important to me and those

things must move forward as soon as possible. I see no need for these things to drag on. There are practical things that must be done. How do we do that? I'll be eager to receive those items from you. I'll feel a sense of responsibility to channel those items to the appropriate places as soon as possible. Midden: We do have some individuals whose Senate responsibilities have been significantly reduced in these Charter changes. Perhaps those individuals would be willing to help in this effort. DeBard: Maybe Kris could facilitate a discussion of the faculty. Let the faculty have some input and a working group should be put together who is capable of generating these questions, concerns, and recommendations. I would suggest that gets going prior to the start of the semester, before the Faculty Senate meeting. The ball is in our court now. We have to respond to them. Blair: We have the authority to put forth issues and concerns. Such a call can be sent out to all faculty – not through the listserv. I can get that out by the end of the week. Those issues and concerns can come in through Pam or myself. They can be classified. We could assemble those and review as the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) – whether we do that during the 1/11 meeting – and we can make this a formal agenda item at the January or February Faculty Senate meeting. Any suggestions as to how we present this information? Folkins: Inherent in that is providing the administration enough time to develop complete responses to these questions and concerns. DeBard: What I suggest, sometime between the first of the year and the 11th we generate a document that becomes a discussion point at our 1/11 SEC meeting and authorize it to go forward to the Faculty Senate meeting at 1/18. Given the seriousness of this; we now need some answers. Blair: If we keep it away from wages, benefits, and working conditions we can forward those. Folkins: Two issues we talked about today: 1) What do we do in the interim in terms of areas that are mandatory topics of collective bargaining when we don't have a Charter in place and we don't have a contract? 2) This initiative has to do with the parts of the Charter that have been excised or changed that are not related to mandatory items of bargaining. LeClair: The President's e-mail made this sound like everything was to comply with Ohio state law. That doesn't appear to be the case. Borland: There are mandatory points and there are permissive points. Folkins: We don't want to give up any of the permissives. We want to hold on to those. LeClair: It's still unclear to me what the status is of people who are going to become Administrators in the spring. Can they continue to serve in Senate? Borland: You may. You can also resign if you'd like. Blair: To clarify sometime in the next 24 hours, I will send out a message to all faculty members calling for questions and concerns about areas of the Charter amendments that deal with areas other than wages, benefits, and working conditions. These will be sent to both Pam Pinson and me. What date should we use? We need a deadline. January 3rd? I'll be attending a conference on the 6th through the 9th. DeBard: Can we schedule something for January 4th? Blair: We can and those who are in town can attend. DeBard: We should also do our due diligence in reviewing these issues. Borland: The practical issues will get the more direct, immediate, concise answers. A more practical, let's move forward in this way type of response. The more theoretical, global issues will be more difficult to answer. I expect there will be a range of these issues. I don't want you to think each area will be addressed completely. Also remember there is a negotiation going on. You create delimitations that you have to live with when going through that process. I'm a champion of being highly interactive and transparent, there are delimitations that will be frustrating to everyone.

Carothers: In the interest of time should we forego the rest of the agenda? Is there a motion to adjourn?

ADJOURNMENT

4:30 p.m.