

## SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

February 22, 2011  
2:30 – 4:30 pm

Senate Conference  
140 McFall Center

**Attendance:** Basch; Blair; Border; Brodke; Carothers; DeBard; Dinda; Folkins; Gremler; Herman; Leclair; Midden

**Guest:** Bertelsen; Labbie; Williams; Zickar

### CHAIR'S REPORT

Thank you all for being here. Introductions. I'll provide a little background that leads us to this conversation today as my Chair's Report. We've had so many questions and concerns about all of the Charter changes. Faculty Senate has done its best to facilitate dialog about those questions and concerns. We've synthesized and presented questions and concerns as they were collected from faculty and presented those to the Provost, President, and Pat Pauken. If you've attended the Faculty Senate meetings, we have been discussing these issues both informally and formally. We seem to be at an impasse with ongoing questions and concerns and the Administration's ability to answer these questions. We'd like to determine how we can be more focused and proactive in our remaining months together; what our concerns are and remedies suggested. It may be an action such as the one taken for the Faculty Personnel and Conciliation Committee (FPCC), which was reinstated though not technically a Faculty Senate organization at this point. We need to determine modes of operation in regard to things such as budgeting, evaluation of chairs, College and University level administrators. We'd like to understand where we go with some written documents to share with the administration. We decided to invite both former and current standing committees to meet with us today to talk about that process and to help us engage in some brainstorming to be sure we're on the right track in regard to questions and concerns. We know that the current administration might not address these but we hope that this will come forward to the next administration. We met last week during our on call meeting to determine which are the concerns we're most needing to look at.

### OLD BUSINESS

No old business

### NEW BUSINESS

**Shared Governance Proposal Planning**  
**Procedures Governing School Formations**  
**School of Cultural and Critical Studies (Attachment)**

Blair: We'll start by looking at the document with our articulated concerns. These are some of the big issues we've articulated at this time. We want to get feedback on these issues, concerns we might have, and proposed remedies. Some of the areas are blank. Today we'll collectively share some ideas. We also hope to have some individuals who are interested in continuing to work on these in depth. By the end of the term we have a document we can share with at least the administration and perhaps other constituencies. Questions or concerns from our guests? That's where we're at in the larger SEC discussions.

*Original Issue 1: Budget Planning (including Financial Exigency)*

*Concern: Current changes to the Academic Charter eliminate the ability of faculty, students, and staff to participate in the University budget conversations about academic and other strategic priorities not related to collective bargaining.*

*Proposed Remedy: Proposed committee or panel in place that ensures student and staff participation on such topics as the projections of the costs of academic reconfiguration or implementation of new programs.*

Bertelsen: Upon being invited to this meeting, I sent an email to the Faculty Senate Budget Committee (FSBC) members. The response was mixed. The biggest concern that has come to our attention is the voice of students. For at least the last two years with our budget hearings, I have a schedule of the open meetings, divisional and college presentations. Their priorities and recommendations will be brought to these meetings. After the 45-minute presentations, we would have an opportunity for conversation or discussion. The University Budget Committee (UBC) and FSBC will review these findings separately. We would match those recommendations to the priorities and University strategic plan. Then the UBC and FSBC would come together to discuss our individual findings. We then come together again to discuss and pull together one report that goes forward to the President for consideration. In the past we've also had Undergraduate Student Government (USG) representation and presentations. That is our biggest concern. Where is the student voice? Will there be an opportunity for student voice? Blair: We're moving from a very complex system of participation and advisory role to virtually nothing. It's a concern for all constituencies but especially faculty and students. What is the remedy? We talked about how important the use of language is. We weren't sure if we should be asking for a panel? A committee? An advisory group? Bertelsen: Having shared that, we have done an impact study for both Firelands and Continuing and Extended Education for new programs. That's usually what we do in the fall semester. Folkins: How did these meetings fit with what has been done in the past few years? Bertelsen: This is the same process. Folkins: These meetings are slated for discontinuation, as I understand it. Bertelsen: We have not met since late fall. These meetings are still in play and I understand from UBC the meetings will continue. Folkins: But this is written nowhere. Whether it is in the Charter or not we need a written agreement that says we want this in place of FSBC, with student representation, and a process for the continuation of the hearings. Bertelsen: These have always been available and open to the University. We've always had representation from FSBC and a take away, a handout. DeBard: Is there a reason that the vice president for enrollment management was included here? Bertelsen: He has come in on the finance so he has been invited to talk. Blair: Having attended a number of these last Spring, they are very poorly attended even though they are open hearings. One of the things we might discuss is how we might foster greater participation in this process. We need to make it clear that we want to play an active role in budgeting and fiscal accountability on this campus. I think this message needs to extend to the students as well since they are the ones who have been disenfranchised in this process. Border: I attended the CoT discussion last year. It was hardly a meeting. I asked the Interim Dean to announce the meetings. He refused. We weren't sure if we were allowed to talk at this meeting. It's not an interactive forum. Bertelsen: We were learning as we went along last year with that. The following day we did revisit this information from your Dean's presentation. An invitation for additional information that came forward. Had that discussion not happened we might not have had that additional information. Midden: Does FSBC get information prior to these meetings? Do they participate in the development of these budgets? Bertelsen: We get a copy of what is being shared by the individuals presenting. Background and process, PowerPoint presentations and budget sheets...we have had those copies in the last two years. On the day of the presentation we are given Charting of Our Future, the goals and strategies, as presenters must identify which of these is being implemented. At the presentation we get a handout for our note taking and things we should be listening for. Midden: Does the VP

for Finance and Administration present the big picture for the institution and an assessment of the likely income will be? Prior to these presentations you don't have numbers? Bertelsen: Yes. What we do have is review existing and next year budgets that typically start in January. Midden: No body is doing that right now? Bertelsen: Yes, that's correct. Zickar: Then who is calling these meetings if FSBC no longer exists? Bertelsen: UBC is calling them. We had that planned and agreed to back in October. Folkins: FSBC/UBC goes back a long way in this process. Midden: This process is new. Bertelsen: Yes. When we are getting all of this information we always get an update at the beginning where we learn what is happening in Columbus. What is the budget? Where are we? We ask for scenarios for what will occur. Midden: I thought FSBC got more information than what was presented at the presentation. No one is getting that information now? Bertelsen: Yes, from our committee perspective. Brodke: The College Budget Committee continues to meet at Firelands. Blair: The College committees may not be comprised of faculty members. In the case of arts and sciences it is comprised of chairs. Bertelsen: We have looked at these carefully and asked questions. It was presented on one month and we deliberated on that. We do come back with questions and vote at the end. We do have ample time to address these issues. It goes from January through May. Midden: You would come into these meetings already informed. Bertelsen: Yes. Sometimes because of the nature of the process it can be overwhelming given the amount of data. But, they have been very forthcoming and Sherri Stoll has met with us; we've asked Albert Colom to come in and talk with us. Sometimes the numbers just aren't matching. We need to understand the numbers and where there are gaps. Midden: That type of critical analysis of this budget data will not be occurring to any great extent under this current arrangement? Labbie: We are facing a position that we're taking the choices away from faculty. We don't have a voice in the budget? Folkins: They would argue it the other way around. We have a structure here that does have the voice of all constituencies. That's what they would argue. Zickar: Can this schedule be sent to everyone? Bertelsen: The schedule will be sent out to the faculty. Blair: And we can send it out too. Folkins: I wouldn't put a lot of stock in this process. I would focus our efforts into a new FSBC. Blair: Yes, this gets us back to the issue of a remedy process. We're all concerned by the lack of participation opportunities. We need a venue to allow for the type of input that we previously had. LeClair: Can we provide feedback? Blair: They are very structured and timed. There is question and answer period at the end of each presentation, maybe ten minutes. I'm certain that you can ask questions at that point. Midden: In that scenario, I don't think you could analyze the data and ask questions in that time span. That's the handicap. If the faculty are limited to obtaining information about the budget through these presentations there is not time to do an analysis of what has been presented. LeClair: We wouldn't have time to do a proper study. Midden: Right. This is what FSBC has done in the past. If you don't have that information in a form you can study, you need a complete body of information and time to do the analysis if you're going to make any reasonable alternatives to what's being presented. Folkins: You need the give and take of the committee structure. You need something more than a show and tell. Bertelsen: It is informative. You do learn quite a lot but really you are given so much information you don't have time to analyze it. Midden: I think this process is fine but if we are going to have a significant constituency group voice in this process we need something more. Blair: Given the agreement that the presentation style is insufficient; are there those that will work on this issue and develop some proposed alternatives? We need something concrete and specific. Folkins: I don't think you need more than we have here. We want a panel. In the first sentence, let's change the first sentence – we have the *ability*... eliminate *the requirement that*... Maybe a sentence could also be put in that this panel should meet on a regular basis and have the information and time to perform a thorough analysis. Blair: One of the things we shared last time was language from various collective bargaining agreements and in particular at the permissives language. They were setting out the advanced time before any budget recommendations were made. Zickar: Why are we asking that? It sounds like you're asking for the committee put back. Why would they do that? Brodke: Why are we working with the administration and not working

with the Union? Zickar: Or working in concert with the groups? Blair: We have been in contact with both the BGSU-FA and the AAUP legal representation. They have talked to us about these issues. They will have their own governance committee. They want to partner with us in that process. We aren't against that. We have voted as the SEC to meet with the FA this semester. It will happen at some point very soon. We're also trying to maintain a sense of the Senate's autonomy, particularly because of some of the give and take that might occur as part of the negotiation process. One of the examples last week was given outlining compensation for Faculty Senate leadership, I believe in the form of a course release. In a negotiation process, it might be a raise or compensation for Senate leadership. We need to be collegial and partner but we need to establish our own agenda. We're doing both. Folkins: Neither sections of the Charter were stricken and we will not get those back. We can try for a compromise. We need a panel that does the good work we want done. Even it is in a written agreement if not the Charter. Zickar: What is their motivation to give you these things? How will you convince them this is in their best interest? Folkins: If we say this is good enough when it isn't then we've given up without even trying. LeClair: The Faculty Development committee continues to function. They seem to be making this up as they go along. There is precedence that certain faculty functions continue. Folkins: We should decide what we want and what is reasonable and go on record with these issues. They have taken a position to not have this in the Charter but lets at least have something in writing. Labbie: If we did that from Amendments and Bylaws, we could propose it as an amendment. Blair: It is possible for faculty, a minimum of three, to propose an amendment to the Charter, whether or not it happens. It can be done providing a paper trail. Folkins: If we propose an amendment they'll say no, but if we propose something else, they might agree. Border: If we propose a panel and they refuse then we could propose an amendment. Blair: Yes, Plan A, Plan B. DeBard: I'd like to suggest a change to the proposed remedy, something like this...

***Revised Issue 1: Budget Planning (including Financial Exigency)***

***Concern:*** Current changes to the Academic Charter eliminate the requirement that faculty, students, and staff participate in the University budget conversations about academic and other strategic priorities not related to collective bargaining.

***Proposed Remedy:*** Proposed panel that would meet on a regular basis to ensure thorough analysis through faculty, student and staff participation on such topics as the projections of the costs and impact of academic reconfiguration, implementation of new programs, elimination of existing programs and yearly budgets.

Blair: Yes we have to look at what's on the horizon for us. If the plan is to eliminate graduate programs on this campus, where are the cost savings? LeClair: Or reconfiguration? DeBard: Very important something that is happening to us even as we speak. We were told that our Dean would be given a set of money for graduate fees and scholarships. We were allocated money from the Dean, which was insufficient to cover the needs. We rearranged the fee/scholarships to come down to 85% rather than 100%. That allowed us to continue on with our existing number of internships. We were then informed yesterday morning that through a conversation between VP for Enrollment Management and Provost, based on the recommendation of the VP for Enrollment Management, our off-campus internships should be eliminated regardless of our ability to pay for them. We have 15 off-campus internships in post-secondary institutions all around Northwest Ohio. We were told; philosophically it is unacceptable to help institutions that may be competitors to Bowling Green. We pointed out we were helping our students, not those institutions. The impact on our program, aside from losing one third of our masters students, would be to significantly alter one of the most respected, long standing programs. Their preference would be that we would be a fully fee generating program which we cannot do. Blair: It eliminates a professional development opportunity for graduate students. This is an academic issue where a higher authority has made this decision to eliminate something rather than faculty.

DeBard: The point is, this is a well thought out plan that we've implemented for decades. The internships are a required part of the degree plan. This is a capricious power decision. Rather than do these internships, you should be out making money. Folkins: My understanding is that they didn't do this purposely to meddle in the structure of your graduate program but they saw it as competing with our undergraduate recruiting. DeBard: That's possible; that's one interpretation. Folkins: We have one of the highest percentages of external internships and have been proud of this. Blair: If this were part of a course, would they be able to make that change? It is part of the curriculum. DeBard: They do get 9 hours credit and it is a regular course we teach as advisors. Our experiential component is integral. Here's an example of where impact has to integrate with cost. We dealt with cost but it wasn't good enough. We don't want arbitrary and capricious unilateral decisions being made by administrators who may have the right to do so by the Board of Trustees but who do not have the academic expertise to look out for the academic welfare of a program let alone the entire University. Labbie: It's a myopic view. In the long run, those students do bring money back. LeClair: It requires a long view and an informed view. Midden: Lots of graduate students from the College Student Personnel program have been far and away the most mature, creative, dedicated students I've encountered. I can attest to the quality of that program. DeBard: The decision has not been made. There has been push back. Our Dean is now representing us in a meeting involving VP for Enrollment Management, Provost, and the Graduate Dean. My concern is; where is our Department Chair? The Dean has been a very good advocate but he needs information. Folkins: In many programs in times of cuts this is the kind of issue that comes up. However, this isn't the kind of thing FSBC has gotten into in the past. It's a much broader brush. This isn't elimination of a program. DeBard: It represents a whole culture that seems to be changing. Zickar: Why don't you start passing resolutions condemning these actions? Blair: We did one at the last meeting. Border: CAA was given the graduate stipend funding policy. We believe the Graduate Council passed approved this policy. However, we understand it includes language that is changing and evolving. We're trying to get our arms around this. Is this an academic issue? Does it need to go to Faculty Senate? DeBard: The micromanagement that led to this decision would not be covered by a panel that would simply receive information. The idea is that the actions of the administration toward the Academic Charter has greatly enhanced its ability and inclination to make these decisions without shared governance that is essential to a thriving University. It's not just cost but impact. Blair: This does lead into other issues such as Academic Reconfiguration as well as the various roles of Council. For times sake do we want to move on? Article XIV was virtually stricken from the Academic Charter. What happens to a faculty member once his or her program is eliminated? What happens in terms of retaining expertise? Retraining? No articulated guidelines in a document like this leaves many faculty feeling scared. DeBard: Moving towards academic reconfiguration, the document on the Proposal for Formation of the School of Cultural and Critical Studies that was shared with us leaves questions. I would have been far more impressed if I had received a copy of the Dean's endorsement. Is this decision to consolidate these departments into a school in concert with the parties involved? This document represents a reconfiguration.

### ***Original Issue 2: Academic Reconfiguration***

#### ***Concern:***

#### ***Proposed Remedy: Review procedure***

Blair: However, these impacted units want this very much. DeBard: In so far as they want it and they will save money, that's great. The proper procedures were followed. We've already had it proven that if good will prevails, why do you need it in writing? What you need in writing if good will might not prevail. Blair: Having heard from Pat Pauken on this matter. This proposal came directly to SEC with the understanding that this would be passed along to CAA that has already happened in a conversation with David Border last week. The sharing of this document with SEC

and CAA are stressed as kind of optional. The assumption of the administration once it has been reviewed and we offer our commentary; this will not go to the floor of the Faculty Senate for review and approval. It will be transmitted back to administration for endorsement and implementation. That is what is expected of us. Folkins: You don't have to do it. We can take it to the floor of the Senate. Blair: No. They don't believe that the Charter language supports taking this to the floor of the Senate. The SEC is the final stop for this proposal. Folkins: Is this the way it was done in the past? Bertelsen: No. In the past this would have come to FSBC. We would have gotten this to do an impact study. Then, we would have passed this along to CAA. We don't know who did the fiscal impact study. Folkins: They are not expecting us to take it to the floor of the Senate. Should we do it anyway? Blair: Well that's the question. Transmitting it to CAA and letting them have their opportunity to review. I think that's an important part of this process thought it is not required by the language in the Charter. DeBard: I have fewer problems with this now as long as the faculty and programs and students of these programs properly understood the impact of this move. If the administrative needs of each of these programs will not be met in the future then I have a problem with that. In so far as they chose to do that, that's fine. Under the current lack of Charter language, they could have done this with no consultation. Blair: Yes. Folkins: My point is that if we still want to follow our previous process as outlined in the Charter then we can take this to the floor of the Senate. Labbie: Yes, but it was ready 18 months ago. It doesn't seem feasible to keep some of these programs and they want the formation of this School. In a way choosing our battles is important. Folkins: I'd like to set precedence. DeBard: This may not be the proper fight. But, I don't want Faculty Senate coming off as obstructionist. I do want Faculty Senate coming off as deliberative. There is a difference. Labbie: If this is the model for condensing other programs that don't want to be condensed, we have a problem. Blair: This is not the model of reconfiguration as outlined in the old Charter, that's between multiple departments/colleges. All of these units do reside within the same College. This is all within one College. The administration has said we have the right to have an advisory role. And this will be shared with CAA. That is the role they would typically play on this type of curriculum. Border: I don't see the Charter as changing that much in regard to new schools, new departments. According to the Charter, Undergraduate Council should have reviewed this. As Chair of Undergraduate Council Tim Messer-Kruse put it forth as an informational item. I don't believe he did his due diligence. It was a discussion by Undergraduate Council, action was taken and CAA gets to review it and inform Senate. That hasn't changed. Pat Pauken's citation of Section X.H... DeBard: According to Article X.H of the Academic Charter, on the creation of new schools, "[d]etailed proposals shall be submitted to the Dean, the VPAA, and the VPFA who may review, analyze, and consult with such members of the University Community they deem necessary including the Faculty Senate leadership." Border: If I were to rule on what the Charter says, this is yet another inclusive way of involving Faculty Senate leadership at different points in the process. This may be before Undergraduate Council gets it. Talk to Faculty Senate leadership, we want your involvement. I don't think it is subtractive of Undergraduate Council's responsibility. It is CAAs right to review it and pass it on Faculty Senate. Blair: We might decide that similar to what Tim did at Undergraduate Council it is reported as an action of the SEC that is informational on the floor of the Senate as opposed to actionable. There would not be a vote as there was last year for the Firelands curriculum modification and Continuing and Extended Education. Whether we want to use this the model by taking it forward to Senate for a vote, I don't know. I welcome commentary on that. Border: I'm persuaded. I think we need a vote on the floor. Labbie: I'm convinced as well. Blair: I would like whatever review and commentary CAA has to offer on this proposal to be complete by March 28<sup>th</sup> prior to our SEC meeting. Border: This issue will be on CAA's agenda on 3/2. We have guests lined up. Blair: Right. We just took care of that item on our agenda.

Blair: Back to Academic Reconfiguration: Where do we want to go with this issue given the ways in which the Board has amended the Charter? Border: Things falling under the reconfiguration, multi colleges and this has been removed completely from the Charter. This could happen without shared governance. Folkins: Eliminate the requirement of the faculty, students, and staff to participate in discussions and deliberations related to academic reconfiguration. A sentence could be added to define what Academic Reconfiguration is from the old Charter language. ARC? Blair: The Academic Reconfiguration Committee. Border: It was the setup of two or more colleges. Folkins: Do we want to propose a panel? Border: I think we can propose a panel. Labbie: Or a review procedure? Folkins: Yes, I think a review procedure would work. It should be explicit and spells out projecting expenses and approval by CAA and UC or GC and includes an impact study. LeClair: It's not simple. What seems like substantial savings, if you walk through it and do the math, in fact is not. It can be presented as a simple matter but it may not be. Folkins: It uproots faculty and their identity as well as reconstructing and restructuring many different student programs. Very often it ends up sometimes people who are involved are not located physically in the same place. It costs money to relocate personnel. LeClair: Is there a concern that before any AAUP regulation is in place, changes could be made in between. Blair: Given the financial status? Yes. I think there will be a substantial period of time between now and the University has its first contract has been negotiated. LeClair: That is what I'm concerned about. The administration can view this as a window of opportunity to do whatever they want to. And they can. Midden: If we neglect academic expertise, changes can be made that are detrimental just as happened with the College Student Personnel program. DeBard: In Section AXI, SG: the section deleted... "Approval of a proposal that involves relocation of faculty members may be given only after the faculty members concerned have had the opportunity to consider the proposal and to advise the several councils and administrators regarding their views. Whenever transfers of departments or the creation of a new department involve faculty members from more than one college or school, the academic Deans or Directors and college or school councils of all of the colleges and schools involved shall participate in the foregoing consultative procedure." This speaks to FSBC and UBC. The whole concept of shared governance is gaining the expertise necessary to formulate the sort of decision that will have a lasting impact. Folkins: I'd like to add to our list of concerns in regard to academic reconfiguration; there are really two issues. One issue is, restructuring the programs, undergraduate and graduate, and moving faculty around; the second is reconfiguration that results in the termination of tenured or tenure stream faculty members. That's a much more serious issue. I think we should include in our concerns that there must be some assurance that tenured faculty are not to have their positions eliminated due to academic reconfiguration unless there is financial exigency. I think we should be right out front with that point. Blair: That was my primary concern. Folkins: I think there is a smaller concern. Unilaterally from the top down they can leave people in the lurch. The smaller tweaking with moving one unit from one college to another and it can have a significant impact on the programs and faculty. It has to be done in deliberative ways through shared governance. That is on a different scale than the elimination of programs.

### ***Revised Issue 2: Academic Reconfiguration***

#### ***Concern:***

***Proposed Remedy:*** Review procedure; assurance that tenured faculty are not to have their positions eliminated due to academic reconfiguration unless there is financial exigency.

Blair: We have some talking points here. Should we move on to Issue 3: The Role of Undergraduate/Graduate Council & CAA? Dave, I'd like you to address this.

### ***Issue 3: Role of Undergraduate/Graduate Council and CAA***

#### ***Concern:***

***Proposed Remedy:*** *Written agreement for the review of graduate and undergraduate programs to retain faculty authority over curriculum development and modification.*

Border: I don't have a problem with how it is as it stands. The Undergraduate Council (UC) still has the responsibility to review new programs, the suspension of programs, and the elimination of new programs. I know quite a bit has been inked out. I'm not as familiar with the workings of the Graduate Council as I am with UC. I'm looking at the Graduate Council (GC) responsibilities now. Blair: We can look at this in regard to the school proposal that was transmitted to us. It was transmitted to us as a courtesy. Border: Consider proposals to the modification or discontinuance of graduate programs. As CAA we are to review actions and discussions of UC and GC. That automatically includes CAA. This is complex because an extra layer of complexity has been added because Tim Messer-Kruse wears two hats. It's his degree of cooperation with CAA that matters. We'll be cut off from both streams simultaneously. It's a matter of them, or Tim, committing to communicating with CAA their actions and discussions. Blair: Is the issue just ensuring the process is consistent for all major curricular modifications? One would argue CUE was a major curricular modification that initially some senior administration thought didn't need to go through certain channels. Do we need this issue? DeBard: No, I don't think so. Folkins: The fewer issues the better.

*The decision was made to eliminate this issue as it is still sufficiently covered in the Charter.*

Blair: Moving on to issue 4. What additional language do we need? Provost Borland's actions are commendable to insist this will continue but we don't know it will continue in the future. And it needs to be consistent across colleges. The old version of the Charter was very consistent; some form of evaluation would take place. We could adopt similar structure for issue 5 could we come up with similar language.

***Original Issue 4: Evaluation of Chairs, Deans, and Provost***

***Concern:*** *Feedback about the performance of administrators tasked with advancing the academic mission of the institution is considered both a faculty right and responsibility.*

***Remedy:*** *Proposed written agreement that articulates a consistent process for the evaluation of chairs, deans across the colleges. Language can be taken directly from the Charter.*

***Issue 5: Input on the Selection of Academic Administrators***

***Concern:***

***Remedy:*** *Develop an open, transparent process that allows for constituent group input on administrative appointment.*

Folkins: I think saying language can be taken directly from the Charter throws a red flag. It indicates we want the Charter back. Why can't we say, language will be crafted that articulates past practice. Blair: Could we for Issue 5 come up with similar language? Folkins: Why not add Selection to Issue 4 to collapse if further. Border: What about the recall of a Dean? Folkins: Recall is a very different process. Selection requires a search committee and other processes. You can always have a vote of no confidence coming from the faculty. I think it is a very different process. Border: They were very close to each other in Charter language. One was Section D and one was Section E. Recall was also titled the special evaluation or recall of the Dean. Whether we wanted to argue for special evaluation language including the scope of recall. Labbie: Special evaluation might get at this. The vote of no confidence could lead to something more. The organization of the Charter wouldn't necessarily need to be these sections next to each other logically. It might have been flow of the document. Border: Just evaluation is sufficient to imply recall? LeClair: Would we be asking that faculty participate? Blair: Yes. Folkins: It doesn't mean



they won't continue past practices. My guess is there is no way they will put together a Dean's search that does not have faculty representation. It would put the new Dean at a disadvantage. Border: When it comes to recall, Baugher had a unique perspective... When she composed the committee to take a look at it she included faculty, staff, and others. The Charter was clear it should be composed of the faculty of the College. She brought in faculty outside of the colleges. It altered the outcome of the recall. Blair: So we'll presume evaluation will include implicitly issues of recall as well. On Issue 6 Faculty Senate compensation, we talked about the importance of this issue. I wonder if that's something we might as SEC pursue separately. Perhaps we should develop an individual policy that we share with Provost Borland at one of our upcoming SEC/VPAA meetings. It's important for the sustainability and efficacy of the Senate. We need a stated policy about what the compensation for Senate leadership is; here's what we suggest. DeBard: Excellent there is a theme behind the first four issues. This is a technical issue that can be worked out. It doesn't have to do with shared governance. Folkins: It needs to come from SEC rather than from Senate leadership.

*Issue 4 was revised and Issue 5 was merged with Issue 4.*

***Revised Issue 4 including Issue 5: Selection and Evaluation of Chairs, Deans, and Provost***

***Concern:*** *Feedback about the performance of administrators tasked with advancing the academic mission of the institution is considered both a faculty right and responsibility.*

***Remedy:*** *Proposed, written agreement that articulates a consistent process for the evaluation of Chairs and Deans across the Colleges. Language can be crafted that articulates past practice.*

Blair: Our next step is to continue to refine the document. I'll create a draft document. I think we'll have to figure out the model... is it a memo? A statement? An introduction or preamble? We want a viable timeline. Starting this early gives us a chance to look at what we have. I think the issues are clear and the remedies are reasonable. Having them articulated and on paper for institutional memory when new administration comes in is a good symbolic strategy. Given the rest of the agenda, I believe we've talked about the procedures of school formations and the School of Cultural and Critical Studies. It has been transmitted to CAA. CAA is starting its process. When we meet again as the full SEC, this will be the 22<sup>nd</sup>, we will return to the issue of school formation. Issues and Concerns?

## **ISSUES AND CONCERNS**

Carothers: On the Presidential Search Committee – will the search be completed this year? Blair: Yes. That's all I can say at this point in time. Things will become clearer in the next few weeks. Midden: Any prediction of when we may have campus visits? Blair: Soon.

Dinda: Is anyone here aware of a strategic plan for graduate education? No? Apparently it has been in the works for six months based on a meeting I had with the Provost today. Folkins: Virtually every college has been working on their own strategic plans. Dinda: This was something the Provost had asked Tim Messer-Kruse to do this. I wanted to be sure I hadn't missed something. Midden: Every unit is required to have a strategic plan. Folkins: The point is it might be time for a re-evaluation of the past plan. Blair: The graduate college would have had a compact. Budgets are based on strategic plans. Bertelsen: Yes, and they did present last April with their recommendations. It should be on file. A public document from the hearing last spring is available. Dinda: It should exist and I should be able to find it? Bertelsen: Yes. Dr. Snavelly presented last year. Dinda: Where do I look for them? Folkins: Graduate Council webpage.

Labbie: Do we have a sense of the definitions for faculty versus management versus administrators? This impacts our work on the emeritus administrator policy. Blair: It's impacting

Faculty Senate elections so Pam Pinson will be getting information from Pat Pauken. Could you please send that question to both Pam and me? Folkins: There is the new version of what's in the Charter relating to: are you part of the faculty when you are a department chair? There is also a code in payroll that says you are: academic faculty; professional staff; administrative staff; student employee; etc. They have codes for all of that. You can't be two of them. That is articulated. Blair: those are HR classifications. Labbie: I have asked HR. Border: I'm trying to track down how the inquiry courses are being fitted into BG perspective courses. I contacted Chris Cox and Sue Lau. We've heard the quantitative literacy proposals have been coming forward. See some proposed modification of check sheets with the QL line in it.

## **SENATE AGENDA**

Standing Committee Nominations

General Education Update

### **Faculty Misconduct Policy**

Blair: On the agenda for the upcoming Faculty Senate meeting, please note the Faculty Misconduct Policy as it was endorsed based on the amendment we made and approved at our last meeting of the joint SEC/VPAA. It will go to the floor so we want to make sure we have everything in terms of routing. Bob you'll be the one to introduce it. We're finishing our business and we are discussing our concerns about faculty rights and responsibilities. We are sharing a version of how misconduct should be dealt with on this campus that represents the spirit if not the letter. DeBard: We have the right to approve a policy but we do have a right to recommend a policy. Folkins: To the extent to which it fits within the mandatory topics of bargaining; this is a statement that will help inform the bargaining process. LeClair: When should we have the final determination on who is administration and who is faculty? Carothers: Tomorrow. Blair: It is impacting elections. There will be a presentation of empty slots for existing standing committees; Senate standing committees and University standing committees as well. LeClair: How will that information be disseminated? Blair: I'm not sure that will be disseminated by the Faculty Senate. LeClair: But faculty who are coordinators or directors of small units? Blair: My understanding of it is, those individuals won't be considered management. LeClair: But we don't know that for sure? Blair: No. Folkins: If you can say this is the executive officer of this academic unit, then you're management. That's my guess where the line will be drawn.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

4:21 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

Terry L. Herman, Faculty Senate Secretary