

FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES

March 1, 2011
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

Vice Chair Carothers called the roll in Secretary Herman's absence.

Absent

Bradshaw; Callen; Darabie; Herman; Klein; Lockford; McManus; Sohoni; Thompson; Whipple

Vice Chair Carothers announced that there was a quorum.

COMMUNICATIONS

Chair of the Faculty Senate

Good afternoon. I want to begin today with several reminders:

I know you've all seen the update about our Presidential Search process and encourage you to participate in the public presentations by each candidate,

- **Dr. William N. Ruud, President, Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania** on Thursday, March 3,
- **Dr. Mary Ellen Mazey, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Auburn University** on Monday, March 14, and
- **Dr. Gary L. Miller, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research, Wichita State University** on Wednesday, March 16.

All presentations are scheduled for 3:30 p.m. in the Union Theatre, Room 206.

We have extended our deadline for Faculty Senate Award nominations to this Friday, the 4th at 5 p.m. These awards are the Outstanding Unit, Leadership by a Chair or Director, Community Engagement, Faculty Mentor, Distinguished Service, and Lifetime Achievement.

In addition, the Faculty Senate Forum "Planning for Change" is scheduled for Tuesday, March 22, at 2:30 p.m. in the Union Theatre, Room 206. This forum will feature President Cartwright, Provost Borland, and Vice-President Stoll and will focus on the impact of the budget on various aspects of strategic planning, including undergraduate education and enrollment and the ability of and need for the constituent groups to participate in the ongoing planning process.

On a related note, I want to remind you about the University's open hearings on budgets; we just sent out information about these forums on the Senate's list. They are scheduled to begin March 29 and conclude April 1, and I hope your schedules allow you to attend these presentations from the various colleges and other major administrative units.

Today, we return to a piece of old business, the Faculty Misconduct Policy. Despite the vote in favor of collective bargaining, the Senate Executive Committee believes it is important that it finish its business, and much work has gone into the revision of this document. It will be

presented today with the understanding that, similar to the Flexible Tenure Policy we passed last fall, the spirit of this document and its suggested procedures can and should help inform future conversations about faculty rights and faculty responsibilities.

Finally, we also begin the process of calling for nominations for Senate leadership, including officer positions as well as Senate Standing committees. I strongly encourage you to consider such a leadership role to participate in what will continue to be crucial conversations about shared governance and its impact on the faculty's role in curricular oversight and fiscal planning.

This concludes my report. President Cartwright

President

President Carol Cartwright read the following report:

Good afternoon. Thank you for these on-going opportunities to bring important topics to your attention in Faculty Senate meetings. I want to address two topics today: our continuing success in student recruitment; and the latest news from Columbus about the state budget and other policy matters that have implications for higher education in Ohio.

Regarding enrollment, yesterday we surpassed our goal for applications for the Fall 2011 entering class. The goal set for this entire cycle of student recruitment—a cycle, which ends as we move in new students in the fall—was 15,000 applications. Congratulations to the team that accomplished this goal with six months still to go in the recruitment cycle. Each and every day, they tackle the fundamentals of admissions by going out and telling the BGSU story, by welcoming prospective students and parents and showcasing the campuses and the programs of BGSU, and by responding to individual requests about the opportunities at BGSU, among other activities.

I have heard some statements along the lines that “the reason we are having so much success in admissions is because we are decreasing our standards.”

Nothing could be further from the truth. Here's the evidence:

1. We are using the same criteria for admission this year as we have for the past four years. We have not decreased our standards for admission.
2. Fall freshmen denied admission stands at 1,324 which is 391 (about 42%) more than were denied for fall 2010.
3. Our probationary freshmen admits are slightly up from last year (743 vs. 712 students) but down as a percentage of admitted students. These students represent 6.52% of our fall 2011 admitted pool vs. 7.04% at the same time last year.
4. The overall ACT of admitted students is the same as last year at 22.5. The overall SAT (with much smaller numbers of students taking the SAT) stands at 1,034 vs. 1,044 at the same time last year. The overall SAT score measures Math and Critical Reading.
5. The overall high school GPA of freshmen admitted this year currently stands at 3.28 vs. 3.22 at the same time in 2010.
6. Students with a 4.0 or better high school GPA are up 37% this year. Those with a 3.5 or better GPA are up 49% and those with better than a 3.0 GPA are up 35%.

I hope this puts the concern to rest and ask that you share this information with colleagues who might be expressing concerns along these lines. The fact of the matter is that we made some very important strategic investments in enrollment management during the past two years and they are paying off very positively. Of course, the yield on these admitted students—how many choose to accept our offer of admission and enroll next fall—is the important measure. We monitor signs of likely final enrollments of the new class but must await the opening of the new semester in fall 2011 to know for sure.

I'll turn now to the second topic—state budget and higher education policy news. I should probably quickly check my Blackberry since this news can—and does—change frequently! When I reported to you in February, I shared what we knew as of your meeting and then I received some interesting additional information on the very next day. More about that in a moment.

Governor Kasich plans to submit his proposed biennial operating budget on March 15th. His public statements to date suggest that there will be cuts in our state support, and “relief” in terms of regulatory reform. The Governor also plans to deliver a State of the State address on March 8th. While he won't be unveiling budget proposals in that address, he will likely lay some of the policy foundation for the budget in that speech.

A day after the February Faculty Senate meeting, I received a report on statewide discussions among public university CFO's. Based on those discussions, budgets are being modeled based on a -10% SSI cut on the one end to a -50% SSI reduction on the other end across the 14 public universities. We are modeling -16.6% (the loss of the federal stimulus funds that are currently part of SSI), with our worst-case scenario as a -30% SSI reduction. We are also hearing that we may have more flexibility regarding tuition increases. There is some speculation that a 10% increase is being modeled at some institutions, and I want to quickly add that we are not modeling anything anywhere near double digit increases for tuition. Our current models are based on a 3% to 3.5% increase. Of course, the key word here is “modeling” and, as we learn more from Columbus, we will adjust our models accordingly.

We know that enrollment increases will not completely mitigate the loss of SSI. Therefore, we have asked deans and vice presidents to be thinking ahead and be prepared for dealing with budget reduction targets. We will likely give them these targets very soon after the Governor's budget presentation. We will share more specific information through written communications and other forums as new information becomes available.

One final piece of news is the formal announcement yesterday that James Petro will serve as Chancellor of the University System of Ohio effective March 14th. He was Ohio Auditor of State from 1995 to 2002 and Ohio Attorney General from 2003 to 2006. We look forward to working with Chancellor Petro and appreciate his public statements about the important role that higher education plays in building a vibrant Ohio economy.

Questions? Senator: Is it known how reliably the State Legislature will follow the Governor's recommendations in the budget? President Cartwright: No. In the sense that the process works by having the Governor make a proposal. The House and the Senate debate that proposal and then both will likely come up with their own version of the budget which will be somewhat different from what the Governor has proposed. They will have to meet to reconcile the differences and eventually they will agree. A revised budget will be sent back to the Governor and he will have veto power over some items. We have a long way to go but we have the parties lined up this time with majorities in the House and Senate that match the party of the Governor so there may be less than we see in other cycles but it's not what the Governor will propose. It will be important to have those guidelines. It allows us to continue narrowing our perspectives

on our various planning models. Dixon: In that announcement about the change in the state they also discussed the issue of Charter Universities and that the Universities would be very pleased with this because they would have less structure and able to do what they felt they needed. This makes me very nervous. I wondered if you would speak to that. President Cartwright: The Charter University concept has been around for a little more than a decade. It is being tried in some states in various agencies of state government. I think we are a long way from having that concept in this budget bill. The basic idea is that you give up some of the state support and in return you have more flexibility around regulatory expectations. We as a group of universities are going full bore after some important regulatory reform. We think regardless of what happens with a Charter University for any state agency, we believe that certain regulatory relief is very important. It varies. The University of Virginia might have given up all of their state support and in effect had the permission to act more like a private institution but there were various stages of that process in Virginia. I've seen some reports about Iowa state agencies and in some cases they were asked to give up as little as 10 to 15% of state support in order to get some regulatory relief. I think there is a lot more debate yet to come in Ohio. The Chancellor-Elect has also indicated an interest in consolidation and I think that on that score the public universities will be quite well positioned because we have a very robust feasibility study underway about how we could share backroom services. That type of consolidation that allows us to maintain our mission autonomy and our academic autonomy could be very helpful in the long term. Thank you. Great question!

Blair: Thank you President Cartwright, Provost Borland...

Provost/VPAA

Provost Kenneth Borland read the following report:

Good afternoon everyone! I wanted to spend some time today talking with you in the same fashion I did last week at the Graduate education breakfast meeting. It was a very important gathering with significant information shared. The Graduate student leadership was present, Graduate Program Coordinators, some department Chairs were present, and staff that support graduate education were present among others. It was a very good mix of individuals who, like many others and myself are invested in graduate education in a significant way and care deeply about it.

One of the things I want you to know about was a promise that I made that this year we would begin a strategic planning process to help us determine or describe the desired future for graduate education within the context of Bowling Green State University. We're keeping that promise. We are going to start a process that will help us discuss the vitality and importance of graduate education. We'll be looking at where we are and where we need to go. The graduate faculty, graduate students, graduate program coordinators, those who support graduate education, and other constituents are going to be an important part of that conversation. All need to have part in that conversation because this is so important to us as a University. We'll be engaging in a plan very soon. In fact, Dean Messer-Kruse has already begun that process and has some information about how you can start to take part in that conversation that will yield a strategic plan over time. I anticipate it will begin this spring, move through the summer, and also into the fall. We don't want to inadvertently leave anyone out of the conversation. With the arrival of a new President, that will be an important conversation to keep going through her or his earlier months here. We do need a strategic plan for graduate education to tell us what the future should be. We will have three open forums this month and in April. The discussions will start in those open forums. The Graduate Council will also be having discussions. Their input is very important in comprehending where we have been and where we can be. A discussion blog will soon be started that will be open to the campus community as well. The process will continue to move forward not at rapid, lightening speed but at a thoughtful pace, which is

constructive so we can begin to identify where we need to go and how we can align that plan and support it with allocation of resources and to make sure we're putting forward the very best graduate education that we can accomplish at Bowling Green State University. I know our faculty are invested in this, many came here because of graduate education and we want to hear from them as well as those invested in a reciprocal sense sometimes with undergraduate education so we can understand what we need to do to better prepare undergraduate students for graduate education. All of this is very important and will take place after spring break.

I also mentioned that we are about to start the search for a person to serve as Graduate Dean. That was also promised. Tim has been filling a position for an interim period that was to be one year. We do want to continue with that search. We were ready to go a little while ago but we wanted to see where we were fiscally. We wanted to be fiscally responsible but you sometimes need to balance fiscal resources with the priority. Graduate education is very important and so someone to lead that as Dean is going to be accomplished. During the last few weeks I've been accumulating a lot of feedback about how things have worked this past year relative to the position that was re-crafted. I also want to say at this point, not because that has become an issue, that particular position, but because I recognize that this has been a most challenging year in regard to graduate education at BGSU. Not only was there a change in leadership, again, but also there were many conversations carried forth about the alignment of graduate programs, where they fit in and where there were strengths. I'll talk about that more in a little bit. There was also a discussion about the issue of funding graduate assistantships and the decentralization of certain functions and many resources from a centralized Graduate College out to the Colleges and places where there could be collaboration in terms of the back office processes. There have also been improvements and changes in policy and procedure related to graduate education. In the eighteen months since I've been here it has been a very busy time relative to graduate education. And, I'll admit that while all of the change was meant to better graduate education, it doesn't mean that it has always been easy. I really do deeply appreciate all who have invested in that process. Continuous improvement will be a part of the fabric of our graduate education program.

I also wanted to mention to you that it is not, nor was it ever intended to be, a secret that for the past five years or so there have been periodic conversations about our graduate programs; which should be sustained, which were strong, which needed to be strengthened, which might be eliminated; which were invaluable; which struggled to meet accreditation criteria, etc. The conversation was continuing when I arrived here on campus and when I arrived here at BGSU we developed a set of criteria to utilize. Those who sat with this body last year know that we shared those criteria with the Senate. Those criteria were a result of many conversations and came from many places including the Faculty Senate. I want to tell you that the conversation has been rekindled. But, it is not a conversation singularly rooted in the fiscal context of this institution. In fact, I think that is one of the criteria that are marginal. It has to be about quality of programs and strengthening those programs we have and that we are committed to sustaining and identifying some of those that need strengthening. The Deans have been talking about this but they have not given me any recommendations at this point in time. They are aware that quality is the primary issue. If we cannot maintain quality with the current resources or stewardship of reallocated resources we are at a point where a five year conversation has to come to a conclusion. We will be making decisions based on those very specific criteria that we agreed upon before. The timing of this is a sensitive matter particularly as we are about to admit new graduate students. I recognize that. So, while I want the Deans to be thoughtful, I also want them to be purposeful. They are in the process of bringing particular programs to me that we need to discuss.

I'm going to talk more about CUE in a little while so I'll step away from the presentation at this point and see if you might have a question or two that I can respond to at this juncture. Senator:

What are the criteria that will be considered as the graduate programs are evaluated? Provost Borland: I did not bring the list of criteria with me that I shared with the Senate to this meeting but the criteria we were looking at, four different categories, and perhaps one of the Deans would like to respond to this as they have been working with this most recently. Accreditation, where are we relative to accreditation? Tim you might remember some of these better than I at this point. Messer-Kruse: Centrality to the University's mission was one. Academic quality of the program has already been mentioned. The fiscal returns of a program were a criterion. Sustainability was another and I think those were the main points. Provost Borland: Those are the bigger categories. The issue of quality is most important and it is a multi-faceted way in which we are looking at this. I think there must have been at least twenty factors we were looking at on that sheet. Dixon: Does fiscal returns refer to students who are admitted and are not funded. We have fewer funded students and we are hoping they bring funding with them, perhaps from an employer or some other source? Provost Borland: I think what we're trying to do in terms of the fiscal piece is look at it holistically, there is state support for instruction that comes in from certain levels depending on what the program offers, there are programs that generate revenue from students, there are programs where the students are supported by assistantships, there is external funding, and grant dollars to support students. If we look at this from a fiscal standpoint, which I'd rather we didn't – I'd rather we look at this as a quality issue, I think there are many ways to look at the fiscal piece but if it is not rooted in the quality piece, then I don't think that's what we want. By the way, I've heard this conversation raised as a concern or an issue many times, will every College be expected to give up a portion and if so, will every College be expected to give the same amount? The answer is no. Absolutely no. We're going to look at quality of programs. College A might have a program that is their weakest but it is still stronger than College C's best program. We want to look at all of these programs collectively as we go through this process. Dixon: In your opinion, are the criteria you've mentioned are they applicable to the sciences, social sciences, and so on. One size does not fit all. Provost Borland: You're absolutely right and these criteria are fairly universal. For some of the criteria will fit certain disciplines and not others but in most cases there will be criteria that are appropriate for that discipline. It is quite likely that each program could be examined from all of those particular lenses. Brodke: I had heard that there was a concern about one of our nationally known programs in the College of Education and Human Development that made it all the way to Firelands. I'd like to thank you as I understand from members of that College that the Administration supported the College in making the decision on how the money would be distributed. Provost Borland: Thank you for saying that. The reality is every Dean was given the opportunity to distribute funds as they determined best with their faculty. I think the program you are talking about... there was some question about the criteria. The criteria were, here's the resource, and you make the decision.

Blair: Thank you Provost Borland. Graduate Student Representative, Steve...

Graduate Student Senate Representative

Steve Dinda provided the following report:

Good afternoon everyone. We're pleased and enthused with Provost Borland's remarks. It has been a rough year for graduate education losing 9 million dollars over the next two years. It's good to hear there is a silver lining in the dark clouds. The first announcement that has come recently that really pleased us is that if the University absorbs further reductions, graduate education will be spared. The announcement that we're enthused about is the creation of a strategic plan. On Friday I'll be asking the General Assembly to create a committee so when the forums are ready to go and the conversations begin, we'll be there and ready to go. Thank you.

Blair: Thank you Steve. Undergraduate Government Representative Kevin Basch...

Undergraduate Student Government Representative

Kevin Basch provided the following report:

Good afternoon. There are two things I'd like to touch on this afternoon. The first item is the budget. The numbers don't look good for the future and we will continue to do our part in these conversations and through tuition increases. Second, our elections have begun so I believe this is my second to last Faculty Senate meeting. I have been to every meeting for the last three years.

Blair: Thank you Kevin. Retiree Representative Professor Lunde...

Retiree Representative

Professor Lunde provided the following report:

Good afternoon. My report is going to be very brief today. The pension reform is now in the Ohio Legislature and churning along with the budget. Our Retiree Association will be going down on Tuesday, March 16th for a big meeting presented by State Teachers Retirement System (STRS) on pension reform. Thank you.

Blair: Moving on to reports from Senate Committees, Committee on Academic Affairs, Dave Border...

REPORTS FROM SENATE COMMITTEES

Committee on Academic Affairs – Border

Report to the Faculty Senate 3/1/2011

CAA held meetings on February 9th and 16th

CAA's scheduled February 2nd meeting date was postponed to the 9th due to weather.

On February 9th we received Dale Klopfer, Associate Dean, Arts and Science, Tim Messer-Kruse, VPAP and Graduate Dean and B. Madhu Rao, Senior Assoc Dean/Professor concerning the proposed Graduate Stipend Policy.

On both dates, Chris Zirbel, Associate Professor, Math and Statistics dept, met with the committee concerning his Quantitative Literacy proposal.

At our meeting tomorrow, we will be looking at the proposal for the new School of Cultural and Critical Studies. We will also be looking at a USG proposal on changes to the current student excused absences policy.

Thanks,
Dave Border
Chair CAA

Blair: Thank you. Amendments and Bylaws Committee, Erin Labbie...

Amendments and Bylaws Committee – Labbie

Amendments and Bylaws met today at noon. We welcomed our new member, Chris Keil. I reported to the Committee some of the material that was presented and discussed at the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting that I attended last week. We are grateful for the chance to become familiar with some of the conversations that are ongoing at the Executive level of the Senate. We also worked to revise the policy for Emeritus/Emerita status for Administrators. We

plan to have a draft of the policy to SEC by the end of this week. Our next meeting will be scheduled for March 22nd. Thank you.

Blair: Thank you. Committee on Committees, Daniel Williams...

Committee on Committees – Williams

No Report

Blair: Is there a report from the Committee on Professional Affairs?

Committee on Professional Affairs - Howes

No Report

Blair: Moving on to Old Business, the Faculty Misconduct Policy.

OLD BUSINESS

Faculty Misconduct and Discipline Policy

Blair: Before I turn this over to Bob DeBard to present revisions to the policy on Faculty Misconduct and Discipline, I would like to give you a little bit of background. As many of you will know from last academic year, this policy was considered at our April 6th Faculty Senate meeting. As a result of deliberations on the policy it was voted to be returned to the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) for revision of language. Some of the specific concerns had to do with language based on factual conclusions. The policy language was revised primarily during the fall semester by the Faculty Welfare committee and it was returned to SEC in the fall semester. However, changes to the Academic Charter and some of the re-prioritization of the SEC's agenda delayed SEC's deliberation on this policy. That's where we are at this point in time. The policy was revised by the FWC and it was approved and endorsed by the SEC based on the timeline presented in the document you have before you. With that timeline in mind, I will turn it over to Bob DeBard who is representing both SEC and was the Chair of the former Faculty Welfare Committee.

DeBard: Thank you for that introduction. I am prepared to explain to you all what the changes are. In order to do that I would like to move the acceptance of the Faculty Misconduct and Discipline Policy. Blair: Is there a second? Brodke: Second. Blair: We'll open it up for discussion but perhaps you'd like to review the changes your Committee made Bob before we do that. DeBard: If you recall, Kris did give a good overview of what happened and why. I will try to give a specific account of how the policy has been revised since that time. The very first deletion has to do with a line, please refer to lines 13 and 14. The original policy had this particular sentence included in it. **Though confined to misconduct issues this policy is intended to provide the same procedural elements set forth in general applicable FPCC.** However the two processes are distinct. While this remains true, the statement is superfluous and we've decided to delete that particular statement. The next change was more substantive. If you turn to lines 170 through 173 of the Policy it actually originally read... and this follows the statement, "This time period may be extended by the Dean or Provost/VPAA in extraordinary circumstances." A statement then followed, "In appropriate circumstances the fact finding committee shall also make a written recommendation to the Dean or Provost/VPAA about the appropriate disciplinary measure that should be imposed, if any. The fact finding committee shall forward their findings and recommendations, in writing, to the Dean or Provost/VPAA as appropriate." After extensive discussion it has been decided that this sentence be deleted because it was judged that there would not be appropriate circumstances for a fact finding committee to make written recommendation because that would have to do with decision making that was inappropriate and we did not feel would be acceptable to the Administration or ultimately the

Board. Finally, and most substantially, if you review lines 233 to 234, this has to do with the appeal process. As you may recall, this was the main sticking point last year. The original line was that, "The Provost/VPAA may in his or her discretion sustain, modify, or reverse the factual conclusions reached by the fact finding committee." Then later, on lines 253 to 254, "The University President may in his or her discretion sustain, modify, or reverse the factual conclusions reached by the fact finding committee." That language has been changed, and now it reads, "The Provost/VPAA shall indicate whether he/she is in agreement or disagreement with the findings and recommendations reached by the fact-finding committee. Where circumstances so warrant, the Provost/VPAA, at his or her discretion, may return a matter to the fact-finding committee for further action." The same applies to the President.

For those of you who are sharp eared or sharp eyed, you'll note a conflict there. What I would like to do is entertain a motion to drop "...and recommendations" from that new line. It would then read, "The Provost/VPAA shall indicate whether he/she is in agreement or disagreement with the findings reached by the fact-finding committee." We've already deleted the statement concerning the appropriateness of making recommendations so that phrase should be dropped from both the Provost/VPAA and University President passages. At this point, and if there needs to be an explanation, I will ask John Folkins to provide further explanation. What I need now, according to Robert's Rules, is to have an amendment to drop the phrase, "...and recommendations". We'll need a motion, a second, and then we can open this amendment up for further discussion if in fact you feel we need discussion as to why those two words were dropped. Blair: Is there a second? Senator: Second. Blair: Thank you for that excellent explanation of parliamentary procedure given our lack of a Parliamentarian. What this means is that the motion to remove the phrase, "...and recommendations" is now open for discussion. Senator: Was there a discussion in SEC about striking this phrase? DeBard: Yes. In fact, a member of the SEC made the suggestion and it was done in the presence of the Provost. Senator: Are you reporting now that the SEC was in agreement with making this change? DeBard: Yes, this was a technical oversight for which I take responsibility. I should have deleted the "...and recommendations" and didn't. Senator: Thank you. Blair: Is there other discussion? Senator: There are lots and lots of places where recommendations are mentioned in this policy, not just the lines you are referencing. Blair: Can you please cite the lines? Senator: Yes, lines 163, 169, 174, 175, and 177 all contain that phrase. DeBard: The fact is I think all of those "...and recommendations" should be removed. Folkins: I don't have a problem with the recommendations part of it. Generally what these fact finding reports will have are the facts and also some information that could be in line with how to interpret the situation in terms of the recommendations. In that case, they are not a problem. Without the grounding in the past circumstances and in terms of the types of sanctions that have occurred, to be asking the committee to make recommendations of a specific type related to the type of sanction without context, which can lead to real problems down the line. Blair: Other discussion of the motion. Hearing none, we can move to a vote on the amendment. Bob, could you please re-state the motion?

DeBard: I move that the phrase "...and recommendations" found in lines 233 to 234 and 253 to 254 regarding the appeal process be deleted from the proposed Policy. Blair: There was a second to that motion and so with no further discussion we are ready for a vote. This requires a majority of those present. With a show of hands could I see those in favor of this motion as stated by Professor DeBard? Those in favor? Those against? Abstentions? The vote is 43 in favor – 1 against – 4 abstentions. The motion passes. With that we return to discussion of the motion to endorse the Policy. Senator Evans? Evans: I want to make a motion at this point to postpone the endorsement of the Faculty Misconduct and Discipline Policy indefinitely. Blair: That is your right. Is there a second? Senator: Second. Blair: I'd like to open this up for discussion. Evans: Last spring I supported this policy so it is with regret that I make this motion at this time. The difference is that last spring we were still in the campaign to determine whether or not there

would be a collective bargaining unit at BGSU. That train has left the station. We do now have a collective bargaining unit at BGSU and certain issues mandatorily fall under a collective bargaining agreement. This is one of them, or collectively represents some of those issues. If we follow this through and attempted to implement this policy it is conceivable we would be conducting an unfair labor practice that could create difficulties for the University. In its mildest form would create additional complications to the negotiations that will have to take place for the collectively bargained agreement. Blair: Yes, that is technically accurate. Other discussion of the motion? DeBard: While not disagreeing with Jim, I would suggest in the spirit of what Kris shared in her remarks, that the rationale for moving forward with the endorsement of this policy is for the faculty and most specifically the Faculty Senate of this University to carry on with its obligations to its faculty with regard to the business that we had been given before. I do appreciate that the landscape has changed. However, historically, it should be recognized that this original document came from the Board and legal counsel. Dr. Pauken created a committee on which I served, along with others, we reviewed and eventually developed a policy that was reviewed by the Faculty Welfare Committee as Jim attests last spring. I was in favor of it then, and I'm in favor of it now. I believe the faculty of this University need a Misconduct and Discipline Policy. I well recognize a couple of things can happen here. One, there is no obligation on the part of the President to advance this recommendation to the Board. The Faculty Welfare Committee no longer exists. I also recognize that the Faculty Association (FA) can bring up existing policies for discussion and negotiation in so far as they have to do with salary, fringe benefits, and working conditions. This could well be considered a working condition. That said, what we are doing is carrying on our business. I do respect where Jim is coming from. I was determined to see this through. We will do this regardless of the outcome. Blair: Thank you. Senator: I have a comment, somewhat in general but it addresses this policy as well, the whole question of faculty welfare and faculty misconduct relates not only to the full time faculty that are now represented by the BGSU-FA but also to Department Chairs and part time faculty who cannot by state mandate be represented by BGSU-FA. My feelings are that this policy is necessary, as it will apply to those who will not have representation by BGSU-FA and for that matter with the Faculty Welfare Committee. This policy is necessary for those constituencies. Blair: Thank you for that comment. Again, the motion being entertained here is to postpone indefinitely the motion to endorse the Faculty Misconduct and Discipline Policy based on the rationale that Jim provided. Is there other discussion of this motion? Hearing none, we will vote on this motion that requires a majority of those present. By a show of hands, those in favor of the motion to postpone the endorsement of the Misconduct Policy... Those for? Those against the motion? Abstentions? The vote is 9 in favor – 27 against – 11 abstentions. We are able to continue discussion of the policy. Evans: I'd like to raise a parliamentary inquiry. I request the President advise us if she will transmit this policy to the Board if it is endorsed. Blair: President Cartwright? President Cartwright: No. I would not. And, just to be sure that there is clear understanding that we do have interim policies in place that were negotiated between the Administration and the BGSU-FA. The agreement outlined in a separate Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that will be transmitted to all of you this afternoon fills the gap until such time as a full contract is negotiated. Evans: Again, I'd like to raise a point of order because according to Robert's Rules the business conducted by an association is supposed to be lawful and meaningful. If in fact we are engaged in an exercise of passing a piece of legislation that cannot be transmitted to the Board of Trustees and may in fact be unlawful under the state of Ohio law then this body is acting in violation of its own principles and rules of order. Blair: I understand that. My role as the Chair of this body is not to advocate for endorsement but is to return discussion to the floor as voted on by the SEC. Evans: That is not correct Madame Chair. Your role is to rule on a point of order. Blair: Might I ask for some parliamentary assistance? Pauken: Just because this policy may not reach the Board of Trustees does not mean that Faculty Senate cannot discuss this topic. It looks like a piece of legislation and it may never become an enacted piece of legislation courtesy of the Board, but you can still discuss the content. Blair: Thank you. Senator: Frankly it was news to me just now to learn that there was going to be a

communication released today that described the transition time. I would have voted differently if I had known that information was forthcoming. Therefore, I would like to suggest that this body needs not to take action on this policy today until this body has an opportunity to read and reflect on this new information. President Cartwright: Just a point of clarification, the information was released in December when the two parties reached the agreement that the FPCC process was mutually determined to be the process we would use in the interim. The actual final language with all of the appropriate reviews is in a finalized memorandum of understanding (MOU). All we are announcing today is the finalization of the MOU. The concept of what we agreed to do was in fact communicated to everyone on December 29th. Senator: Thank you for that clarification, but even so, reading the final product I think would be useful. Is it appropriate to make this a motion at this time? Blair: I do believe Senator Evans point of order is still on the table, is it not? Evans: That is a ruling the Chair makes. Blair: My sense is that we can certainly decide today that we will not take action on this document. But what my sense is on the basis of the SEC and the FWC was that we wanted to share the document with the body. One of the ways in which to share that document with the body is to call for endorsement of the document as I did. Folkins: I just want to make a bit of clarification here if I may. The MOU and the role of FPCC relates to faculty grievance processes. That's not what we're dealing with here. We've put years of work into this. Because of this situation I agree with Jim that it is not going to go anywhere in the standard format. But, why can't we have a statement on the record of the sense of the Senate after all that work went into it. The FA is free to use this statement as they want. But, at least we would have on record what the sentiment of the Faculty Senate was. Evans: There is a mechanism for the Faculty Senate to make its views known and to create a paper record of those views and that is to have a resolution. Resolutions are transmitted to the Board of Trustees. This is not a resolution. This is an attempt to modify the Academic Charter and again I would repeat my earlier objections. Blair: Thank you. It is my sense that even if the Faculty Senate were to vote to endorse this policy today and actually transmit it, it would be the transmittal of the policy from the President to the Board that would constitute an unfair labor practice. It is my sense that we could pass and endorse many policies that would not necessarily fit with the goals and contract negotiations might ultimately be. My sense is that we can discuss this and potentially vote on it and go from there. DeBard: I would also like to remind Senator Evans and others in the room that we have an existing policy document that has been forwarded to the President. I believe it has to do with delaying the tenure clock. She has chosen not to advance that to the Board, which was her prerogative. However, it is still important in my mind that the Senate had passed that document because of the policy that we have carefully reviewed, discussed, and acted upon. I say the same thing about this. I am suggesting that the Faculty Senate is in a tenuous situation in regard to the Academic Charter and its future. We hope that Faculty Senate action will remain respected by the Administration at this University. Obviously that will have to follow the law, as Faculty Senate will. At this point we do not have a contract. I would fully expect eventually for some document related to faculty misconduct to emerge. I think, for now, it is important for us to carry on our business as we are chartered to do. Blair: Thank you. Jude? Edminster: I had a question about whether or not the work of the FPCC is really completely separate from this policy in that a grievant may really be grieving the way their conduct has been interpreted and dealt with and the existence of this policy might assist the FPCC in carrying forth its own deliberations. Senator: Point of clarification, if this policy is not endorsed today, could it come back in the form of a resolution at a future Senate meeting? Blair: Yes, it can. That type of resolution or revision of the genre could take place by the SEC. Senator: Can I call the question at this time? Is that appropriate? Blair: I believe if you call the question it means we will vote to endorse this policy or not. Is there a second? Senator: Second. Blair: A vote in the affirmative, which will require a majority, would in effect endorse this policy. Evans: I believe it is still possible to make comments at this point and I'd like to make one last comment. According to the preamble of this proposed policy it incorporates by reference all of the states of Ohio. By passing this policy we are knowingly violating those laws. Folkins: I don't think we are violating any laws in passing this proposal and I don't think there is any difference

in bringing this back as a resolution. All we are really doing is passing on the sense of the values that are in the Senate that has the potential of being completely ignored in negotiations by both sides. Or, it may be used by either side to inform their processes. They'll at least know where the Faculty Senate was coming from. Evans: I have to say one more thing in response to John's comment. The collective bargaining agreement will not be using the existing grievance policy at BGSU and it will not be using this Misconduct Policy even if it were already a part of the Charter because in fact it will be involving arbitration methods rather than making recommendations. It is in fact a wasted exercise and it has the potential of confusing a lot of people who are going to say didn't the Faculty Senate already approve this? We are not doing good work here. Blair: Thank you. Folkins: I fundamentally disagree. They may not use our statements here. Why be quiet if we can at least have the views of the Senate on the record? Edminster: As a member of the grievance policy subcommittee of the BGSU-FA I must say that we will be relying in part on the existing grievance policy of the FPCC in constructing our own grievance policy. Blair: Thank you for that clarification. Oppo? Zongo: Could we just continue on doing what we're allowed to do until the negotiations do take place? I don't see why we can't. Blair: Thank you. Any final comments? Hearing none, going back to the vote. It will require a majority to endorse this policy. All those in favor? All those against? Abstentions? By a show of hands the vote was 24 for; 7 against; and 10 abstentions. The motion does pass. As a way to conclude we do see the merits of sharing information and contributing ideas on important topics like faculty misconduct, understanding of course as Senator Evans has pointed out the language and the process by which some of these issues and concerns may have an entirely different form. Moving along to new business I invite Provost Borland and Arts & Sciences Dean Simon Morgan-Russell to provide some updates on Charting Our Future Strategy 1. Provost Borland.

Vote: 24 For; 7 Against; 10 Abstentions
Motion carried

NEW BUSINESS

Charting Our Future, Strategy #1: Undergraduate Curriculum

Provost Borland: I'd like to say thanks for warming up the room but I might have started that earlier with the Graduate conversation, it's hard to say. I wanted to spend some time giving you a brief update reaching back a few months now into the fall semester when Connecting the Undergraduate Experience (CUE) as we've come to know it, Strategy #1 was very important in the minds and experiences of many, many people throughout the University. It remains a top priority for the University. It has not exited our strategic plan. It is one in which we continue to work and resource because this is so absolutely important for our students' future. This is a way in which they can be liberally educated that makes as much or better sense for their future than what they are currently experiencing. You've seen the report from the committee working on this earlier. I remember Dale Klopfer, Paul Moore, and others making presentations here and providing visuals and graphics showing how certain learning outcomes were not being achieved and sustained throughout our students' four years here at the University. And this proposal wrapped itself around the care, the development, and the teaching of our students so they could accomplish and sustain this level of growth and opportunity. This is also a strategy that will position the University relative to liberal education, more importantly liberally educating students, within the state of Ohio and within the context of public higher education universities within the state of Ohio. I'm really speaking of Miami. This curriculum has the ability to raise the academic bar for every student who would consider BGSU. It will challenge them, encourage them to think long and hard at BGSU as a place where they can get something better for their dollar, better for their investment of educational time and energy, because it connects the students in a way that we have not managed to do based on the data that we've seen. The data, that I referred to a few minutes ago, graphically depicted that we were not seeing our students

achieve and sustain those very same learning outcomes we've all consistently said we valued. The principles of this proposal that we've been working with and refining have remained constant. In fact, they remain principles and values that faculty from throughout the University have said are the best principles we could consider for educating our students. This embodies for many faculty an ideal philosophy, an ideal set of educational principles that will change students' lives for the better and change their learning experiences for the better. What I've been doing very intently over the last several months is listening, processing what I'm hearing, reflecting on what I'm hearing, thinking about it and talking to groups of individuals about it. I'm convinced that we're all pretty much on the same page. There will of course always be exceptions but by and large, we're all pretty much on the same page. Not just about some of those principles that we've noticed in the proposal for CUE but in terms of the issue of rigor. Many have voiced concern that perhaps the course offerings, the course designs would not expect or demand a rigorous learning experience for our students. When I heard that I knew something in the message had not connected. I will not be supporting a program that does not expect and demand academic rigor in the classroom. I've also heard the same thing about content. Would courses that are being proposed as part of CUE content light, experientially high, and intellectually low? If that was the message people received, the message didn't work. I will not support a program that is content light. I will expect and demand courses to be rooted in disciplinary content and dominated by disciplinary content. And delivered in such a fashion that the disciplinary pedagogies, the best existing and new disciplinary pedagogies, that help us convey and help students interact with and engage with content that is interdisciplinary based. Help those students achieve getting up to and beyond that academic bar we would set not only in rigor but also in terms of academic content. I've heard people express that they felt the future of their particular departments, because of the specialized nature of their department and discipline, might be at risk because of this proposal. I assure you, as much as I can assure anything in this life, the last thing we want is to see graduate programs in particular be at risk because of undergraduate education. This is a signal that we're raising the bar at the undergraduate level. We have to consider what students will do beyond this. Why would we put our graduate programs at risk? We're going to work diligently, individually; department by department to make sure that programs that feel there is something at risk have their concerns heard, comprehended thoroughly, and then we can respond in a creative, collaborative way to make sure that in the first years of this program and beyond we are not mis-stepping relative to the future of those particular departments and programs that are concerned, both for their graduate and undergraduate programs. I've heard concerns about the timeline. It's obvious with the messaging not connecting the way we intended it to and the process not connecting the way we intended it to. It's quite obvious that the timeline was aggressive. We admitted to that early on. I'm not here to apologize for that, I'm here to tell you that Fall 2012 is a much better target. That's where we'll be focusing all of our efforts. The curriculum efforts that have been going on suggest that there are plenty of faculty, not plenty in the sense of enough already, but plenty in the sense of many faculty members who are committed to this and are proposing numerous courses that will fit into this. Fall 2012 looks like a much better timeline to begin implementing this program. I've also heard people say they weren't listened to, they weren't heard. That will not happen again. We're going to continue listening and having conversations. I'll be talking to some senior faculty members as this week goes along, who relative to this University are gray at the temples, who know its culture, history, and values so we can draw upon that wisdom to form an advisory group to help us move forward in process and understanding us, BGSU. I've also heard some things about cost and I'll talk more about that in a few minutes. I want you to hear a couple of illustrations of feedback that I've provided the CUE leadership to date. In regard to BGSU 1000 I've asked that they consider making that course not an orientation to the University as much as an assimilation of young scholars into the academy. Let that be a scholarly assimilation process. Let that be a big part to getting our students off on the right foot. Inquiry courses, I've mentioned academic rigor, I've mentioned content. Problem solving related courses, to be honest as time went on it was clear few people knew what that was all about. I'm

going to credit Dr. Pauken here for giving me the to key to unlock what I thought in my mind but couldn't quite articulate. It's something that those of us who teach students how to do dissertations especially in the social sciences talk about all the time. We talk about a researchable problem. Does that help you envision what a problem solving course is all about? A researchable problem where we draw upon the disciplines content and methodologies and we take a real world context and explore with our students how that discipline engages that problem and interact with that world. We needed to refine that. The four credit courses are problematic mechanically in figuring out the nuts and bolts so we'll focus on three credit courses. The list goes on of refinements because we're listening, we're hearing, we're working together to help move this forward collectively. I've invited the Deans to be more involved in this process. They were not at all resistant all the way along. But their input at this point is invigorating me. To hear what they're saying; how what they're doing in leadership is relative to CUE. They are a big part of our success and they support CUE. We're so thankful for that. I did mention cost. What is this going to cost? We've looked at this in a number of ways in a bit more detail. We're doing some hypothetical modeling because we cannot predict enrollment patterns, which courses students will desire, which courses advisors are making placement for. Not all of the Colleges have contributed as many inquiry or BGSU 1000 courses as we know they're working on. It's hard to model exactly, but using hypothetical modeling we can. I'm convinced in this transitional period where we move from having one curriculum to two curricula for a time and back to one curriculum. As we move through those phases it is going to take money to help with the transition. Some of that can come out of Provost reserve. In March I'm going into the budget hearings saying we'll need a big chunk of money to help us deal with all the transitional issues. We've already made commitments to look at the incoming freshman class to make sure that as it grows, the revenues it generates helps us provide instruction in the inquiry and BGSU 1000 classes. We did the same this year with the larger class. We put that money into providing instruction. I'm going to be asking for a large amount of money so that those contingencies that we can't even anticipate will be covered. I will tell you there will be as much re-allocation of resources as there will be allocation of resources. As we see where students go, resources will need to follow. Students vote with their feet. We have to put together high content, high rigor, and high pedagogy experiences so as we propose these courses we can help all our students to reach and extend beyond that bar we're setting. I could go on here but I mentioned that the Deans have been very engaged in this process and very supportive of it. Dr. Morgan-Russell will be talking to you. I have asked him to talk to you not only because he is one Dean but also because he is the Dean of a College where many questions have been raised, many challenges noted. I want him to talk to you from his own perspective as a professor, Dean, and University leader and to share his experience.

Dean Morgan-Russell: Thank you. What I'd like to do today is to achieve two things. Report out initially on Arts & Sciences (A & S) progress with inquiry courses to give you a sense of where we are. To date we have had 34 courses originally submitted to Arts & Sciences. They were equally distributed across the three domains and more or less from all units in Arts & Sciences. Most departments did submit courses. Thirty-one of those courses have been reviewed by divisional curriculum committees in Arts & Sciences and twenty-three of those courses have been approved for group credit by curriculum committees in Arts & Sciences. Of those, the BGP committee has approved nine for general education and another fifteen are awaiting review and approval by that body. To date, the curriculum committees have rejected only one course. I have been pleased with the response and progress of Arts & Sciences. We really have some interesting courses and course shells were created ahead of the scheduled development process. They were available for scheduling for the fall. I did ask A & S Chairs if they would be willing to allow any faculty member who proposed a course to offer it. We should have some interesting courses. But the main topic that I'd like to discuss today is probably a parallel track that Ken discussed with the CUE project. What I'd like to talk about today is the A & S response to CUE within its own College structure. I am aware that we have multiple audiences here today. Some of you are from

A&S and are familiar with what I'll be talking about and some of you are not. I'll do my best to communicate with all audiences. I wanted to talk about A & S's notorious group requirements, much reviled internally and externally to the College of Arts & Sciences. These are things we need to consider and address certainly as CUE goes forward. I'm not sure what form that will take as it progresses over the next year. A & S does need to be responsive to that process and to make sure that we adapt our own curriculum within the College along side. The group requirements are, as I've been told, pretty byzantine. They are complicated. There is all kind of double canting, in some areas canting across divisions. I thought it might be a good idea to communicate to you how these things work especially for those outside of the College. I need to do this by hand; I hope you'll bear with me. I've structured this like the A & S checksheet. On the left side of the checksheet there are the major and minor requirements that traditionally the department and unit govern what goes on in those areas. On the right side of the checksheet are the group requirements and traditionally the College has policed these very carefully. These are things that the College owns and the department does not. These group requirements are specific to particular degrees, Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Fine Arts. That is traditionally how administrators in A & S have considered these. Now one of the complications is that in the column on the left, the group requirements and the general education proper courses are combined. It's true even in A & S that some faculty don't adequately understand the differences in the general education and group courses. We've been polling the faculty on this issue and we did get one anonymous response that suggested that it is double counting, mysterious, byzantine, overly complicated. One of the experienced faculty on the committee said that was clearly from a new advisor and they'll figure it out in time. My question is, what about our students? Will they figure it out? Many of us who have advised over the years know our students have had a difficult time figuring out these different pathways. I see many nods so I know you agree. What we need to do is figure out what to do with this. I'm proposing that A & S take a very careful look at our group requirements. I've been interested in this for years. I don't think these requirements do our students any service. One of the criticisms that I hear when I mention this is, if it isn't broken why are you trying to fix it? I would suggest that it is broken. I don't believe it represents the gold standard in general education and perhaps never has. This is a combination of archival research and rich old tradition in A & S. These structures were put in place in the early 70s, perhaps 1972. The reason these group requirements exist in the form they do was a matter of territory and to crystallize funding structures at that time. While we might argue that these group requirements are close to forty years old and may not really have the currency we would hope for our students in the 21st Century, it also occurs to me the premise under which they were constructed was not the best one in pedagogical terms either. It's time we look at this a bit more closely. Why are they broken? I'm going to speak from the perspective of someone who advised all the English department's majors in the 90s. I'm sure someone from another department would have had a similar story. How do you justify why if you are a Bachelor of Arts student that you have to take this number of science courses more than general education? This number of social science courses more than general education? What is the reason for this? I was never given one. I'm not sure there is one. Inevitably as an advisor I had to construct my own narratives. Why should an English major take three science courses rather than the two required in other majors? I know that others experience the same thing. Why am I required to take this extra humanities course? It's not advancing us in our degrees at all. I know that a number of these questions arise. The faculty don't know why we do this. The students certainly don't know why we do this. It's a real mismatch in the way this works. What do I think we should do? I have another diagram so I'm going to quit speaking. CUE as a proposal, if we think about this and separating out the general education program, proper from those group requirements. That would amount to nine courses, 27 credit hours. We don't know what CUE will be exactly. Most majors are in the low 30s and minors are 20 or 21. So the group requirements between our strictly defined general education program and the major and minor courses we have our students take, there's a gap there of about 40 – 45 credit hours. That's a full third of our students' degree right there. If CUE, or whatever it is ultimately called, becomes our

general education program, what are we going to do to use those 40 – 45 hours for our students in order to prepare them for life outside of BGSU? This is the question I'm going to call. What I'd like to do is have A & S faculty engage in a conversation about what we want to do with these particular credit hours. Do I have suggestions? I do have some thoughts that I've been considering over a number of years. Other people have given me ideas as well. I'm not going to prescribe them. Here are some possibilities we might consider. If we're thinking about our majors and minors as faculty in A & S, how many of us have run up against the frustrating situation when we might like to add another course? Of course, that would be great but we don't have room in the curriculum to do this. What if we decided that our majors or minors could expand into that block with the question mark? It seems to me there all sorts of possibilities to strengthen our majors right there. Would we consider a CUE or general education core that crosses all Colleges? Could we consider that part of A & S might think about a course specific to our College? What might that look like? What do we expect of our students? What are the College learning outcomes in that regard and how do we meet them? Would we do it in one block by the College? By degree? By department? Would we want to say that all of our students that get Bachelor of Science degrees would have a particular roster of science courses upon which to build? Would we want to be more prescriptive? Another area that has enthusiastic support is revising that area of general requirements to include something that has been part of the A & S mission for years, interdisciplinary courses. Not all majors value interdisciplinary courses. Right now we have interdisciplinary programs and when the courses are approved for delivery we make them pick one category or the other thus defeating the interdisciplinary nature of the course itself. Would we then want to change the groups then in that regard? It seems to me there are all sorts of possibilities. These are things we can consider. What I'd like us to do as CUE progresses is to challenge for A & S to figure out how we can best use those 40 – 45 credit hours to challenge our students and make their degrees all that they can be. How do we take this on? About a year and a half ago A & S Council appointed an A & S Curriculum Committee. They have been working diligently. One of the things they did last year was they developed some learning outcomes they felt represented the College that was quite useful. They've been thinking about many models. I've also talked to Chairs and Directors recently to explore how we might go about this. I've also asked them to give me names of people in their departments, undergraduate coordinators and advisors, who might have on the ground knowledge of how these things work and how they don't work. This will give us better on the ground intelligence to work with. We'll be working with them over the course of the next several weeks. Ultimately I want every faculty in A & S to have an opportunity to participate. I know A & S is very large and I'm not sure how we do that. I know some Chairs and Directors have already talked to their faculty about how we do this. I would expect as things continue we'll try to find ways to invite faculty and pull them in to this process. It is difficult to predict how radical these changes might be as we bring our curriculum in tandem with whatever CUE becomes. We have an opportunity to shape what we do in very interesting ways. I will acknowledge that there are some real challenges; I would very much like to hear what those concerns are. In the interest of time, are there any questions?

Border: This question is for Provost Borland; in early July last year you wrote the University community a very welcome letter saying that the academics would not be cut with respect to the budget. Can we look forward to a similar letter to the academic community this year? Provost Borland: I think your interpretation is a little bit generous in terms of academics not being cut. Because, there have been areas that have had cuts this year within academic affairs. Some of you will remember a conversation and presentation regarding the 24 installments of Student Share of Instruction (SSI). We only received 23 and so there were cuts relative to carry forward. I think your question, as I understand it David is that if we're going to be investing money in CUE, who is going to pay for it? Is it going to be coming exclusively out of academic affairs if there is re-allocation to be done? The understanding I have and the plan at this point, knowing that a lot of details are missing because the Governor has not presented a budget and no one has acted on

that, which has not been presented, where we think as a University we will have to make cuts in expenditures, colleges will be given an opportunity to show us their priorities relative to the dollars that are theirs. In terms of the rest of the University beyond the core of the academy, beyond Academic Affairs, my understanding at this point is Academic Affairs will have to be supported in order to see this project through financially. My expectation would be that other areas of the University would be making significant contributions to help sustain this top strategy. Did I come close to answering your question? Border: Quoting from your letter a year ago, you said, "The academic mission is the most precious object of our resources. Recently and in planning for the next fiscal year, Academic Affairs has been held relatively harmless with preserved operational and personnel budgets. Next year only Academic Affairs and the libraries will have no reductions." I was hoping that would be the case. Provost Borland: That was the case. Border: I was hoping we'd have a similar announcement for the next fiscal year. Provost Borland: The desire is still there. The budget isn't there yet for us to look at. Ideally, where there are cuts coming to Academic Affairs they would not be those that will generate nearly as much harm that we can deal with strategically, would be informed by the Colleges as we did with the reduction in the carry forward money. We've decentralized this so it's not a single strategy. For example, one Dean has reminded me in particular that the College he serves gave a disproportionate amount of open faculty lines because the way to bring money in was to recall those faculty lines. That's not how we're going to do any reductions in Academic Affairs. However, I cannot guarantee that Academic Affairs will be held absolutely harmless. Where there is money to be brought back in it will be done strategically and with counsel from the Deans. However, there will be other places in the University relative to their budgets will be contributing more so we can carry out the academic mission. I don't know if I'm overstating this but I'm trying to say, there is still some space for decision making to be made. Cuts that do come will be driven by input by the Colleges and their strategic plans and our processes. We'll see what the Governor's budget has in store for us. This is an investment. Strategy #1 is an investment in our students' future. I don't think we'll see Academic Affairs stripped bare, harmed as much relative to what could still be an immense cut for us as a University. This is strategic. This is how we move forward. This is how we remain competitive. We don't want to kill the Academy. We don't want to maim it; we want to protect it. Perhaps President Cartwright has just the right words I'm struggling to find here. President Cartwright: I think this is a wonderful moment to ask you to carefully consider what happens in Colleges that is not academic. There are a number of business functions that are carried out in the Colleges that might be managed differently without touching the academic programs and delivery of academic programs. To make it a little more concrete one of the things that Ken is asking Deans to do is to look at what is really core in the College and to protect what is really essential to deliver on the academic mission and academic priorities and to be ready to think differently about some things that might currently happen in Colleges but are not academic and are not central or core to the academic mission of each College. That requires a little bit more parsing even though it might be a reduction at the College level it might not be an academic reduction. We need people to be willing to talk through some of those issues without leaping to conclusions that if it is in the Academic Affairs area it must be "x". It's not. They're mixed. We know we can do some things differently and not touch the academic core. Border: I want to thank President Cartwright and Provost Borland for answering my question. I know it's a difficult question. As I faculty member I applaud your effort in improving the academic mission here at the University. I hope that message is clearly communicated to Department Chairs and others. I think it's wonderful. Blair: Thank you for your presentation. I apologize, we only have a few moments left and I do want to provide Daniel Williams with time to review the vacancies for Senate Leadership and Senate Standing Committees. I'll briefly turn the floor over to Daniel.

Nominations for Senate Officers and Standing Committees

Williams: Thank you. I think everyone has the handout that was available at the back table. In the interest of time, just a call for any nominations you might have for the various vacancies on

the sheet you were provided. I have one nomination for the Faculty Personnel and Conciliation Committee (FPCC), Jonathan Chambers from A & S for a two-year term. He has consented to that nomination. The nominations will be accepted at the Faculty Senate office for a period of time, until April 1st. Nominations can be submitted via email to the Faculty Senate office. Moving on to the Faculty Senate officers we have vacancies for Vice Chair/Chair Elect and Secretary. Are there any nominations for the Vice Chair/Chair Elect? Nominations for position of Secretary? Once again these can be submitted to the Faculty Senate office. Thank you.

Blair: Thank you Daniel. That brings us to Issues and Concerns even though we are at the 4:30 hour. I would still entertain issues and concerns if you have any. Hearing none is there a motion to adjourn? Senator: So moved. Second? Senator: Second. Blair: Thank you, we are adjourned.

ISSUES AND CONCERNS

None

ADJOURNMENT

4:32 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Terry L. Herman,
Faculty Senate Secretary