

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

March 29, 2011
2:30 – 4:30 pm

Senate Conference
140 McFall Center

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

Absent: Carothers; DeBard

Chair's Report

Given the number of business items we have, both old and new we'll just begin with these items.

Old Business

SB 5 Resolution

Blair: Based on the excellent feedback everyone contributed over the last several weeks, I'm hoping we can approve some version of the Resolution we have here today. I know there was a question about whom we should refer to as senior administration. I'd like to endorse this today and put it on the floor for next week. Senate Bill 5 has passed and gotten out of the committee and will be voted on by the full House tomorrow. Discussion? Is there more that we need to do here or can we accept the changes? Folkins: When you raise the question about the senior administration, is that what we want to do... to get the senior administration to do something? Or do we want to make a stand so that all constituent groups know where we are. Blair: We had language of senior administration and then you changed it and then someone changed it back. Brodke: Who would the other groups be? Folkins: We can say all constituent groups (students, staff, alumni, community members) or spell them out. It's a little too pointed to say we want the senior administration to do something about this when they have many other pressures on them for what they can and cannot do. Midden: If we are going to have any influence, we need to influence the people who will vote in November. We might as well make the statement publicly. Unless we're persuasive at large, we won't have much impact. I favor making this broad to include all constituents. Brodke: I think including students is important. Blair: Can we say call upon all constituents and those who support the University to reaffirm publicly their support for shared governance... Brodke: That's a very long sentence now. Blair: Yes, do we really need to name all the constituents? Folkins: No. Blair: The way it now reads... Be it resolved that the Bowling Green Faculty Senate opposes Senate Bill 5. We call upon all constituents and those who support the University. Does that work for everyone? Everyone: Yes. Blair: Other changes we want to make to this document? Hearing none, is there a motion to endorse the resolution as revised? Midden – So moved. Leclair: Second. All in favor: 7 Against: 0 Abstentions: 3. This will be distributed along with the Faculty Senate Agenda on Tuesday.

School of Cultural and Critical Studies

Blair: This is the third time we've discussed this issue either with or without the Provost. Dave Border as Chair of the Committee on Academic Affairs (CAA) has shared correspondence with us based on CAA's work. Border: CAA has reviewed this matter. CAA did listen to the proposers of the new school and do not have any difficulty with the sort of synergy they are trying to develop within their College. Our only problems were in the way of trying to be helpful. Those who come from a different background felt the word Director should be used in the way it was used in the Academic Charter. The faculty have established a reputation external to Bowling Green State University (BGSU). They have used the word Director in their title. They won't automatically change this wording without outside influence whether it is the Provost' office,

Senate or others. The proposal contains a Charter and even that is somewhat newly controversial. The Provost was not sure why the proposal contains a Charter. This is common practice. In the Charter you'll find the details on the tenuring process. The Provost is concerned that the tenuring process be something that is understandable and helpful to those seeking tenure. It's not clear the number of steps would be helpful to the candidate. In some cases the role of the School Director is truncated and in other cases the role is similar to a Dean in the tenuring process. It depends upon the discipline of the program to which the faculty member belongs. Not being an expert on this matter I am reluctant to say this is right or wrong in the tenuring and promotion process. The final section deals with release time. The Provost is concerned that this might be too restrictive for the Director or Dean in respect to release time. The proposers indicated that this is not an ironclad recommendation but it is subject to change. Folkins: Does it say that in the Charter? Border: I don't believe it does. Blair: Your committee says it is inclined to endorse this. Do you feel the stipulations in regard to management preclude the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) from endorsing it at this time? Border: I'm not an expert. I would defer to SEC on this matter. I believe that if I'm charged with protecting the Charter, Senate leadership might feel parochial about the use of the word Director. When it comes to the tenuring process and release time negotiations, I definitely think these are red flags. I think we need a sense for how they may operate after the new school is endorsed. Folkins: Has this been vetted to the Provost's office yet? Border: This has already been through the Provost's office. Folkins: So he has seen this? Border: Yes. Folkins: The Provost did raise questions about the tenure and promotion process. Border: But at no time did the Provost endorse the proposal or not endorse the proposal. Blair: There was a public meeting within the College of Arts and Sciences. I attended that meeting. Is there a fiscal impact statement? Border: I don't believe I have seen that. Blair: Despite the fact the Provost has raised some concerns, I believe we can endorse this proposal and let them work out the details. Folkins: We can also put a provision in there. We can call attention to the items that the CAA has some concerns about. This has been vetted by many groups with no issues but I believe the Provost still has issues. Blair: Are we prepared to do that today? Folkins: To endorse the proposal with a provision that we call attention to the concerns raised by the CAA and urge the Provost to take any action he feels appropriate in regard to that. Folkins moved to endorse with this provision. Gremler seconded. Dinda: What happens if the Provost does nothing? Folkins: Then he isn't sufficiently concerned about those issues. Blair: In Favor: 8 Against: 0 Abstentions: 2. Blair: Should this endorsement go to the floor of the Senate? Discussion? What would we like to do? Midden: Why would we not send it? Blair: The Charter does not mandate that we do this. Leclair: Is there any reason not to? Blair: CAA endorses this as does SEC. Dave, if you'd please address the provisions during your report that would be helpful. Midden: I move we forward this to the full Senate. Seconded: Folkins. Blair: In Favor? 10 (unanimous vote). We will ask the subject matter experts to be there to speak to the proposal.

New Business

Emeritus Administrator Policy

Blair: We'll review the Emeritus Administrator Policy. This comes directly from Amendments and Bylaws. I'm not sure we want to have this labeled as B.I-G. This might become B.I-F5 if we approve this and send it to the floor. But with that said, I'd like to open it up for discussion. The Amendments and Bylaws Committee have been working on this for quite some time. Border: Is there a defect in the Charter that makes this appealing? Blair: On page 3 for emeritus faculty, the only thing that might make it somewhat redundant, the title can be... That might suggest that someone who had been a Dean can be conferred a Dean Emeritus. Midden: I'm not sure I see a need for this. Faculty are faculty for life. You aren't a Dean for life or a Provost for life. If you've held these other positions, do you get to choose which one you want to be? Folkins: The one you retire in? What is the impetus for this policy? Midden: You'll have to be holding that position? Folkins: Yes. I'd like to know who wants this and why? Blair: We can postpone discussion.

Midden: I appreciate the time and effort that has gone into this. Brodke: What problem is it solving? Folkins: We need to be competitive. Other institutions are doing this. It has been irregular in terms of when it has happened at BGSU. When Chris Dalton retired they made him a trustee professor and not an Emeritus Vice President. That didn't make sense. Blair: In all honesty I think it is an attempt to recognize administrative service of sitting administrators who are not returning to the faculty. Dinda: B.I-F part 4 the faculty has to serve for five years and administrator have to have served for ten. Blair: Other issues and concerns? Folkins: Does it say in here that the tenure has to be here at BGSU? Blair: According to this the eligibility says ten or more years at BGSU. This is a specific type of administrator emeritus for the senior administrators. Honoring long-term service as a senior administrator. Other issues with the proposal? Border: Privileges? Are they common to all emeriti whether they are faculty or senior administrators? I believe that is item 6? Blair: I'm looking at the original with the ID card. Gremler: With faculty it is just one line. It doesn't spell out the regular privileges. Blair: I think part of it is based on the generalization of the perks you get when you retire. Folkins: In the Charter it states: Privileges... all privileges accorded to members of the regular faculty will be accorded to the emeritus faculty. Blair: Does it refer to a specific set of privileges? They do get a parking sticker and office space. Folkins: Emeritus faculty do when available and that varies greatly across units. We have three or four faculty members who have offices in different locations. I'm not sure why they spelled all these privileges out here. Why can't they just use the last sentence that says they get all the perks accorded to emeritus faculty? Blair: We should give this back to Amendments and Bylaws to make this more consistent with the overall language of emeritus faculty which is very generic in regard to privileges. Would this be a viable plan of action? We could review this for the May meeting. Motion to return to Amendments and Bylaws for minor revisions for consistency... Midden: So moved. Brodke: Seconded. All in favor? 10 (unanimous vote). Dinda: It's more for a section B.I-F part 5? Blair: Yes.

Talking Points for Joint FA/Senate Statement CAA Evaluation of Provost

Blair: I think we had a very collegial conversation with the BGSU-FA. Based on that discussion, Bob DeBard drafted this language. I'd like to share this with you to see where we'd like to go with this. I think the genre is troublesome. A resolution is not necessarily a joint statement. We need to think about other genres that would allow the BGSU-FA to be a participant. I'd like to open this for discussion. Midden: What would another genre be? Blair: A letter. We decided there would be a joint statement representing the BGSU/FA and potentially the Senate, shared on the floor and endorsed. Folkins: We can just call it a joint statement. Another approach would be to take the word resolution out of the title and send it to the BGSU/FA. Blair: Yes, I like that idea. When they left they indicated they'd like to focus on the shared governance aspects. Midden: Rather than saying, "be it resolved" you could say that the BGSU/FA and Senate hereby state their commitment. Folkins: Therefore can be used in place of "be it resolved that the" in that sentence. Blair: Good. I'll make those changes and send this along to them. Any other wordsmithing issues? Folkins: The comment I made in the second to last paragraph. No one will really know that the FA and the Union are one in the same. We need an explanation. Blair: Second whereas... add collective bargaining unit, BGSU/FA, to represent. Anything else? Hearing nothing we'll move on to the General Education Quantitative Literacy Proposal.

General Education Quantitative Literacy Proposal

Blair: David do you want to begin the discussion? Border: How Quantitative Literacy (QL) was developed is very interesting. When we originally heard about Connecting the Undergraduate Experience (CUE) we were told by the Provost that Quantitative Literacy would be one of the first items developed. This shows that the math department listened to that and then took another route. It would implement the current math courses we offer rather than creating a Quantitative

Literacy course. We noted a couple of problems with this approach. Some were concerned we would bump up students workload by 3-credit hours if their checksheet indicated no math credit required. It could actually increase it by more than 3-credit hours. Currently Math 1150 is an outlier. If it were to be brought into compliance with the state you'd need an algebra requirement for 1150. Some members also felt the procedure being followed for the QL proposal was that it was too encompassing as it did include the Ohio Transfer Model (OTM). Overall, we're happy with the proposal. We're watching the credit hours creep up but have no objections. Blair: It's my sense this is a done deal given the mandate. Sending this to the floor of the Senate is a moot point. It's different than the school proposal where we have a role to play and an endorsement to provide. Can we treat this as an information item that Dave includes in the CAA report? Folkins: Can someone explain this to me? We must be in line with the Ohio Transfer Model? Is this about the 1991 mandate that we've ignored? Border: What had happened is that it was felt the CUE proposal would be strengthened by this QL proposal. Folkins: And that's fine. If in fact someone realized that we've been out of compliance with the OTM I'm in support of this. Border: All of the courses within the QL would be the math courses we have right now. Midden: We're not requiring all students to take a class that satisfies the Ohio Transfer Module. The mandate is requiring us to satisfy that OTM. Border: Math 1150 is an outlier. It does not meet the mandate for the OTM. The Provost felt we could grandfather in that one course. Midden: How many other universities are not complying? Blair: None. We are the only University that does not. Midden: How do they manage this? It's my guess that a number of students would struggle to pass this more rigorous math course. Dinda: That is the case. Border: It may not appear so but some of the members did remark that this would impact our admissions process. Folkins: It says a non-trivial number of students do not have a math requirement. Border: Early childhood does have a math class but it would not fall in the QL area. Blair: Do we need to put this on the agenda for the full Senate next week? If we do maybe we need a 10-minute presentation about what has happened with QL and this becomes an information item and not an action item. Midden: I would prefer to have a presentation that would explain this. Blair: But we will not take a vote on this. Midden: I think it is important for the University to understand the rationale. I think a presentation would be worthwhile. Folkins: Who would give that presentation? Blair: Tim Messer-Kruse or his designee. Folkins: I think the faculty would respond favorably to this if it were explained to be beneficial. We might also ask that person to tell us how many people do not have a math class. That can be complex. Most majors do have some sort of a math requirement. Blair: Do we need to vote on this? Border: I would like to put this to a vote. You may create precedence for creating significant curriculum changes with no Senate vote. Blair: Point well taken. Are we ready to take this forward? Midden: I think that's because they don't feel they need our approval. Border: I should have sent you a copy. Folkins: What are the rules? Blair: This would have been transmitted to the SEC and then to the floor. Folkins: And that part of the Charter is out? Blair: Yes. CAA doesn't have to submit every piece of curriculum to the SEC. Is that correct? Border: The question is if it is a major or minor change. That would be the way to determine what went to the Senate and what did not. Blair: My only concern is that even if we vote against it, based on the Charter it won't mean anything. This QL policy will go forward. Midden: But we are making a statement that we should be involved in these decisions. Border: The CAA may forward curricular and academic programmatic recommendations and may decide to place them on the Senate agenda for discussion if 10 members of FS sign it. Blair: Is that the old language? Border: Yes. Blair: It doesn't provide any stipulation about what SEC must do? Folkins: My understanding of the way it used to be, it could come to SEC and we could vote it down which means it doesn't go to the floor of the Senate. That's why the bypass of SEC. It doesn't say SEC can look at it and it's a done deal. Border: I agree. Blair: It's not said; but that can happen now. Folkins: I think we should take it to the Senate for endorsement. Folkins: So Moved: Border Seconded. Blair: I'll explain this to Vice Provost Messer-Kruse. We are in the business of

information sharing and allowing FS to have a role in the endorsement of important policies.
Midden: Faculty Senate needs to continue to have a voice.

Proposed Charter Amendment: Excused Absences

Blair: The next item is the proposed Charter Amendment on excused absences. This started last summer with Kevin and Steve. We have some draft Charter language that was forwarded to me by David. This would be an extension of Section B-II.G of the Charter. You'll see in number four there are three exceptions (a through c) under Exceptions to the Class Attendance Policy. This change would be included as d. I'll open this up for discussion. Dinda: I'd like to thank everyone for his or her support. I think it is well written. It is written that no one takes unfair advantage. Students are protected for doing the right thing. What happens if the student doesn't provide the student written warning 25 days in advance? What happens if our basketball team makes the final four? We can't plan for every eventuality. Border: First it doesn't preclude the operation of the old Charter Language. It also doesn't prescribe what the mandatory absence detail must be. If you think your team may be in the final four you could try to address it in advance. I think for the most part faculty would be willing to accommodate these types of issues. Folkins: What is the advantage of the 15 days in advance? That's a long time. Border: A number of people in CAA felt that in some cases laboratory experiences are critical to the course experience and are non-repeatable. What about guest lecturers? If you are given three weeks in advance you may be able to make equivalent experiences available for that person. With less time you may not be able to do that. There is nothing magic about three weeks. Blair: These guidelines for the 15 class days, the 25 class days were endorsed by the majority of CAA? Border: Yes. Blair: So they've endorsed this as a Charter Amendment? Border: No, not as a Charter Amendment. It was endorsed as an item to be circulated to SEC. It has also been circulated to Dr. Meserve, undergraduate and graduate councils as well as others. It is not a Charter Amendment at this time. Blair: But ultimately that will be the case. Border: Eventually. We're looking for guidance on the length of time and the number of people who need to be brought into the community of this discussion. Blair: Other issues and concerns? Border: I'd be interested in hearing from the students how they feel this should be handled. Dinda: It doesn't seem clear to me that the students won't necessarily be penalized. That is our major concern. We realize you can't make up a guest lecture or a laboratory exercise or experience. While work cannot be made up I don't see where students are protected from academic penalty from missing a class. That was the heart and soul of what we were seeking in the beginning. That's definitely one thing we'd like to see included. I agree it doesn't relieve students of the responsibility. Leclair: You're saying that if I'm a teacher and the student missed work they couldn't make up, I can penalize them by dropping their grade from an A to a B and nothing here prevents me from doing that. Dinda: Right. Folkins: It becomes a little tricky in regard to the wording. It says you cannot be penalized for something even though you cannot make it up. But, on an exam the student is penalized. Leclair: You can say that the student can make the work up if the student does so to the teacher's satisfaction. Dinda: It's about making sure the student is aware of the expectations and responsibility if the class has a guest lecturer or other experience. It's not the responsibility of the faculty to provide notes from the lecture or other experiences. Folkins: In section b, the first sentence: "It is the policy of the University to make every reasonable effort allowing students to observe their religious holidays without academic penalty." I think that is nice wording. Leclair: That was at the end of the first sentence? Dinda: Yes. Folkins: Not to receive academic penalty. The CAA wants to circulate this to all constituent groups to get input? Border: We've already done that. I've already received some feedback. I'm seeking the widest audience including SEC. And input as to whether CAA should be overseeing this wider audience mechanism or whether SEC or Amendments and Bylaws should take it forward from here. Folkins: So this is here for SEC to provide input? Border: This is not for SEC to take action on. Blair: Based on how quickly you get the feedback you need, this could come back in time for the May agenda. Knowing how long

Steve and Kevin have been advocating for this, I'd like to see this happen. Border: I would like to have some wording from you (Steve and Kevin). We could use John's wording. This is not an easy topic and people tend to go to the worst case. For instance, if there is a program and the student must complete a competency and they fail that, how can we guarantee there won't be any academic penalty? We need to continue to work on this. Blair: I have two specific suggestions I'd like to offer. In the sentence that states "However, students must also be aware that some required work may not be "made up", i.e., laboratory exercises, guest lecturers, etc., as determined by the instructor." The tone and language style in relation to the other language in this section of not relieving students of their responsibility for completing the required work missed doesn't read very Charter-like. I would recommend some word smithing to formalize this. My final suggestion or question is with the days... the 15 class days or the 25 class days I just wonder why we can't be more generic and use language such as "reasonable notice". I know that's vague. Folkins: I like it. Border: That will be a point of contention. Folkins: That is what is already in the Charter, "reasonable notice". Border: When it comes to the old grievance process, I think there was good reason for counting class days. This is beyond religious, military and weather. Some believe counting class days is important. Blair: That's fine. That's just our advice at this time. Please communicate with CAA that we're flexible. Ultimately I would love to see this on the May agenda. Whether it passes or not is a different story. But I'd love to see this presented as one of the final pieces of business Senate deals with from work that started last summer.

CAA Evaluation of the Provost

Blair: David, I put this on the agenda based on your query to me. Border: We've had this relationship with the President and felt it was important in the past. We tried to do this with President Cartwright, but with the recent changes it has not been exercised during Provost Baugher or Provost Borland's tenure. We did meet with Provost Borland to give some formative suggestions that were shared with the President. When President Ribeau was here we routinely met for this at the end of the year. He would carefully take notes and ask questions. CAA always felt this was valuable. Now we have a new President and a new Charter. Blair: I said we would be happy to share this concern or this question with the President when we meet with her next on April 11th. She is out of the country soon. She will not be present at the next Senate meeting. We will be happy to share CAAs request that such a conversation take place. And, we would be prepared based on her feedback we'll extend a formal invitation. Border: Thank you.

Issues and Concerns

Blair: On the WF Policy... that is the final handout. Border: We had a timeline on this. CAA meets on Wednesday morning. Undergraduate Council meets on the same Wednesday in the afternoon. On our last meeting on 2/16 CAA knew nothing about this. During that afternoon undergraduate council produced this document. It was sent to me and I forwarded it for comment to all the members of CAA. We were going to put this on our 3/2 meeting. Vice-Provost Tim Messer-Kruse indicated that there was a slight change. CAA felt it had some problems but UC had not met. When UC met, and we have a member on CAA that is also a member of UC, she reported they endorsed the Policy that you have in front of you. She mentioned the doubts that CAA had but they were not dissuaded. I also shared my concerns with Tim. That did not dissuade them either. They produced this as policy as of 3/2. On 3/16 we met and discussed this right at the end of the meeting. We did not get to a vote. I thought we'd meet again in April on this. Tim Messer-Kruse indicated that this must be back by 4/1 approved and to Registration and Records. He indicated students would be disappointed if it is not in the catalog for 2011/2012. That's a problem because our next meeting is not until 4/6. Tim suggested that we do this via email. But even so, how do I get it to SEC in April? Folkins: But there is still contention about this so an email vote would be inappropriate. What is the concern? Border: The concern by a number of faculty members is the departure. There is no instructor involvement with the assignment of a W.

It just happens as long as the student observes the procedure and withdraws by the date, they are assigned a W. It's not according to College policy, program policy, instructor discretion, nothing. Folkins: It is being administered by Registration & Records instead of being discretionary by the faculty. Border: Many remember the WP. We could depart from the WP because W is similar. Now we're being asked to depart from the WF and just use the W. Maybe the majority would be in favor, but maybe they would not. It removes the faculty member's prerogative to assign the WF. Blair: I think on one level you can treat this as you have these other proposals. You can forward this on to SEC. But given the concerns you've outlined, it is appropriate to say to Tim you will not have it done by the date. The reality is though that they can go forward without your blessing. Folkins: I think we should stick to our guns. Basch: What was the rationale? Border: One was never given. Dinda: Is this a retention issue? Border: It has passed Undergraduate Council (UC) and Graduate Council (GC). I'm not sure of the dynamics of UC. Blair: The standard meeting time of CAA is well known and this does not honor that timeline. You can simply report out in your report to Senate. In regard to this item, here are the facts. We had a mixed conversation about the merits of this proposal. If they choose to go forward, by the Charter changes they can, but we'll be on the record of not endorsing it.

ADJOURNMENT

4:27 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

Terry L. Herman, Faculty Senate Secretary