

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

April 26, 2011
2:30 – 4:30 pm

Senate Conference
140 McFall Center

Attendance: Ancinec; Blair; Border; Brodke; Carothers; DeBard; Dinda; Folkins; Gremler; Herman; Leclair; Midden; Sleasman

Guests:

Dr. Katherine Bradshaw, Dr. Gi Woong Yun
School of Media and Communication

CHAIR'S REPORT

My report will be brief. This is our last official Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting. I want to thank you all for your service. With three additional SEC meetings not on the schedule originally it has been a busy semester. I appreciate your service during this very challenging year. A quick reminder, our SEC dinner will be next Tuesday, May 3rd at 6:30 p.m. at Biaggis, Levis Commons. If anyone needs a ride, please let Pam know and we can carpool. One final note before we begin old business, you know representatives from the School of Media and Communication Studies will join us at 3:30 p.m.: Dr. Katherine Bradshaw and Dr. Gi Woong Yun.

OLD BUSINESS

Emeritus Administrator Policy Charter Amendment

The first item for discussion is the Emeritus Administrator Policy Charter Amendment: B.I-F 5. Amendments and Bylaws went back and changed the language to make it gender fair. I indicated this would be a minor change. The section we are concerned about for today occurs on the second page, B.I-F Special Appointments, number 5 Emeritus/Emerita Status for Senior Academic Administrative Officers. We can either send this back to the Committee or recommend changes. Folkins: Where did this policy come from originally? Blair: Amendments and Bylaws. DeBard: Do we understand why this policy is being advanced? I'm in favor of the policy but do we understand why? It's almost draconian in its demands. This is a step beyond Trustee Professorship. It doesn't make any sense to me. Blair: There might be a perception in an era of collective bargaining of Why this? Why now? But this has been going on for some time. Folkins: Is there strong feelings about this policy? Do we need a dialogue with whoever is suggesting this? DeBard: Both John and I would have a vested interest in this. I think this is a good idea to reward a high level of administrative service; to encourage such service in the future; and to encourage rapport. In truth, faculty emeritus status is not a big deal or point of controversy. For instance this seems like it would originate from the administrative position above. For faculty emeritus status it comes from the unit level up. Folkins: In some cases the unit doesn't know they need to do this and it doesn't happen. The number one concern is that the bar is too high. If you look at AAUP the average for a President serving is 6 years, Provost 4 ½ years, Deans are a little longer. Olscamp and Wilson are the only two who would have qualified for this. You have to have the combination of more than ten years and then retire from that position. Many go back to faculty and become a Trustee Professor. It's more exclusionary than it needs to be. If a person serves in good stead, they must have done a good job. To make them write a rationale is paperwork intensive and a mechanism that doesn't need to be there. It's not really a very clear mechanism as to how the individual gets into the loop. The person should be able to make the choice. Another thing that isn't clear, administrators bring in years of service from somewhere else, this should be explicit. Does service at another institution count or not? I wasn't clear how free we were to

change this and how substantially it can be changed. Blair: I think we can amend the policy as we see fit, as we are the body who endorses this on the Senate floor. Amendments and Bylaws are advisory to the SEC. We can make those changes. Another option is to send it back to Amendments and Bylaws. I did voice these concerns to them at the time I spoke with them about this. I know they've worked very hard on this and would like to see this go forward. As an amendment, we have no guarantees it would pass. I can say we don't feel it is ready. We could address this in the fall. We do have options. DeBard: I'd like to suggest we include by whom the Emeritus status has been endorsed. I believe it should be the unit. There have been cases when the person has been turned down. And, it is in keeping with the tenure and promotion process. I think it is important for the unit to endorse and honor the administrator. You are being rendered Emeritus in a role from an academic unit. It involves a unit and it should be identified. Blair: Should number 2 supersede number 1? DeBard: Yes, I think so. It should go to the Dean, Provost, President, and Board of Trustees based on rank. Blair: In some ways the order is backwards. DeBard: Yes. Ultimately it is the Board of Trustees that approves this. Limiting this to retiring administrators is quite restrictive. Folkins: I would agree with you. There should be a set number of years served in a particular role. I think the number 10 is too high. I also don't think that has to be your last appointment at this University. DeBard: Dean Balzer did approach me about this policy and he wondered if I would be interested. I said of course, but under these restrictions, few would qualify. I would gladly give that title up if we could get a policy that is in keeping with emeritus rank, which is a thank you for a job well done. I understand the Trustee Professorship is very important and we have had only had two in recent memory. Blair: Am I right in the assessment that this policy is not ready? Folkins: Yes. DeBard: I would agree. Midden: I think it needs substantial change. Can we make those changes in this body? Blair: From what I'm hearing I don't believe we can make these changes in this body today. I have John's feedback and concerns. I think we should pass these concerns along and whoever is guiding this policy in the Fall can meet more directly with the SEC about ongoing concerns. LeClair: It doesn't look like to me that the retiring person has to write this rationale up. Folkins: No, they don't. A two-page write up is difficult to summarize these criteria. I have a problem with evaluating whether they contributed enough to be emeritus. Blair: I can ask for someone to endorse a motion that given SEC's concerns about the restrictiveness of the current version of the policy. We'd like Amendments and Bylaws to work on this. DeBard: So Moved. Folkins: Second. Blair: Discussion? Carothers: Just a quick process point. Number 1 indicates that someone above you can initiate the process with or without your knowledge. You're saying the individual should initiate the process? DeBard: Yes. Blair: I endorsed a couple of emeritus faculty this year. Carothers: Often the individual doesn't even know they are eligible. If you had been a long time Professor and then you were a Dean, you may want to choose to have the title of Professor Emeritus. Folkins: I strongly feel it should be the individual's choice. Blair: There was a motion on the table; do we need further discussion? The motion was to return the document to Amendments and Bylaws for further work. All those in favor? All.

Blair: Before we move on to the Graduate Programs issue, I'd like to see if our guests are here.

NEW BUSINESS

School of Media and Communication

Dr. Katherine Bradshaw, Dr. Gi Woong Yun

Blair: On behalf of the school you had requested an opportunity to share information with the SEC related to the announcement that came out about the School of Media and Communication. Bradshaw: I have handouts. We are here to represent the School of Media and Communication Studies. We feel our concerns impact all faculty. I am here to request that we be on the Senate's May agenda. We'd like the Senate to add their voice to ours. We would ask that they rescind the

decision to close doctoral programs. We would like the Deans to design a new set of criteria. We can all appreciate the need for cuts. We should have a shared process. We are quite certain there are mistakes of facts by the Dean, the Provost, and Dean Messer-Kruse. Part of the facts and omissions are mistakes. Primarily, the National Resource Council (NRC) data is deeply flawed and horribly out of date. We would like to share these mistakes with you. We're working off their data. The assertions come to us from a document given to us by Dean Morgan-Russell and Dean Messer-Kruse. The first assertion is incorrect. I don't have the numbers from Fall 2009. Assertion 2 seems to be invalid as well. The data are incorrect. There is a drastic drop in the selectivity of people being admitted. Doesn't anything in academe change by 40%? This is a face validity issue. That is our issue with all of the NRC data. The GRE scores only address verbal. I wasn't given an explanation as to why. The maximum GRE score, 50 points is not very much. We have statements in support of the School of Media and Communication. We've been talking to our friends. Journalism is generally treated poorly by this data. They were shocked that any bit of this data would be used to close a program. Item four is another item that is troubling based on face validity. The data is saying that faculty published .08% over seven years. If all the journal articles have not been included, the citation data makes no sense either. The department has never been dominated by social scientists in the ten years I've been here. Yun: I asked this question about publications of Dean Messer-Kruse and his interpretation of the data. This number is quite low. If that is the case, there is something wrong with the department or the data. He was telling us it might because some faculty left without getting tenure. He didn't look at the data very closely. For us, only one faculty did not get tenure. We don't give tenure to people who have .08 publications in seven years. Bradshaw: Item five includes additional issues. I was part of a program to get more journals in this area. We have someone who publishes in law review and they are never counted. Item 6, 13 faculty have joined the Communication doctoral faculty in these past 6 years. Yun: I contacted NRC to get the list of names they included. I'm quite sure the TCOM faculty were not included. I am quite certain that the count is quite lower than 13. Bradshaw: That's our initial concern. Yun: I would like to emphasize that this is pre-publication data. It has not even been published yet. The data is fluctuating throughout this process. We don't even know how the data is calculated. They will not tell you. The problem I have with this data is that we do not know how it was collected. It is very faulty and it was overlooked at face value. Blair: Can we ask questions at this point? Bradshaw: I would like to repeat my request. We'd like to be on the agenda of the May Senate meeting after the Provost's remarks. We'd like this closure recommendation to be rescinded. On April 14th all of our students were told they were the last class. We're suggesting a new design with meaningful measures of quality: selectivity, time to degree, employment, how many teaching in universities and industry, demand for programs across the country. Thank you for your time. Carothers: Those criteria were explicitly mentioned as to how this process was completed. They also indicated this was very closely aligned to program review. Folkins: Can you explain the process to us? What were you told and when? What was the whole range of indicators? What was the process in terms of finding them out? Bradshaw: At the last Senate meeting during Issues and Concerns I broached this subject about the closures. I was in a meeting an hour before the Senate meeting and that was the first I had heard of this. Yun: That was a rumor only at this point. Bradshaw: Yes, that was the way I phrased it during Faculty Senate. I saw the *Toledo Blade* article and learned about the letter to the students. The rumor came up during this meeting about something else. Yun: Wednesday of last week the Director sent an email to everyone out of the blue. Terry Rentner indicated she had had a conversation with the Dean about the closures. We had an emergency meeting the next day without our Director. That was the first time we saw the data. Gremler: Can you share the data? Bradshaw: Yes, I have this here to share with you. Carothers: You did not supply this data? Yun: Yes, that's correct. Dean Messer-Kruse indicated that there was some kind of time series data. He indicated that he'd present that in the Fall. So, I still don't have the data. Bradshaw: We've also heard differing accounts of when this process started. We were told the Deans began this work in

February. We were also told that it began in the Fall. And, then, the Provost indicated that this is a process that began in 2005. We have never been told that we need more journal articles, or more of anything. I was at the Graduate Senate and he said of course there is room for programs to improve. Yun: Out of the faculty, three people have passed away since 2005. We are talking about faculty who have passed away and we are being judged by the data collected during that time. Blair: One issue I have is, how do we best support you? Is the appropriate chain automatically going to the floor of the Senate? I attended that Graduate Council meeting and heard how upset people were with this process. There would also be a communication chain that would involve the Committee on Academic Affairs (CAA). Do we feel that presenting this information next week at Faculty Senate is the best course of action? Bradshaw: I know you know your process. But when the Provost was at the Graduate Student Senate, Pat Pauken indicated what the steps were for this process. If the Graduate Council says no thank you, does that stop the process? Pauken indicated that this was not the stopping factor. I think our voice must be strong. Whatever is said now doesn't really matter. It goes from the Graduate Council and even if they said no, it can still proceed on and become a yes. Every faculty can collect and aggregate their own data. I want to talk on Tuesday. Midden: What I see is an issue of shared governance overall. When Provost Borland talked to us about this process, he indicated it was imperative the units had an opportunity to refute this data. They can of course make the decision but we hope they are looking at good quality data. The faculty themselves need to participate in the data collection and analysis and refute the findings. We need a formal process much like in program review. It helps to ensure the validity of the data and analysis and that the faculty understood the process. All of that has been short circuited in this process. This applies not just to Communication Studies but every program. Blair: This document that you've shared begins with a statement from 2008 by Dean Snavelly. I wonder which data they are using? More recent or this older data? Carothers: That was my point. Those questions were asked. What is this data going to be used for? We were told for this reflective, collaborative process. No such thing has happened. Midden: But it appears that this decision was made on NRC data. Folkins: Let me make a suggestion. One of the things I would advise against is to bring this data to the Faculty Senate. What I think could be useful for the Communication School and those in the College of Education, is to say what you knew and when you knew it. What were the criteria? When was the school consulted? How did this play out? I also don't think it should be presented after the Provost's remarks. Blair: They have been asked to make some formal presentation about this Graduate Program process. If this presentation were approved, it would follow that discussion. Bradshaw: I want to tell you about a disputed fact, the Director of the School of Communication – Provost Borland seemed shocked at our surprise. They insist that Dr. Rentner knew all about this closure. I don't believe she did know this. If she did, she would have addressed this with the faculty. DeBard: The letter that went out to students particularly disturbs me. This is something close to defamation of the program and playing with students' academic lives. What also disturbs me, if we replay the tape of Dr. Borland two Tuesdays ago; he had not seen a list. He has backed off of that. Two weeks ago Tuesday, he expected to get a list but he had not seen one. In fact, we apparently have on fairly good authority that that list was delivered at 10:30 in the morning. Perhaps he purposely did not look at the list or the memo because he wanted to say he had not seen the list at the SEC/VPAA meeting. What is not conscionable to me, this was the start of the process. This was not the end of the process. The recommendation must come from somewhere. This was not a decision but a recommendation. We shared the criteria, which was far more comprehensive than anything you'll see here. What disturbs me most is what this symbolizes as what has happened all through this year. They have the authority to do what they've done. They have that authority until this faculty questions it. I have no doubt a Board of Trustees is a very powerful body but they cannot run a University without faculty. Yun: It was very disheartening that our Graduate Dean is telling our students they are in a poor quality program. Bradshaw: There were many allusions to an April 14th deadline for this student letter to be sent out. Blair: It

was due to the Graduate Council's decision made on April 15th. Folkins: But even so, students will be able to complete their degrees. Blair: What would be the most appropriate format and venue for supporting not just this School but also others who have experienced this? We cannot rescind the process. Bradshaw: But they can, can't they? Blair: The way we do this is through a resolution. You are sharing information with us but we don't have an action item to endorse or not. Midden: We can certainly pose questions to the Provost. We can also check with the other programs. Folkins: I think we should ask the administration to again explain their process. Carothers: How does it align with the very things they said it would? Midden: It should include a presentation of the data to the program and a chance for them to rebut. Carothers: They also said the program would be involved in the collection of the data and the analysis. He told us this but that did not happen. Blair: If we were going to approve this for a presentation next week, my strongest recommendation would not be to talk about the data but talk about the process. Provost Borland will tell us there was a specific process and there will be a specific process. What we can approve is a dialogue about process from a number of fronts. Not just faculty but also from the point of view of the graduate students. LeClair: I agree a bit about this. I don't know if just saying we feel like your process wasn't what you said it was. You've said one thing and done another. Carothers: My response would be I'm sorry but all this data is taken out of context. I'm sorry you misunderstood the data. DeBard: Let's remember that Dr. Ha sent out a copious message that contained a lot of confirmative data. I felt she built a prima fascia case here that something is terribly wrong. The Graduate Student Senate (GSS) was more than upset at its last meeting to the point of moving a vote of no confidence in Dean Messer-Kruse. There are some serious issues going on here. Dinda: We have been requesting the data since November 19th. I'm a statistician; I'd like to see some data. On the point of the vote of no confidence in Dean Messer-Kruse we decided it was not the best course of action. What we have done is drafted a resolution. Bradshaw: It needs to be stopped because it seems like a steamroller to me. Maybe the resolution is enough. But is it enough? Midden: We can make a statement. Blair: Maybe we can make this resolution ours as well. Carothers: We can also look back in the minutes to see if they have included other bodies to review and they did not, which is within our purview. Midden: We have two aspects here... process and the appropriateness of communications. I think it was inappropriate to send a letter to graduate student applicants or make remarks about the quality of our programs. This has been cast as recommendations. It's not a decision that has been made. That is a separate issue from process. Folkins: I would say it is part of the process. The communication was premature. Carothers: The Provost did mention that would be a part of the process. Dinda: Dean Messer-Kruse may have shared that with students on our request. We felt students should know. Midden: I agree, but I think that should happen at a point after the data has been validated. This program has been damaged by these assertions. If this decision is reversed you cannot reverse the damage done to these programs and these students. Carothers: We all know how powerful word of mouth is. Blair: This is already happening on Twitter. LeClair: If they have a bone to pick, is it possible to have this discussion in a serious way. Folkins: They need to do that with their Dean and perhaps Graduate Council. What they could do is to share what happened from their point of view. We didn't get to respond to the data and it was inaccurate. We don't want to get the Senate bogged down in verifying the data. Blair: I can see something in this process. Dean Messer-Kruse and Provost Borland need to engage in dialogue and commentary. You could do your presentation. We can review the GSS resolution and perhaps endorse that. Folkins: It doesn't really fit. There's more than just this School. The others should be players too. DeBard: My knowledge of administration tells me that there has to be something else going on here. This is so egregious in the use of data and process. Some other group or body has made a determination before this process was put into place. I find it hard to believe that someone could draw this conclusion based on this data. Something else is at work here. It is conceivable that you are too big. Bradshaw: That was inferred. Carothers: But we were told it was about quality. Blair: Could their presentation be informational and then we engage in Question &

Answer? Midden: Yes, I think so. Carothers: We need a timeline. Here's what happened and when. Midden: Not as an exhaustive presentation of the case but as an example of how there are flaws within the data evaluation and analysis. Blair: In some ways, in looking at the agenda, we could move the Senate Bill 5 presentation, and then have Provost Borland followed by the School of Media and Communication presentation. Folkins: Could there actually be a statement by the GSS? Dinda: I fully expect this Resolution to be passed this Friday. I would be happy to wordsmith this further to make it more inclusive. I'm happy to work with Faculty Senate on this. Bradshaw: Would it be appropriate for me to receive Provost Borland's comments? Blair: That won't happen. Should we take a formal vote? DeBard: I think something must be done. Blair: Is there a motion to approve the request by the representatives? Carothers: Moved. LeClair: Second. Blair: Discussion? Midden: I am concerned that other programs will not have a voice. I would urge you to keep this direct and make this an example. Keep it short, simple and to the point. This is about being persuasive about the flaws in the data collection and analysis. Every program will want to make a presentation. Folkins: I don't think it is unreasonable to allow them to join together to make a statement. Blair: We only have a week. Carothers: You'll be introducing this topic, preface this is being presented as an informational example. Bradshaw: I will write the information and send it to Kris for comment. DeBard: I think one of the things you said in passing as part of your statement was that there but for the grace of God go all of us. If this process can go forward, it can go forward for any of us. We have to stand up and question who has this authority. Bradshaw: Provost Borland has indicated that SEC called the question. Blair: I'm very conscious of time, there was a motion made. All those in favor please show of hands. All in favor.

OLD BUSINESS

Graduate Programs

Blair: Before we move on, let me make sure that when we get to the Graduate Program issue that we'll have Tim Messer-Kruse; Response; GSS Response. Folkins: I think we should be asking Provost Borland. Blair: I will indicate that we are expecting a presentation and we would prefer it come from him. Dinda: He did try to redirect our questions but we were successful in getting the Provost to respond. Blair: Given that we've already discussed your Resolution... Dinda: Please let me know if Faculty Senate (FS) wants to make this a joint venture. Our general assembly is on Friday. If this is something FS feels strongly about. Blair: Is this something we want to pursue? If so, it must be done electronically. Dinda: We'll make ourselves available. DeBard: If we are to join forces it must be streamlined. We have to be very careful. We have done more than our share of resolutions this year with very little impact. These are historical documents that we hope our new President does look at. Blair: I would prefer we do not do a resolution. We should facilitate the presentations and dialogue next week, and let everyone have their say. That's a good use of FS time. Folkins: I think it is more effective for each group to have their say. I think the resolution should be distributed.

Border: I have several handouts, the stipend and fee waiver policy and CAA review of Graduate Council approved... First a little about CAA, I'd like to say that we did have John Folkins as a guest during our 4/20 meeting. He chatted with us about the excused absence policy. We've decided to send the policy back to the various constituencies. Tim Messer-Kruse did not address the W/WF policy recommendations and we decided to table this for the academic year. The policy is here... read the letter. Include here...

This policy is all SECs now. Blair: The problem is, it is a done deal. The money has already been allocated. We appreciate your candor in sharing next steps. Is this the report you'll read on the floor? Border: These reports are transmitted to Kris.

ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Blair: Other issues and concerns? Gremler: Is this done? Blair: Yes, this is done. Border: CAA transmits to SEC. Folkins: Do you want the Senate to endorse this letter? Border: No, the policy. If you were to take it to the floor for a vote maybe that would draw the issue. Maybe people would ask why are we voting on this if it's already done. Folkins: I think it makes us look ineffectual. I think we should make a statement about the process. If we vote to disapprove something that happened months ago, we look ineffectual. Gremler: Isn't that the point? What is this body for if we are getting policies that have already been put in place? Voting against it makes a statement. Border: I'm inclined to agree. Blair: That's not, in all fairness, a new issue. That happens all too frequently. One of the biggest challenges is that we get policies and proposals way too late in the academic year to have meaningful dialogue. I'm not sure this particular policy should go to the floor. DeBard: Graduate Council had no particular problem with this policy even though it was presented as a fait accompli in the context of the budgetary cause and effect. We are facing a time that is highly unusual. The question is how do you handle this? This administration has been somewhat arbitrary and capricious. I didn't see much wrong with the policy, it's the process that is flawed. Blair: I think there were only two votes against it. Dinda: I agree. It was rushed through at Graduate Council. They waived the second reading and went to an immediate vote. His reason was that graduate education was expected to absorb a great deal of the budget cut. The way the vote was taken was suspect. It was taken by email. Blair: Further discussion? LeClair: Did I miss the answer to this? Who can serve on Faculty Senate? Midden: I was informed. Blair: Yes, that has been determined. LeClair: I don't know my own status. Blair: Check with your college office. We are beyond our 4:30 ending time, is there a motion to adjourn? Midden: So moved. DeBard: Second.

ADJOURNMENT

4:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

Terry L. Herman, Faculty Senate Secretary