

FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES

May 3, 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

Secretary Terry Herman called the roll.

Absent

Buerger; Bullerjahn; Callen; Carothers; Cillo; Darabie; DeBard; Folkins (Sub: Scherer); Griech-Polelle, Lake, Miller, Popov, Rogel, Sohoni, Sullivan, Thompson, Williams, President Cartwright

Secretary Herman announced there was a quorum.

Guests

Dr. Pat Pauken, Vice Provost for Governance and Faculty Relations
Dr. Katherine Bradshaw, School of Media and Communication
Dr. Michael Butterworth, School of Media and Communication
Dr. Gi Woong Yun, School of Media and Communication
David Sleasman, Graduate Student Senate
Jeff Larocque, Graduate Student Senate

COMMUNICATIONS

Chair of the Faculty Senate

I want to extend a thanks to all of you; with collective bargaining, CUE, the academic charter amendments, and, as you see from today's agenda, Graduate Education, it has been a challenging year, and I very much appreciate your support over the last nine months.

At our April meeting, there were concerns raised about possible closures to graduate programs; as a result of those concerns, we asked Provost Borland to address them at SEC's meeting with him on April 12 and here today. With the goal of ensuring all constituents are heard on this issue, we have added a representative program response, along with remarks from the Graduate Student Senate. I am hopeful we can engage in a productive dialogue about the existing state and long-term future of graduate education, just as we have done so on issues such as CUE, particularly involving issues of process and transparency.

Because I am a Department Chair, I am no longer eligible to serve on Faculty Senate, which makes today bittersweet in that I believe in the role of the Faculty Senate in meaningful shared governance and the need for such a role to move beyond the ceremonial to the influential, not merely cooperating with the administration on university-level initiatives but collaborating on their development and implementation and challenging those directives that do not involve faculty, students, and staff as key stakeholders and that negatively impact the ability of the faculty to have a voice. I will genuinely miss being a part of this important group, but will continue to be a strong advocate for maintaining the efficacy of the Faculty Senate at Bowling Green State University.

This concludes my report. President Cartwright is not able to be here today and thus I will read her report into the record.

President

Chair Blair on behalf of President Cartwright

If all goes as planned, I'll be coming out of surgery to repair two broken bones in my ankle about the same time as the Faculty Senate meeting is convened. I am truly sorry that I cannot be with you in person for the last meeting of the academic year, and my last meeting with you as BGSU president.

I have often used this time to bring you updates about state policy and budget topics and (replaced period with comma), where possible, to suggest implications for BGSU.

In that regard, there is news from Columbus. The Ohio House has developed a series of amendments to the Governor's proposed budget. They are scheduled to vote on the amended bill on Thursday, May 5th. The "big ticket" items for higher education have not changed: the SSI and the tuition cap provisions are as proposed by Governor Kasich. We are continuing to plan for \$12-13 million reductions in SSI for each year of the new biennium and for tuition increases at or near the cap. We will take the proposed BGSU operating budget for FY12 to our Board of Trustees on June 24th. Robust enrollment of new freshmen and transfer students is mitigating the effects of the SSI reductions, but some reductions to base budgets will still be required.

The process of building the state's new operating budget is not complete, however, until the Ohio Senate finishes its work. Therefore, we may need to modify our planning once we see the recommendations of the Senate and the reconciliation that will occur between the House and the Senate versions of the budget.

Important transitions are underway at BGSU. Our new president, Dr. Mary Ellen Mazey, and I are working on a daily basis to ensure a smooth transition. We are working to identify interim leadership for academic affairs with the news of Provost Borland's resignation. I commend Ken for the courage to follow the convictions of his family priorities while also determining the best way to serve BGSU. As for me, I started as a university faculty member in 1966 so I will be celebrating 45 years in higher education as I retire from BGSU on July 1st. I hope I'm in a walking cast by then! Seriously, my life passion has been public higher education and I feel especially privileged to have had the opportunity to work with you on behalf of our important mission during these past three years. Thank you and best wishes for future success personally and on behalf of your contributions to BGSU.

Provost/VPAA

CUE

The work on Charting Our Future's first strategy, known as CUE, has been progressing in a manner that very much pleases very many faculty colleagues and me. Many voices have delivered invaluable perspectives to refine the process, the developing proposal, the timeline (fall 2013) and the staffing, faculty development, and funding. This morning a semester-end CUE communication was delivered to the University community. It focused on the last five months and the next number of months. I hope you will read it and find a good platform of information for continuing the dialogue.

Inclusion

A communication has been prepared to update the University on the Inclusion Network that is a practical outgrowth of Charting Our Future's seventh strategy. Network members have

established a common understanding of their charge and are ready to initiate *ad hoc* sub groups to design and implement work on a number of fronts so that all persons at BGSU are included.

Ad hoc groups will focus on student organizations, artifacts and physical environment, policies and procedures, curriculum, and the recruitment and retention of students, staff, and faculty. I encourage members of the University community to volunteer service in these groups intending to elevate the level of inclusion for all persons.

Reaccreditation

The first visit from North Central Association's Higher Learning commission took place last week. As you know, this is the body of peers that will evaluate BGSU's regional reaccreditation in spring 2013. BGSU faculty, staff, and students will hear more about this conversation and work in the coming months.

BGSU is one of only 14 well-grounded institutions to be invited into a special review process. The focus is to be not only on a list of required quality indicators but on a special initiative the university is undertaking. Charting Our Future's first two strategies (CUE and Strategic Enrollment Management) were the focus of the first visit. A specific, achievable project will be focused; for example, assessment of student learning within the first year.

Commencement

This Friday evening and throughout the day on Saturday BGSU will celebrate the accomplishments of staff, faculty, and our administrative and governance leaders as commencement ceremonies are in full swing. Students love to see their faculty and staff supporters, and they love to introduce them to their family members.

I believe this will be the final commencement to be held in Anderson Arena as well as the final BGSU commencement for Dr. Cartwright. It should be a grand day of celebration.

Appreciation

It was wonderful to work with the Senate leaders, Executive Committee, CAA, and other committees. We did important work, hard work, and good work. Thank you.

Blair: Thank you Provost Borland. On behalf of the SEC we have appreciated the opportunity to work with you over the past two years. Graduate Student Senate Representative, Steve Dinda...

Graduate Student Senate Representative – Dinda

Good Afternoon. I'd like to say thank you to all the people who have worked so hard this year for Graduate education. In particular, we'd like to thank President Cartwright for all she has done and wish her a speedy recovery. We'd like to thank Provost Borland for his work, dedication, and service to BGSU over the past two years. We'd also like to thank Chair Blair. Her leadership of the Faculty Senate was wonderful this year. This is a historic time for Graduate education at BGSU. We have financial constraints, the creation of a new strategic plan as well as a recommendation for program closures. At our last meeting of the general assembly we had our ceremony to transition to new leadership. We have chosen someone who can certainly meet these challenges head on, David Sleasman. David is the President Elect of Graduate Student Senate (GSS). He'll be offering remarks later on in the agenda about Graduate programs. I know he'll excel at the job. Thank you.

Undergraduate Student Government Representative - Ancinec

Hello everyone. I am Emily Ancinec. I am a junior political science major and the new Undergraduate Student Government (USG) President. We are transitioning and wrapping up this

year. We are looking forward to working with you all next year and throughout the term. Thank you.

Retiree Representative - Lunde

I have very brief report from the State Teachers Retirement System (STRS) and what's going on with the pension fund in the State legislature. Ohio STRS proposed pension reform calls for a 3 percentage points increase from 10% to 13% for the employee contribution. No change in the current 14% employer contribution is planned. It is my understanding that those percentages are up in the air at this time.

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

REPORTS FROM SENATE COMMITTEES

Committee on Academic Affairs (CAA) – Border

In October 2010, interim Vice Provost for Academic Programs Tim Messer-Kruse shared with CAA a proposed policy on Graduate Stipends and Fee Waivers. During CAA's meeting of November 17, 2010, the GSS representative asked that CAA to look into the proposal. By December 2010 it was clear that the proposed policy was being disseminated to various members of the BGSU community and CAA began discussing the proposed policy. In January and February, guests to CAA provided their opinions about the possible effect of the proposed policy.

At its April 20th, 2011 meeting, with a quorum present, CAA voted on a motion to send the proposed Graduate Stipend and Fee-Waiver policy to the Senate Officers and Senate Executive Committee and to provide such comments as is necessary and appropriate so to provide a context for CAA's review.

Such comments were shared with the Senate Executive Committee at its April 26th meeting.

Finally, as CAA chair, it was my responsibility to transmit to the Senate Chair and officers that it was the opinion of the committee that the proposed policy changes are major in nature and need to be reconsidered.

The Chair of CAA learned of a proposed Master of Science (MS) in Gerontology in an email from the Vice President of Academic Programs (VPAP) time stamped 3 minutes prior to its Wednesday, April 20th meeting. This notification did not allow CAA adequate time to review the MS.

Further, there are rumors of a proposed MS in Architecture. CAA did not receive notification of such a proposal.

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

Amendments and Bylaws Committee – Labbie

The Amendments and Bylaws Committee met on April 12th to finalize revisions to the Emeritus Administrator Policy, which we re-submitted to the SEC for a second review. We received preliminary feedback this past Friday, SEC indicated the current version of the Policy might be seen as too restrictive in nature. We will await further details containing suggested changes this summer.

Blair: Thank you. Is there a report from the Committee on Committees today?

Committee on Committees – Evans

Dan Williams was not able to attend today's meeting and asked me to provide today's report in his absence. The Committee on Committees is working on a proposal from the new Chief Information Officer (CIO), John Ellinger to change the Information Technology Committee (ITC) to form a new committee that would be the CIO Advisory Council. He would like to broaden the membership to include representatives from USG, GSS and also certain administrators. We are supportive of this proposal but we're still having problems with some of the details related to membership. He has given us a list of names of individuals. What we need is a more formalized proposal that lists them by their ex officio position or indicates if they would be appointed and if so, by whom. And, in the case of faculty would they be elected? If so, how and for what terms of office? We are continuing to work with the CIO to resolve those issues.

Blair: Thank you. Committee on Professional Affairs...

Committee on Professional Affairs - Howes

No report.

Blair: Thank you. Moving on to new business, the SEC has asked Pat Pauken to provide updates on several issues with regard to Senate Bill 5 and our own election process. Pat...

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

Senate Bill 5 and Election Update: Pat Pauken

Thank you. These two items are listed together because of the common presenter not necessarily because they are related to one another.

I wanted to provide an update on Senate Bill 5 (SB5) and its impact on our work here. Second to that I will provide some updates on elections, primarily for Senate and for University standing committees. With respect to Senate Bill 5 the applicable provision in Senate Bill 5 for higher education faculty is a definitional exemption of faculty from public employee. For those of you who are subscribers to the faculty listserv you will have seen conversations on this topic. What we mean by definitional exemption is that the definition of public employee would not include faculty in higher education. Senate Bill 5's effective date is 90 days after the Bill's signing on 7/1/2011. However, as many of you know there is a petition underway to place a referendum on the ballot for this November 8th. Passage of that referendum would repeal SB5. If the petition has enough valid signatures filed by 6/30/2011 then the referendum will go to that ballot. If that is the case, the application of SB5 will be stayed. In the meantime, we continue bargaining as we remain subject to the law as it is today and that law is the pre-existing law. If it does not, then SB5 becomes effective upon the certification of the election results. We really do as faculty and as administration continue as though pre-existing law exists because it does exist.

With respect to elections I want to offer a thank you to Pam Pinson and to the Senate officers for their work this semester with me in my Vice Provost role. I also want to thank you all too for your patience as we settle into this new era and a new definition of faculty as defined in our Charter. This is a complicated system of titles, practices, and traditions that really do need to find a more common sort of parameter and definition. This is a longer process than we knew going

in. We worked this semester with Academic Affairs, Finance and Administration, and Human Resources to finalize the current eligibility list.

We really have two goals here. We have to stay true to the Academic Charter in regard to the definition of faculty. But, we also have to assure that the membership list for AAUP matched the eligibility list for elections to Senate, Senate officer positions, Senate Committees, and University Standing Committees. It's important that any spot designated for faculty membership be open to faculty members, as defined in the Charter. We need to be sure that the individuals are faculty as defined by the Charter and equates with AAUP eligibility. Those who are faculty through this semester, including Chairs and Directors, do have the opportunity to vote in Senate and University Standing Committee elections even if they are not eligible to serve, courtesy of an administrative role beginning or continuing after Spring 2011. Chairs and Directors are not faculty for the purposes of the AAUP. We do have some work going forward. Academic Affairs will continue to lead this work in conjunction with the Senate Office. What happens this time of year, we expect that list of eligible faculty members will need to be amended with Chair and Director changes occurring this summer, and with retirements, departures, and the arrival of new faculty members.

Pauken: Questions? **Edminster:** With regard to the change with our status as faculty in regard to Senate Bill 5, the actual language in the Bill extends the category of supervisor role to include faculty. Faculty are management and not labor. **Pauken:** Yes. I was speaking to the language on the referendum not knowing the precise language of that. **Edminster:** I think they should both reflect the same language. **Pauken:** Having not seen the petition, I agree. Thank you. **Dixon:** I'm very curious how it is that the Charter having been practically erased by fiat without any help from faculty, very curious how it is that using the Charter, an essentially dead document, that you can say I am now management. I do thank you for that and expect a raise in my next paycheck. I do not find this appropriate at all. We are all peers. If I were management I could fire someone and we would not be peers. As I cannot fire anyone I do not have the rights of management. I'm grateful for that but I'm very upset when the horses are changed midstream with no notice. By what power did you change the definition of faculty? **Pauken:** The Board changed the definition of faculty and they have the authority to do so courtesy of the Charter. **Dixon:** The Charter that is gone? **Pauken:** The Charter still exists. **Dixon:** If it exists, I'd like to see it. We have several committees that felt they could not continue to proceed because of the Charter changes. **Pauken:** I'd need to know which committees you are talking about. **Dixon:** EEOC. **Pauken:** The Charter does not list the University Standing Committees. Those continue to meet as we indicated in February's Senate meeting. **Dixon:** I know you don't know the answer to this but we would like to know who was supposed to meet and take care of business because that did not happen. **Shields:** I understand that the AAUP definition of manager and faculty is guiding the current list of who is eligible to serve in this body. Is that not something that we, well not me as I can no longer be a member, can debate? Could they in a contract moving forward talk about membership on faculty senate that would allow the historical practice at this institution that would allow department chairs to continue to be faculty and engage in representation? **Pauken:** We continue bargaining with the Faculty Association (FA) this summer and that will very likely become part of that conversation. For purposes of elections this semester, we felt it was most important to maintain the list of eligible faculty members from the AAUP for this purpose. As faculty members have membership on these committees that they reflect the actual definition of faculty in the Charter. This may or may not change courtesy of bargaining. With respect to Chairs, Directors, and other faculty administrators, and I'm in favor of this, they can continue to be represented on committees, especially University Standing Committees. That's not to say that they wouldn't and couldn't in the future. I would be in favor of that. **Shields:** I appreciate that. It doesn't speak to the larger question. We can negotiate working conditions. There is a great irony here. It was the membership of the Faculty Senate that allowed the Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) to be part because we viewed them as an

important part of our membership. Now is the time when we can negotiate working conditions. I think it is highly ironic. Pauken: I'm in favor of establishing some agency for this group to continue to have a voice. Whether that comes through Senate or representation on Standing Committees, I'm not sure. I'm certainly in favor of that. Howes: I'd like to clarify that what has been called the AAUP definition – this isn't something AAUP came up with this is Ohio Labor law that we had to operate according to in our election as well. I don't see how that applies to how the Senate functions. Since the Senate deals with other issues besides working conditions I think there is a possibility within the Senate to determine membership in broader terms. Pauken: I agree with that as well. That word for the best moving forward practice would be to use that word consistently in our Charter. This does not mean that the work of Senate would not be reworked to include administrators. That's not my job to say for sure here. Shields: I welcome the clarification of the status quo. I also welcome Geoff's statement that perhaps there is a way to move forward to deal with the question of fair representation of everybody that works here. Pauken: I agree entirely. This was not a part of my report. Shields: I appreciate that. Pauken: As Vice Provost for Governance and Faculty Relations, the governance part of that job would very much appreciate conversation about Chairs, Directors and others who are not members of the union by Ohio law. I'm in full favor of that. I can't speak to what Senate would like to do with that. Thank you.

Blair: Thank you Pat. In structuring our next agenda item on Graduate education, SEC felt it was important to have representatives from a range of constituencies. In addition to the Provost update about the recent recommendations for closures and reconfiguration of several graduate programs on campus, we will hear a representative program response based on a request from the School of Media and Communication that they are allowed to present here today. And finally we'll have a presentation from the Graduate Student Senate. We've asked each group to not take questions until the presentation has been completed. Our reason for that is simple. Several of our meetings this year have gone past 4:30 p.m. Many people do have to leave at 4:00 p.m. We want to honor the voices that will be speaking today and ensure they will have an audience and be heard. With that said, I will turn it over to Provost Borland.

Graduate Programs: Provost Borland Update

I appreciate the fact that whenever there is a recommendation that comes forward and it is of concern to individuals or groups of people it is an important recommendation to talk about. It has values attached to it. It has questions attached to it. It is worthy of discussion. The best thing the Provost can do is move it into the official process of the University that have been agreed to, that are part of the Charter, part of the curricular process. We've done that in this case.

I want to give you a bit of history. First, I'd like to get a sense from the Senators here; I don't want to be redundant. I know we've put a great deal of information on the website regarding graduate programs, particularly in regard to this year. Have you read it? Are you familiar with it? Have you worked with it? If so, I can move a bit more quickly. The conversation about graduate programs and their status as standing, or those to be sustained or eliminated, goes back a number of years here at BGSU predating my arrival. In 2007-2008 a significant study was done, conducted by the Graduate College. A multi-year program review effort that a committee of faculty peers conducted. It has been described as a process that was driven by faculty input resulting in a wide range report but no recommendations for action. That review was continued in 2009 under then Interim Dean of the Graduate College. A new committee was charged to review the work of the previous committee and recommend future steps. That also ended without any action being taken. I came along during the Fall of 2009. I visited many, if not all, academic Departments, Schools and Colleges. I remember one particular instance when questions were asked. One of those significant questions was, "What is the future of our graduate programs?" We will hear from that School this afternoon. It was an important question for them and

throughout the University. It hadn't been answered. It had been studied but no recommendations made.

This is about the same time the economic impact was beginning to shape much of thinking on expenditure of dollars, the scarcity of dollars available to the University. I want to remind the Senate at about that same time I discovered that there had been an ongoing conversation about reconfiguring the colleges at the University. How many Colleges would there be? Everyone knew that this very confidential conversation was going on. I brought that to light. We reported on it, wrote about it, and brought that to the faculty. When a conversation takes as long as from the time of 2007 to this very day and it has only been in the last few weeks that recommendations have come forward, it was time that recommendations come forward.

In fact the Faculty Senate asked me, in the SEC committee asked that we move forward in this process. In fact to quote the person who represented the Senate in that conversation, speaking for everyone around the table judging on the level of consensus, "We're calling the question." We want to know what the recommended movement would be regarding graduate programs.

There were a lot of conversations that have taken place between 2007 and the present in regard to graduate education. I was involved in many conversations as were Interim Graduate Deans with Graduate Student leadership, Deans, Chairs, Directors, GSS, and others over the years. We tried to be sure that we were moving in response to the Senate calling the question. I want to say that this spring following some earlier work that the Deans led. I want to tell you something about our Deans. These are people of great integrity. Great integrity. You ought to be proud of each and every one. I think almost all of them were able to be here this afternoon. They were concerned about that same looming question. They determined that the earlier processes provided information, some information. Not all information. This spring they went into a process to work collaboratively. Earlier there were conversations about making recommendations but there was not a collaborative spirit. Your Deans have developed a collaborative spirit. They worked together. They have looked at numerous data points, not one or two, but numerous. They made recommendations, and these are only recommendations, the green sheet process will follow. With the green sheet will come the data they examined, the information they looked at. They provided me their recommendations on April 12th after my meeting with Senate leadership. It was in April that I said I was expecting the recommendation from the Deans. They did outstanding work though I did not witness or participate in their process. I was aware of their conversation and I certified they were doing the right work. It was outstanding, credible work. The work is worth standing upon.

When I received their report, recommendation I didn't want to see another 10 months pass as we saw with the reconfiguration conversation with people being more anxious particularly that I announced this was in the works. I wanted to be sure that I put those recommendations, or single recommendation, where it belonged according to our Charter. It belongs as a recommendation in the hands of the Graduate Council. That is where it was moved on April 14th. I moved it there because I believe our Deans did outstanding work because that is the type of people they are. They also made contact with involved Chairs or Directors to notify them, in some cases over the years that this review was underway, that their particular programs were mentioned in a particular fashion. The Deans then notified them where their programs were relative to this April 12th recommendation. I believe them. And, I moved that forward into the process where it belongs. One thing about our Graduate Council that many people wouldn't know experientially is that they have a responsibility to review programs for closure as part of following up on this type of recommendation. They wouldn't know that experientially because it hasn't happened here in a good number of years I'm told, if ever. What we did was move forward recommendations that are worthy of our curricular process. The green sheets will arrive with the data. Every one in this University community is entitled to engage this process. We wanted to

notify the Graduate Council in April so people wouldn't be lingering over the summer wondering what's going on.

There is no *fait accompli* here. There is nothing I find in that regard to be amiss. It is an honest recommendation coming from the Deans. They may want to speak with you about that this afternoon. As to the detail they want to engage the conversation, I will leave to them. They know those details. In every way we have tried to bring forth recommendations that made sense at this point in time. But, in all ways all members of this University can be engaged in this dialogue. This Senate conversation today I hope is helpful but this is not our curricular process. We wanted to respect that.

We have moved this information forward as an alert to the Graduate Council. They will pick it up in the autumn and they will work with it. This is their responsibility to move it forward but it is everyone's responsibility to engage this; to provide supplemental information, to provide information from other informed stakeholders; to follow our Charter, to give our Deans the ability to provide their perspective, their recommendations into the process. I think it is a legitimate process and a good one. It happens to be fairly new to this University in terms of program closure. I understand where many people are coming from these days. I understand that there are multiple data points and criteria that could be considered. There was no one single data point or criteria that was mentioned during conversations that the Deans have had. It's not about enrollment, the finance, it's not about accreditation, and it's not about publications because frankly every program stands on different ground in regard to these factors as a baseline.

Certain programs are more likely than not to be eligible for external funding, others will not. They will not have a reasonable expectation of bringing in millions of dollars. Some programs, one we'll hear about today, have a fairly decent balance of diversity. It's not the most diverse program according to the data provided by institutional research but that's not the only criteria to be considered. All perspectives the Deans had came from various sources, various perspectives, and various criteria. Would any of the Deans like to speak to this? Perhaps during the question and answer period might be a more reasonable time to do that. We want to be sure it is consistent with the Charter and it is not a done deal. These are purely recommendations. It is quite amazing to me at some level when I look at our process, it always works; it always works. It worked with CUE. You sent the proposal back to the drawing board where it belonged. It will work with this recommendation. If it's not right it will go back to the drawing board, so to speak. I trust our process. I hope you will as well.

Blair: Thank you Provost Borland. From the School of Media and Communication, Professors Bradshaw, Butterworth, and Yun.

Representative Program Response: School of Media and Communication

Professors Katherine Bradshaw, Michael Butterworth, and Gi Woong Yun

I share the hope with the Provost that this process will come out right in the end; that it will come out fairly and will involve a systematic approach involving faculty that goes beyond what has already happened. I'm here today to tell you about our, the School of Media and Communication, particular view of the process that has gone forward and about the public announcement of that and how that has affected the University. I think that public process has harmed us all.

Thank you for your time. We thank the members of the Senate Executive committee. They decided that our story about the lack of shared governance was worth sharing and important to the entire community. Any earlier discussion of graduate program cuts at the University has not

been systematic as far as we can tell and flowed through in the timeline of history as the Provost discussed. I don't deny that those discussions exist.

I am here to talk about the current lack of shared governance in the decision to close the doctoral program in the School of Media and Communications. I share the Provost's respect of the Deans, some of whom I am immensely fond of. In the School of Media and Communications, our graduates earn PhDs in Communication Studies. We were informed three weeks ago that our doctoral program was being closed. Not one of us was involved in the decision making process. Certainly what happened to our doctoral program can happen to any other program. The Provost has said that this was a process that was put on the table. I will talk about that more in a minute. It is only entering the process.

In a process that I will describe momentarily, we were informed that our doctoral program would be closed.

We were told that closing academic programs was a way to cut costs, save money.

We were told that our doctoral program would be closed because of its low quality compared to other doctoral programs. This was clearly communicated to us.

Had we been asked about the data used to determine the quality of our doctoral program, we could have alerted administrators early in their process that the data was badly flawed. The data was out-of-date, incorrect, and incomplete. The data was gathered using a suspect design from uninformed people. Or as a now retired Graduate Dean from Penn State University said ... the NRC data is a skyscraper built on sand.

If academic programs are to be cut to save money, and perhaps they need to be, and the decisions on which program to cut is based on program quality... then the process of evaluating the quality of BGSU's graduate programs must start over. Maybe that will happen.

We believe at this point, our leadership should withdraw support from the flawed recommendations to cut graduate programs – both that support us and that damn us. The discredited National Resource Council (NRC) data must be removed from consideration of program quality. Graduate faculty from every program should be involved in a process using quality variables respected by other universities. Those variables should be applied to all programs in an open manner so that we all know what this rank order of quality is.

We want our president to make a public announcement that mistakes were made, the data used was flawed, and a new, transparent, and shared process will determine a rank order of quality among all of our graduate programs.

We hope that you go back to your departments, think about this, and share the knowledge that a bad process using bad data could be used to cut your program.

April 5

Just four weeks ago, at the end of our Faculty Senate meeting, I described the closure of our doctoral programs as a rumor.

April 12

Exactly three weeks ago today, Dean Morgan-Russell told our Director that our doctoral program had been recommended for closure to the Provost. The next day, she told faculty and graduate students.

April 14

Dean Messer-Kruse told the Graduate Council that Provost Borland recommended closure of several graduate programs. Graduate Council was unwilling vote on the recommendation at that point in time.

April 15–public knowledge

The Deans' and Provost's judgment about low quality of some graduate programs at BG became public knowledge when Dean Messer-Kruse informed incoming students that our doctoral program had been recommended for closure.

April 15, 2011 –public knowledge

The same day, a sourced article appeared in the *Toledo Blade*. In the article, the Provost endorsed the recommendation to close seven graduate programs. The programs were listed.

Dean Messer-Kruse said the changes are about more than cutting costs.

“There's (sic) been a succession of attempts at reviewing graduate programs and really trying to get a handle on the ones that are thriving and the ones that aren't,” Messer-Kruse said.

April 19

Two weeks ago today, our faculty met with Dean Morgan-Russell, Dean Messer-Kruse, and Provost Borland. Before this meeting, two weeks ago today, no one in the school had been consulted about this decision to close our graduate program.

No one had been asked to review data.

At the meeting, we asked questions about the specific reasons for cutting graduate programs and the criteria used to make the decisions.

We were told that financial information released in February triggered the process to determine academic program cuts. That February trigger had been mentioned in the *Blade* article four days earlier.

We were told that cutting spending generated the discussion this semester, but that it was program quality that was the basis of deciding which specific programs should be cut.

We asked about how much money would be saved by cutting our doctoral program. No one seemed to know or they were not willing to share that information with us.

We asked about the criteria used to determine program quality.

It was suggested that the numbers measuring quality related to our graduate program might embarrass us. However, a one page executive summary of quality data was shared with faculty members. When I saw this sheet of data I was immediately uplifted. Nearly all of it was National Research Council data. I've known for years this data had been discredited over and over again. There is a virtual cottage industry in deconstructing the NRC data essentially saying you should not use this data for program review. I thought, they just don't know. It will be OK. They don't know this is bad data. No other data source was cited. There may be other data sources but they were not shared with us. Subsequent to this meeting two weeks ago, no additional data sources have been provided to us in the last two weeks. No one has explained how much money the University will save by closing our doctoral program, or any of the other graduate programs. We have no doubt there must be shared pain, and maybe we'll be the only ones to share the pain. But, we certainly need to see the data and a systematic accounting of what went into that process that got us to this point.

April 21

Our graduate students met with Dean Messer-Kruse.

No additional data sources were provided.

April 22 (4:00 p.m. Good Friday)

Provost Borland attended a special meeting of the Graduate Student Senate.

No additional data sources were provided.

That's what happened. Getting into the process has been so damaging because it has been public through the article in the *Toledo Blade* and what was shared with our graduate students.

We were cut out of the process. There existed not a shred of shared governance in making the decision on which graduate programs to cut. The data we know about was deeply flawed.

And it appears that not all graduate programs were evaluated. Some were evaluated on some measures and some on others.

And yet, the public announcements of the recommendations have harmed the careers of our graduates, our students and our faculty members. It has harmed BGSU. This discussion about quality became a public discussion when the Graduate Dean informed incoming students, and when the sourced newspaper article appeared in the *Toledo Blade* and was immediately picked up by *Inside Higher Ed*. I just returned from an Accrediting Council meeting for journalism education. At that meeting we were the topic of education either because I heard others discussing the elimination of our program. I had to tell them that, “No!” This is not a done deal.” I’m sure there will still be discussions at our University. Or it was in talking to graduate deans and deans who said, “No! They can’t be using the NRC data. Everyone knows that is flawed data.”

Two kinds of errors were made in this misguided process to determine graduate program quality that failed to include the School of Media Communications faculty in any meaningful way.

There were errors of ignorance. Mistakes were made because of a lack of knowledge.

The decision makers were apparently unaware of the severe problems with the National Research Council data that, as far as we know at this point, they used to determine quality.

There were errors of ineptitude. Mistakes were made because improper use was made of what was known. The decision makers used old, and all incorrect data.

We still do not know how much money cutting graduate programs will save.

We still do not know how graduate programs compare based on quality.

Repeatedly, in multiple venues, the Provost has said that he is giving his strong recommendation to the Deans’ decisions on these specific graduate program cuts.

We wonder if his recommendation was put over the top to become a strong recommendation by the wrong data, or the old data?

Had anyone asked, we could have explained that the National Research Council Data has been widely discredited. The respondents were poorly informed. The data is inaccurate. The data is old. The age of the data varies by indicator. To give you just one example, the data on the mean number of publications by our faculty is wildly inaccurate. And there’s really no excuse for that error, since that data that could have been gathered from our annual reports.

A basic principle of academic life is to openly defend your method, data, and arguments. To openly explain how you know what you know.

We all deserve a process of shared governance that adheres to that standard. We still do not have data.

We want all university leaders to withdraw support immediately from the highly flawed recommendations to cut graduate programs.

We want our president to make a public announcement that mistakes were made, the data used was flawed, and a new, transparent, and shared process will be used to determine a rank order of quality among all of the graduate programs. Honest, honorable, admired people can make mistakes. I’ve made mistakes, I’m sure you have too. We don’t know if our program is the best, the worst, or somewhere in the middle based on this data.

We want the discredited National Resource Council (NRC) data removed from consideration in any process that evaluates graduate program quality.

We want faculty from every graduate program involved in a process using shared quality variables that are respected and used by other universities.

We want the same measures of quality applied to all of the graduate programs on campus.

If any academic programs are to be cut to reduce costs it should be crystal clear exactly how much money will be saved before we damage the lives of faculty, students, and alumni in these programs.

If any academic programs are to be cut based on their quality then sensible variables need to be used to compare programs.

We want you to go back to your departments and share the knowledge that a bad process using bad data could be used to cut your program.

If you have any specific questions about the quality data, our faculty members can answer them. Thank you so much for your time and attention.

Blair: Thank you Kathy. Representing the GSS, David Sleasman.

Graduate Student Senate Response: David Sleasman and Jeff Larocque

Sleasman: Good afternoon. Graduate Student Senate when the program closures were announced, graduate students in general were a little overwhelmed. We received a formal memo regarding summer fee waivers four days prior to that. A few days later the program closures were announced. GSS was very concerned. These program closures fit into a pattern of behavior we had observed throughout this year. The GSS, even prior to these various announcements, were very active. We were engaged in meetings with Provost Borland, Dean Messer-Kruse, and Vice Provost Pauken. We had questions regarding the data being used and the timeline. Three days before the April 15th deadline when graduate assistantships should be distributed was cutting it close. There were serious budgetary concerns but we were told these were not financial decisions. As you'll see in the first line of the Resolution we are distributing, they mention budgetary concerns. There was concern about process and where we go from here. There were no conversations about future processes would be, what the criteria were. Graduate students were concerned. Over the course of the past several weeks GSS has engaged in many conversations within the Graduate Student Senate. Dean Messer-Kruse engaged in conversations with GSS. We extended the invitation to Dr. Borland who could not meet at that time but met in special session to address student concerns. Last session we left our conversation at a vote of no confidence for Dean Messer-Kruse. The vote was put to the floor at the last meeting we decided that was not the proper course of action. We reviewed the resolution that has been put before you, as these were the concerns of graduate students. This resolution mirrors a letter that was sent to the Board of Trustees last semester, which includes concerns about shared governance, voice, process, and communications. I will speak to two of these specifically. The issues were the same. I am very proud of the GSS' civility and professionalism as they voiced these concerns. We wanted to be an active voice in this process and we weren't sure what the process was. When you have lack of faith and don't know who is to be held accountable it takes patience. You address the main issues at hand. This resolution addresses those points – communication, process, shared governance, and trust. As the resolutions states:

S2011.R1

Resolution of the Graduate Student Senate

WHEREAS, The process to separate the tuition scholarship and stipend of graduate assistantships was decided upon without giving the general assembly of the Graduate Student Senate the opportunity to engage in the process, thereby circumventing the mechanism of shared governance afforded to the graduate student body.

WHEREAS, The reduction of the budget for graduate tuition scholarship will be reduced by 9 million dollars, or by 30%, over the next biennium without communicating a clear rationale, or providing supporting evidence for why such a drastic reduction is necessary.

WHEREAS, A result of the reduction to the tuition scholarship has resulted in the “earned summer waiver”, the contractual benefit of graduate assistantships for a six credit hour tuition waiver for the summer semester following the term of their contract, not being honored as stated despite a commitment made to hold current students harmless.

WHEREAS, A result of the reduction to the tuition scholarship has led to a recommendation of the closure of graduate programs by college Deans, quoting the first sentence in the recommendation memo from the Deans: “The reduction in the graduate scholarship budget by 9 million dollars over the next biennium has made it impossible to sustain all the graduate programs at BGSU.”

WHEREAS, The actions taken by the administration as listed above towards graduate education in the absence of a strategic plan for graduate education has instilled an atmosphere of distrust in the vision that the administration has for the future of graduate education.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED That the Graduate Student Senate requests the administration to provide clarity to the graduate student body regarding the necessity of these major changes to graduate education this year and the process by which these decisions were made.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Graduate Student Senate will be consulted about the appropriate and clear mechanisms that will be created to help facilitate communication between the Graduate Student Senate and the administration so that the Graduate Student Senate will be an active participant in decisions impacting graduate education in the best interest of Bowling Green State University.

Submitted by: The Senate Executive Committee of the Graduate Student Senate

Sleasman: We are looking for these appropriate mechanisms. That has been our message since the beginning of the last academic year. It is with that we are gravely concerned. We are glad that we are seeing a process unfold for these graduate program closures. We are glad we’ll be able to see data. We do have concerns about the timing of the process; we wish the conversations could have occurred sooner and in a more open fashion with data in front of us. Thank you.

Blair: Thank you for your patience in holding your questions. I’ll now open the floor to questions and conversation. Jim... Evans: It seems to me there are two different problems here and one of them is specific to the closures of these graduate programs and I hope that the process will allow revision of these decisions and so forth. It seems to me there is a systemic problem that exists and we need to talk about it. Despite anything that is said at this point about following process there is a very high level of mistrust about what exactly that means. This is not a new problem. It reached a very high point in December when the Board of Trustees stripped out half the Academic Charter with a pen stroke. It goes back to the arrival of President Cartwright and arrival of University Attorney Shawn Fitzgerald, who has openly expressed the opinion that the Academic Charter means whatever he says it means. There are people in this room that have spent hundreds of hours of their time learning the Academic Charter and what it means. I’m sitting next to one, Kris Blair is another and Ron Shields, Pat Pauken. A number of people around this room have put that time and effort into learning the rules with the idea that this is a way to protect people, processes, garner respect, and setting an example for students. Which is something we all have an ethical responsibility to do. Teach them respect for the law, respect for process. That’s what is lacking right now. That is coming from the administration no matter how

they try to cover their tracks in this particular decision and it won't change until those administrators change.

Blair: Thank you Jim. Other comments? Rajaei: I have a comment and several questions to Provost Borland regarding our program in Computer Science (CS). As part of the proposal it was indicated that we should move to the College of Technology. Two weeks ago, our Dean indicated that this plan is on the table and it is going to happen. Although it is a proposal, the rumor is that this is a done deal. I appreciate that Provost Borland says it is not a done deal. First question, could you tell us the timeframe of the move? This question has been brought up in an open meeting with the Deans of Arts & Sciences and the College of Technology. Dean Frizado indicated he wanted to confirm the move as soon as possible, before the new President arrived. He indicated it would be dangerous to wait because the decision to implement this move would be delayed. If we are to have transparency, we must answer the question why the rush? Why do we need to move? Is it beneficial to both parties? What are the issues to consider? Blair: You've directed the question to Provost Borland but it does seem that Dean Frizado would like to respond. Frizado: When, I'm misquoted I need to respond. At that meeting what I said and what I implied was that the faculty needed to talk about the possibility of this recommendation going forward. I have categorically stated in several meetings with the ECT and CS faculty that absolutely no negotiations could commence until the permanent Dean was on campus. I'm not the permanent Dean. I initiated the process with the permanent Dean to allow the faculty to have input to allow for shared governance. If anyone thinks that an Interim Dean can get this done in 4 weeks they are sadly mistaken. I take umbrage at that comment. Rajaei: I appreciate your response; let me respond now. Evans: May I ask that all speakers address their questions to the Chair, which is the appropriate etiquette? Blair: Thank you Jim. Rajaei: I appreciate knowing that the permanent Dean will address this recommendation when he arrives. Whether this is a done deal or not, what is the timeline? Why are the faculty in the CS department not included in the discussion? All of these questions are valid. Frizado: The express purpose of the meeting was to start the discussion with the faculty. They were told, as everyone was told, this was not a done deal. This is to start a discussion and get faculty input. Nothing can happen until the permanent Deans are in place. Nothing can happen over this period of time. This is the perfect time for the faculty to have this discussion. The timeline goes into the fall. You have to have time to discuss the possibility in an open and public manner. That's why we had the meeting. That's what the faculty were told. The ECT faculty included the Chair of the CS Department and the Dean in their advisory board to open a communication channel before anything happens. Blair: I want to vary the discussion and address various questions. Jude... Edminster: I think this is a question for Provost Borland. When these recommendations go to Graduate Council, what criteria will they use to evaluate these recommendations? Borland: I've asked Dr. Messer-Kruse to talk about how that group would function in a general sense and approach to any proposal that comes through. Edminster: I am interested in the specific criteria that will be used to evaluate your and the Deans' recommendations. Messer-Kruse: We will provide a list of criteria that was developed in cooperation with the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) in 2009 that helped guide the Deans discussion. I cannot bind the Graduate Council to follow that course. Edminster: Will that criteria be made public to us, as faculty? Messer-Kruse: Yes, I believe that criteria have been public for quite some time. Edminster: I was referring to what may develop by that set of criteria. You indicated they were not bound to those criteria. Will changes made to the criteria be made public? Messer-Kruse: It's part of the Graduate Council process. I don't believe we'll be recommending anything beyond that. They are an independent body. Edminster: Do you know if part of their process will be to make that measuring stick public prior to their recommendation? Messer-Kruse: That will be up to the Graduate Council. All of their minutes are public information and are posted. Edminster: Thank you.

Messer-Kruse: I had a couple of points of correction I wanted to include. I want to thank the GSS and its leadership for the collaborative work this year. I have been very impressed with the

professionalism, decorum, and civility in which it has conducted its business. I would like to correct one statement though and that is the earned summer waiver policy was shared with GSS on 1/28/2011. It was in the Harmless memo and it included detail about the process. The April memo was merely a communication because students seemed to have not been informed by GSS and/or graduate coordinators about the policy. We didn't withhold information or make an untimely decision. I also wanted to correct a torrent of information tumbling down this week through the press of various kinds. I would note in this presentation today and earlier today at the forum as well as at other forums. Various individuals have made the charge that our decisions were made entirely on NRC 2010 data. I would agree that it was a mistake for me to include that data so prominently. In fact that was not a major part of our discussion. We included much other data. There were half a dozen other data points that were considered much more closely by the Deans; data points dealing with demand for the program, selectivity, GRE scores of incoming students, and so on. These were data points that allowed us to make comparisons across other social sciences and doctoral programs. Those data points weren't mentioned here today and that's probably because they are irrefutable. They were done with an informed group of Deans. I would like to express my personal and professional objection to the use of the criteria of diversity as an element of this decision. According to the BGNews our student body is the most diverse PhD program at BGSU and in our field. As the Chair of Ethnic Studies and one who studies in this field, I feel these uses of race should not be used lightly. It is a serious matter. It is not something we toy with or bring out of our pocket simply to win a point. You look at the data for the current students in the School of Media and Communications are not adding to the diversity of this campus. I object to this being used in that light and rhetorical way. I think it is a much more serious issue. I wanted to say that personally. Dixon: Tim, one of the things that have given us a great deal of confusion is when we have asked about criteria. We believe this sincerely that if you look at other parameters we fare very well. One of the questions was, is this financial or quality decision? We have heard both. There have been some exclusionary statements that this is about money or it is not about quality. You said three times in presentations to our graduate students that it is not about the money. I'd like to know what it is really about. Messer-Kruse: I think this is a confusing issue because it has been imperative from the beginning not to confuse the two things. When the Deans and I had our discussions, we didn't want to cut programs for purely economic reasons. We are in a dire budget situation and the figures we were looking at did focus our attention on the need to review these programs and make recommendations. Some programs have become unsustainable over the years because they had been drained of their faculty, some programs because some had drifted from the core mission of the unit or University. We applied these criteria. We separated the budget and the criteria. We didn't want anyone to think we were reacting to a bad budgetary situation. As the Dean of the Graduate College I would rather we suffer through a few bad years and retain our programs that are thriving, sustainable, and mission central. In our review we did find some programs through the review that were not sustainable or not thriving. There is a huge benefit to making these decisions now. The benefit is financial. We have many other doctoral programs. In the College of Arts & Sciences our recommendations do have the possibility of helping the graduate enterprise as a whole survive during this difficult time. We didn't want anyone to think that we were just reacting to a budget situation. We have all experienced cuts across the board, across all programs. The Deans and I felt it was time for us to be more strategic and not make across the board cuts. That's why we chose to look at programs and make these recommendations. It might have appeared that we were playing both sides of the budgetary line but it is a complicated situation. Dixon: I understand it is a complicated situation; but we still need to ask how much money we are saving with the Communications program and how much are you saving with the other seven? In the big picture, we have a 99% placement for all of our graduate students. That should certainly be one of the criteria. Messer-Kruse: We will certainly have an opportunity to debate that data. Dixon: Why was it not done before? Messer-Kruse: We've made the recommendation and now we will discuss. That's the appropriate procedure. As far as savings go, all I can say is that the doctorate scholarships for the School of Media and

Communications represent 10% of all the scholarships we award to the College of Arts & Sciences. Yun: Dr. Messer-Kruse do you know Alicia Sanders? Is that name familiar to you? She is an African American person and a US citizen. Your data doesn't have any African American in there, why? Can't you just call us and verify the data when you see something strange? You've been doing this a long time. Blair: I realize that this discussion can become very contentious and I realize that there is quite a difference of opinion and perspective. I want to remind everyone that collegiality should be one of our criterion here today. I realize people may not understand the impact of their statements. As Senator Evans suggested please speak through the Chair. Karen... Johnson-Webb: I take great exception to the use of the term race card. It's interesting because this administration in context and light of the fact that there has been an exodus of black faculty, classified staff and administrators from this University. In light of the fact that this administration has made such a big deal of defining diversity in its own way I believe phrases like dimensions of difference have been used in the past to justify not having visible minorities in certain positions. And to take someone to task for using diversity this way by a member of administration that has been using this way of describing diversity, I didn't appreciate that at all. Shields: Multiple data sets have been called upon in the past years to look at this issue. In our unit in Arts & Sciences (A&S) we were told to provide a whole range of data to provide a profile of our programs. I would assume that all A&S units were asked to provide similar data sets this year. I am assuming they were a part of the Deans' conversation. Is that correct? Blair: Dean Morgan-Russell can respond to that. Morgan-Russell: We did collect all of that data so that as we moved into the allocation of graduate resources for next year we could make those difficult decisions. You know we barely had a meeting where we did not ruminate over the problems with graduate programs. It was toward the end of the fall when Dale Klopfer brought very stark information to the table. We cannot do this by cutting across the board. That was a fairly sobering realization for everyone at the table. We did collect the data we did not have an opportunity to use that data as Deans and making our decisions. I felt that was more College data. It was collected for our internal processes. We have to aggregate it. Shields: That data which was submitted was not used for this year? Morgan-Russell: That is correct. Park: I think we are talking past each other between Dean Messer-Kruse and our faculty. I would propose that we get together with Dean Messer-Kruse and all of the data and make the determination about this data. The truth will come out. I strongly recommend we proceed this way. We can go back and forth forever and neither side will prevail. Thank you. Blair: Other comments? Skinner: I think part of our concern is that if this is indeed a recommendation we need to have that term clarified. Does that mean finality? If not, we have points to contest the recommendation. Thank you. Blair: Jim... Evans: If the process were that we make a public announcement about program closures and then begin our internal conversation – that's a problematic process. What is our process? I think we need to clean up what that process is. It sounds to me like that should not be a public airing but an internal discussion. Zongo: Can we have a timeline? It seems like this is an opportunity to discuss what was recommended. Would it be possible for the administration to give us a timeline and at what level of faculty would be allowed to submit additional information before the decision is made? I think that would be helpful. What kind of input can we bring forward and when? I think that would be very helpful. Borland: There are a lot of very reasonable people trying to get our heads around this process and to work through it together. This was not the Council of Deans but the Deans. This was the Deans themselves having this conversation. Zongo: So all the Deans at BGSU met and recommended these closures and downsizing? Right? Borland: Yes, but they can correct me. I did want to respond to some very reasonable set of comments in the last few minutes, they've all been reasonable comments, as I find they are constructive. I would like to have a day or two to sit with the Deans to discuss timeline and process. I want to be sure I have an understanding and we have a collective understanding of that timeline. When that is ready, we would share that. I would hope within a few weeks there would be some assemblage of the types of information they looked at, etc. We'll find a way to put that in the hands of the faculty in these programs. I want the Deans to have a hand in this recommendation. I don't want to put them in a box like

that. They know the amount of time they need to get this information together. They know what it takes to do that. I would like a few days to sit with them and report back on the process. Part of the question or the thinking around these statements is we don't want to come back to campus the last week of August and have proposals at GC we have not seen and then rapidly catch up. Zongo: Do they have a chance to appeal? Would the program faculty have a chance to appeal the recommendation and under what conditions? Do the faculty have rights or options? What is the process and timeline for appeal? If there is a chance for appeal, it has to be very clear. Borland: I believe the Charter does speak to that in several regards. I think GC needs to be up to speed on that and respond to it. Dr. Pauken may be able to respond to that in particular. Pauken: There would be no appeals process in the Charter. However the green sheet process and Graduate Council would look to local level conversations. Borland: I just realized that this is the week of commencement, Board meetings, etc. but I will try to get back to you in as much speed and diligence as possible.

Blair: Senator Evans... Evans: In response to Senator Zongo's question, there used to be a process. It was called academic reconfiguration and it was stricken from the Charter in December. There were processes and protections. There is really no reason I can see that it was stricken from the Academic Charter unless it was revenge. Blair: Terry Rentner, last comment. Rentner: I am the Director of the School of Media and Communications and I welcome Provost Borland's comments going back to the Deans. I would ask two things. I would recommend they rescind that recommendation. And in the spirit of shared governance and transparency, I would like to work with the Deans so we can together collect the data to make an informed decision. Blair: I don't mean to shut down conversation as this is a very important dialogue and should be continued. I wish all of you well in that process. This would be the time in the meeting when I would pass the gavel. However, Neal Carothers is giving a final and John Folkins is out of the country, so I'll hold on to the gavel. Before I entertain a motion to adjourn, I do want to engage in a few symbolic recognitions. First, on behalf of our half year Parliamentarian Pat Pauken, who continued on in that role behind the scenes, I think he deserves a big round of applause for that. We are very fortunate indeed that Terry Herman has agreed to continue as Faculty Senate Secretary. It will provide some much needed continuity and she has been a Godsend in terms of her skills. Please join me in congratulating Terry. And, finally the Faculty Senate would not survive without the efforts of Office Manager Pam Pinson. Pam will you please come down here and be recognized. Something told us Pam didn't really want a plaque. Herman: And Kris, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, SEC, and other constituent groups I'd like to thank you for your leadership, your advocacy, your great spirit in a very challenging year as you have guided us through the Academic Charter changes, other major changes, and served on our Presidential Search Committee. Blair: Thank you very much. Any issues or concerns?

ISSUES AND CONCERNS

None.

Blair: Hearing none, do we have a motion to adjourn? A Senator made the motion and another Senator seconded the motion.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Lee Herman
Secretary, Faculty Senate

