

Senate Executive Committee Minutes

August 31, 2010
2:30 – 4:30 p.m.

Senate Conference
140 McFall Center

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

Absence: Gremler

Guests: CUE Representatives: Neal Jesse, Tim Messer-Kruse

Chair's Report

We will be deviating from our standard agenda to allow Neal Jesse to report out on where CUE is in its process. The CUE committee report will be received on the floor of Senate next week (9/7/2010). The CUE ad hoc Senate committee is ready to disband and go forward with an implementation committee.

New Business

The CUE Report

Jesse: The CUE committee was formed 18 months ago to pursue the revision of general education at BGSU, to revise the undergraduate curriculum. The CUE Committee's work produced 3 documents that can be found on the CUE site at <http://www.bgsu.edu/cue/page83887.html>. The three documents include the full report (69 pages) including research upon which recommendations are based; the proposed catalog copy; and the flyer.

A model that includes over 250 general education courses just doesn't work for most students – they won't see the overlap or make the connections. The model the CUE Committee has chosen is purposeful. Students can't avoid seeing that the skills overlap. The model includes nine credit hours of foundation, including general studies writing. Students won't see any difference in that aspect. Math is now a requirement in general education. Nine credit hours of transition will replace the current BGex 1000 course. The most exciting parts of the CUE model include the nine credit hours inquiry sequence at the end of the freshman year or beginning of the sophomore year. The inquiry sequence includes common themes and broad strokes (for instance sustainability). The problem-solving sequence follows with three four credit hour classes (12 credits) to meet transfer requirements in the state of Ohio. The model includes two separate ways to complete the general education requirement - interdisciplinary or applied. A global issues course is required.

An increase in credits – up to 39 credits. For some specializations the Implementation Committee may need to work with departments and programs to accommodate these changes seamlessly. A representative team from the CUE Committee will report next week at Faculty Senate (09/07/2010). The original committee will be discharged as the implementation phase begins. An implementation committee will be made up primarily of

members of CUE or individuals who have served on BG Perspective (BGP). The Implementation Committee will focus on the necessary curriculum modifications, including blue sheeting of courses. Other members will also be included – Student Affairs to focus on co-curricular, Faculty Senate, graduate and undergraduate students to ensure faculty buy-in. Sub-committees will be devolved out of that main committee and will be curriculum driven. Each sub-committee will feature one or two members from the original CUE committee and include individuals from faculty and staff based on area of expertise to shape the content in that course.

Jesse addressed questions from the SEC.

Brodke: It seems the problem-solving sequence will be inter-disciplinary courses that must be created. Math literacy at Firelands is coming back and we are starting over. I'm concerned about what will constitute and meet that math literacy requirement. Jesse: Not sure about Firelands representation. But,

Brodke: What about for an Associate's Degrees? Jesse: We're not sure about that yet. This is something the sub-committee will work out. If a program has 3000 level courses, if that course meets those requirements they won't need that particular course. These things are all on the table and have been considered for some time.

DeBard: Does this change amount to inter-disciplinary studies? What has defeated this laudable endeavor in previous attempts was the faculty who would teach these courses. Who are they? Jesse: An example would be an xPOL course owned by general education. The faculty and content would come from Political Science. The department would be aware of the enrollments, etc. The problem solving will be more challenging and will require perhaps team teaching and faculty professional development. We will provide incentives for faculty to create classes they want to teach as part of this process. The faculty come up with the problem, submit a proposal... this is what I'd like to teach and with whom... and include the learning outcomes. The faculty will want to teach these courses because they had a hand in shaping them. Impact staffing in departments, impact risk and rewards structures... these all have far-reaching implications. It's the reverse of the BGx model.

Folkins: We still need to worry about the numbers. Has anyone done a quantitative gap analysis? How many courses/seats do we need? Messer-Kruse: Yes, that work is underway right now. Folkins: Thinking of an ideal teaching load – that is something we do within the department not outside. This impacts departments and department chairs. Jesse: Some are majors who need to take those classes. It's a complicated picture and we are working on it. Folkins: Some of these introductory courses are also used to recruit majors. Jesse: That has been said early and often. The XSoc or XPsych or XWhatever... provides that type of ownership.

Border: Is this the total number of courses that will go up? Jesse: Not necessarily, that's why we're getting rid of some of the BGX courses. It's possible the number of total courses may increase. They are removing the restriction on all small sections being offered in the

Fall – we can go from 25 students to 80 students again. That’s where the implementation committee comes into this process.

Blair: What is a viable timetable? Where will we be in Fall 2011? Kruse: We hope to be able to implement the Connecting the Undergraduate Experience inquiry sequence with at least a portion of the incoming class. We plan to be ready to go with those foundation courses in the Fall 2011 along with a significant number of inquiry courses. By year two the problem solving courses will be added.

Carothers: I’m concerned about the hidden costs. Some of these courses are meant to carry on throughout the student’s career. One price that will be paid... there will be a lot of informal consultation to help prepare all of these artifacts that doesn’t show up here. There are pitfalls with some of these themes. If those themes change too often you impose a huge overhead in preparation. A faculty member could have worked for two years to get a course ready and the theme has fallen out of favor; he or she is back to the drawing board.

Messer-Kruse: Themes could be connected to the Centers of Excellence for added stability. Jesse: The problem-solving courses do not have a theme.

Carothers: As individuals in power change their minds or directions, we create a problem of obsolete courses. The math requirement robs our technology and other students of flexibility. Jesse: That was one of the critiques we heard early on; we have accommodated that in the plan. Certain combinations might have been easier in the past than they will be now.

Folkins: I’d like to provide an historical overview of the revamp of general education. You need to win the hearts of the faculty who have to make major time commitments and course development changes. You need big motivators. What are those? Kruse: Funds are available for faculty development. The implementation committee will be considering this. They will re-examine tenure and promotion guidelines. The professional development plan will use some of the resources we already have on campus, like the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) and other areas that foster discussion. We’re open to suggestions – it’s not at all clear what the best way forward might be.

Blair: Who’s in the queue for CUE? It needs a group who says Yeah! We can do this. Where is your buy-in?

Jesse: We have been discussing this with CTL. Who would like to get these first courses going? They would like broad participation. Folkins: That’s why that gap analysis is important.

Brodke: At Firelands, finding a collaborator is not as easy, nor is finding the same kinds of collaborative relationships.

Carothers: Special assignments will be an issue; now I have to develop and teach this class... My tenure is at risk because now I can't focus on my specialization. You might be wise to have a dog and pony show that addresses issues like this with departments.

Brodke: How will Firelands work with this department structure?

DeBard: When it comes to general education the "How?" is more important than the "What?" How will you achieve the why? Can you pull this off? If you're going from 25 to 80 students in a writing class... well adjustments have to be made. What will we have to do to make this come alive in the classroom for students?

Letter from the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U).

Jesse: All of these issues are why CUE took so long in this process. We know others have been tripped up in the implementation stage. We'll have to be flexible and... it has to be real. We can't just move the deck chairs.

Blair: The CUE committee is in fact an ad hoc Faculty Senate committee. The implementation committee formation will be based on guidelines from the Academic Charter.

Leclair: Can we find others who failed in their implementation? Can we avoid their mistakes? Jesse: Kent State failed because they didn't have the buy-in. They didn't involve Faculty Senate. Folkins: Buy-in has to include faculty, departments, and convince people that this is better than what we had. Leclair: You may want to have something like "Connecting the Faculty Experience" – get chairs working with you. Create as much receptiveness as possible.

Chair's Report:

Blair reported out on meeting with Sean Fitzgerald, General Counsel. The discussion centered on the impact of unionization and the collective bargaining vote. If that vote is positive, how do we proceed as Faculty Senate?

Carothers: That may or may not be apparent. It could take as many as three years to implement collective bargaining. What happens in the meantime is unclear.

Folkins: The way it worked in Iowa – nothing was the domain of the Union until it was in a ratified contract. Therefore, during the first negotiation process each side puts something on the table. The administration can decide what goes in the negotiations.

DeBard: I remember the last time BGSU went through a collective bargaining vote. The day after the vote the Academic Charter is not null and void. BGSU administration and faculty, with the ultimate approval of the Board of Trustees, will have the right to fashion the relationship they want regardless of the Union. I maintain there is a culture in this institution of shared governance and that won't change.

Blair: Our purpose here today is not to debate the pros and cons of collective bargaining but to determine what we should do in the Faculty Senate as we go forward. Folkins: Faculty and Faculty Senate want to know what the effect of Unionization is on the Faculty Senate and its role. I don't think we should change the agenda... let's continue on in our current path.

Folkins: Is there any potential for the Faculty Senate to help inform the faculty about how the process works. What will be the effect on BGSU with a Union in place? Who should be the source of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on union issues? Should we have a forum later this fall? How are collective bargaining and the Faculty Senate interacting/working at other institutions? Blair will contact the chairs of those Faculty Senates. Folkins: It's a role of Faculty Senate to provide this information. How does collective bargaining impact Faculty Senate?

Old Business

Status of Flexible Tenure Policy

The Flexible Tenure Policy was pretty close to passing the Senate. The only sticking point was language – how much time would actually be allowed.

Status of Faculty Misconduct Policy

Conduct is always a touchy issue and may take more time. We can come back to this one. Having a process that actually involves faculty would be viewed as a good thing. The sticking point in the Faculty Misconduct Policy was the lack of clarity in the appeals process. With some word-smithing this Policy could be returned to the floor of the Senate.

Parking Budget/Fee

The May meeting presentation by Art Samel, Chair of the Parking Advisory Committee led to the need for clarification about whether a change in funding structures was in the proposal or the policy stage. The focus of this report was to address the financial support for parking lots and the proposed imposed implementation fee structure. In this implementation, dollars, sufficient to cover the parking fee, would be moved to faculty and others and then taken back in the form of a parking fee. This proposal should be coming forward from Vice President Stoll's office to the Faculty Senate Budget Committee (FSBC) and Faculty Welfare. Parking has been a benefit on this campus and needs to be reviewed by the appropriate constituent groups. Part of the issue for Faculty Senate is if we get the necessary information early enough to enable us to act on them. Faculty are not being charged at this time, and it may be years before any actual payment will come from the faculty for parking.

SEC Appointments to Committee on Professional Affairs

SEC is required to make two appointments to Professional Affairs. We don't have to decide this today, but we need to have it on our radar. And, we do want to make this appointment soon. Professional Affairs is a liaison group between what's happening in Columbus and here at our University. Chair Geoff Howes indicated the committee has not yet convened for the year. A reminder will be sent in a couple days to see if anyone is interested. If you are interested in being a member of Professional Affairs you can leave the information with

Neal, Terry, or Pam. Please get the approval of anyone you'd like to include on the list of potential nominees before sharing that information.

Student Attendance Policy (USG & GSS)

An appeals process should be in place for students who are missing classes for all the right reasons... athletics, conferences, etc. Students should have the opportunity to engage in these types of activities and not to be penalized academically. The USG and GSS have drafted a proposal to consider some type of appeals process. An ad hoc committee could be formed to hear these cases. This would be a proposed Charter Amendment.

Blair: Issues for SEC, how to proceed? Who is able to propose a Charter Amendment? Students are not eligible to propose Charter Amendments. As a result Blair suggested this is a Committee on Academic Affairs (CAA) issue. This would be a CAA issue before it is an SEC issue. Blair proposed that the individual serving on CAA work with USG and GSS on this matter. CAA will then bring forward the proposal.

Folkins: We already have reasons for legitimate student absences in the Charter. Overruling the professor in the classroom probably won't go anywhere.

DeBard: I think you need to eliminate the word "appeal", perhaps in favor of consideration to allow, between the faculty member and the student – and the student will always come to the professor BEFORE the fact, not after the absence has occurred. Most times faculty members understand about legitimate absences – before the fact. After the fact it comes off as an excuse. The appeal idea supersedes the faculty decision.

Dinda: Presented well in advance.

Carothers: A student shows up and announces, "My coach says I'll be missing these 12 days, take it or leave it." If the professor has tests scheduled during those times this is a burden on that professor, as he or she must develop makeup tests, etc.

Dinda: Right and that would make sense that the student should move to another section if that were the case. But, if it's just one time and the faculty won't accommodate the student... We just want students to have another venue to air the grievance.

Folkins: The grading issue belongs to the instructor. A minor change to the Charter language that we want consideration of ABC and also DE and F. We have provisions for weather, military service, athletics, and others could be added. CAA will help you with this... they will want to err on the side of explicitness.

Faculty Climate Survey

This is an information item and query. Faculty Climate. Last year the Provost asked the Faculty Senate to work with the IDEAL group who are collecting data for an NSF project they are involved in, particularly for women in the Sciences. The survey was sent out through Bill Knight's office. The handout is the executive summary from Bill Knight for our

review and possible action at a future SEC meeting. This executive summary will also go to the Faculty Welfare Committee. At a minimum of every five years, Faculty Welfare is charged with developing a report on faculty welfare. Please review this data so we can discuss any future issues and/or forums as a result at future meetings. What relative merit this data might have?

DeBard: The summary reveals really very little breakdown between men and women. I see a couple of comments in that regard but in terms of comparative data from 2004 – 2010, no break down of men and women... just not sure what IDEAL will do with this. Blair: That's not our charge.

Blair: We could invite Bill Knight to debrief us on this, either with Faculty Welfare or with us. IDEAL did seek us out for assistance. The identifying features could get so narrow an individual might be able to be identified.

Charter Review

Blair: A Charter review is in order based on a conversation with Becca Ferguson that revealed some elements in the Charter are out of date and/or out of compliance. We could consider some form of ad hoc committee from Amendments and By Laws, SEC, HR and other appropriate constituencies to review the Charter (issues like FMLA). For instance, language for a recent Charter amendment allowing NTTF to serve on Faculty Senate is not found throughout the Charter. Some of the changes will be short term, others long term. We'll discuss this with President Cartwright on Friday. Some of it is messy – it needs to be as up to date and clear as possible.

DeBard: Approach this from compliance versus non-compliance perspective. Fuzzy language is tougher to approach. If we're not compliant with the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA) we need to take care of that. It's a really big job.

Blair: We may need to do that really big job anyway through a smaller sub-committee or ad hoc group.

Folkins: I would suggest Amendments and By Laws contact various offices around campus to see if they are aware of any place the Charter is out of compliance.

Issues and Concerns

None

Senate Agenda

- CUE Presentation – Neal Jesse, Paul Moore, and Deborah Wooldridge

Adjournment

4:30 p.m.