

Senate Executive Committee Minutes

September 28, 2010
2:30 – 4:30 p.m.

Senate Conference
140 McFall Center

Attendance: Basch (Substitute – Jesse Powell); Blair; Border; Brodke; Carothers; DeBard; Dinda; Folkins; Gremler; Herman; Leclair
Absence: Midden

CHAIR'S REPORT

Some of the business will provide our updates, particularly about last week's forum and the same sex domestic partner benefits that will likely be reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees this Friday. So I might reserve comments on those issues as they occur in the agenda. I am the Faculty Senate representative for the Presidential Search Committee. Thank you to those of you who attended the breakfast with Heidrick and Struggles. I thought that was a good exchange. As a member of the committee I have signed a confidentiality agreement but I can say that the committee is progressing and the search is going well. As updates are available and as I'm allowed in my role as a committee member, I will keep this group up to date.

OLD BUSINESS

Status of Flexible Tenure Policy

Blair: I heard from Faculty Welfare individually both last week and early this week. They have no additions to the modifications that were made. Based on the feedback that you all provided to the Policy last time. Amendments and Bylaws also made a minor change. They had no substantive additions to add. I take that as a very good sign. Given our committee structure and so many groups have had a hand in this Policy, it has been sufficiently vetted. I'd like to point out one minor change in particular. Amendments and Bylaws made a minor amendment. I'd like to point that out to you and then hopefully move to a motion for endorsement to bring this to the floor the at the Faculty Senate meeting next week. The actual change on B-I.C.2.b(2)(a) ii, "The probationary period may be extended for one academic year." Based on our conversation the language is now more direct. The probationary period may be extended by one year to be more emphatic. The change recommended by Amendments and Bylaws combined the two other sentences into one. "Without exception, when an extension is granted, the eighth year will be considered the terminal year." Meaning that if you were to pursue tenure and promotion in year 7, and this policy allows that instead of year 6, in the event you would not receive tenure and promotion the 8th year would be your terminal year. We had a good discussion about this Policy and the changes are reflected in this updated Policy. We clarified the approval process on page 2, B-I.C.2.b(2)(b) iii: "Final decisions about extending the probationary period and the nature of the modified duties shall be made by the Dean at his/her discretion applying the factors set out in the policy and approved by the Provost/VPAA." The final change in the clarification B-I.C.2.b(2)(c) i: "In general, the commitment is to work with a faculty member to devise a plan to extend the

probationary period for **one year** and to help him/her meet both personal and workplace demands,” instead of **one semester**. Amendments and Bylaws returned this to me yesterday with the updates. Some of the earlier language and clarification tweaks came from the Provost’s office.

DeBard: I move to endorse the Flexible Tenure Policy.

Brodke: I second that move.

Discussion: Gremler: If there is a request to extend the probationary period, I have two questions. 1) If you are granted the extension, is it for a year? 2) Can you request an extension more than one time? Blair: No. Gremler: Is there somewhere in the Policy that covers that? Blair: I don’t believe so. Folkins: On 2 on the first page, probationary can be extended for one year. Brodke: This is an extension program. If you had an FMLA issue and you apply for FMLA leave during that time, the tenure clock would stop. Folkins: We have had instances of illness where someone has had to step out for 4 – 5 years on unpaid leave. They were allowed to come back and restart the tenure clock. This is for an instance where the individual is still getting a full time paycheck. Brodke: And you still need more time. Folkins: You’re getting the full time paycheck and you haven’t changed your percentage of your time that is going to scholarship but we’re giving you an extra year due to extenuating circumstances.

Blair: There was a motion on the floor and that motion was seconded. Any further discussion? Are we ready to move to a vote? All those in favor? All indicated yes. Any opposed? No one was opposed.

Motion passed unanimously.

Blair: Given the endorsement of this Policy, as Chair I will introduce it and give some background and then ask if there is a motion to approve. Once that is approved then it will be open for discussion. If there are those of you who are comfortable speaking in favor of the proposal, and given the questions Dwayne just raised, if other people want to be there to provide clarification about that issue I think that would be helpful. I do believe there will be some who still have concerns that it’s not enough time and perhaps that might be something to consider at another time but for now, I think this is a very necessary and viable Policy. I’m glad we’re bringing it back as quickly as possible since it was introduced in May 2010. The Faculty Misconduct Policy is another matter but one we will address again in the future with Faculty Welfare and administration to see where we go from here given the work that has been done on that Policy as well.

NEW BUSINESS

Memorial Resolutions – Beth A. Casey and Edgar F. Daniels

We do have two memorial resolutions. Beth Casey was the founding director of general education here at BGSU. Dean Simon Morgan-Russell will read her resolution. Edgar Daniels will be read by Brett Holden an Assistant Professor in Theater and Film. Those will be at the beginning of the meeting that is fairly pro forma.

Domestic Partner Benefits

Blair: In regard to the Domestic Partner Benefits, I want to reiterate this for those of you who may not know it. The Domestic Partner Benefits resolution is an item of business for the Board of Trustees meeting this Friday and is expected to pass. For clarification, the way in which the policy has been written it is same sex domestic partner benefits. If you look at the original resolution that was passed by the Faculty Senate in 2005, it does define domestic partner as a same sex relationship, it is not a both gender relationship. Whether that holds in the future remains to be seen; but for the action by the Board on Friday, it is same sex domestic partner benefits. Some concern has been voiced about the ability to cover all. Looking at same sex domestic partner benefits, the administration is looking at this is a first step. Not the last conversation on the issue, but a first, necessary good step. Gremler: Does that mean that opposite gender domestic partners benefits are not on the table? Blair: It is not on the table at this time. The extent to which that becomes an issue for the Senate we can certainly discuss that, but I think it's an important clarification as we go forward. It is for same sex. Gremler: This is the first time I had heard that distinction. Blair: Other comments or concerns about that? Is this an issue to return to Faculty Welfare? Dinda: I'm a little confused. Is this a city ordinance as well or a BGSU issue? Blair: No. This has to do with recommendations through Health Wellness and Insurance and the 2005 resolution that was passed by the Faculty Senate from a task force that was charged to investigate domestic partner benefits, a comparison to benefit structures around the state. I can't speak to the Classified Staff Council, because I haven't seen it, but I know Administrative Staff Council also passed a similar resolution for domestic partner benefits at approximately the same time of the Faculty Senate resolution. This language has been around for a while and we're finally seeing it come to fruition at the Board meeting on Friday. DeBard: Part of the rationalization here is that at least in the state of Ohio in 2010, the only way you can be a domestic partner as defined as they seem to be defining it is to be same sex. If you are a domestic partner, opposite sex – to enjoy the same benefits you need to be married. In Ohio right now, you can't be married. It's not that they are endorsing not being married over being married. They are acknowledging that same sex people who presumably would want to be married if that were available cannot be so they are going to define it as them enjoying the same benefits. Gremler: That explanation might be needed by this body to explain to others. Folkins: Where are we in the process? It's already going to the Trustees on Friday. Blair: This will be an informational item on the floor of the Senate that I include in my opening remarks and perhaps Provost Borland will make in his.

Forum Feedback

Blair: For the most part, the feedback has been positive from the University community. We were able to run the forum very collegially with the BGSU-FA, administration, and AAI. Given the participants we couldn't get around the pro side seeming to have a larger voice. However, we did negotiate for the BGSU-FA to have four participants. Overall I thought it was a good event. I do want to solicit feedback from this group. Any perceptions you'd like to share? DeBard: I think Faculty Senate stood tall on this. It was well organized. The moderators did a good job. Everything came off as well put together, well organized. Folkins: I want to commend Faculty Senate for doing such a good job. I was at another University for a similar event in 1995 at a previous University that was

nothing like this. It was contentious and people were chanting and so on. The tone of this one was really very good. Having external media editors coming in and making sure the questions were ones that each group was able to address was well done. Gremler: It seemed like a political debate with real structure. Everything was so structured so the parties couldn't interact with each other. They interacted through the questions. It might have been nice to have more of that give and take. However, because it was structured, it did not become contentious. DeBard: Given the numbers, there could have been a ganging up on the BGSU-FA, not that the administration would have done that but others might have. It was informational. I brought my doctoral class in governance. They found it fascinating. Blair: We did have students ask us if they could attend. We encouraged attendance, as this was a good learning experience. One of the things I was happy about, and reinforces a philosophy I have, as a Senate we should be involved in the conversation but at the same time I think we should figure out where and when that conversation occurs. The information was made available and the Senate had a role in that.

ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Folkins: Have we had a memorial resolution for Margit Heskett? Blair: No, I'll contact her department and ask someone about that. Folkins: Rich Hebein would be a good person to talk to about this.

DeBard: I have a concern, if collective bargaining does not pass; we go on with business as usual. If on the other hand, collective bargaining passes my concern is the role that Faculty Senate will play both immediately and eventually in terms of governance of this institution. My contention has been that collective bargaining can be less than meets the eye in terms of true governance input. I find it largely a financial issue of collectively bargaining the resources available. When it comes to actual interaction with the administration, you need a Faculty Senate. You will need an administrative counsel, a classified counsel. Given that, a lot will depend on how the administration reacts. One thing that I have seen here that I have not seen before is the extent to which the administration has taken a firm stand on this issue. It has been definite. What I'm concerned about, if collective bargaining passes, and there is a noticeable chill in the air toward faculty / administration relations that could be very damaging. I worry about morale. I don't see any reason it has to be this way. Is there anything we can do to try to play out the scenario with the administration? I believe the reality is the administration will be the administration regardless of what happens. The need for good collegial relationships will remain that and I see no reason it can't be. The administration will hold the power over how they want to meet, when they want to meet, what they want to talk about. Brodke: So you're saying they could suspend the participation in SEC/VPAA, Faculty Senate? DeBard: I don't want that to happen. I think they know how this will unfold if collective bargaining passes. Folkins: The topics of bargaining are determined by the first contract. Prior to that first contract, with the exception of the formal language in the state law that salary, benefits, working conditions – with the exception of those items; my full expectation is that the administration will continue to play the same role they have always played until we have a negotiated contract. Why wouldn't they not do that? Blair: I think we have ongoing business that we need to go forward with that does impact working conditions; this Flexible Tenure Policy, the Misconduct Policy, and

parking. I have spoken with Faculty Senate leadership on other campuses, in the event we have a positive vote what is the role of a Faculty Senate with collective bargaining? We could address this in a forum in the spring that can help us navigate this process. DeBard: I believe that Faculty Senate should have a major role after the signing of that first contract. Part of what will ensure that happens is that if we both act and we are treated as partners as the administration has suggested we are in fighting against collective bargaining. There has been this veiled assumption that if you vote in collective bargaining, something will be lost. I want to disabuse people of that. It has nothing to do with the vote. The vote will be what it is. It doesn't have to be that way. Faculty collegiality and shared governance will still be a part of the culture of BGSU and we will not cede to a faculty association the governance of this organization. The collective bargaining on behalf of the people is expected. The people have voted. Blair: It's a legitimate concern. We have to fight for our efficacy, if you will. We have to figure out ways to insert ourselves into that conversation. Part of the challenge will be that even as you look at the body of Faculty Senate, there are some who are pro and some are against collective bargaining. How do we as a leadership serve as an advocate for all of our constituencies? What role can we play given those topics of negotiation? Some of those things that were covered by the Charter will be bargained. It doesn't need to be an identity crisis for Faculty Senate but I think it will necessitate an overhaul of the Charter. Other perspectives, concerns about that issue?

Powell: Mine is more of a personal concern. I'm worried about my academic experience may suffer given how much effort has been put into the process. Carothers: The last time this rolled around and came to a vote collective bargaining didn't pass by just the slightest margin. It actually settled things done; calmed everyone down. It calmed people down for a bit. Powell: Music to my ears! Carothers: We can't know anything until it happens.

Folkins: Faculty members have a value system that is very important. The question is not about our value system it's how to best protect it and play it out on both sides of this vote. I can't imagine any outcome, no matter which side wins would influence the attitude of faculty in the classroom. Powell: I didn't mean to question the integrity of any faculty member. I love my professors. Brodke: If you felt a faculty member was really not acting professionally the rest of the semester, you could go to the Chair of the department.

Blair: Other issues and concerns?

Dinda: Speaking of shared governance, over the past couple of years Graduate Student Senate (GSS) has felt we have not been heard as well as they would like. We feel we haven't been adequately invited to the table and allow our representatives to express the concerns that graduate students are facing. Concerns with policy shifts or benefit shifts before they become policy. For example, print responsibly caught us all by surprise. We voiced our concerns about graduate students who had to print for instructional use or for their research at their own costs. We expressed these concerns early on, we requested meetings in the middle of the semester, and then by the end of the semester things were pretty much a done deal. We thought we were discussing this issue and then it was a done deal. We were told that parking was going to be removed as a benefit for graduate students. We were going to be given a one hundred dollar increase in base pay to offset

this change. We thought it was being discussed. It wasn't something that would be acted upon. In the second to last general assembly we were told not only were we being charged the hundred dollars, but a late fee would be assessed soon and no one saw the increase in base pay. Again we thought this was just a discussion and found we were totally out of the loop. We have this concern. As the University has restructured based on the economic shortfall and other initiatives, GSS is feeling even more uneasy that a hammer will be brought to us. We don't know if we'll have an ability to protect our interests. We've written a letter to the Board of Trustees. Blair: I'll be happy to forward this to the SEC. Dinda: I'd appreciate that. GSS would like to invite you to provide us with a letter of support in our concerns. The Undergraduate Student Senate has also written a letter of support. We could use all the support we can get. Brodke: Does anyone know the proportion of graduate students who are teaching? Blair: It's hard to say. The Colleges don't even necessarily have this information. This data are being gathered right now. I don't think there is a clear-cut picture of who is doing what. Brodke: That's amazing. They are either getting money or they are not. Folkins: You should be able to go to the Graduate College records to see who are getting assistantships. The relationship will be different between masters only programs and doctoral programs. Brodke: Research assistants also need to print as part of their assistantship. Dinda: I've give those examples of what's happened in the past where shared governance didn't work. We want the shared governance process to work. DeBard: To me the big issue that is looming is fee waivers for graduate students as Dr. Borland indicated when we met last. The idea is that this is where a lot of input is needed. I don't want the Chief Financial Officer, Chief Enrollment Officer, or Chief University Counsel making this decision for us. Graduate programs are the source of a lot of expenditures and in tough economic times, it can be a hard sell. Student input is of vital importance over the next year or two as we go through these changing times. I think you're bringing up something important. Blair: There's no doubt that graduate students are particularly vulnerable right now as there is a push for more fee paying students, a push to reduce costs, some of the language of graduate programs these days is that they are simply too expensive to run. How do graduate students fare, both in the recruitment of new graduate students, but in the continuing support and success of current graduate students. That is very much an academic issue that might be worth conversation with CAA to determine what role the Senate should play in advocating for our students. Stipends across campus might be better in some areas than others but they are notoriously bad; that, coupled with diminished fee waiver opportunities, really does put graduate students in a very vulnerable position. We're very worried. Brodke: And in these difficult economic times, it's not like students can just go get a job anywhere. Blair: There is a notion that graduate students can automatically pay their own way, even a portion of their fees. And they can't. Carothers: It's worse than that. It's utterly misguided. We have this sort of schizophrenia about graduate students on campus. In the Math Department we think of you, graduate students, as our children, our protégés and colleagues. Colleagues that don't get any benefits... We see you as our partners; whereas the administration views you in another light... just yet another student who should be paying fees. The misguided part is that if you had a better program you could get fee-paying students. It just isn't true. Brodke: It's almost the reverse. How much research activity and grants that students are involved in that yield results to the University. Blair: Students are often instructors of records and other important roles and

we may want to consider that in our support of GSS. DeBard: What kind of representation do you have on Graduate Council? Dinda: Myself and one other person. DeBard: Keep in mind that Provost Borland did bring up the idea that Graduate Council was going to function as the review committee for some strategic plan for graduate education. Input into that process will be truly essential. You need to be in the room where the policies are being formulated. Dinda: Yes, that's the heart of what we're asking for. Let us in the room before policies are made. Waiting for a budget or waiting for the other shoe to drop is not shared governance. We work it out together. Blair: The question becomes how do we help you in this process? Carothers: Do you have representation on the Faculty Senate Budget Committee (FSBC)? Dinda: Yes. DeBard: What I'd suggest is that we aren't in a position today to endorse having not seen the letter but we would in the future. We can endorse the letter – take this seriously. Blair: Other issues and concerns? LeClair: Noted a couple of editorial issues in one of the memorial resolutions. Blair will contact the author about the edits. Blair: Any other general concerns? Brodke: Just a minor one. Is there any way we can get a Firelands banner for the Chart Room? I'm sure it will come up again. Blair: Those banners are tied to admissions. Admissions at Firelands happens at Firelands. Herman: You'll find that information in the Senate minutes. I was informed about the purpose of the banners after the meeting. Folkins: Yes, this room is used every day at 10:00 and 2:00, or almost every day for groups of prospective incoming students. They're all first year students. That's one of the constant uses of that room. I think the room should be fixed up and spiffed up more than it has been. Brodke: Thanks for clearing that up. Blair: We can tell Phil if he does bring it up again. Brodke: I'll tell him too. Blair: Anything else? LeClair: Yes, just one more thing. After the Presidential search breakfast I spoke with Ellen and she said I was the first person who had spoken to her about the strengths of the College of Musical Arts. In terms of attracting applicants it would be great if we could highlight the Arts, the Wolfe Center. The Arts are a strong feature of this campus. Blair: I've seen the institutional profile. I'm fairly certain it refers to the Centers for Excellence, and the Wolfe Center. I do believe there was an attempt by the search firm to draft the institutional profile in ways that highlighted the strengths in each College. Folkins: The Centers for Excellence encompass most groups on campus. In this way they can avoid the inevitable you highlighted this group but not that one. Going back to those existing documents you stay above that. Blair: It's in no way exclusionary. They tried and they listened. They did discuss anything that might not have been foregrounded as specifically. Folkins: There are two things... the position description then there's the one page announcement. It's pretty generic and brief but the position description goes ten pages or more and you get more of a flavor. Any serious candidate will look at that document. Blair: Any other questions? If not, is there a motion to adjourn?

SENATE AGENDA

- Memorial Resolution – Beth A. Casey and Edgar F. Daniels
- Flexible Tenure Policy

ADJOURNMENT

Brodke moved and LeClair seconded we adjourn.

3:35 p.m.