

Senate Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

August 23, 2011
2:30 – 3:30 p.m.

Senate Conference
140 McFall Center

Attendance: Ancinec; Border; Brodke; Buerger; Folkins; Herman; Jackson-May

Guests: Pauken

Special Meeting to Review Academic Charter Proposed Changes

CHAIR'S REPORT

We're on a relatively short timeline today. The President will be speaking at 4:00 p.m. with a reception at 3:30 p.m. So, we need to finish our work as soon as possible. Thank you for being here and for your efforts in this vitally important function. Restoring the Charter to a functioning document is important.

Our new members will include Ray Swisher, College of Arts & Sciences and Andy Pelletier from Music. They cannot be here today but will join us in the future. We're still working on a representative from the College of Business Administration. I want to thank David for forwarding the email over the weekend. This was a lot of work and it is so important. Rather than continuing to slice through in the way we did before, I'd like to address the points raised in David's email. We only have today's meeting and the meeting next week prior to the Faculty Senate meeting.

Border: By retaining the December 10th strike through of the following (IV. A):
"A senator who, through assignment to administrative duties, is ineligible for election to the senate may continue to serve only until the next election." I feel that we unwisely prolong the disenfranchisement of a College faculty group in the Faculty Senate.

Folkins: I'm willing to go along with David's suggestion here. We don't want to disenfranchise any particular group. To be ineligible you would need to be a Dean or an Associate Dean and these people would not last very long in their administrative positions if they did remain in the Faculty Senate. Border: I would like the original Charter language restored. Folkins: Thoughts? Group: Agreed Buerger: I think we should clarify when the next election actually is. Pauken: We could include until the next Senate election, which would indicate the Spring election all colleges have as opposed to that person's term. Border: We can leave it open so if the College wants an immediate election, they can do that.

Border: Awkward construction of the following (IV.C):
Faculty Senate action is determined by those Senators present and voting. Faculty Senate action that frames University academic policy or standards, except Charter amendments, which are covered in Article XIII, or provisions covered by any collective bargaining contract, requires a two-thirds vote of those Senators present and legally entitled to vote, excluding blanks or abstentions for approval; actions of recommendation or advice require a majority vote of those

Senators present and legally entitled to vote excluding blanks or abstentions. IV.D.1. Border: I trust this sentence construction can be improved.

Folkins: If we take out the "or provisions covered by any collective bargaining contract" - I think we should follow David's suggestion and delete that section. Bargained contracts will always supersede anything in the Charter anyway. Border: Can we go back to the standard Charter formatting?

New items of consideration:

Border: In the pre-December 10th Charter, the Faculty Senate was acknowledged to have a "consent" role. This was found in IV.C.1) just after the words "faculty's right to review, advise and consent..." The consent role was limited to IV.C.4 and XIII.B.3 and 4. Will (should?) the new charter point to times when the Senate's role is that of consent?

Folkins: I think that's fine. Did they completely remove that section? Pauken: No, I don't think they did. We're restoring most of Article XIII so I think that's fine. I do think we should be sure that the numbering is correct.

Border: In Section IV, Committee on Academic Affairs.

In the December 10th Charter changes, the Board of Trustees had the word "programmatic" inserted in numerous places (e.g. academic issues became academic programmatic issues). This has caused many difficulties, since no one seems to know what "academic programmatic" means. Can we just go back to the original language, please?

Folkins: I don't have a problem with this at all. My guess is that what they meant was not programmatic as a process but that they were program related. I'm fine with this change.

Buerger: Agreed. SEC: Agreed.

Border: Again concerning the Committee on Academic Affairs (CAA)... Can we improve the language in the section on CAA:

Current language:

(2) Review the actions of the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils (the CAA does not approve or reject any actions of the Undergraduate or Graduate Councils, but is a review and facilitating mechanism for the Faculty Senate regarding the actions of the two councils);

I propose a change that is more like that found in VII:

(2) Reviews and comments on the actions of Undergraduate and Graduate Councils to SEC for consideration by Faculty Senate (the CAA does not reject any actions of the Undergraduate or Graduate Councils, but is a review and facilitating mechanism);

Folkins: Excellent change. Everyone agreed this was awkward. Pauken: The more consistent we are from article to article the better.

Border: Again concerning the Committee on Academic Affairs... This power was removed in the December 10th Charter version:

(7) Advise the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) on disagreements over academic matters arising between Graduate and Undergraduate Councils or between colleges; ***** New language *****

Border: It would seem that this has nothing to do with wages, salaries or working conditions. Can we please put this little used section back in the Charter? It could be a very useful clause if Bowling Green State University (BGSU) has an honest problem that affects relationships between the Colleges.

Folkins: I feel that if there is a friction between Colleges that it is the responsibility of the Provost's office to arbitrate that conflict. Faculty Senate should not get in the middle of the dispute. Brodke: I tend to agree with that. Folkins: David do you want to make a case? Border: I would say this is an academic matter. Let's say that A&S in going over group requirements decides that other Colleges' course offerings are no longer in those offerings. I would not mind cooperative language here. I think there should be an opportunity for faculty to feel like they have a voice. Brodke: I'm not sure I understand this section. I thought Graduate Council voted on Graduate matters and Undergraduate Council voted on Undergraduate Council. Folkins: That is true, but sometimes something happens in one area that impacts the other.

Border: Again concerning the Committee on Academic Affairs (CAA)... The logical body to review the Provost is CAA. Prior to December 10th, CAA had this responsibility:

Discuss each year with the President the annual evaluation of the VPAA. VI.D. -- Separate discussions

Border: Can we please return to this practice? I don't care for the proposed VI.D change that would (if accepted) put the review with the SEC rather than CAA. While SEC does great work, CAA works much more closely with the Provost than SEC, two meetings per month focused on undergraduate and graduate issues plus creation of new colleges/schools/departments, etc. CAA is experienced at VPAA reviews, having done reviews of the Provost from the beginning. Past Presidents have been very welcoming to CAA and met with the whole committee to discuss our review.

Folkins: I would point out two things. First, the Provost needs to be evaluated on his or her entire performance with Faculty Senate. SEC has oversight over all of those areas. CAA could report issues that it would like reviewed. Second, the SEC changes Chair every year. That is healthier than if we have a Chair of CAA over the course of many years. Brodke: Can we be consistent with the use of verb? Pauken: There are two different sections. The discussion part is the correct procedure. Buerger: I'm not sure we need to use the word however. It shall include... Pauken: I don't mind that. There may be other howevers as we're trying to be consistent in language. Brodke: So the issue is SEC or CAA? Folkins: Yes. Border: I think we can find a middle ground. Ancinec: What if you had an ad hoc committee between SEC and CAA? You have a mix then of both groups. Buerger: I don't see why you can't do both. Folkins: Here's something we can do, the President visits CAA and SEC and gets input from both bodies.

Border: Again concerning the Committee on Academic Affairs... Is there another mechanism to create a working relationship between CAA and the new Fiscal Affairs Advisory Committee (FAAC) other than by crossing membership between the committees? I know CAA meets two times a month and asking a member to then meet with another hard working committee could get really tricky. Perhaps, someone can think of a solution that would meet the objective while keeping the workload reasonable (of course, we could always ask for a one course workload reduction).

Folkins: It really is awkward as David points out. Asking someone to serve on both of these time consuming committees is difficult. I don't have an alternative solution. Border: I'm not sure. Pauken: I'm not sure how this came up with the two groups working together. I think having people who have the "big picture" is important. Border: What we'd like to see is an analysis for SEC. What we got was very uneven. What we're looking at, as a committee, is if SEC is coming up with the same interpretation that we are. Folkins: That is important. You need individuals who can help clarify. Border: Instead of a year appointment, maybe just a semester appointment? I'm not sure if that helps. Buerger: For those of us who has 2:3 workloads that might work but for someone with a 4:4 load it doesn't work. Pauken: Maybe we can identify times when they need to talk but not all the time. Buerger: Does the time factor make a difference? Pauken: I'm not sure but I have seen this liaison role work well with Graduate Council. Border: What we've had historically is one person serving on CAA. Right now, I don't know if that was an anomaly or not. The other thing I'm wondering about is if you put someone on CAA, it's important that CAA have that information. CAA gets undergraduate work after Undergraduate Council (UC) and others have seen it. Folkins: Here's another approach. Let's not do anything with this one right now. Border: I'd prefer to leave this one cook for a bit. Folkins: Take out liaison for now.

Border: Concerning Com/Com, who really gets to decide if a University standing committee is formed, gets modified or gets deleted? In article IV, it seems that the VPAA does, yet in article V, it seems the mechanism is somewhat more involved. Can these be made to match better?

Folkins: Thoughts? Buerger: On page 19, by whom? But found the reference on page 25 too. I think the language should be more consistent. I think the language on 25 is good - and can be added in. See handout H2

Border: Council of Deans (VI.E) now is outside of Faculty Senate review. Good thing?

Folkins: I think this is a good thing. This is like the Cabinet for the Provost. It advises but it is not a decision making body. It hasn't functioned as decision-making body. Because it isn't anymore, the answer to the question is yes it is a "good thing?" Yes. Border: Do we know if the Charter still references the Council of Deans in other places? Herman: Pauken and Herman will do the search and address this. Brodke: How will this be presented to Faculty Senate? Folkins: We'll be sending out the materials to members of Faculty Senate. We'd like your advice on how to do this. We were thinking of going through the major points and present and discuss those in order. The other idea was to use the table. We felt that may be overwhelming. Buerger: Do you really think this will be settled during the first meeting? Folkins: Yes, we definitely need to. Buerger: I think these materials need to go out in advance. Folkins: Whatever is taken to Faculty Senate needs to be approved by SEC. We need to send the materials out Wednesday morning if

all goes well. The President is giving us a huge opportunity. She is willing to work with us on this. I'd rather have a repaired Charter than this existing version of the Charter. Brodke: That's a tall order. Border: If the faculty can be made aware that this is a concession, I think faculty will look very favorably on this. Buerger: The idea is to restore a functioning Charter for Academic Affairs. Folkins: How should we present this? Buerger: The Board has provided this opportunity.

Border: In the sections on creation of new schools, please change: "CAA shall review the proposal and transmit it to Faculty Senate" to "CAA shall review the proposal and transmit it to SEC for consideration by Faculty Senate" (New college creation/new department, has yet other language; they could also be changed to improve consistency).

Border: A number of us (Pat, Ellen Williams, the Amendments and Bylaws Committee) had worked to get the new college/new department/new school/academic reconfiguration Charter procedures to be more uniform and streamlined. This was done in hope of creating a flowchart that anyone who was proposing such changes could easily follow/understand all the steps. I think that was moving along until the December 10th massacre. Is there anyway we can get the work that was done incorporated into the Charter now?

Folkins: We think it was incorporated. If anyone can find places where they haven't been, we want to catch those. This is the time to streamline things. The flowchart in the past was hard to follow. Buerger: This is new territory for me. Can I see that flowchart? Folkins: The flowchart is a handy guide based upon the provisions of the Charter. It didn't change any of the rules. Border: I think what Ellen, Pat and I worked on was going to change the wording of the Charter. Buerger: I'm on Amendments and Bylaws. Border: When December 10th happened that work just vaporized.

Folkins: Thank you for your work. We'll pick this up next week at our regularly scheduled SEC meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

3:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted
Terry L. Herman, Faculty Senate Secretary