

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

September 6, 2011
2:30 – 4:30 P.M.

Assembly Room
McFall Center

(A Faculty Senate Reception was held in the McFall Gallery from 1:30 – 2:30 to welcome new Senators.)

CALL TO ORDER

Chair John Folkins called the meeting to order and asked the secretary to call the roll.

ROLL CALL

Secretary Terry Herman called the roll.

Absent: Muthusamy; Sullivan; Zongo

The Secretary announced that there was a quorum.

COMMUNICATIONS

Chair of the Faculty Senate

Chair John Folkins offered the following report to Faculty Senate:

We will begin communications with the report from the Chair of the Faculty Senate.

I am John Folkins. Neal Carothers served as Vice Chair/Chair Elect last year. However, Neal decided to retire in May and so I was moved to Chair. One of our first items of business today will be to elect a new Vice Chair/Chair Elect. One of the duties to the Senate Chair is to appoint a Parliamentarian. I have asked Senator David Border to be Parliamentarian and he has accepted. I am sure he will do a great job. It has been a busy summer for the Senate. Terry Herman, Secretary, and I have worked hard. It will be good to get a Vice Chair/Chair Elect. I will explain more of what was done this summer when we get to the agenda item on Charter Changes.

This is a new year, with new opportunities:

- New President, new Provost, new Dean of Students, five new academic deans
- 62 new tenure track faculty members
- 4639 new students
- Six new buildings

Indeed, there are new players, new facilities, and new opportunities.

Years ago, Sidney Ribeau told me that when I give a talk, I must not give comparisons to something that was long ago and far away—I must keep it to the here and now.

That is why I want to begin with the mediaeval universities in the 13th century, and one of my favorite books: *The Rise of Universities* by Charles Homer Haskins. In those first universities, at Paris and Bologna, what is interesting to me was that there was complete shared governance even at the dawning of our university heritage. There was no administration to speak of, except for one deanship for each college that rotated regularly among faculty members. Thus the faculty shared all aspects of governance. However, that said, it should also be mentioned that there was also: no university budget, no buildings, no library, and no dedicated classrooms... Faculty members charged for courses by collecting money at the door before a lecture. However, Haskins also makes it clear that, even though there was little to no

administration—there were still contentious times—He refers to the “tyranny of one’s next door neighbor.”

Why am I mentioning this? It is because BGSU has a long history of shared faculty governance. This is illustrated by our Charter and our long-term involvement of faculty members in academic issues. I mentioned before that this is a new time, with many new players at the university. The new President and Provost have both gone out of their way to demonstrate their commitment to the ideals of shared governance. There is no better reflection of that than their desire to have the Senate rebuild the Charter.

I’d like to now introduce our President, Dr. Mary Ellen Mazey, for her first remarks at a meeting of the BGSU Faculty Senate. I might mention that even before she arrived, President Mazey has worked hard to include the Senate and Senate representation at every opportunity.

President

President Mary Ellen Mazey offered the following report to Faculty Senate:

Thank you. I’m so pleased to be here with you today and to welcome you all to a new school year. I hope this will be a very productive year for all of us as we go forward and as we take BGSU forward not just this year but well into the future. At the state level, I think the one topic we’ll hear a great deal about this coming year is the Enterprise University. The Inter University Council (IUC) will be meeting on a regular basis on this issue. We will be a part of those discussions and putting forth our ideas to the Ohio Legislature in terms of this proposal. The state will lift a number of mandates that have in the past cost us more than they should through bureaucratic mandates. If they do lift these mandates, they want to create a merit scholarship fund. In concept, I think we’d all agree with that but who is going to fund the merit scholarship fund? Right now, the proposals have that coming out of our subsidy from the state. We do not want a cut in our subsidy. There are many other institutions in the state that agree with us. We’ll continue to meet on this important issue. We’ll try to hold a forum in the next month or so for faculty all across campus and others who are interested in the Enterprise University. We should at least wait until we get through some of this at the IUC. At the state level this is likely the most critical issue we will be addressing this year.

As for the new freshman class, we should be so pleased. It is a large class. 15% of those students are from out of state, 22% are students of color, 3.2 average grade point average, and 22 ACT score. We are pleased to welcome the freshman class. As the Interim Provost will talk about in a few minutes as part of strategic planning, retention will be one of our most important issues. As our Vice President for Enrollment Management says, “Retention, retention, retention.” We want these students to be a success. It’s also important in our overall ranking in News and World Report.

It is an exciting time to be on campus with all the new construction on campus. I can’t take any credit for it, the credit all goes to everyone who has been here before. Two hundred and fifty million dollars worth of new buildings being opened including the Stroh Center, the Wolfe Center for the Arts, new dining facilities, and new residence halls. We will be taking to the Board of Trustees (BoT) at their October meeting the proposal to start the academic master plan renovations. That proposal will be for the planning and design for a little over a hundred million dollars for the renovations and new designs for the academic buildings. We’re very excited about that. The BoT was very receptive to this idea at the August retreat.

In the two months I’ve been here we’ve been working on a number of items. I’ve worked with the leadership and others on strategic planning issues from the undergraduate curriculum revisions that you’ve been working on long before I arrived and I commend you for that. We’ve reviewed the graduate enrollment and we’ll be working on a graduate strategic plan. I just mentioned retention, which is very important. External funding will be important. If we want to be an Enterprise University there will be criteria we have to meet in terms of external funding. I mentioned facilities and the master plan – another important item in the strategic plan. We’re working on the first faculty contract. The next capital campaign is very important because all public universities all across the country will be more and more

dependent upon those private dollars. Branding and marketing are important, as is internationalization. We want to build our reputation in the area, the state, and across the world. The final issue I have here is the Charter. I know you're going to be working on that today. I commend you for that. When I interviewed I heard over and over about the Charter issues and what had taken place over the last year. I talked to the BoT and they are receptive to us bringing back Charter changes to the October meeting. I want to commend Pat Pauken. He has worked on this, he has been a member of this body, and he has been a member of the Faculty Senate. He has worked with the Charter before and he has taken the lead on working on these revisions being proposed to the Charter. I am anxious to hear the discussion today. Finally, I want to thank all of you for what you do everyday to build this institution. I really do look forward to working with each of you to build BGSU's future. Thank you very much.

Folkins: Thank you President Mazey. I'd like to introduce our Interim Provost Rodney Rogers for his remarks to Faculty Senate.

Provost/VPAA

Provost Rodney Rogers offered the following report to Faculty Senate:

Thank you very much. I am honored to serve as Interim Provost. I'm looking forward to working on a couple of specific initiatives in consultation with the Dean's Council, Faculty Senate, CAA and others. Specifically, we want to ensure that we've created the very best proposal with respect to the undergraduate educational experience at BGSU. We must ensure that we deliver a rigorous, coherent, integrated approach to the undergraduate educational experience. We've been working on this for several years and have reviewed a variety of different proposals. Faculty will be receiving an email describing this further but I wanted you to be among the first to hear of our strategy to ensure that we have a more complete engagement of the faculty, Chairs and Deans in this process. This summer there has been a development task force working on CUE. Several members of that task force sit on the Senate as well. They have spent a great deal of time addressing the specific concerns raised over the past year. They are now writing a version 2.0 proposal based on these concerns That proposal will come to the Office of the Provost and the Dean's Council, after which it will be sent to the Deans. The Deans will facilitate a discussion with Chairs and faculty with respect to the implication of this recommendation. Our hope is that this will have engaged the entire faculty who are focused on undergraduate education. This process should be completed by the end of fall term. I look forward to providing updates to the Senate. The Committee on Academic Affairs (CAA) and Undergraduate Council (UC) will also be engaged in this process. At the end of the fall term, we hope to have all of the colleges' comments, criticisms, and recommendations. This information will allow us to continuously improve the proposal. We must have a full range of engagement with regard to the proposal to improve the undergraduate educational experience at BGSU. We do a great deal of things very well within our undergraduate educational experience, but we have the opportunity to make our programs even better.

Lastly, I want to mention another important imperative for Academic Affairs. This imperative is retaining our undergraduate students. We've had great success bringing students to BGSU with some large freshman classes in the last couple of years. Our undergraduate retention rate will drop to 72% this fall. That is a decrease of 4 points from last year. This is a concern for all of us. We need to understand the causes and ensure when students come to BGSU they will be successful and stay to complete their education at BGSU. A taskforce has been formed to begin to investigate this issue. As Chair of Faculty Senate, John Folkins serves as a member of this task force Of course we're only at the beginning stages but I will be providing updates as we understand this issue more clearly and potential strategies to increase our retention rate.

Other initiatives that we will be addressing include graduate education, research support, centers of excellence, strategic planning, and the alignment of resources to support the plans.

I would like to mention one final item. On October 10, 11, and 12 the Office of Multicultural Affairs and the Office of the Provost will be sponsoring a three-day diversity workshop, The National Coalition

Building Institute. It is a nationally recognized approach to having discussions around inclusion and diversity. More information will be sent to you tomorrow in an official email. I would encourage you to attend this workshop. We have also encouraged each of the Deans to identify a couple of people in their areas to attend. Hope to see many of you at that workshop as well. Thank you.

Folkins: Thank you Interim Provost Rogers. At the suggestion of the SEC, I would like to reorder the agenda to New Business: Audience Response Devices; Election of the Vice Chair/Chair Elect; and Charter Changes. Each of these issues is of such importance that we should get this process under way now. We will have the rest of the reports later. Do I hear any objection to reordering the agenda? None noted. Thank you.

NEW BUSINESS

- Audience Response Devices – Kim Fleshman, Program Coordinator, ITS
- Election of Vice Chair/Chair Elect
- Charter Changes

Folkins: I am pleased that we have a new system for voting on Senate motions and we will be using it for the next two agenda items. The Audience Response Devices that you have are a great addition. This was the suggestion by President Mazey, and I would like to give her credit for suggesting this. However, if we have problems with them, it is not her fault but mine. Terry Herman, Faculty Senate Secretary, will now explain our system of Audience Response Devices. Special thanks to Terry Herman, Kim Fleshman from ITS's Academic Resource Center, and Joe Decker our audiovisual support person for their great work on this.

Herman: The slides that you see explain how to set the channel. I went through each of the clickers and set them to channel 41. We're all on 41 so we're set to go. I also want to tell you that these were purchased for the Faculty Senate but we'll only need them once a month. If you'd like to check them out for classroom use, Kim Fleshman will explain how that is done.

Fleshman: I am the manager of the Academic Resource Center located in 103 Olscamp Hall. If you need to borrow clickers we have several kits that can be borrowed. Most sets can be borrowed for six weeks at a time but this set, because the Senate will use it once a month, would be more limited. Feel free to see me if you have questions.

Herman: We want to be sure the clickers work so I have a slide with some BGSU trivia to test them before an election. As you cast your votes you can see the response numbers rising. They worked. Let's just hope they work as well for the next vote!

Folkins: Does anyone have any questions at all? Now we will have the election of Vice Chair/Chair Elect of the Faculty Senate. There was only one nomination, Mark Earley from the College of Education and Human Development. You should have a biographical sketch for Professor Earley. Does anyone want one, but doesn't have one? Does anyone have any questions or concerns? Are you ready to vote? Hearing no objection, the vote was taken. If you want to abstain, don't vote. Earley was elected Vice Chair/Chair Elect. Congratulations Professor Earley. Could we ask you to come up and sit in the Vice Chair/Chair Elects seat? I'm sure Mark will do an excellent job.

Folkins: Thank you. We'll move on to the Charter changes next. I'd like to provide some background first. There were significant Charter changes on December 10, 2010. These included both mandatory topics of bargaining and other topics.

- President Mazey met with Kris Blair and me before she even began as President. She asked what we could do to work together, and Kris and I suggested restoring the sections of the Charter that were not mandatory topics of bargaining. She was supportive.

- Kris and I agreed that, as we were without Charter protections in a number of areas, that it was important for the Senate to move as quickly as possible. In further discussions during the summer, President Mazey explained to me that it was important for us to move quickly in getting the charter changes done, as that was important from her end too. She assigned Pat Pauken, as Vice Provost for Governance and Faculty Relations, in his role as liaison to the university's governance groups, to work with us so that the Faculty Senate would be working jointly with the administration.
- According to the Charter, the Senate officers are supposed to handle Senate business during the summer and to call SEC meetings in unusual circumstances. We thought this was unusual and we had two SEC meetings at the end of the summer/beginning of the school year. This was prior to our regularly scheduled SEC meeting last week. All in all, the SEC has met three times to discuss reintroducing sections back into the Charter.
- Also, please note that there are a lot of changes. We would like to have an open discussion; however, with the time available I would urge you to keep the discussion to changes that make a substantive difference. The Amendments and Bylaws Committee has agreed to look over the proposal carefully if it is passed. They will want your input in terms of stylistic issues or efforts to be consistent and uniform, as well as to use proper Charter language. Please forward any stylistic suggestions you may have to Pam Pinson at the Faculty Senate office and she will forward them to Erin Labbie, the Chair of Amendments and Bylaws.

Two SEC members are here to introduce the Charter changes we are proposing. I would like to introduce Judith Jackson May and Michelle Brodke. Brodke: Good afternoon. I would like to move that the Senate accept the amendments in the Charter. These are the amendments that came with the minutes. Keil: I second the motion. Brodke: I would like to explain that Part A was the original academic Charter covering faculty governance, Part B used to be a separate handbook for faculty and was made a part of the Charter in the 1990s. All of the changes you received were for Part A. No changes were made to Part B as they address mandatory topics of bargaining such as wages, benefits, and working conditions. Also, sections to Part A have been left out as they are mandatory topics of bargaining, including the Faculty Welfare Committee and the Faculty Personnel and Conciliation Committee. Jackson-May: For those of you who may not have had time to peruse this document, I want to say I have spent more time with this document than I really would care to. What you have outlines the proposed revisions and changes. However, none of these changes radically change the pre-December Charter. Attempts have been made to bring the document into line with recent past practice. The changes simplify procedures, make them more flexible, and apply more directly to the full range of issues for Senate in the future. Thank you.

Thank you Michelle and Judy. We're now going to address the four major categories related to the Charter changes as in your agenda. I'd like us to structure our discussion in that order.

- Faculty Senate membership, including expanding eligibility for Senate membership (III.C., IV.A) and ex officio membership (IV.A and F) and Senate officer incentives (IV.D.2.b)(as passed by Senate last spring.)
- Faculty Senate Committees: Establish Fiscal Affairs Advisory Committee (IV.F.6) and Administration of University Standing Committees (IV).
- Faculty participation restored in selection and review of administrators (VPAA, VI; Graduate Dean, VIII; Undergraduate Dean, IX; School Director; X; and Department Chair, XI).
- Academic reconfiguration restored (XIV) and creation of new programs, departments, schools, and colleges and academic reconfiguration.

Folkins: The first topic for consideration is Faculty Senate membership, including expanding eligibility for Senate membership (III.C., IV.A) and ex officio membership (IV.A and F) and Senate officer incentives (IV.D.2.b)(as passed by Senate last spring.) This brings the Faculty Senate back in line before

December 10th. There have been many people actively involved in Faculty Senate over the years who as a Chair or School Director did not hold more than a 50% administrative position. I'd like to open it up for discussion from the floor.

Meek: Given that this was taken out of the Charter is it actually an amendment at this point? Folkins: Yes. It's being put back into the Charter. Meek: We are amending something that doesn't exist then. Folkins: The Charter exists we are putting sections back in so technically this is a Charter amendment. Thank you. Archer: I'd like to make a comment – and then I have a few questions that are more global than this set of changes that are before the Senate membership. I'm wondering if we could get some answers about the process that you suggested. First, I want to commend the new administration, President Mazey, for recognizing that the unilateral changes that were made to the Charter by the BoT were extensive and unilateral. There were things that were removed that probably should not have been removed so I commend you all for working to restore the Charter. I do have a few questions. First of all I understand this was done over the summer – in an emergency setting, which suggests to me that no other committee on FS who had actually reviewed this. Having served on FS committees I know several levels of committees to review changes. The only committee who considered this was the SEC. Is that a correct assessment of how these changes came to be? Second, I don't know about everyone else, I received these on Wednesday afternoon and then we had a holiday weekend. We only had a few days to absorb and reflect on sixty pages of changes. Is there an expectation that we are going to vote on this today? A lot of things have changed and while things may have been restored to what they were before, perhaps things that were there before are things we may not want to continue. It seems we are moving very fast through this. While I understand the sense that we need to restore a piece of the Charter, I wonder if this is too fast?

Folkins: I appreciate your point. One, we got the changes to you as soon as we possibly could. The SEC met on Tuesday, we stayed late to incorporate the latest changes. We really did try to get this out as expeditiously as possible. The larger issue is that the SEC is indeed the only Senate committee who has looked at these changes. We have a window now to work to reinstate the changes. If we wish to go through the Charter process for any of the particular topics that we feel needs to be changed, that could be done. Amendments can come forward in future months or years. What this is doing is plugging a hole. We really need some sort of Charter protection. We don't want to wait for months. We have review of administrators and things that are essentially a part of shared governance. We can always change it. We need something in place now that will serve us well. We can always change it using the usual methods. Any committee can react to this. We have a window to put something in place. Archer: If I may follow up, that sounds very similar to the rationale as to why the BoT moved so quickly to removed the language in the Charter. It was based on expediency and things had to be done immediately and in that case it was done without wider FS or faculty input. I understand and appreciate the issue that the Charter needs to be restored. I'm concerned that we're willing to move forward and get this done expediently instead of having more than a week to review this. I understand the SEC worked hard on this but the reality is we got the document 6 days before this meeting. I don't know if we've had a chance to tell our constituents. I have not had a chance to share this with my constituent group at my faculty meetings. We're dealing with a big issue here. We're trying to restore things that I fully believe are well intentioned and should be restored. However, the process is being ignored for the sake of getting this through and that is my concern. Thank you. Folkins: Any other comments? Dixon: Remind us that those are the very same words that were used to rush CUE and that resulted in a lot of happiness and misunderstanding. I would like to urge this body to give us at least a couple of weeks to read. Perhaps we can vote another way or at another meeting. If we fix something that has been broken since last year, I would ask you to not create chaos. Folkins: Any other comments? Archer: Are we voting on each individual section? Folkins: No. One vote, up or down on all changes. We have a window and if we don't do it now we may not get another chance. Dixon: Why? Archer: Does the window close before the next FS meeting? Folkins: I'm worried. Dixon: Why? Folkins: Would you like to address this President Mazey? President Mazey: I can address it but I'm not sure I have the answer. I want you to be comfortable with what comes forward. I talked to the Board about this at the August retreat. It would be good that we could bring this back to them in October. That's the reason for moving forward in this time frame; this is the only meeting prior to the BoT October

meeting. Archer: When is the next Board meeting? Mazey: December. Border: I'm glad Lynda mentioned CUE. As the CAA Chair, I feel the restoration of the Charter will help our committees on campus deal with issues such as CUE. It will make shared governance clearer. I would argue we are an anemic patient; we need this transfusion to get our strength back to participate in shared governance on this campus. I think of this as a life saving exercise. I think putting this vote off is not advisable. In the case of CUE, we were attempting to doctor a large undergraduate curriculum. As a committee chairman of the FS, I would like to see the transfusion performed. If there are mistakes in the procedures, let's have an analysis afterward and we'll make those adjustments in the future. I feel we need to get the patient back. Labbie: On behalf of Amendments and Bylaws, I appreciate all the considerations expressed so far. I agree with David's comments as well. I would not compare this to a new project being administered but a restoration of what we have been seeking since last year when it was removed. I have reviewed the changes to the Charter, and a member of Amendments and Bylaws is on SEC and so has also reviewed these changes. We have not had a chance to meet as a committee but will do so next week. But, from what I can see of what SEC has done, and Pat – and Pat has extensive experience in working with the Charter, I think it is well written and I don't see any changes that are substantive. I don't know if it's a matter of considering it as Jeff suggested -- we're voting to return something to its prior state and then we deal with the actual language later or we are voting to restore the document in a different way. Whatever happens we can be certain that Amendments and Bylaws will review the actual language very carefully and take all of your recommendations into consideration as soon as we receive them. Thank you. Lunde: I would like to say I'm retired and I had enough time to read this. I have had a long experience with the FS and with the original Charter. It's a wonderful instrument. I did not see anything that was unusual or strange or not in synch with the original Charter. It really is a restoration of the Charter in my opinion. I believe very strongly that you should act quickly on this because you do have a window of opportunity. Do not let it pass; it may disappear and make your life much more difficult. I'm strongly in favor of passing the Charter changes. Folkins: Thank you. Other comments? Craigo: I'm a little concerned with the mechanism for voting. I think we have a good new Vice Chair/Chair Elect but the results indicated that 100% voted. We couldn't vote no; we couldn't vote an abstention. I'm not sure that 100% did vote in favor of the Vice Chair/Chair Elect. I don't think we should use this same process for the vote unless it is set up differently. Folkins: It is set up differently. The procedure for voting for Faculty Senate officers is not to show the vote count. That's never released. Craigo: I don't have the solid green light on my clicker. I'm not sure that 100% is accurate. I know my clicker's light was blinking on and off. I'm not sure my vote registered. Folkins: Thank you for your point. I think we want to do what we can to get in the next century in regards to the technology. Kim, do you have anything to share on the blinking light? Fleshman: The blinking light typically means you have a bad battery. I apologize if you had that. In the very top right corner you could see the number of responses. That number was not the same as the practice vote. Folkins: So that means some people did abstain. Votes involving individuals, we do not announce the vote count. It's not appropriate. Senator: In the future, maybe we can have a vote to abstain? Folkins: Yes, and that is the way the next vote is set up? Herman: Yes. You have options: For the Amendment/Proposal; Against Amendment/Proposal; Abstain. And actually, you will see the number of actual votes. This vote requires a 2/3 vote of the entire body, not just those present and voting. For today, given our membership, that number would be 44. Folkins: We need 44. If you're not comfortable voting electronically, we did bring paper ballots. If the group is more comfortable with paper ballots, we can do that. Meek: It was not 100% because two people abstained; we need that to be reflected in the process. It was not 100%. Folkins: That's because of the way the software worked. We didn't have a way of handling it differently. Herman: The actual number of votes was also registered so we do know how many people actually voted. Folkins: We would not announce that at any rate.

Deters: I'd like to ask – there are several times where it refers to the BGSU Faculty Association and some deference to the BGSU-FA. Has any of this been submitted or given to the BGSU-FA to comment on? Folkins: The answer is no. We did contact David Jackson to set a meeting prior to this meeting but have not heard back from him. Is that correct? Deters: When was that? I contacted him last evening and he had never heard of this. Folkins: We were going to tell him about this at that meeting. I think that was approximately a week and a half ago. We couldn't do much until we had the document from the SEC.

Deters: I have several comments; there are several changes I noted. In the end there is a new committee being proposed, the Academic Reconfiguration Committee (ARC) I believe. Folkins: No. That was in the Charter before, Section XIV. The first part is identical, but the second part has been shorter, streamlined. Deters: Maybe I was confused by the fact that all of that is in red which I took to be new text. Is that wrong? Folkins: XIV was taken out of the Charter on December 10th. We're putting it back in. Deters: I think someone was getting at this before, if the BoT unilaterally took all of this out, why don't we let them unilaterally put it back in? Folkins: I think it is in our best interest to take this action. We have a window and we can propose changes in the future using standard Senate procedures. President Mazey: I suggested that if they took it out, why not let them put it back in. But, in discussing this with faculty governance they preferred to re-establish shared governance. Folkins: We didn't want to do the same thing that was done on December 10th. We wanted to maximize the involvement of the Senate given the timeline. Deters: It looks to me like what is going on now that it looks like SB5 is going to be defeated and no one knows what is going to happen and that the Union is going to be able to negotiate. In fact Pat Pauken is one of the negotiators, it looks like an end run around the FA so the FS is in a position of strength, they believe. They will look to be the major player in this process as the Charter has been removed. Now things have to be negotiated. I believe others feel the same way. I think this is a real concern. I'm not very comfortable going forward with this. If the Trustees want to reestablish this, they can do it just like they took it away. The problem goes away. As far as I'm concerned they can reinstitute this Charter. I would like to propose we postpone consideration of this document until next FS meeting, the October meeting. I believe that needs a second. Folkins: Doesn't that have to be in the form of an amendment? You're offering an amendment to the motion on the floor? Deters: I am proposing we postpone consideration of this document until the next FS meeting. Folkins: I'll ask the Parliamentarian. Doesn't this have to be in the form of an amendment to the motion on the floor? Border: It's a motion to postpone. Folkins: We do need a second. Dixon: Seconded. Folkins: We'll have a discussion on the motion to postpone. Dixon: If we don't put a date or time at the end of the proposal does that mean it never comes back up? If we table something we have an end date. Border: Are you talking about a date to reconsider? Deters: I said the next meeting. I understand that a postponement is different than tabling it. Folkins: Please read the motion. Herman: I would like to propose we postpone consideration of this document until next FS meeting, the October meeting. Folkins: Further discussion? Terry-Fritsch: A point of clarification, when is the date of our next meeting? When is the date of the next BoT meeting? Folkins: October 4th is our next FS meeting; the next BoT meeting is December 2nd. Murnen: I'm under the impression that Pat Pauken worked on some of this language this summer; I'm interested in Pat's take on what the BoT feels about the work we're doing here. Are they comfortable with this? Do they think this is in the best interest of the University from their perspective? Maybe we understand the work they want done and we are doing are in harmony. Pauken: I can speak similarly to President Mazey. In early August at our retreat, the Board spoke to us about our work and vice versa. They are receptive to the work SEC did this summer and look forward to seeing it in October. Folkins: Is it appropriate to comment on Senator Deters comment on the end run around the FA? Pauken: It is definitely not an end run and it is very deferential to the FA. President Mazey: I would like to reiterate that. I met with Kris Blair and John Folkins on this issue at the end of April or beginning of May before anything was done in terms of faculty contracts. You bought it up to me. Folkins: I want to reiterate that this should be entirely independent of the present negotiations going on. Senator: If our next meeting is on the 4th and the Trustees meeting is on the 14th, is that enough time for us to vote? Does that window close if we cannot agree to vote today? Pauken: Unfortunately that would not be enough time. Our bylaws require a certain amount of time between the time we send them the agenda items for review but also a window of review for items that pass the Senate, specific number of days. There would not be enough between the 4th and the 14th. Folkins: Thank you. Senator: Is that equal to the number of days we were given to read this document? Pauken: Our bylaws require a week to send materials to the Board. Folkins: It was pretty close to a week. We felt it was important for the SEC to meet at its regularly schedule time so all members could attend. Labbie: Would it be possible to propose a motion that we vote to return the Charter to its status pre-December minus those elements that conflict with the FA, minus the bargainable elements that would make it illegal? It would be two votes, one, to return the Charter to the pre-December status; two, to return whatever elements are agreed upon in this document to the Charter. Can we do that? Then we

could do the work to analyze these changes. Folkins: There is a motion on the floor right now that this conflicts with. My understanding is that right now we have a tangible document in front of us. Take the whole thing back except for those areas that conflict. Labbie: Thank you. Lunde: I read this material and read it as carefully as I could. To me it was the old Faculty Senate at the heart of it with a recognition of and deference to the Union. It's already been done. I would urge you to move quickly on this. Weinsier: Let's say we postpone the vote, what happens between now and next month? Deters: I guess people would have a chance to read it. I think that is the main thing. There are lots of other questions. I don't think there is anything in here for example about the FPCC. Folkins: No, there is not and cannot be. Deters: That was a question I had, that was supposedly restored earlier. It was to be restored last spring because of the cases that were proceeding. I expected there to be something like that addressing that in here. I don't see it all. The question is where is it? Folkins: Michelle and Judy pointed out in their opening remarks that both the FPCC and FWC were in Part A of the Charter. They are clearly within the realm of collective bargaining they are not in this document. There was an agreement between labor and management in January that said pending a new contract, the previous FPCC will continue to function. Is that correct? That's why it's there and it cannot be in the Charter. Santino: It seems to me that there are two main issues that have arisen... 1) We haven't had the time to thoroughly digest the document and 2) It seems important to most of us to restore the changes to the Charter. This is a question of procedure. Do we actually have to vote on this today? Can we vote on this in two weeks without having a meeting? Is there a mid-point? Border: There is no mechanism for an electronic vote. We could have a special meeting of the Senate. Folkins: We would have to vote at the FS. We cannot vote electronically. Could we schedule a special meeting 2 weeks from now? Terry-Fritsch: To follow up on Jack's point, I'm looking at this calendar and on the 20th there is an on-call meeting where we could vote. We could meet with our constituents and really read this and vote on it. Is that enough time? Folkins: What are the circumstances for an on-call meeting? Border: I think it just takes a written request to the Chair. Senators can make direct written requests for agenda items on a Senate agenda and for special meetings of the Senate. Or a majority vote of SEC. Folkins: We could have the SEC do a majority vote? Border: Yes. Folkins: Thank you. Archer: I don't think there is anyone in the room that doesn't want the Charter restored. The things that were taken away were important for all of us. I feel the issue is that if we vote today they'll vote against things they want. It's 60 pages of changes and we haven't had time to review this. I don't want to send a message to the BoT that the faculty doesn't want the Charter restored. But what I do want to send the message is we need more time. Bringing us these changes without time for review is saying we have to accept this. No one has asked the question so far on the membership because I'm guessing very few people have reflected on what was restored and if we want that. I'm in favor of trying to call another meeting. I don't want people to vote against simply because the process is one that people might object to. Edminster: With all the dire predictions about what will occur if we don't take advantage of our window of opportunity, I'd like some of those specifically stated. It has been implied if we don't do this now, something terrible will happen. What will happen if we wait? Labbie: From the perspective of the reflection of our participation in shared governance and our rights as faculty members since they were removed last December. We've been talking about this since December and to decline this motion seems illogical. I don't know where else we can go. Rogel: I'd like to say, I did get a chance to review many of the changes and I would agree with Dr. Lunde. There doesn't seem to be strange, just revisions. I'd hate to miss that October meeting; if we do we have another two months without the protections built in. If it takes a special FS meeting, fine if that makes people comfortable. It is important to get this going as soon as we can. If there are small points that need to be changed we can address them as things progress. Labbie: I would like to amend the motion on the floor currently to suggest that we vote on a continuance of the topic to the 9/20 meeting for a vote. Folkins: Would the proposer and person who seconded agree to that as a friendly amendment? Deters: Yes, I will accept that as a friendly amendment. Dixon: Yes. Border: Will that be in time? Pauken: It would be tight. Minutes would have to be posted as soon as possible. The timeline will be very tight. There is a comment period after Senate minutes are posted until they become official. That's when the door is open in the Senate office to send items forward to the President. The timeline would be very, very tight. Folkins: 15 days. Zirbel: My understanding that this needs a 2/3 vote of the entire body. We must commit to being here. I hope everyone is very clear about that. If we have a five minute meeting the minutes will be very short. Weinsier: The world as we

know it didn't come through an end but I'd like to have as much of this back as possible. What we're doing is reinstating what we had. Unless there were major changes that I didn't see, I think we should move forward with this. Having said that, why can't the board wait until November for this? December? Why can't it wait until the next meeting? Folkins: It would push it back to their February meeting. Folkins: It's too tight, but two weeks from now it's tight but doable. Senator: Call me crazy but the BoT made these changes. Shouldn't they fix it so we don't have to waste our time with this? Then we could be more proactive and fix the language the way we want it? I don't understand why they can't restore it and reinstate it. Folkins: I would much rather have the FS involved. Howes: You can interpret what the BoT did was extra Charter action. We would like to restore those missing parts. I understand the reluctance to vote without greater review. I became quite familiar with the parts that were missing in my FA work last year. I've reviewed it briefly again. I don't see anything I'm uncomfortable with for what that's worth. I was ready to vote in favor of these changes today. Border: I believe the Charter that talks about amendments is a 10-class day review period, which gives faculty the right to review after the special meeting. Effectively two weeks after the special meeting assuming it is approved. Pauken: In that case, the timeline would be tight but possible. Buerger: All shared governance is merely advisory to the BoT. What we have is an opportunity that probably reflects the honeymoon period with the new President. It may expire; it may not. There are no dire predictions it may collapse. We have to anticipate that if we move with the usual speed of FS we may miss this opportunity. We do have the opportunity to restore the original platform, as much of it as applies. I would urge Senators to recall the recipe for chicken soup; first hatch a chicken. We can work on the exact language later. Herman: The motion was made by Erin Labbie and accepted by Don Deters. Erin would like to amend the motion on the floor currently to suggest that we vote on a continuance of the topic to the 9/20 on-call Senate meeting for a vote. Folkins: My understanding that the motion is still made by Don Deters and seconded by Lynda Dixon. They have accepted Erin's friendly amendment. Deters: It could be stated that we want to postpone this to the next FS meeting. If that were 9/20, fine, if not it would be the October meeting. Folkins: Correct. Deters: No one has convinced me of the urgency if the Board doesn't get this in the October meeting. If they get it in December, that should be adequately soon. Folkins: Vote of hands – majority vote to support the amendment, which would delay the vote on the motion to approve the Charter changes until 9/20 on call meeting... those in favor of the motion to postpone for two weeks signify by raising your hands. Those opposed to the amendment to delay the vote for two weeks, a show of hands? Those abstaining?

For/Against/Abstained

25/22/5

The motion passes and we will not vote on the proposed changes today. We will call an on-call meeting for 9/20. We have 11 Senators who have signed a petition to have the on-call meeting on 9/20. I want to urge you to be here for that vote. This will take 44 votes to pass. I would like to take this time to take any other questions. Labbie: I would like to remind the Senate members that once the Charter has been amended it is not the end of the process. This is an ongoing process. We'll always have the chance to revise in the future. Please consider that over the next two weeks. Weinsier: We won't have the discussion we were having a few minutes ago. It will be pushed to 9/20? I'd like to point out in Section XIV – toward the end of the summary section, pages 58 – 60, in short, for reconfiguration it talks about tenure track and probationary faculty kept in the system is not in there. Only sections A, B, and C are being reinstated; sections D and E are left to collective bargaining. In realignment, the tenure track faculty are kept in the system. If that's left out you have a very easy way of getting rid of faculty. Rogel: I believe that the point is a mandatory bargaining point. Weinsier: It's a big point. Just keep that in mind. Folkins: Thank you for that point. Anything more? Deters: I had a question early on, there was this terminology about Chairs and departments and other possible administrators whether they are eligible for FS... There was a phrase; they can't have more than 50% administrative. Is that generally what Chairs have? Folkins: Yes. Deters: Is that the standard situation? I just wanted to know what that meant. If they are greater than 50% then they can't do it. Folkins: Thank you. We'll move on the report by the GSS representative.

Communications Continued...

Graduate Student Senate Representative

GSS Representative David Sleasman offered the following report to Faculty Senate:

I am glad to be here and to be a part of these conversations. GSS has been busy over the course of the summer. We see many exciting opportunities with the new leadership. We're encouraged about the Graduate Strategic Plan talks. Graduate students are very excited about that. We are looking forward to continuing our work with FS in the future.

Folkins: Thank you David. Next we'll have the report from the USG representative, Emily Ancinec.

Undergraduate Student Government Representative

USG Representative Emily Ancinec offered the following report to Faculty Senate:

A lot of the things we're working on right now deal with Student Affairs. We are working on the CUE program and the absentee policy. I'd like to pose a challenge. If you hear students in class bring up concerns, please contact us. Students tend to complain during classes. I hope if you do hear something, you'll contact me.

Folkins: Thank you. Next Retiree Representative, Hal Lunde.

Retiree Representative

Retiree Representative Harold Lunde offered the following report to Faculty Senate:

Thank you. My remarks are very short focusing on the economics in the country and state. The STRS fund last year, 2011, had a 22.6% rate of return on the whole fund, doing a good job. On the fund domestic equities were at 33%. For the year we're in fiscal 2012, not good at all. The assumed actuarial rate in our guaranteed benefit plan is 8%. They are now talking like we may not make that. Everyone is going to be short of money including the STRS.

Folkins: Thank you Hal. Committee on Academic Affairs, David Border.

REPORTS FROM SENATE COMMITTEES

Committee on Academic Affairs – Border

Chair David Border offered the following report to Faculty Senate:

Our first meeting is tomorrow. Our guests will be Albert Colom, Vice President for Enrollment and HSS Dean Petrosino and Nancy Orel concerning an inter-disciplinary masters degree that is being proposed. I hope for a good year.

Folkins: Thank you for your report. Next we have Amendments and Bylaws Committee, Erin Labbie.

Amendments and Bylaws Committee – Labbie

Chair Erin Labbie offered the following report to Faculty Senate:

We will be meeting next week on Tuesday, 9/13 at 11:00 a.m. If you have had a chance to read the Charter document we are considering today prior to that meeting, please send any concerns, recommendations, and/or modifications to me. We'll try to address those prior to our next meeting on the 9/20.

Folkins: Thank you. Next Committee on Committees, Ann Darke.

Committee on Committees - Darke

Chair Ann Darke offered the following report to Faculty Senate:

We have met twice and we've filled five out of 47 positions. We're trying. We're in the process of collecting nominations and basically every committee has an opening. Please get a hold of me if you'd like to serve or if you have nominations. Surveys have been sent out to faculty in their first four years. Many committees have vacancies for those faculty members. Surveys are due back this Thursday. The positions that need to be filled by Senators and only Senators... one for Committee on Committees, two

on CPA; one for honorary degrees committee; and one Senator from Business to serve on SEC. Again, if you are interested, please see me. Our next meeting is Tuesday, 9/13.

Committee on Professional Affairs - Howes

Terry Herman offered the following report to Faculty Senate on behalf of Chair Geoffrey Howes: The Committee on Professional Affairs (CPA) is working with the Committee on Committees to establish membership for the year. We will need two additional Faculty Senators. To remind you of the functions of the committee, the Charter states:

b) Functions

The purpose of the Committee on Professional Affairs is to focus on issues external to the University that affect the profession of teaching and research, and the value and mission of higher education in society. Specifically, the CPA shall:

- 1) Perform an advisory function to the Faculty Senate about important developments related to the professional role of educators in society, at the local, state, and national level.
- 2) Perform an educational role to the faculty and to the University community at large about professional issues that affect educators.
- 3) Advise and assist the Faculty Senate with media and governmental affairs relationships.
- 4) Work cooperatively with the administration and other campus constituency groups to conduct outreach to the general public and to local, state, and national officials on behalf of higher education.
- 5) Initiate studies, or conduct studies at the request of the Faculty Senate, on issues relevant to professional affairs.
- 6) Receive suggestions or requests, initiate consideration, and make recommendations to the SEC on issues relevant to professional affairs.

One of our major plans this year is to continue the tradition of visiting the state House to represent BGSU. We will work with David Robinson in Columbus to arrange this visit. If you are interested in serving, please contact Geoff Howes.

OLD BUSINESS

No Old Business

ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Murnen: Just one simple concern, if we wanted, in the next couple of weeks, to do a side-by-side comparison of the various versions of the Charter would that be possible? Folkins: On the FS webpage, the original Charter is still there. You can do that comparison. I would encourage you to do that. A number of SEC members have done this. Border: You will also find the post-December 10th version of the Charter on the Provost's site – the version with strike throughs. Folkins: There really is no cleaned up, clear version of the Charter in existence. Rogers: I think the version of the Charter you are referring to has been removed from the Provost's site. We can make it available though and have it posted on the Senate site. Murnen: This Charter document that we have today has not gone out to the rest of the faculty has it? Folkins: No, it has not. We encourage anyone to review this. Any other issues and concerns? Deters: Is this on a website? Folkins: You have the electronic copy you received via email. Hearing no other comments, we'll move to adjourn. Buerger: I move to adjourn. Rogel: Seconded.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Lee Herman,
Secretary, Faculty Senate

