

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

December 6, 2000, 4:00 p.m.

Room 132, DeBartolo Hall

PDF Version

Note 1: Please submit agenda items and cover sheets for the February 7 Senate meeting to Bege Bowers, English Department, by noon on Friday, January 26. Provide both a hard copy and a disk copy of your report and cover sheet in Word or rich text format. A downloadable cover sheet is available at the Academic Senate web site:

<http://cc.ysu.edu/acad-senate/index.html>

Note 2: If you want to read or print the pdf version of these minutes and you don't have *Adobe Acrobat Reader*, you may download the program at the following link:

<http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep2.html>

Use the Acrobat Reader menus or toolbar to print the file, not the menus or toolbar in your web browser.

OVERVIEW:

Topics presented/discussed: Topics presented/discussed: National report card on education and proposed OBOR budget; Charter and Bylaws Committee motion on the Ohio Open Meetings Laws; plus and minus grading scale; University Curriculum Committee Course Proposal Progression form; summer scheduling guidelines; General Education Proposal Flow Form; old versus new general education requirements for transfer and other students.

ACTIONS:

The following motion carried: a motion to amend Bylaw 11, Section 3, to read "All meetings of the Senate, its committees and subcommittees shall be open in accordance with State of Ohio Open Meetings Laws and the exemptions specified therein."

The following motion carried: a motion to approve the University Curriculum Committee Course Proposal Progression that appeared in Attachment 3 to the December 6 agenda.

The following motion carried: a motion to approve the summer scheduling guidelines that appeared in Attachment 4 to the December 6 agenda.

The following motion carried: a motion to approve the General Education Proposal Flow Form that appeared in Attachment 5 to the December 6 agenda.

CALL TO ORDER:

Jim Morrison, chair of the Academic Senate, called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS:

Minutes of the 4 October and 1 November 2000 meeting were approved as posted. They are available at the Senate web site.

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE/REPORT FROM THE CHAIR: Jim Morrison made the following announcement:

The Senate Executive Committee received the resolution on open meetings that Student Government sent to all senators. Since Student Government wanted the resolution on the agenda but did not indicate that a motion pertaining to the resolution would be made from the Senate floor, the resolution was attached to the agenda for the December meeting as correspondence. For a copy of the resolution, see the agenda for December 6, Attachment 1.

OHIO FACULTY COUNCIL REPORT: Tom Shipka, our elected representative to the OFC, reported. See Attachment 1 to these minutes.

Links to the National Report Card, OFC, and OBOR web sites mentioned in Shipka's report also appear on our Academic Senate homepage at <<http://cc.yosu.edu/acad-senate/index.html>>. Shipka asks that you inform your colleagues about the letter to faculty and staff that appears on the OFC web site at <www.sba.muohio.edu/snavelwb/senate/ofc/budget-letter.htm>.

CHARTER AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE: Dale Harrison, chair of the Charter and Bylaws Committee, reported, beginning with the open-meetings issue:

Harrison: In response to earlier proposals from the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) and the General Education Committee (GEC)—proposals that included items closing portions of their meetings—the Charter and Bylaws Committee voted unanimously to propose an amendment to the Senate *Bylaws*; there was one abstention. The proposed amendment and the committee's rather lengthy rationale for it appeared in the agenda for the December 6 meeting, Attachment 2.

We were fairly meticulous about the language of the proposed amendment, which went through several revisions in the committee. The initial question we were given can be paraphrased as follows: Do Ohio's Open Meetings Laws apply to the Academic Senate; and if they do, should the *Bylaws* be amended to reflect that? We felt that the laws probably do apply (absent a direct test in court) and that the *Bylaws* should therefore be amended.

Harrison summarized the rationale that appeared in the agenda, noting that the Charter and Bylaws Committee never questioned the legitimacy of the UCC's and GEC's concerns about openness. The Charter and Bylaws Committee felt that the "risk factor" was too high, though, especially since the matter under discussion has become a fairly high-profile issue.

Harrison read the motion:

I move that we amend Bylaw 11, Section 3, to read "All meetings of the Senate, its committees and subcommittees shall be open in accordance with State of Ohio Open Meetings Laws and the exemptions specified therein."

The motion was seconded, and discussion followed:

Phil Chan, Art: If all meetings of decision-making bodies are to be open, does this mean that subcommittees that are advisory and don't make the decisions—that in fact refer back to the Senate to make decisions—must be open?

Harrison: The Open Meetings Law says that decision-making bodies are public and shall be open. The second part of the law says that the committees and subcommittees of such bodies must also be open. There is no case law on point regarding what “advisory” is in Ohio. However, other state supreme courts, both in California and in Tennessee, have dealt with what is “advisory.” A dean’s advisory council was declared not to be a decision-making body. There were two parts to the rationale: The word “Advisory” was in the title of that body, and that body did not make and pass motions or legislation. But our Senate committees and subcommittees do make motions; in effect, our committees and subcommittees are creating law and forwarding it to the Senate. And though there is no Ohio case law on point, courts often rely on what other jurisdictions have done with the same kind of question.

Bill Jenkins, chair of the GEC: Our committees feel that the issue has already been presented from both sides. We continue to have some concern about the open deliberations because of power relationships. However, we recognize that there is a strong “sunshine” law in Ohio, and there is a possibility that it applies. Hence, both of our committees (the UCC and GEC) have deleted the closed-deliberations provision from the recommendations we are making today. The vote on this motion will govern what the UCC and GEC do.

J-C. Smith, Philosophy and Religious Studies, read the following statement regarding the question of a uniform requirement of open meetings for Senate committees:

1. My department is roughly split on the issue.
2. I have done some research, primarily involved with review of the Ohio Revised Code and review of an Internet search on: academic senate > committee meetings.
3. The ORC review resulted in the following points:
 - a. The open meetings statute applies only to committees of public institutions that have decision-making authority, which many of the Senate committees do not have, due to their advisory status.
 - b. The statute applies to such committees only when they are conducting “public business,” which is an undefined term but which surely does not include “all business,” as suggested in the student proposal, nor all business involving allocation on campus of any public funds, as suggested in the faculty motion.
 - c. The case of *Toledo Blade Co. v. Univ. of Toledo Foundation* clearly involves the conduct of “public business,” involving explicit relations of the Foundation with public entities, and is not relevant to the issue of internal Senate committee deliberations.
4. The Internet review included 361 “hits,” with the following results:
 - a. There were no “hits” for the state of Ohio.
 - b. Approximately 4% of “hits” had any mention of open meetings considerations.
 - c. Those “hits” that had such considerations were roughly divided equally between prohibiting open meetings, commonly for executive committee meetings of academic

senates, and requiring them, with numerous exceptions, including personnel deliberations and evaluations of programs.

- d. In any event, there were so few “hits” as to make it clear that the issue was not a major concern.
5. Practical implementation of the faculty proposal has not been thought out and could easily cause unmanageable results for the conduct of normal business of the Academic Senate, its committees, and other areas of university administration. A sentiment in favor of general openness does not justify requiring it in every specific case.
6. So, why should YSU lead in this regard? Why should the Academic Senate apply to itself a standard that the administration does not apply toward its own meetings? Why should the Senate adopt a policy that the administration may use to coerce (especially junior) faculty or otherwise determine the outcome of Senate committee deliberations? These committees are staffed by faculty, our colleagues and professionals whom we should trust to exercise their judgment. If we do not like the result of their advisory roles, we have other avenues for addressing that. Moreover, the threat of a lawsuit is specious. If we are taken to court over this, we will have every other Ohio university at our side.
7. In conclusion, if we are truly worried about closed doors, these are not the closed doors that are really of concern, which are those closed outside of all committee meetings. Thus, I will vote against this motion.

Harrison: Two wrongs don’t make a right, and vice versa. If there is some question about how the administration conducts business on this campus, it should not affect the direction the Senate takes about how it conducts its own business. I don’t think a lawsuit is specious. I think the likelihood of one is high. We listed the exemptions in our attachment to the agenda for today’s meeting (see the December 6 agenda, Attachment 2, items 3.A.1-7). Why should YSU take the lead on this matter? Because we’ve been posed with the question in a public manner, when perhaps no other institution has. It’s an opportunity for us to take the high road.

The Charter and Bylaws Committee was interested in making the correct decision. Members of the committee requested that I send a memo to the University counsel (Sandra Denman), asking her to solicit an opinion from the state attorney general. We have asked for that opinion—though it may take quite some time to get it. The Committee wants to continue to do the right thing in terms of the law. There’s a separate matter, though, and the Student Government resolution addresses that: the principle of openness in this type of atmosphere at a public institution.

Tammy King, Criminal Justice, and chair of the UCC: Like the GEC, we have removed from the proposed UCC motion the idea of closing the deliberations. We don’t want to be secretive. We just felt that during the deliberative stage, after hearing the arguments, we would feel more comfortable to discuss the issue as a committee and then send our recommendation forward to the Senate. It can be contested on the Senate floor. We were concerned about power issues coming into play. Not everyone is tenured. Not everyone is a full professor. We had hoped that we could put the power issue aside and deal just with the hearing. But we’ve removed the statement concerning closed deliberations. We were concerned about the articles in the *Jambar*. We want Student Government and everyone here to know that we were not trying to be secretive or close the entire hearing.

Elaine Greaves, Criminal Justice: If we're waiting for an opinion from the state attorney general, why are we moving at this point? If the attorney general says we don't have to have open meetings, what then? Will we just ignore the opinion because we have already voted?

Harrison: No. It could take years for the attorney general to issue an opinion. The smart and perhaps the right thing now is to open all meetings of all committees. If the attorney general issues an opinion contrary to this, the Senate can take the matter up at that time.

Greaves: What about an opinion from the University counsel?

Harrison: Denman issued a memo that said a number of things. I'm paraphrasing: She had talked to sister institutions and asked whether they had rules saying they operated by Ohio Open Meetings Laws. She said the other institutions did not worry about such things. They had not been posed with the question or challenged. She said there was no case law on point—no law in Ohio that says academic senates fall under the Open Meetings Laws. One media law expert I talked to says no one would dare to close one and risk having all of their laws overturned.

I don't think that memo was sufficient. It did not mention the *Toledo Blade* case, which doesn't have to do with academic senates but does have to do with universities. I asked Denman what universities she spoke to, what questions she asked, what case law she looked at, etc. That was three weeks ago, and she hasn't responded.

Greaves: I'm just concerned that we may be rushing into something we don't need to do at this point. I think the attorney general's office could act expeditiously if we explain the urgency of the matter. To act prior to receiving the attorney general's opinion seems to be jumping the gun.

Tess Tessier, Philosophy and Religious Studies: Because there is no motion before the Senate to close any deliberations or any portion of the meetings, we could wait for the attorney general's ruling.

Harrison: I don't think there is a reason for urgency; I do think there is a reason to do the right thing, though. Many people considered this issue from many perspectives—from the University Curriculum Committee, to the General Education Committee, to everyone else who looked at it. We believe we came to a sound conclusion, and as a committee we responded to the questions we were asked to consider.

King: I think it might be prudent to wait and see what the attorney general has to say. But in the mean time, the UCC and the GEC have removed the closed-deliberations sections from our proposals. Results of deliberations do go forward to the Senate, where decisions are made on the Senate floor. The UCC is a group of your colleagues; we are here to assist individuals in putting their proposals forward.

Shipka, Philosophy and Religious Studies: I think this issue has been debated satisfactorily over an extended period, both in and out of the Senate. **I move the previous question.**

Shipka's motion, which would close debate, was seconded and carried by at least the mandatory 2/3 majority.

A vote was taken on Harrison's motion to amend Bylaw 11, Section 3, to read "All meetings of the Senate, its committees and subcommittees shall be open in accordance with State of Ohio Open Meetings Laws and the exemptions specified therein." Morrison called for a show of hands. There were 35 votes in favor of the motion, 23 votes against it. The motion carried.



Morrison: It is the opinion of the chair and the Senate Executive Committee that the exceptions in the Open Meetings Laws would cover such activities as those of the Academic Grievance Subcommittee, etc., that deal with material that would fall under privacy and student rights acts.


ELECTIONS AND BALLOTING COMMITTEE: **Louise Aurilio, chair of the committee,** did not report at the meeting but submitted a written annual report listing those elected and appointed to Senate positions. **See Attachment 2 near the end of these minutes.**


ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE: **Martha Pallante, chair of the committee,** reported that the Academic Standards Committee met on November 11 and discussed the proposal to change the grading system to allow the use of pluses and minuses in assigning course grades. The committee felt that this is not an appropriate time to pursue such a change and decided to table it indefinitely. The next day, Pallante made a report to Student Senate and answered the students' questions.

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS COMMITTEE: **No report.**


UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE: **Tammy King, chair of the committee, reported:**

Formerly, the Hearing section of the proposed University Curriculum Committee Course Proposal Progression form contained an item that read, "At the close of the open hearing, the objector, department representative and all observers will be excused so that the UCC members can conduct their deliberations." As noted earlier, the UCC has removed this item pertaining to closed deliberations from the Hearing section of the proposed document. For the current version of the document, which does not refer to closed deliberations, see the agenda for December 6, Attachment 3.

 **King moved that we approve the University Curriculum Committee Course Proposal Progression that appeared in Attachment 3 to the December 6 agenda. The motion was seconded; there was no discussion. The motion carried.**

 **ACADEMIC PLANNING COMMITTEE:** **Ram Kasuganti, acting chair of the committee, moved that we accept the summer scheduling guidelines that appeared in Attachment 4 to the December 6 agenda.** He noted that minor adjustments to the number of minutes per class meeting may need to be made. **The motion was seconded; there was no discussion. The motion carried.**

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE: **Bill Jenkins, chair of the General Education Committee (GEC), reported on two matters—the GEC Proposal Flow Form, and general education requirements for transfer and other students:**

 **Jenkins:** In regard to matter 1, the GEC has also removed the statement pertaining to closed deliberations from its proposed flow form. **I move that the Senate approve the General Education Proposal Flow Form that appeared in Attachment 5 to the December 6 agenda.**

The motion was seconded; there was no discussion. The motion carried.

In regard to matter 2, the GEC is discussing different types of students, whether they should choose the old or new general education requirements, and the governing principles for such decisions. We are bringing forward for your feedback what we've developed so far (see **Choosing Old or New General Education Requirements** in Attachment 5 to the December 6 agenda). We have operated on the principle that we don't want to harm students; that we should adopt policies that make fulfilling the GER

penalty free. We believe that for the most part our draft does that.

However, I've had several meetings with the advisors for the various colleges, and I am presenting an alternative proposal in regard to items 3 and 5 of the material attached to the agenda: The following policy is recommended by college advisors for transfer students without a bachelor's degree (item 3) and for students re-enrolling after three or more semesters of absence or its equivalent (item 5)—

It is preferred that such students take the new general education requirements. If, however, they lose general education credit hours gained prior to transferring or re-enrolling, they may choose to take the old general education requirements.

Jenkins summarized the other items in the attachment and opened the floor to discussion.

[Since the discussion was informal and speakers did not go to the microphones, the minutes list only the topics of discussion:]

- **Feld:** What happens to a student who re-enrolls after two semesters? (Answer: One has to be out three semesters to be considered not continuously enrolled.)
- **Berger:** Does the three-semester rule include summers?
- **Sarro:** In regard to item 3, what is the advantage of letting transfer students without a bachelor's degree follow the old GER? the new GER?
- **Sarro:** Couldn't we make adjustments under the new GER if necessary to serve a particular student?
- **Jenkins and Chan:** By what year should all students be required to follow the new GER? 2002? 2003?
- **Collins:** What about students who are "stop-outs"?
- **King:** How many colleges near here require intensives? Will we have any leeway in terms of intensive-course requirements for students who come in with a considerable number of hours already completed? (Answer: The GEC will consider any proposals you might have.)
- **Collins:** We must honor our articulation agreements/contracts with community colleges.
- **Brothers:** Just as when requirements for a major change, it is important to base decisions on how many hours a particular student has completed and what will best serve that particular student.
- **Mapley:** Check with the state articulation council on items 3 and 4.

Morrison: We have lost a quorum. The Senate Executive Committee is asking the GEC to present proposals such as this through and in concert with the Academic Standards Committee, which deals not only with general education but also with matters pertaining to transfer students. **We would like this matter to be the first to fall under the Senate Executive Committee's request that committees present such resolutions and policy statements in catalog format or otherwise publishable form so that there is no misunderstanding of what the policy is.** Then, a student can find answers to questions about transfer or other matters all in one place, whether it's the catalog or a student handbook or whatever.

INTEGRATED TECHNOLOGIES, UNIVERSITY OUTREACH , LIBRARY, ACADEMIC

RESEARCH, STUDENT ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, STUDENT ACADEMIC GRIEVANCE, HONORS, AND ACADEMIC EVENTS COMMITTEES: No reports.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None.

NEW BUSINESS: None.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

Attachment 1: OFC Report

Report to the YSU Academic Senate, December 6, 2000, on the Ohio Faculty Council

The Ohio Faculty Council (OFC), which consists of two representatives from each of Ohio's public four year universities, met in Columbus for the third time this academic year on November 21, 2000. Dr. Morrison and I represented YSU.

Early in our meeting Chancellor Chu alerted the OFC to an impending release of a national report card on higher education by The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, a two-year-old group funded by The Pew Charitable Trusts and The Ford Foundation, and including a mix of corporate executives and current and former governors. This report card, entitled "Measuring Up 2000," was released on November 30, and senators may view the report in its entirety at the web site of this organization at www.highereducation.org or at the OFC web site, which has a link to this report.

The OFC web site, which is new and which was created this year by OFC member William Snavely of Miami University, is found at www.sba.muohio.edu/snavelwb/senate/ofc.

Chancellor Chu had speculated, without having seen the report, that Ohio would not fare well in the report, and that our low marks could well strengthen the case for the regents' budget proposal. The report card grades each state on a scale of A through F on six criteria based on a state's comparative standing, and it purports to be a measure of each state's effectiveness in providing higher education to their citizens. The Chancellor was right on Ohio's grades. On the six criteria Ohio gets C+ for preparation of students for college, C- for level of participation in college, D- for affordability, B for completion rate, C for benefits returned to the community by graduates, and I (incomplete) for learning achieved by college graduates. All fifty states received an I on learning achieved, according to the Report, because there are no existing measures of learning achieved by college students to compare the states. Please read the actual report.

The Chancellor also made these points to the OFC: the Inter-University Council (IUC), the statewide council of university presidents, has hired an advertising firm to promote the Board of Regents budget proposal; the 12% increase in appropriations sought by the Ohio Board of Regents in the budget proposal has the unanimous support of the university presidents; the newly elected Ohio General Assembly is more conservative than its predecessor, but fortunately no successful candidate had run on a tax cut platform; a recent increase in state Medicaid costs and a shortfall in state tax revenues might make achievement of the full budget increase sought by OBOR difficult; and the OBOR budget proposal has very strong and enthusiastic support in the Ohio business and corporate community. The Chancellor repeatedly stressed the importance of faculty and staff in Ohio higher education seeking and securing support for the budget proposal outside higher education, particularly among employers.

The Council took several important actions. We adopted a mission statement. We elected officers. We approved a letter from the OFC to Ohio public university faculty urging support for the OBOR budget proposal. We also agreed to compile information about the employment of part-time faculty at the public universities in Ohio as a first step in the investigation of this issue.

The officers are chair, Ginny Hamilton from Shawnee State University; vice-chair, Gary Pfeiffer from Ohio University; and secretary, Bill Snavely from Miami University.

I have circulated to you today a list of the web sites referred to in my report, a copy of the OFC mission statement (see below), and a copy of our letter to public university faculty and staff. You will find the mission statement and the letter and a great deal of other information on the OFC web site.

I ask that all senators distribute copies of our letter to faculty and staff in your department or send them a note asking them to read the letter on the OFC web site. The OFC web site has a link to the Board of Regents web site. I also urge all senators to visit this regents' web site from time to time. One particularly informative on-line publication at the regents' web site is entitled "Get the Facts." (The regents' web site is www.regents.state.oh.us.)

Tom Shipka
12-6-2000

Ohio Faculty Council Mission Statement

Adopted November 21, 2000

The Ohio Faculty Council (OFC), recognized by the Chancellor and the Ohio Board of Regents, represents the faculty at all of the four-year public colleges and universities in the State of Ohio.

1. The OFC addresses concerns common to faculty members of the four-year public colleges and universities and issues crucial to the citizens of Ohio related to higher education.
2. Based on shared information and active discussion, the OFC presents a faculty perspective on major issues affecting higher education to the Chancellor, the Ohio Board of Regents, officials of the State of Ohio, the administrations of four-year public institutions of higher education, and the general public.
3. The OFC advocates shared institutional governance so that faculty participate in a substantial way in formulating academic policies appropriate to each college or university.
4. The OFC espouses strong and consistent faculty influence at the state level on issues and policies related to higher education.
5. Based on its representational nature, the OFC adopts resolutions and takes other public positions on behalf of the faculty at the four-year public colleges and universities in the State of Ohio.
6. The OFC maintains a permanent liaison with the Ohio Faculty Senate of Community and Technical Colleges.

Attachment 2: Elections and Balloting Committee Report

Senate Elections and Balloting Committee Annual Report, 2000-2001

Submitted by: Louise Aurilio, Chair Senate Elections and Balloting Committee, 2000-2001

Committee Members: Louise Aurilio, Health and Human Services 1999-2001
Jane Kestner, Arts and Sciences 2000-2002
Patricia Hauschildt, Education 1999-2001
James Tackett, Business 1999-2001
Fred Owens, Comm. & Theater 2000-2002
David Kurtanich, Eng., School of Technology 2000-2002

Election Results for Academic Senate

College of Arts and Sciences

At-Large-Senators 2000-2001:

Bege Bowers, English	James Morrison, Psychology
Robert Hogue, Comp. Sci. & Info.Sys	Martin Berger, History
John Buoni, Mathematics & Statistics	Charles Singler, Geology
L. J. Tessier, Philosophy & Religious Studies	Thomas Maraffa, Geography
Thomas Shipka, Philosophy & Religious Studies	Daryl Mincey, Chemistry

Departmental Senators 1999-2000:

John Jackson, Chemistry	Robert Kramer, Comp. Sci. & Info.
Megan Isaac, English	Jeff Dick, Geology
Richard Goldtwait, Math & Statistics	David Porter, Political Science
Robert Weaver, Sociology & Anthropology	
John-Christian Smith, Philosophy & Religious Studies	

Departmental Senators 2000-2002:

Mark Womble, Biology	John Sarkissian, For. Lang.
Nancy White, Psychology	Donna DeBlasio, History
Clyde Morris, Economics	James Andrews, Physics & Ast.
Barbara Jones, CSIS	David Stephens, Geography

GER Committee 2000-2003:

Warren Young

Senate Executive Committee 2000-2003:

Robert Hogue

**College Representative to Academic Senate Elections and Balloting Committee—
Term 2000-2002:**

Jane Kestner

College of Business Administration

At-Large Senators 2000-2001:

Greg Claypool, Acct. & Finance
James Tackett, Acct. & Finance
David Law, Acct. & Finance
Anthony Kos, Management
William Vendemia, Management

Departmental Senators 1999-2001:

Bart Kittle, Marketing Department

Departmental Senators 2000-2002:

Peter Woodlock, Accounting & Finance
Ram Kasuganti, Management

GER Committee 1998-2001:

Ram Kasuganti, 1998-2001

Senate Executive Committee 1998-2001:

James Tackett

College Representative to Senate Elections and Balloting Committee—term 1999-2001:

James Tackett

College of Education

At-Large Senators 2000-2001:

Janet Beary, Teacher Education	Margaret Briley, Teacher Education
Janet Gill-Wigal, Counseling	Mary Lou DiPillo, Teacher Education
Richard McEwing, Educational Administration, Research and Education	

Department Senators 2000-2002:

Susan De Blois, Educational Administration, Research and Foundations
Bill Evans, Counseling
Len Schaiper, Teacher Education

GER Committee 1999-2002:

James Pusch

Senate Executive Committee 1999-2002:

Janet Gill-Wigal

**College Representative to Academic Senate Elections and Balloting Committee—
Term 1999-2001:**

Pat Hauschildt

College of Engineering and Technology

At-Large Senators 2000-2001:

Robert McCoy, Mech. & Industrial Eng. Salvatore R. Pansino, Elect.Eng.
James C. Zupanic, School of Technology.

Departmental Senators 2000-2002:

Scott Martin, Civil/Env. & Chem. Eng. Philip Munro, Electrical Eng.
David Kurtanich, School of Technology Elvin Shields, Mech.& Indust. Eng.

GER Committee 2000-2002:

Philip C. Munro, Elect. Eng.

Senate Executive Committee 1999-2002

David Kurtanich

College Representative to Academic Senate Elections and Balloting Committee—

Term 2000-2002: David Kurtanich

College of Fine and Performing Arts

At-Large Senators 2000-2001:

Phil Chan, Art Darla Funk, Music
John Murphy, Comm. & Theater Patricia Sarro, Art

Departmental Senators 1999-2001:

Andrew Bac, Art
Frank Castronovo, Comm.& Theater

Departmental Senator 2000-2002;

Allan Mosher, Music

GER Committee 2000-2003:

Frank Castronovo

Senate Executive Committee 1998-2001:

Frank Castronovo

College Representative to Academic Senate Elections and Balloting Committee—

Term 2000-2002:

Fred Owens, Communication & Theater

Bitonte College of Health and Human Services

At-Large Senators 2000-2001:

Kathylynn Feld, Health Professions Louise Aurilio, Nursing
Robert Frampton, Physical Therapy Joan DiGuilio, Human Ecology

Departmental Senators 1999-2001:

Marsha Kuite, Nursing Elaine Greaves, Criminal Justice
Shirley Keller, Social work Cathy Parrot, Physical Therapy

Departmental Senators 2000-2002:

Jack Neville, Human Perf & Exercise
Carol Mikanowicz, Health Professions

Vacant-Human Ecology

GER Committee 1998-2001:

Nancy Mosca

Senate Executive Committee 1998-2001:

Nancy Mosca

**College Representative to Academic Senate Elections and Balloting Committee—
Term 1999-2001:**

Louise Aurilio

Administration Appointees:

Cynthia E. Anderson
Thomas C. Atwood
Barbara H. Brothers
Margret A. Collins
Bassam Deeb
Joseph Edwards
Janice G. Elias
Peter J. Kasvinsky

Betty Jo Licata
Gordon E. Mapley
George E. McCloud
G. L. Mears
Virginia L. Mears
James J. Scanlon
Charles A. Stevens
John J. Yemma

Student Government:

Joseph Gregory
Kristin Serroka
Matthew Pavone

ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEES

Academic Senate Executive Committee:

Chair:

James Morrison, 2000-2001

Vice-Chair:

Thomas Shipka, 2000-2001

Beeghly College of Education
Williamson College of Business Administration
College of Engineering and Technology
Bitonte College of Health and Human Services
College of Arts and Sciences
College of Fine and Performing Arts
Student

Janet Gill-Wigal, 1999-2002
James Tackett, 1998-2001
David Kurtanich, 2000-2003
Nancy Mosca, 1998-2001
Robert Hogue, 2000-2003
Frank Castronovo 1998-2001
Tenika Holden

General Education Committee:

Chair:	William Jenkins
Beeghly College of Education	James Pusch, 1999-2002
Williamson College of Business Administration	Ram Kasuganti, 1998-2001
College of Engineering and Technology	Philip Munro, 1999-2002
Bitonte College of Health and Human Services	Nancy Mosca 1998-2001
College of Arts and Sciences	Warren Young, 2000-2003
College of Fine and Performing Arts	Frank Castronovo, 1998-2001
Student	Brynn Hannay

Skills:

Julia Gergits, Writing Skills	Sherri Lovelace-Cameron, Nat Sci
Darla Funk, Artistic & Literary Perspectives	
Tom Maraffa, Society & Institutions	
Linda Tessier, Personal and Social Perspectives	

Charter & Bylaws Committee:

Chair:	Dale Harrison
Bitonte College of Health and Human Services	Kathlynn Feld, 2000-2002
College of Arts and Sciences	Thomas Murphy, 2000-2002
College of Arts and Sciences	Ikram Khawaja, 2000-2002
College of Arts and Sciences	Nancy White, 1999-2001
College of Arts and Sciences	Dale Harrison, 1999-2001
College of Arts and Sciences	Tom Maraffa, 1999-2001

Elections and Balloting Committee:

Chair:	Louise Aurilio, Nursing, 2000-2001
Beeghly College of Education	Pat Hauschildt, Teacher Education, 1999-2001
Williamson College of Business Administration	James Tackett, Accounting & Finance, 1999-2001
College of Eng. & Technology	David Kurtanich, School of Tech., 2000-2002
Bitonte College of Health and Human Services	Louise Aurilio, Nursing, 1999-2001
College of Arts and Sciences	Jane Kestner, Psychology, 2000-2002
College of Fine & Performing Arts	Fred Owens, Comm.& Theater, 2000-2002

Academic Senate Chair Term 2000-2001

James Morrison

Academic Senate Vice-Chair Term 2000-2001

Thomas Shipka

Secretary/Minutes

Bege Bowers

Attendance Sheet for December 6, 2000 (Scanned Image), is in a separate pdf file.

Arts and Sciences

MB At Large
 Martin Berger
BKB Bege K. Bowers
JP John Buoni
BH Robert Hogue
MM Thomas Maraffa
DM Daryl Mincey
JCM James C. Morrison
TS Thomas A. Shipka
CS Charles Singler
TT Tess Tessier

MM Departmental
 Mark Womble, Biology
DS David Stephens, Geography
GS John Sarkissian, For. Lang.
NW Nancy White, Psychology
 Donna DeBlasio, History
CM Clyde Morris, Economics
JAC James Andrews, Physics & Ast.

Exc Departmental (Cont'd)
 Robert Kramer, CSIS
 John Jackson, Chemistry
MI Megan Isaac, English
JD Jeffrey Dick, Geology
RG Richard Goldwait, Mathematics
JCS J-C. Smith, Phil. & Rel.
 David Porter, Pol./Soc. Sci.
 Beverly Gartland, Soc./Anthropology

Business Administration

At Large
 Gregory Claypool
 Anthony Kos
 David Law

At Large (Cont'd)
JAT James Tackett
WV William Vendemia

Departmental
PW Peter Woodlock, Accounting/Finance
RK Ram Kasuganti, Management
 Bart Kittle, Marketing

Education

At Large
 Janet Beary
MB Margaret Briley
 Mary Lou DiPillo

At Large (Cont'd)
JGW Janet Gill-Wigal
RM Richard McEwing

Departmental
LS Len Schaiper, Teacher Ed.
BE Bill Evans, Counseling
 Susan DeBlois, EAR&F

Engineering and Technology

At Large
 Robert A. McCoy
 Salvatore R. Pansino
GCZ James C. Zupanic

Departmental
SCM Scott C. Martin, Civil/Environ.
 and Chemical Engineering
PM Philip C. Munro, Electrical/Computer Engineering
EBS Elvin B. Shields, Mechanical/Industrial & Systems Engineering

Departmental (Cont'd)
 David G. Kurtanich, Technology

Fine and Performing Arts

At Large
PC Phillip Chan
DJF Darla J. Funk
JM John Murphy
PS Patricia Sarro

Departmental
AB Andrew Bac, Art
ARM Allan Mosher, Music
FC Frank Castronovo, Comm. & Th.

Health and Human Services

At Large
LA Louise Aurilio
JD Joan DiGuilio
KF Kathylynn Feld
RF Robert Frampton

Departmental
Exc Carol Mikanowicz, Health Prof.
JN John Neville, HPES
 Hannah Nissen, Human Ecol.

Departmental (Cont'd)
EG Elaine Greaves, Crim. Jus.
MJK Marsha Kuite, Nursing
 Shirley Keller, Social Work
Exc Cathy Parrott, Physical Therapy

Administration

CA Cynthia E. Anderson
TA Thomas C. Atwood
BH Barbara H. Brothers
Mac Margaret A. Collins

Bassam Deeb
JE Joseph Edwards
 Janice G. Elias
 Peter J. Kasvinsky
Betty Jo Licata
JG Gordon E. Mapley
 George E. McCloud
GLM G. L. Mears

VM Virginia L. Mears
 James J. Scanlon
 Charles A. Stevens
 John J. Yemma

Students

At Large
DD Deena DeVico
TH Tenika Holden
AS Anthony Spano

School/College
RJ Rajah James, A&S
PS Patrick Sculli, Ed.
BH Brynn Hannay, E&T
 Richard Russo, FPA
KA Melissa Amorn, HHS
 Paul Mucci, WCBA

School/College (Cont'd)
 [Vacant], Grad. School
Other
JG Joseph Gregory, Pres.
KS Kristin Serroka, VP
 Matthew Pavone, 2nd VP