

Note: Please get agenda items for the December 2 5am meeting to Betsy Brown, English Department, by 10:00 a.m. Thursday, November 15.

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING

CHARTER 16 1998

OVERVIEW:

Major topics presented/discussed: used for a procedure for future course changes in semester continuation (pg. 3); Charter amendment to permit elected/appointed committees (pg. 3); Bylaws addition defining the membership and role of the General Education Committee (pg. 3-7); Policy changes

(1) The first topic was taken to amend the Senate Charter to permit elected/appointed committees (see below, pg. 3). The proposed amendment will now be voted upon in a final ballot according to the procedure outlined in the Senate Charter.

(2) The Senate approved a Bylaws amendment defining the membership and role of the General Education Committee (contingent upon final ballot approval of the Charter amendment described in policy change number 1, see below, p. 3).

CALL TO ORDER:

Jan Morrison, chair of the Academic Senate, called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

Minutes of the 10 October 1998 Senate meeting were approved as drafted.

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT FROM THE CHAIR: Jan Morrison made the following report:

- The Senate Executive Committee met and worked to review what needs to be done to complete elections for the Fine and Performing Arts, science and for certified positions on the Election & Balloting Committee, the Senate Executive Committee, the Charter & Bylaws Committee, and the General Education Committee (of the Charter & Bylaws revision an appendix).
- The Executive Committee also reviewed topics for the future for conversion to motions. The committee leads those who developed the forms but recommends creating a form procedure for making other changes. The first track items are not present; changes in course descriptions, even for a single word or updating professional jargon. It is not an efficiency to "push" people for identifying old descriptions? Syllabi, etc. are not required for even minor changes. In addition, the forms for new/revise courses suggest a 40-word limit on course descriptions, a limit that not make sense for all courses. Descriptions should fit the course. Furthermore, it is not logically consistent for new descriptions to be limited to 40 words while old, less-track descriptions are not. Thus, the Executive Committee is asking the Curriculum and Programs committees to meet quickly, organize, and take up with the Executive Committee the problems with the forms.
- The Executive Committee reviewed what needs to be done in terms of Senate committee structure and changes this year. All committees need to elect a chair and vice and Betsy Brown and Jan Morrison know who she elected that is, also let her know when you are meeting to what changes motivated by the process or revision. The Charter & Bylaws Committee needs to review the Charter and Bylaws in its entirety for change motivated by the needs or revision; these changes could be made at one time rather than piecemeal. Furthermore, committee chairs and names need to be reexamined - do they meet changing states of the University? For instance, it's not clear what the role of the Integrated Technologies Committee has been these past few years. University Outreach may not be consistent with changes to the University; some committees may need to be disbanded, some committees may be merged.

The University Council will meet on Thursday 17th, and that topic: Topics of discussion include 1) a new revision of the entire of faculty activities which require some additional certified faculty, though it is not clear what the information will be used for and meeting required automatically, and 2) other matters of performance that just committees had individual as well. How can we demonstrate to others the process, the public, legislators who we do and the success? The next OPC meeting with the Executive will be November 15.

CHAIRMAN'S COMMITTEE: Susan Rose, reporting for Dick Fisher, who has not yet been approved by the Senate, attached to the November Agenda, p. 4. Any action taken on this topic 2-1, contingent on pending and calling the amendment proposed in item 1.

- After reading the motion of the Senate Charter that defines the procedure for amending the Charter, they moved that Article IV, Section 1 of the Charter be amended to add "second appointed committees" to the introduction of the section and to item 4. See an exact wording attached to the agenda, p. 4.

The motion was seconded, and discussion followed.

Paul Sauer: Am I understood that in the Charter's current system, the General Education Committee, as currently formed, is actually an illegal committee and that what we are trying to do is to pass an act that amends to make a committee legal that is not legal under the Charter? Is that proper procedure?

Chair: The General Education Committee currently does not even contain the majority of the Senate, so the proposal is designed to make a committee under the auspices of the Senate. There probably will be a significant amount of consultation with the current General Education Committee. The impetus to go ahead with forming the committee was to go on with business. I certainly do not feel that the Senate is being held hostage, or that because the committee exists we have to make it happen. I think this is a legislative change to the Charter.

Chair: Will we advocate to hold the General Education Committee to be a Senate?

Chair: Without moving into the second amendment on the agenda, I have your attention to the proposed bylaws, which I will present immediately after the current amendment, by which there will be an election for membership on the General Education Committee. Yes, members will be elected and appointed.

Tom Shiple: I would like to voice my approval of this proposal. Those of us who participated in the lengthy debate over general education board courses and have done their part of the General Education Committee, the Chair language attached here should help clarify at least some of the issues expressed along the way. To have this language on the Charter and Bylaws, to make this committee a standing committee accountable to the Senate, is an important procedure to establish as we move forward with our new general education program.

The Chair called the general vote on the proposal to amend Article IV, Section 1 of the Charter, adding "second appointed committees" to the introduction of the section and to item 4.

2. Amending the Bylaws to add or amend the amending the Charter: After reading the motion for amending the Bylaws, they moved that we amend Article IV to add the membership and role of the General Education Committee and to amend the amending the Charter. See the exact wording attached to the agenda, p. 4.

The motion was seconded, and discussion followed.

Tom Shiple: I would like to address several items. The Charter & Bylaws Committee has added the qualifications that the proposed appointments be "subject to confirmation by the Senate Executive Committee"; that was not part of the original language referred to the Charter & Bylaws Committee. The committee has also added language about the suggested name and how long people serve. In addition, there have been questions about whether the change of the General Education Committee is being done in a "revise and recommend" public regarding general education" meeting with all of the Academic Standards Committee, Charter & Bylaws did not attempt to resolve that issue, we would have both done at this time. Also, the committee feels there should be an approval process (with program and curriculum), we are assured that the committee is working on an approval process and that it will be brought forward soon.

Proposed to Amend the Main Motion

Tom Shiple: I have then we amend the language of item (c) in the proposed bylaws by inserting "and subject to confirmation by the Senate Executive Committee" so that the language will be consistent with what was passed by the Senate last spring. The Charter & Bylaws Committee dealt with this issue and voted 2-2 so to do even though there were five members present.

The motion was seconded, and discussion on the amendment followed.

Chair: I oppose the amendment. I don't see why the Senate would want to vote on the process. This is a representative body representing the interests of University faculty. I see no problem with bringing amendments to the general committee via past the Senate Executive Committee. To make that process a matter of expediency because we have already done it that way just goes back to my earlier question about acting on past facts. I think the proposed amendment is a bad idea.

Charles Single: I was chair of the Academic Standards Committee last year, and this was ahead of our committee last year. The language "and subject to confirmation by the Senate Executive Committee" was not included because we did very specific academic issues needed to be addressed. Sometimes, the democratic process does not yield the most suitable process to represent an issue. The process could use the authority to choose people upon recommendations from a number of sources - the General Education Committee, deans, or individuals themselves - for the expertise they bring to these areas. The first amendment contains a minority of that committee. I would support the removal of that restriction.

Laurel Sauer: I was a member of the Charter & Bylaws Committee. I would like to oppose the amendment. What Dr. Single has brought up about the process of having the option to appoint someone he thinks is necessary to the process is not an issue we pass this bylaws is recommended. Sometimes, the democratic process does not yield the most suitable process to represent an issue. The process could use the authority to choose people upon recommendations from a number of sources - the General Education Committee, deans, or individuals themselves - for the expertise they bring to these areas. The first amendment contains a minority of that committee. I would support the removal of that restriction.

Janice Elmer: I was teaching at people here but our Senate committees get limited to quality and have to be taught and that we need something to show down the transition of a committee and getting a system. I believe there are three months of the year when the Senate Executive Committee does not meet. You might want to keep that in mind.

Bill Hinkley: The general Education Committee recommended this approach to the process generally with the intent that the people in the first vote should be determined by general education and each and every program general education. This choice is the people who are appointed just because they come from outside area. The current practice of possible candidates for the Senate Executive Committee relates to that particular issue. The previous General Education Committee supported appointment to the process, the concept was passed without that given by the Senate last spring, and it was supported by the present committee and the present. I strongly support passage of this amendment to go back to the previous State.

Chair: I would like to hear Dr. Sauer said. Charles Single said that the Executive Committee is empowered to judge the qualifications of those who will be recommended or nominated by the process? Or is it just that authority is to give process, and to want to require things? Democracy is a very slow process, but it also is very suitable process.

Barbara Boehrer: Have a question for those who speak in favor of the amendment. As Laurel Sauer says, the proposed amendment does not change who you get the right to make the recommendation. I am not sure why I am being told to vote for this.

Chair: Speaking as a member from your department and College, I oppose the amendment. I'm concerned that the Senate will abdicate its responsibility for the academic status of the University. If we are not to check and balance, the process will have control of a major academic matter - the general education requirement. I have been asked, "Don't you trust the process?" I trust the current process. I do not trust the new process because the Senate will not be responsible for selection and hiring of the next person. On the issue of trust, it would seem appropriate for the process to trust the faculty elected to the Senate Executive Committee and be willing to respect that judgment.

A vote was taken, and the motion to add "and subject to confirmation by the Senate Executive Committee" was defeated.

Further Discussion of the Main Motion

Shiple: As I look at the structure of the proposed bylaws, it seems that all of the paragraphs use "shall" except paragraph (c). Could we add to it say "shall plus the approved courses into the general program and serve as an advisory body..."?

Chair: I do not consider that a "binding" amendment.

Bill Hinkley: I have a general question about the amendment. I had some thoughts about the topic I have a question including being presented to the Board of Trustees, a motion to vote on this was "second appointed committees."

Chair: I am concerned to address that the beginning with the amendment that the second time the proposed bylaws is contingent upon the final ratification of the amendment to Article IV, Section 1 of the Senate Charter.

Single: I ask for clarification. In the general education package passed in May 1998, a number of items were included that I don't feel that your committee's motion. I will vote - the fact that course proposals for general education would have to go through a step-by-step procedure through the college curriculum committee to the General Education Committee to the University Curriculum Committee and all academic units, the movement of the gate of course at the end of a 3-year cycle, etc.

Chair: There were two copies of what was passed in May and June.

Single: I will get you a copy.

Chair: I would like to see a copy of it from the secretary rather than the committee. I don't know Betsy Brown. I did not complete the copies, which were distributed by General Education Committee Bill Hinkley. One committee to those copies was made at the very end of the October 16 Senate meeting, plus one of the minutes of that meeting.]

Chair: We were aware of the discussion about the request for approving programs. In addressing whether the General Education Committee would adopt the University Curriculum Committee, we understood that the Senate wished that the General Education Committee to meet every two academic years (c) of the proposed bylaws says "General Education Committee shall review and approve for general education certification..." Our intention was that a review will be done by the University Curriculum Committee like any other committee it will then go to the General Education Committee for approval of certification. Concerning movement after 3 years, we did not include 3 years per se, but we did have the "General Education Committee shall develop movement plan and procedures..." We did these plans would address that question. The minutes and plans have been provided to us by GEC Committee Bill Hinkley, and we have held on that.

Janice: Certain elements of what was presented in effect. Whether they get put into the Charter is another matter. We did not feel they were Charter elements. Procedures for approving courses and programs are already approved by the Senate Charter and Bylaws. We did that GEC review would be subject to the procedure that has already been established. It happened in the 3 year assessment, we felt that it should not appear in the Charter, but it is certainly in effect. If the GEC Committee wanted to change that, the names would have come back to the Senate. We did that the responsibility for recommending policies was the important thing that should go in the Charter and Bylaws.

If you did not get a copy of the general education needs, which I looked at the Senate meeting last session.

Rebecca: It seems that we need two bylaws changes once another bylaws gives the right or responsibility to general education to the Academic Standards Committee. I do not understand how we can vote on two bylaws without voting on the other. If the proposed bylaws give us the same responsibility to two committees.

Chair: Amending existing Article 4.1.2, the responsibility of Academic Standards "shall include the making of recommendations consistent with University general requirements, undergraduate college degree requirements, the grading system, basic criteria for first and professional..." Our intention was that a review will be done by the University Curriculum Committee like any other committee it will then go to the General Education Committee for approval of certification. Concerning movement after 3 years, we did not include 3 years per se, but we did have the "General Education Committee shall develop movement plan and procedures..." We did these plans would address that question. The minutes and plans have been provided to us by GEC Committee Bill Hinkley, and we have held on that.

Chair: I think it is a problem. If one different program looking at requirements, how is that not applicable? How does that not require certain and conflict?

Chair: Conflicts and conflicts are certainly possible, but the working has to do with "making recommendations" to the Senate. We can have more than one body making recommendations to the Senate. These two recommendations need to be reviewed. We have people with different of opinion all of the time. Bill Hinkley said that Academic Standards has the authority to certify general education courses, then we would have a conflict of who has the authority. As it is, neither of these committees has the ultimate authority. The Senate has ultimate authority to consider recommendations from either body.

Single: I understand the need to address the amendments to the Charter and the proposed bylaws together, but I do not think it is proper for the Senate to vote on the bylaws without. I make a motion to table the vote on the bylaws. The motion was seconded.

Motion: A motion to table is not debatable, passage requires a 2/3 majority.

A vote was taken, and the motion to table the proposed bylaws "was defeated."

Chair: Thank you: Point of information: If the issue comes into effect, how will it affect the current General Education Committee? Will we have to go through new elections and appointments, or would some members be "grandfathered in"?

Chair: We would have to start over. We would need to elect from the colleges. The process would need to replace his members. From a practical standpoint, I suspect that would be a rather massive transition. I do not see a major problem.

Shiple: I will question.

A vote was taken, and the motion to amend proposed bylaws 1) with an amended wording for item (c) "The General Education Committee shall plan the approved courses into the GEC program and serve as an advisory body to the Coordinator of General Education" and committee the remaining bylaws passed.

ELECTIONS AND Nominations COMMITTEE: Mike Maloney reported that he has been conducting elections or voting committees for several elections. Senate chair, the Ohio Faculty Council, the Charter & Bylaws Committee, the Senate Executive Committee, and the Election and Balloting Committee. He has been consulted for ballot and ballot, November 6. Whom will be contacted on Monday. If you did not receive a ballot, he Maloney knows one 1002.

Motion: Refer to Senate chair, Ohio Faculty Council, and Charter & Bylaws should have been included by revision. The others apply to the respective colleges for which they are trustees.

Tom Shiple offered his department's assistance in completing the elections. Some ballots did not have Maloney's contact name and address.

ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE: Louise Peres reported that the Academic Standards Committee met on October 16 and October 30. The first meeting was an organizational meeting. The second focused on criteria for admission related to early admission opportunities and Senate BE 149 courses and an administration of a withdrawal date for the semester system. Discussion of these two items will continue at the November 6 meeting. The committee plans to present proposals regarding these two items for the December Senate meeting.

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS CURRICULUM, ACADEMIC PLANNING, INTEGRATED TECHNOLOGIES, UNIVERSITY OUTREACH, LIBRARY, ACADEMIC RESEARCH, STUDENT ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, STUDENT ACADEMIC GRIEVANCE, HONORS, AND ACADEMIC EVENTS COMMITTEES: No reports.

CONFERENCES AND EVENTS: None.

NEW BUSINESS: None.

ADJOURNMENT: Tom Shiple moved that we adjourn. The motion was seconded, and the meeting adjourned at 4:19 p.m.