

**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**  
**September 13, 2000, 4:00 p.m.**  
**Room 132, DeBartolo Hall**

*Note 1: Please submit agenda items and cover sheets for the October 4 Senate meeting to Bege Bowers, English Department, by noon on Friday, September 22. 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 your name is followed by one or more asterisks on the 2000–2001 committee list available on the Senate web site, please call a meeting of your committee so that the committee can elect a chair.*

*Note 3: Now that I have the software to create pdf files, I will include a link to a pdf version of the minutes rather than a link to a rich text format version. (The advantage is that page breaks will be the same for everyone.) You will need Adobe Acrobat Reader to view the pdf file. If you want to read or print the pdf file and don't have Acrobat Reader, you may download the program for free at <http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep2.html>.*

**OVERVIEW:**

**Topics presented/discussed:** withdrawal of curriculum motions from June 2000; nominations for chair of the Senate and members of the Charter & Bylaws Committee; GEC proposal on course flow, including whether a portion of the hearings following an objection should be closed; changes to the language concerning which courses are eligible for certification as writing intensive, oral intensive, and critical thinking intensive; negotiating agreements for distance-learning courses.

**ACTIONS:**

- The following motion carried: **a motion to table the General Education Committee's motion that we adopt the General Education Committee's course-flow proposal that was attached to the September 13 Senate agenda.**
- The following motion carried: **a motion that we approve the changes in the language for general education "intensive" courses as proposed in the Senate agenda.**

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Jim Morrison, chair of the Academic Senate, called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. He welcomed new senators and thanked those returning for another year.

**CLEARING OF CURRICULUM BUSINESS ON THE FLOOR:** Because of the loss of a quorum at the June 7, 2000, meeting, we began the September meeting by clearing the two motions that remained on the floor at the end of the June meeting (i.e., the Curriculum Committee's motion and Daryl Mincey's motion to amend it):

Morrison recognized **Tammy King, chair of the Curriculum Committee**. King asked permission to withdraw the Curriculum Committee's motion that had been presented at the June meeting. The committee is considering the issues and plans to present a new motion at the October Senate meeting (the

committee does not plan to present the proposal it included in the agenda for today's meeting). Mincey agreed to withdraw his motion to amend.

Withdrawal of a motion requires unanimous consent. Hearing no objections, **Morrison ruled that both the main motion and the motion to amend could be withdrawn.**

**NOMINATIONS FOR CHAIR OF THE SENATE AND MEMBERS OF THE CHARTER AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE:** The Senate *Bylaws* require the first order of business at the first Senate meeting of the academic year to be nominations for chair of the Senate and for open positions on the Charter and Bylaws Committee.

**Nominations for chair of the Senate:**

**Louise Aurilio, chair of the Elections and Balloting Committee,** noted that forms soliciting nominations for chair of the Senate had been mailed to Senate members, resulting in six written nominations. Three of the nominees subsequently withdrew. **The three remaining nominees are Jim Morrison, Tom Shipka, and Charles Singler.** Aurilio called for additional nominations from the floor. There being none, the names of Morrison, Shipka, and Singler will appear on the mail ballot.

**Nominations for members of the Charter and Bylaws Committee:**

Aurilio then called for nominations for the three open positions on the Charter and Bylaws Committee. **The following individuals were nominated for a two-year term: Ikram Khawaja, Kathylynn Feld, and John Murphy.** The *Bylaws* stipulate that the election take place by mail ballot.

**MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:**

Minutes of the 7 June 2000 meeting were approved as posted.

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

- Last spring, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) made faculty appointments to standing committees for 2000–2001 (there is a link to the committee list on the web site at <http://www.cc.yosu.edu/acad-senate/#committee>). President Sweet has since made appointments for the administrative positions on those committees, and Student Government has made appointments of student members of the committees. Although we are close to having full representation on the committees, some committees have vacancies for some colleges. The SEC decided to follow the Senate *Bylaws* (Bylaw 6.1.c) in not assigning any faculty member to more than one standing committee (except as a liaison member).
- The SEC has taken some action on last spring's motion mandating the SEC to explore the possible creation of a standing Senate committee on global awareness (see Attachment 2 in the minutes for the May 3, 2000, Senate meeting at <http://cc.yosu.edu/acad-senate/minmay00.htm>). On behalf of the SEC, Morrison asked four individuals—Stephen Hanzely, David Porter, Ndinzi Masagara, and Dan O'Neill—to study the viability of such a committee and what its composition, charge, and scope might be.

The four individuals recently made a strong and compelling recommendation that the committee

be created; however, they have yet to make recommendations about some of the other considerations, such as the possible composition of the committee. The SEC will address the matter further at its next meeting.

- The SEC will also begin making its recommendations of faculty to fill faculty positions on administrative committees; it was unclear last spring, with the changes taking place in the University, which of the administrative boards and committees still existed and which ones wanted the SEC's input. At its next meeting, the SEC will address a recent request from Student Affairs. It will also address the provost's appointments to the General Education Committee, which—according to Senate Bylaw 7.1.a—are subject to ratification by the SEC.

Morrison noted the recent death of Gene Sekeres, professor of marketing and a long-time member of the Academic Senate; Sekeres was a dedicated member of committees and a valued contributor. We are the lesser for his absence.

**OHIO FACULTY COUNCIL REPORT:** Jim Morrison and Tom Shipka attended the September 8 meeting of the OFC. **Shipka, our newly elected representative to the OFC,** made the attached report; see Attachment 1.

**CHARTER AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE:** Dale Harrison, chair of the Charter and Bylaws Committee, made the following report:

I have two memos from members of the Senate requesting that the Charter and Bylaws Committee help resolve two issues. The first memo asks for clarification on the distinction between policy and procedure in two ways.

First, quoting from the memo: “When a committee of the Senate makes a report, does acceptance of the report constitute adoption of the contents of the report for implementation? For example, if the report includes procedures, are the procedures, upon acceptance of the report by the Senate, in effect? Can committee reports be amended on the Senate floor?”

Second: “May procedures be adopted that are not consistent with approved policy and then stand as policy?”

The second memo asks whether state of Ohio open-meetings laws take precedence over *Robert's Rules of Order* and any action taken by the Senate. The memo requests that the committee address this matter and report back at the next Senate meeting.

The Charter and Bylaws Committee will meet to discuss these issues and welcomes input, which can be sent to Dale Harrison in the English Department.

**ELECTIONS AND BALLOTING COMMITTEE:** Louise Aurilio, chair of the committee, noted that the committee will soon meet and elect a chair for this year. Currently, there are three vacancies on the Senate Executive Committee; elections for these positions will take place in Fine and Performing Arts, Arts and Sciences, and the College of Education.

**ACADEMIC STANDARDS, ACADEMIC PROGRAMS, CURRICULUM, AND ACADEMIC PLANNING COMMITTEES:** No reports.

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE: Bill Jenkins, chair of the General Education Committee (GEC), reported:**

**Jenkins:** The GEC has been meeting in regard to the procedures for processing courses. Because of the time crunch, this past year we operated under emergency regulations put forward by the Senate Executive Committee. The GEC and the University Curriculum Division (UCD) have been meeting separately but consulting in an effort to provide a system that would allow for adequate and fair hearings, on the one hand, while recognizing the practical problems of two committees functioning at the same time, on the other. At what point does one committee pass a proposal along to the other, and how does the approval process proceed from there?

One of the problems the UCD cited was this: If a course that is seeking general education certification comes to the UCD for approval as a new course, the UCD would like the GEC at least to look at the proposal to see if the course appears to be certifiable for general education. The UCD needs that feedback because, most often, the GEC is likely to have a larger impact on the design of a course than the UCD has. The UCD felt such a proposal should go to the GEC first and then proceed back to the UCD for consideration and joint circulation. That is the gist of the General Education Committee's proposal that was attached to the September 13 Senate agenda (<http://www.cc.ysu.edu/acad-senate/sep00age.htm#genEdflow>; approximately pages 7–9 in the rich text format version of the agenda). (Jenkins then gave an overview of the proposal, explaining that the GEC used the term “pre-certified” in section II.C of the proposal in recognition of the fact that a new course must also receive UCD approval).

**Jenkins then moved that we adopt the General Education's course-flow proposal that was attached to the September 13 Senate agenda.**

**The motion was seconded, and discussion followed:**

**Daryl Mincey, Chemistry:** I believe a motion such as this should come from the UCD. The UCD noted earlier that it isn't presenting a motion today. I don't see how the GEC motion can go through without it.

**Charles Singler, Geology:** I'm confused. It was intended that the UCD and the GEC would present parallel procedures, and the UCD has chosen not to. Given that Dr. Jenkins has presented his overview of the GEC process, which overlaps with the UCD process, I would like to make a comment or two. The two proposals attached to the agenda are not parallel and consistent with each other. I could cite several examples.

The most important issue I raised with the GEC a week and a half ago has to do with the procedures for conducting hearings after an objection has been made. I thank the GEC for hearing my arguments and making some editorial changes in the proposal. But according to the proposals attached to the agenda, both the UCD and the GEC, upon holding hearings, would eventually conduct their discussions and reach their conclusions in closed sessions. The language under **Hearings**, section III of the GEC proposal, does not use the word “closed”; however, it says that “the objector, department representative and all observers will be excused.” Only the members of the committee will remain. The same kind of language appears in the UCD proposal attached to the agenda, although that proposal does use the word “closed.” Either way, it strikes me that a portion of the hearings will be closed. The Charter and Bylaws Committee has been alerted and agreed to review the issue of closed hearings. After David Porter makes his remarks, I will perhaps recommend that this proposal be returned to committee.

**David Porter, Political Science:** I support the comments that have been made. If we adopt this

document, we lock the UCD into a procedure—and whether they wish to follow that procedure or not is a matter for future discussions since they chose not to present a proposal today. Also, on page 8 of the agenda, under **Hearings**, there are two potential violations of Ohio’s open-meetings act.

The first is item 2: “All concerned persons are permitted in the room during the hearing.” There have been lawsuits over what “concerned” means. It can be used to say that a political scientist cannot be in the room, because the course being considered is in Geology. So that word has usually been struck from almost anything that has to do with who can attend a public meeting in Ohio.

The second is item 9: “At the close of the hearing, the objector, department representative and all observers will be excused.” “Excused” essentially is a way of saying that it will be a closed meeting. I don’t think the faculty should dismiss this or think this a trite point. It takes 50 or 60 hours of work, or more, to produce the paperwork to submit to these two committees. And yet, the motion before us is to close the door, lock it, and say, “We [the committee] will now decide; you cannot hear the final debate.” The committee members don’t have to look you in the eye when they say, “Get your course out of here.”

However, I do see some problem with voting this motion down or tabling it or sending it back to committee. The report does include a series of courses. If we don’t pass some aspect of this report, technically the capstone and intensive courses that were part of the report cannot be finally certified.

**Jenkins:** I did not make a motion to adopt the report. I made a motion specifically dealing with the course-flow procedure.

**Porter:** My apologies. In that case, my last point is moot. I agree with Dr. Singler that this matter should be referred back to both committees.

Also, in 1999, the Senate approved a document called **Temporary Procedures for Course/Program/GER Approval**. That document states, in the first paragraph under **General Education Certification**, “Subsequent to passage of criteria by the Senate, any course submitted for general education certification must have secured approval from the University Curriculum Committee as a semester course.” I haven’t been given a very convincing reason as to why that is not a workable policy that should be continued. I think the proposal for parallel consideration will make for a very difficult bureaucratic procedure—which may have been justified under the extreme measures of last year, but which probably is not justified when trying to establish standard operating procedures to serve this University for the next decade.

**Jenkins:** The GEC does have the authority to recommend policy, to bring something to the floor. Let me explain the inconsistencies in the UCD and GEC proposals. Dr. Singler had a number of objections to the procedures we had planned to propose, as he indicated. We invited him to meet with the GEC. After taking his objections into account, the GEC changed a number of things in its proposal, and I reported those changes to the UCD. Tammy King, the chair of the UCD, attempted to call a meeting of the UCD, but lacking a quorum, the UCD could not consider the resolution in time to present a tandem proposal.

The GEC brought its proposal forward because we would like to hear your comments. The semester is underway, and courses need to be processed. Should the Senate consider it is ready to pass this, I think the parts that refer to the UCD will be in sync with their eventual proposal.

The major issue that Dr. Singler and Dr. Porter raised is about open meetings and Ohio’s “Sunshine Law.” Let me first read you what Senate Bylaw 8, section 2, says about meetings:

In all cases where other specific rules have not been approved by the Senate, Robert's Rules of Order shall apply to all committee business.

*Robert's Rules of Order*, section 49, states:

**Section 49 — Committees**

**Subsection on Conduct of Business in Committee: Committee Procedure**

When a committee is to make substantive recommendations or decisions on an important matter, it should give members of the society an opportunity to appear before it and present their views on the subject at a time scheduled by the committee. Such a meeting is usually called a *hearing*. During actual deliberations of the committee, only committee members have the right to be present.

**Porter:** Point of order: Will the parliamentarian give a ruling on whether *Robert's Rules of Order* supercedes state law?

**Jenkins:** The Sunshine Law applies to public bodies created legally by the state. The Academic Senate is not a public body created by the state. This Senate operates under its own *Charter* and *Bylaws* and *Robert's Rules of Order*. I think one would have to obtain a legal opinion on whether the Sunshine Law directly applies to this matter.

**Morrison:** I see this as a point of privilege or clarification rather than a point of order.

**Porter:** All I ask is that members of the Senate go to the state of Ohio web site (<http://www.state.oh.us>), search for Open Meetings Act, and look at the Attorney General's opinions on the Open Meetings Act.

**Jenkins:** Let me explain one of the reasons for wanting to have the hearing followed by closed deliberations. Objections in the GEC and UCD often involve hot issues among colleagues, administrators, and faculty. Members of the GEC felt that once the questions have been raised and the arguments have been made, it would be more appropriate for the committee to meet for deliberations without others present—and not to be under any particular scrutiny or subject to possible interruption. A further consideration is that some of the individuals involved may have an administrative, supervisory relationship to members of the committee. The members would feel freer to speak during deliberations if these administrative, supervisory individuals were not present. People will hold back opinions and not discuss the issues as freely if others are there.

It is incumbent on this committee and other committees to report the reasons a course is rejected or a situation is resolved in a particular way. If people are upset with the committee's decision, there is a further venue of challenge: the Senate itself. One could come to the Senate and oppose the committee's motion or make a motion to reject the decision of the committee. There are other examples within the University in which closed deliberations are held: personnel decisions, labor negotiations, etc. There are legitimate points at which people involved in making decisions need to engage in some deliberation—and to engage in it separated from the parties involved in the particular decision.

**Tammy King, chair of the UCD:** I did call a meeting of the UCD, but we did not have a quorum. Three colleges are not yet represented on the committee. As for closed deliberations, once arguments and issues are presented in an open setting—as we see in criminal and civil law—those who are going to make a recommendation reach the recommendation in closed deliberations, whether it's a jury or some type of

committee. I'm not saying these are exact parallels, but there are similarities. People need to be able to speak openly and freely about an issue. If the situation involves a department chair, for example, and a member of the committee is in that department, the committee members may not feel as free to speak as they would feel if the chair were not present. Remember that the Senate does have a final say. If you are unhappy with the committee's recommendations, the situation can be debated and re-evaluated in the Senate.

**Barbara Brothers, Dean of Arts and Sciences: I move to table this motion of the GEC so that we can have time to arrive at a "mature" judgment about whether or not such closed hearings are in accordance with the laws of operation of the state of Ohio.**

**The motion to table was seconded by David Porter.**

**Dale Harrison, Charter and Bylaws Committee:** Point of order: Is a motion to table debatable?

**Jenkins:** It is not debatable.

**A vote was taken.**

**Morrison:** Tabling a motion requires a 2/3 majority. I note a 2/3 majority; **the GEC's motion is tabled.**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Jenkins:** Pages 9–10 of the agenda (<http://www.cc.ysu.edu/acad-senate/sep00age.htm#intensive>) include proposed changes to the language concerning which courses can be certified as intensive courses for general education purposes. The major change is to stipulate that capstone courses are not eligible for intensive certification. The capstone is to include writing, speaking, and critical thinking as much as it can, and should reflect the fact that students have completed the earlier intensive courses and can demonstrate those skills.

In regard to writing-intensive courses, the proposed change also includes the following sentence: "Any lower division course with a prerequisite of English 1551 [Writing 2] may also be certified as writing intensive, provided it meets the criteria for a writing intensive course."

Presently, only 3700- and 4800-level courses are eligible for certification as writing intensive. People have asked whether other courses shouldn't be eligible for certification, especially those courses that students might take for which English 1551 is a prerequisite. The GEC agreed with that suggestion and included it within the proposed changes.

In regard to the bracketed area under **Speaking**, we removed the reference to the GEC as the reviewer of proposals, because that provision is in other parts of the document. Its powers are clearly indicated elsewhere.

**Therefore, I move that we approve the changes in the language for general education "intensive" courses as proposed in the Senate agenda.**

**The motion was seconded** and people were given an opportunity to discuss the changes. No one raised discussion, so **a vote was taken, and the motion to accept the proposed changes in the language concerning intensive courses carried.**

**Morrison:** The courses that have been approved for general education are appended to the agenda.

**INTEGRATED TECHNOLOGIES, UNIVERSITY OUTREACH, ACADEMIC RESEARCH, STUDENT ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, STUDENT ACADEMIC GRIEVANCE, HONORS, AND ACADEMIC EVENTS COMMITTEES: No reports.**

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:** None.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**J-C. Smith, Philosophy and Religious Studies:** I chair the University Distance-Learning Review Committee, which is mandated under the current bargaining agreement between YSU and the YSU OEA. I wanted members of the Senate to be informed that a distance-learning course negotiation packet has been made available in the deans' offices as approved by the Distance-Learning Review Committee. Faculty members and chairpersons who are interested in developing distance-learning courses should acquire a copy of the packet from their dean's office and use it as the basis for negotiating workload release or supplemental pay for preparing and delivering distance-learning courses.

The Distance-Learning Review Committee is composed of some members of the administration and some faculty members in the bargaining unit. It continues to have oversight over all distance-learning agreements, and copies of the agreements signed by chairs and faculty and approved by the dean must be sent to the committee through the Office of the Provost. If you have questions, contact me in the Philosophy and Religious Studies Department, or contact any member of the committee through the Office of the Provost.

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

**Attachment 1**  
**Report by Tom Shipka on the Meeting of the Ohio Faculty Council**  
**in Columbus on September 8, 2000**

The Ohio Faculty Council consists of two representatives from each Ohio public university. One representative is elected and one is the chair of the institution's Faculty Senate or comparable governance body. I was elected for a two-year term last spring as YSU's representative to succeed Duane Rost. Jim Morrison is YSU's other representative on the Council.

The purposes of the Ohio Faculty Council are to address concerns common to the faculties at the public universities and to provide a faculty perspective to the Chancellor and the Board of Regents on issues in Ohio higher education.

The first meeting of the current school year took place in Columbus at the Board of Regents offices on Friday, September 8. The meeting was convened by Ginny Hamilton of Shawnee State University, who had been elected temporary chair last spring. The meeting ran from 12:30 p.m. until approximately 2:30 p.m. Not all institutions were represented. This may be due to the fact that although continuing members knew the tentative schedule of meeting dates for this year, new members did not, and the actual notice of the meeting came only two days before the meeting, via e-mail.

Chancellor Roderick Chu spent about forty minutes with the Council. He gave a briefing to us on the



proposed budget for higher education and then took comments and questions.

The Chancellor said that the Governor had called for budget proposals from state agencies not to exceed a 10% increase over the previous budget without a special justification. The Chancellor said that the higher education budget, as drafted, will seek a 12.5% increase per year in the biennium. The main justifications given by the Chancellor are to elevate spending in Ohio to parity with other states, to launch an aggressive initiative in the state to create a work force which can succeed in the new knowledge-based economy because it has life-long learning skills, and to enable Ohio to retain and attract the new generation of employers and jobs. He said that the higher education budget will help create the 21st century economy for Ohio. He emphasized that the budget proposal was screened by various groups outside of the Board of Regents, including the Higher Education Funding Commission, a state group with strong representation from the business and technology sectors.

The budget proposal includes substantial increases in the subsidy formulae and major additional funds for modernizing classrooms, for purchasing more computers for students, and for research.

The Chancellor said that the budget had extensive input from every campus administration and that nearly all requests by institutions were incorporated.

The Chancellor said that if Ohio doesn't make giant strides in funding in higher education now, it will lose out to other states such as Georgia. He said that higher education in Ohio is at a crossroads, and he predicted that many Ohio faculty will move to other states if Ohio fails to fund its system more generously.

The Chancellor acknowledged two obstacles to the proposed budget. Firstly, diplomatic progress made with the Superintendent and other leaders in elementary and secondary levels could disintegrate in coming months as the budget goes through legislative hearings; and secondly, the vocal tax-cut advocates in the Legislature, many of whom have been elected recently, could succeed in blocking some or all proposed budget increases. The Chancellor asked for the support of faculty, staff, students, and students' families throughout the state and said that support by the K-12 community and the business community is indispensable.

The Chancellor said that a "Fact Book" and an "Annual Report" will be distributed soon to those of us in Ohio higher education to help us understand and promote the proposed budget.

After the Chancellor's presentation, the Council talked about its agenda for the year. It decided to assign a member to attend meetings of all four of the Board of Regents' standing committees because most important initiatives start at the committee level.

Various members proposed specific items for possible attention of the Council, but action on these proposals was deferred until the October 13 meeting. The Council will also work on its mission statement in October.

I ask that members of the YSU faculty, staff, or student body with concerns or issues which you want carried to the Ohio Faculty Council contact me in the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies by phone at (330) 742-3448 or by phone at (330) 742-3448 or by e-mail at [tashipka@cc.ysu.edu](mailto:tashipka@cc.ysu.edu).

**Attendance Sheet for September 13, 2000 (Scanned Image) is in a separate pdf file.**

**Arts and Sciences**

At Large

MB Martin Berger  
SKS Bege K. Bowers  
JB John Buoni  
RT Robert Hogue  
MM Thomas Maraffa  
DM Daryl Mincey  
JCM James C. Morrison  
AS Thomas A. Shipka  
CS Charles Singler  
TT Tess Tessier

Departmental

MW Mark Womble, Biology  
DS David Stephens, Geography  
JS John Sarkissian, For. Lang.  
NW Nancy White, Psychology  
DM Donna DeBlasio, History  
CM Clyde Morris, Economics  
JA James Andrews, Physics & Ast.

Departmental (Cont'd)

CR Robert Kramer, CSIS  
JJ John Jackson, Chemistry  
MI Megan Isaac, English  
JD Jeffrey Dick, Geology  
RG Richard Goldtwait, Mathematics  
JCS J-C. Smith, Phil. & Rel.  
DP David Porter, Pol./Soc. Sci.  
RW Robert Weaver, Soc./Anthropology

**Business Administration**

At Large

GC Gregory Claypool  
AK Anthony Kos  
DL David Law

At Large (Cont'd)

JT James Tackett  
WV William Vendemia

Departmental

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

**Education**

At Large

JB Janet Beary  
MB Margaret Briley  
MLD Mary Lou DiPillo

At Large (Cont'd)

JG Janet Gill-Wigal  
RM Richard McEwing

Departmental

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

**Engineering and Technology**

At Large

RAM Robert A. McCoy  
SRP Salvatore R. Pansino  
JCZ James C. Zupanic

Departmental

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

Departmental (Cont'd)

DK 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  
AM 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

CM Carol Mikanowicz, Health Prof.  
JN John Neville, HPES  
HN Hannah Nissen, Human Ecol.

Departmental (Cont'd)

EG Elaine Greaves, Crim. Jus.  
MK Marsha Kuite, Nursing  
SK Shirley Keller, Social Work  
CP Cathy Parrott, Physical Therapy

**Administration**

CEA Cynthia E. Anderson  
CA Thomas C. Atwood  
BH Barbara H. Brothers  
MAC Margaret A. Collins

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

VM Virginia L. Mears  
JS James J. Scanlon  
CS Charles A. Stevens  
JY 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.  
BLH Brynn Hannay, E&T  
RR Richard Russo, FPA  
MA Melissa Amorn, HHS  
PM Paul Mucci, WCBA

School/College (Cont'd)

[Vacant], Grad. School

Other

JG Joseph Gregory, Pres.  
KS Kristin Serroka, VP  
MP Matthew Pavone, 2<sup>nd</sup> VP