

SENATE MINUTES
YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY
Friday, December 3, 1971

PRESENT: Mr. Lfvosky, Mr. Snyder, Mr. Siman, Mr. **Robinson**, Mr. **Looby**, Mr. Ringer, Mr. Swan, Mr. Wales, **III**, Mr. Rook, Mr. **Scriven**, Mr. Hotchkiss, Mr. **Beckman**, Mr. Rand, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Ronaghy, Mr. **DeGarmo**, Mr. Ellis, Mr. Jones, Mr. **Greenman**, Mr. Almond, Mr. Harris, **Jr.**, Mr. Krill, Mr. Terlecki, Mr. **Crum**, Miss Feldmiller, Mr. Hurd, Mr. von Ostwalden, Mr. Foldvary, Mr. **Mavrigian**, Mr. **Behen**, Mr. **Dillon**, Mr. Williamson, Mrs. **Niemi**, Mrs. **Dykema**, Miss Pfau, Mr. Hare, Mr. Hankey, Mrs. Miner, Mr. Miner, Mr. **Simko**, Miss Anderson, Mr. Hovey, Mr. **Curran**, Mr. Deiderick, Mr. Petrych, Mr. Berger, Mr. Poddar, Mr. Shipka, Mr. Hanzely, Mr. Henkel, Mrs. Budge, Mr. Reilly, Mr. Teodorescu, Mr. Jonas, Mr. Baldino, Jr., Mr. **Ahmed**, Mr. Bronstrup, Mr. Steele, Mr. Dobbert, Miss Boyer, Mr. **Esterly**, Mr. **Kiriazis**, Mr. Blue, Mr. Cernica, Mr. Paraska, Mr. **Zetts**, Mr. Fortunato, Mr. Miller, Mr. Parm, Mr. Brachfeld, Mr. May, Miss Sterenberg, Miss Shellock, Mr. Wilms, Mr. Slawecki, Mrs. Foley, Mrs. Turner, Mr. Earnhart, Mr. Hill, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Jenkins, Mr. **Vanaman**, Mr. Slavin, Mr. **Domonkos**, Mr. Ives, Mr. Hahn, Mrs. Painter, Mr. Painter, Mr. Byo, Mr. Aurand, Mr. **Yozwiak**, Mr. Tarantine, Mr. Richley, Mr. Spiegel, Mr. Schroeder, Mr. Van Zandt, Mr. Kelley, Mr. Kramer, Miss Jenkins, Vice President Coffelt, Vice President Edgar, and President Pugsley.

PRESIDING: PRESIDENT ALBERT L. **PUGSLEY** TIME: 4:00 p.m. **SCHWEBEL** AUDIT.

The President called for the approval of the minutes of the previous Senate meeting (Friday, November 5, 1971). There being no additions, modifications or corrections the President then declared those minutes to be approved as distributed.

REPORT OF THE CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE:

This report was given by the Chairman, Dr. **David M. Behen**. His report follows:

1. The Committee this afternoon will offer two (2) Amendments to the Bylaws and two (2) Amendments to the Constitution which have been previously circulated.

2. Simply to refresh our memories on procedures, it may be noted that (1) Bylaw Amendments require only majority vote at a Senate meeting for approval; therefore, the two (2) Bylaw Amendments to be so moved will be open for discussion and upon receiving a majority vote will become effective. Amendments to the Constitution require for approval, initially, an affirmative vote by a majority of the members present at a Senate meeting, and subsequently, approval by a two-thirds **vote** of those voting on the proposal in a mail ballot. (Constitution, Article V).

3. All proposed Amendments to Constitution or Bylaws are, of course, open to discussion by the Senate, and subject to Amendment from the Senate floor.

(CONT' D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D. : (Friday, December 3, 1971)
REPORT OF CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE CONT'D. : (Dr. Behen)

Dr. Behen stated he **was** not going to present them in the order in which they were presented in the circulated memorandum.

MOTION: Dr. David M. **Behen** moved adoption of Item IV which is to **AMEND** the Bylaws by the addition of the following article:

BYLAW XI. RULES OF ORDER

The rules contained in the latest revision of Roberts Rules of Order shall govern in all cases to which they are applicable, and in which they are not inconsistent with the Bylaws of the Constitution of the Faculty of Youngstown State University.

Seconded.

AYES HAVE IT. MOTION PASSED.

MOTION: Dr. David M. **Behen** moved the Amendment of the Bylaws by the **adoption** of a new Bylaw X as follows:
Motion to **AMEND** the Bylaws by the addition of the following article, this Amendment to become effective upon approval of the Amendment to Article V of the Constitution should that Amendment be adopted:

BYLAW X. AMENDMENTS

Section 1. Proposed amendments to the Bylaws shall be first submitted or referred to the Senate Committee on the Constitution and Bylaws.

Section 2. A proposed amendment to the Bylaws shall be mailed by the Secretary of the Senate to the Senate membership at least one (1) week prior to its being submitted to the Senate for consideration,

Section 3. A proposed amendment to the Bylaws shall become effective upon approval by a majority vote of the Senate **members** present at a meeting.

Seconded.

Dr. William Jenkins:

MOTION: Dr. William Jenkins offered an Amendment to the Proposed Amendment to replace Article V, Section 2 with Sections 2, 3, and 4 becoming Sections 3, 4 and 5 respectively.

The proposed Amendment to replace Article V, Section 2 as follows:

The Committee on the Constitution and Bylaws shall report a proposed amendment to the Senate for a vote not later than the second regular Senate meeting after receipt of the proposed amendment.

Dr. Jenkins: The purpose behind this amendment as stated would be to place a reasonable time limit on the consideration by the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

Consider two (2) regular Senate meetings to be a reasonable time limit, particularly since some amendments get carried over **for** a year or possibly longer,

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, December 3, 1971)
REPORT OF CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE CONT'D.: (Dr., Behen)

Dr. Pugsley: Before he called for the Second on the Motion he asked for a clarification as there was a difference in the wording of the material given to the Secretary and that read on the Senate floor. It had the words 'proposed Bylaw amendment', etc.

Dr. Pugsley: Does everyone understand that the amendment proposed refers only to Bylaw amendments?

Mrs. Dykema: This is an amendment to an amendment of the **Bylaws**. He is not proposing a separate Bylaw, but one Section as an amendment to this one the Committee has proposed.

Dr. Pugsley: The way the Motion now reads:

The Committee on the Constitution and Bylaws shall report a proposed amendment to the Senate for a vote not later than the second regular Senate meeting after receipt of the proposed amendment,
Seconded,

Mr. Ives: I understand the proposal. It does not replace the rest of Section 2, but adds to it,

Dr. T. Miner: There will now be 4 Sections under Bylaw X.

Mr. Livosky: Might it not be simpler to add a sentence to Section 1, rather than create a new Section? All in the same category.

Dr. Pfau: May I ask if the effect of this **Amendment** would be to make it impossible for the Constitution and Bylaws Committee to reject a proposed amendment?

Dr. Behen: I don't know that the Constitution and Bylaws Committee can, properly speaking, either accept, approve or reject a proposed Amendment."

I suppose it would simply leave the way open as it is now to report an amendment in the usual fashion: to report an amendment to you and possibly with the active urging of the Committee that it be passed or to report an amendment as simply a matter placed before the house for its action; perhaps with express disapproval of the Committee.

I **don't** know that this would in any way change either by augmenting or diminishing whatever powers the Committee may now possess. This is only my interpretation.

Dr. Hare: If I understand correctly, under the present procedure a Bylaw can be offered on the floor.

Dr. Behen: If it has been circulated in advance, Yes.

Dr. Hare: The Committee on Constitution and Bylaws can, therefore be bypassed under the present **procedure**.

This amendment you propose would force the Bylaw to go through your Committee before it is reported out on the Senate floor.

This new amendment to the amendment would simply require the person submitting this Bylaw to write it directly by Petition to the Committee or would it first have to be referred to the Committee by the Senate? That is where I am in doubt.

Dr. Behen: As far as I know, there has never been any regular procedure, much less an ironclad rule established with respect to matters referred to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

I think, speaking paranthetically, this is perhaps a good idea for it **gives** everyone the maximum amount of leeway. We have in

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, December 3, 1971)

REPORT OF CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE CONT'D.: (Dr. Behen)
Dr. Behen cont'd.:

the past received requests that we considered amendments to the Constitution but actually I **don't** recall, although Dr. Jenkins may be quite right, any Amendments to the Bylaws having been delayed for a year or more, I do not even recall any particular references of By-law **consideration** to the **Committee**.

But, at any rate, **we** have received and do receive requests for consideration of amendments to the Constitution directly from the Senate floor, Senate Executive **Committee**, and Other Standing Committees of the University Senate,

We **sometimes** consider matters referred to us directly by the President - although I do not recall that the President ever referred an amendment to us to be considered,

We are not at all stickish about where suggestions come from. I am not saying **we** welcome them with open arms (**we** have lots to do).

I don't think we have ever declined to give consideration to a Proposed Amendment regardless of the source, Might if **we** considered the source.

To answer Dr. **Hare's** question specifically: There is not in the Constitution, nor in the Bylaws any action ever taken by the Senate limiting the source of suggestions to the Committee (Constitution and Bylaws **Committee**). I rather like it that way. Any **Committee**, Senate itself, any member of the Senate, Administration, Faculty member who would like to submit something for the **Committee's** consideration will get it considered.

Dr. Hare: The language of the amendment reads "a proposed amendment"? I would **like** to know - What is a Proposed Amendment? What does this mean before I vote on this.

Is it something proposed by a vote of the Senate or is it something that someone might write a note to you and say I think the Constitution ought to be changed in this respect. Is this a Proposed Amendment?

Dr. Behen: I **myself**, and not speaking for the **Committee**, would consider a Proposed Amendment, and again I am not speaking officially, **we** have in times past and certainly on a good many occasions received from individual members, sometimes **from** the President simply a suggestion that **we** take a look at something that we might want to amend the Constitution regarding this. Not saying that we do,
I would interpret it myself broadly and liberally rather than narrowly.

Mrs. Dykema: Could we have a clarification from the proposer of the amendment?

Dr. Jenkins: I would agree that the Proposal be any **form** under which it is presently allowed as a Proposal to the Constitution and Bylaws.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D. : (Friday, December 3, 1971)

REPORT OF CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE CONT'D. : (Dr. Behen)

DISCUSSION CONT'D. : Would the Chairman, Dr. Behen care to comment as to whether or not this might pressure the Committee (2 months)?

Dr. Behen: I had not given it any prior thought, and again speaking individually and not for the **Committee**, I concur with Dr. Jenkins' feeling that 2 Senate meetings should be ample time.

Ordinarily Bylaw **Amendments** are not extremely complicated matters.

If you look back at the series of amendments offered last year for what involved a reconstruction of the Senate and which were Constitutional Amendments then we certainly do get proposals **where** two (2) months or less would not be ample time.

It is a little hard to conceive of a Proposed Amendment to the Bylaws as being so intricate or controversial that we could not come up with something after a couple of meetings.

Dr. Hahn: 1) One question that may not be clear about this, and that is whether referral to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee must be reported as a Bylaw Amendment or whether it can merely be referred back to the Senate as a report?

2) Question arises as to whether it **might** take more than 2 months to bring about a change. I **think** Dr. Behen is correct, 2 months probably would be adequate. However, you cannot anticipate the future. In cases of this kind the language used is "a reasonable period of time." **And**, if you cannot rely on the judgment of the people on the **Committee** you should change the Committee.

Therefore, I suggest a change in the wording to "a reasonable period of time", with the understanding that referrals do not have to be Motions to Amend,

Mrs. Dykema: As the **amendment** presently reads doesn't it permit "Progress Report" from the Committee without bringing in necessarily an Amendment?

Dr. Pugsley: Doesn't it say '**for** a vote*?'

Dr. Jenkins: It does say '**for** a vote', and as Dr. Behen has reported 2 months is a **reasonable** time for Bylaws.

I cannot see the purpose of putting in "a reasonable period of time", since 2 months has been indicated as the time.

I am not in agreement with the change.

Dr. Ronaghy: This is at least 2 months. When you have 2 sessions you really have 3 months to consider. **Someone** tomorrow may suggest **something** and they do not have to report for 2 sessions and then they would have 3 months; possibly if they submitted it yesterday for the meeting today they would have 2 full months so it would be at least 2 or possibly 3 months.

Mr. Livosky: The essence of the Motion is really to put a time limit on a Committee to report out on its charges.

I think it is implied, and it is assumed and really required of any Committee to take care of its charges in a reasonable period of time.

I think if we are going to start this we may as well charge every Committee we have when we may expect them to report out whatever their business is,

I am a present member of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee and I **think** whatever charges would be returned would be done so in a reasonable period of time, whatever time that might be.

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D : (Friday, December 3, 1973;
REPORT OF CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE: (Dr. Behen)

Mr. Livosky cont'd.:

I think it is absurd to tie the hands of anybody in the Constitution and Bylaws Committee to say that something-musk be out in "X" number of months. Let the Committee work as it may work.

There is a presumption that the Committee is not doing its job it seems to me. And, there is no basis in fact, except for one consideration throughout the years when a Proposed Amendment took any period of time. It was because it was too complex,

Defeat that Amendment.

Mr. Brachfeld: I think the point is poorly taken. There have been (Student) numerous occasions at this University where Committees have feiled to discharge their responsibilities. The one that comes immediately to my mind is the Pass-Fail Grade, when something was set up on that, I can conceive of the same thing happening with respect to the Bylaws.

We must assume that this body or someone in this University feels that there must be an Amendment to the Bylaws there is a reason for that, and it is for the benefit of the Constitution and the body and therefore, should be acted upon as swiftly as possible and not delayed - not only through neglect but unforeseen circumstances,

I cannot understand this whole question of people objecting to the length of time of acting upon a charge.

Mr. Reilly: What are you going to do if you have an even decision on a very controversial subject and in 2 months you cannot come to a majority decision? How are you going to make a Motion then on the floor?

Mr. Simko: I was under the impression that a Committee has to make the (Student) final decision on the Motion before it comes before the Senate floor. That is not necessarily true.

A Committee can bring a Motion before the Senate floor for a vote without a final decision from the Committee. Then let the Senate probably decide if it is such a hair-splitting issue, and if the vote is decided by one (1) vote one way or another then I think the Senate has a right to know about it anyway, and have some means of working in the decision process,

Dr. Hurd: I would like to ask whether the Amendments as proposed by the Constitution and Bylaws Committee do not already offer the opportunity toward the proposer of the Amendment to bring it on the floor even though the Committee does not bring it?

Dr. Behen: It would seem to me that such would be the case, though again, this is something to which I had not given any particular thought.

It says it shall first be submitted or referred to the Senate Committee on Constitution and Bylaws but does not contain any statement that only the Committee on Constitution and Bylaws can offer an Amendment to the Bylaws.

The purpose of this is not really at all either devious or profound.

It was simply to give the Committee on Constitution and Bylaws an opportunity to examine a proposed Bylaw to see that it would be compatible if passed with the existing Bylaws and existing Constitution.

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, December 3, 1971)

REPORT OF CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE CONT'D.: (Dr. Behen)

Dr. Behen cont'd.:

It is a definite policy of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, especially reaffirmed this year, and has been the policy of this Committee for several years that the Constitution and Bylaws Committee does not take positions on substantive issues.

Many substantive issues come before this Senate as in the case of Amendments which involve substantive issues and substantive issues of great importance to this Senate.

The Constitution and Bylaws Committee does not use its position nor does it feel the obligation to try to promote or impede any changes of this sort for substantive reasons.

We envisioned the purpose of the function of our Committee to be that of saying that the body of the Bylaws and the body of the Constitution are internally compatible and consistent,

The danger is this, and this has no reflection on the mover of any Amendment. An Amendment offered on the floor by me or by an individual which may seem of itself good to the individual, and might indeed meet with ready reception and speedy approval by this body might turn out when incorporated in its existing language into the Bylaws or the Constitution to create an inconsistency or an incompatibility.

This is the sole purpose this Committee had in mind in providing that a Bylaw first be submitted to the Committee before it is offered for a vote,

I am well aware of the dangers that I have spoken of. I can give you a specific example: It was not until after this proposed Amendment to the Bylaws that we are discussing right now had been approved for presentation and the Amendment to the Constitution which will be presented next (Article V) had been approved for presentation (and both of these came on the initiative of the Committee itself).

It was not until after these had been approved that it dawned upon us that there were certain actions that could be taken and might indeed well be taken by the Senate which would leave us with two (2) different provisions respecting the Amending process. It was then that we went back and added the proviso that one was not to become effective unless the other one did. Things of this kind can creep in, discrepancies, etc. This was the sole purpose of this.

Dr. Baldino: I do feel in all fairness to the last speaker that the question was not answered,

Dr. Behen: What was the question? In giving an answer maybe I overlooked the question.

Dr. Baldino: Can the Committee be circumvented? Yes or No?
Can the Senate act if the Committee refused?

Dr. Behen: By my interpretation, this would in no way preclude anyone from offering an Amendment to the Bylaws on the floor, providing and assuming the adoption of this Amendment, that he had submitted it to the inspection or scrutiny of the Committee, Then my further remarks were merely explanatory that the reason we would want to look at it was simply to see in our judgment that its passage would not introduce any incompatibility and if we did find such, this would still not preclude its being brought to the floor but I suppose the Committee would feel obligated to get up and point out the difficulty.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE: MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, December 3, 1971)
REPORT OF CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE CONT'D.: (Dr. Behen)

Dr. Dobbert: I have been following these deliberations for some time and it seems to me that we are following a close second to the Ohio State Legislature.

Also, it seems to me that the question is rather simple, ~~Are we~~ trusting the Committee's work or aren't we? If we don't trust the Committee then it bottles up the Amendment; if we trust the committee then it goes back to the Senate,

Dr. Dobbert then called for the question. Let's make up our minds

Dr. Puqsley: Asked Mrs. Dykema for a ruling at this point.

Mrs. Dykema: Put it to a vote.

Dr. Swan: Moved the previous Question.
Seconded.

Dr. Puqsley: This calls then for no further debate.
Seconded.
You are voting to close debate,
AYES HAVE IT,

MOTION: Dr. William Jenkins moved the Committee on Constitution
(Recopied and Bylaws shall report a proposed amendment to the
here) Senate for a vote not later than the second regular
Senate meeting after receipt of the proposed amendment,
Seconded,
IN FAVOR: 24 AGAINST: 58
NO'S HAVE IT, MOTION DEFEATED.

Dr. Puqsley: Back to the original Question, Dr. Behen.
Further discussion on the Original motion by Dr. Behen.

Mr. Simko: Although as you said the Motion does not prevent people
(Student) from bringing a Bylaw Amendment to the Senate floor after
it has been submitted to the Constitution and Bylaws Com-
mittee I sincerely hope the interpretation that it can be is made
clear by some means and incorporated in the Minutes of this meeting-
that a person can indeed bring a Bylaw Amendment to the Senate
floor after it has been submitted to the Constitution and Bylaws Com-
mittee.

Dr. Baldino: A comment with respect to the comment made earlier re-
garding the relationship of our debate to that of the State Legisla-
ture.

To have a member of this body make an observation of that kind -
it was one of comic relief. That's all it was.

Dr. Hare: It seems to me that in spite of the assurances of Dr. Behen
and his interpretation of Bylaw X, which we are currently considering,
that there is a strong implication here that may not have been in-
tentional of course, that a Bylaw cannot be brought to the floor of
the Senate without first going through the procedure of the Committee,

Dr. Hare offered as an Amendment Section 4 to read:

MOTION: Dr. Hare offered as an Amendment Section 4 to read:
Nothing in these sections shall be interpreted to mean
that a Proposed Amendment to the Bylaws may not be
brought to the floor of the Senate without the prior
approval of the Committee.
Seconded,

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D. : (Friday, December 3, 1971)
REPORT OF CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE CONT'D.; (Dr. Behen)

Dr. Slavin: Would like to ask the Parliamentarian a question.
Isn't this taken for granted and isn't it traditional?
Doesn't every parent body have a right to consider any question put before it?
In other words, if you turn this down no one has a right to introduce a Bylaw.

Mrs. Dykema: As it now stands it simply **says** there are 2 things (Parliamentarian) that must be done:
1) it must be referred
2) it must be circulated.

It doesn't say that it cannot be brought up to the floor at all.

Dr. Hare: The Amendment I am offering is a clarification of what appears to be somewhat restrictive language subject to **misinterpretation**.

Mr. Ives: Does the individual authorize the Secretary of the **Senate** to make the circulation?

Dr. Hare: The requirement of the circulation remains intact.

Mr. Ives: Who directs the Secretary of the Senate to make the circulation?

Dr. Hare: I suppose the individual could circulate it if he wishes or ask the Secretary of the Senate to do so.
I do not see any difficulty here.

Dr. Swan: Asked a question of the Parliamentarian,
Is it not a fact since anything may be brought to the Senate and then referred to this Committee cannot a charge be given to the Committee that it return and report in a given period of time. This obviously does away with playing around with the period of time limit. It can be handled when the Amendment is brought up before the group; when it is referred to the **Committee**; when anyone wants to do something it will be referred.

Mrs. Dykema: Any Committee can be charged to bring on the floor (Parliamentarian) by a certain time. It must be in the Motion for bringing problem to the Committee.

Comment: It seems to me that introduction to Section 4 contradicts the purpose of Section 1.

First, we are saying that the proposed Amendments to the Bylaws shall first be submitted or referred to the Senate Committee on the Constitution and Bylaws.

Then in Section 4 we are saying we **don't** have to. Mrs. Dykema and Dr. Hare said "No" that was not correct.

Dr. Hare: I think I would interpret it: from the Amendment that I offered that when a proposed Amendment to the Bylaws is brought to the Senate it automatically gets referred to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

But at the same time it can be circulated to the Senate and voted on at the next meeting whether it be Constitution and Bylaws Committee reports it out or not.

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D : (Friday, December 3, 1971)
REPORT OF CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE: (Dr. Behen)

Dr. Swan: Question on the Motion.

Dr. Pugsley: QUESTION HAS BEEN CALLED FOR-
Once again we are ready to vote.

VOING ON THE AMENDMENT: AYES: 30. NAY: 50.
AMENDMENT IS DEFEATED.

Dr. Pugsley: BACK TO THE ORIGINAL PROPOSAL.
QUESTION HAS BEEN CALLED FOR OX THE ORIGINAL MOTION.

This concerns Bylaw X.

One member asked about postponing.

Mrs. Dykema gave her advice as Parliamentarian.

She stated if you vote to table it means you simply set aside the problem you are dealing with until some other urgent problem is taken care of OR you get some other information regarding it and then you take the problem up again at the same meeting.

Mr. Livosky: Only if somebody removes it from the table.

Mrs. Dykema: Yes.

Mr. Livosky: Don't forget - this can also have the effect of killing the Motion. If somebody forgets to remove it from the table it's dead.

Dr. Pugsley: I believe the Parliamentarian raised the question as to whether the intent of the mover and perhaps the seconder was expressed in terms of the Motion to table, Was this not correct?

Mrs. Dykema: Yes.

Dr. Pugsley: That Motion to table if expressing the intent of the mover happens to take priority.

Parliamentarian: In that case you have to say I move to table until more information is available or until something or else has happened or until a certain hour or something of that sort.
(Mrs. Dykema)

Dr. Pugsley: Since that wasn't done let's proceed to see what the next Motion is.

MOTION: To refer back to Committee. Without instructions.
Seconded.
AYES: 27. NAY: 55.
MOTION IS DEFEATED.

Dr. Swan: We have discussed this at some length. It seems to be only a question of whether or not something can be brought to the floor and a time limit put on it. It seems obvious that is the case and it can happen. I think we have discussed the issue long enough.

I MOVE THE PREVIOUS QUESTION.
Seconded.

Dr. Pugsley: This is a Motion to close debate.
Seconded.
AYES HAVE IT.

Dr. Pugsley: Back to the Original Motion without debate.
AYES HAVE IT.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D. : (Friday, December 3, 1971)

REPORT OF CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE CONT'D. : (Dr. Behen)

Dr. Behen: In Section 3, line 4 in Article V, Amendments - the word Senate should appear in there. This was inadvertently left out when typed.

MOTION: Dr. Behen moved an Amendment to the Constitution substituting for present Article V (this placed in here since the printed Constitution does not have the change in it) as amended the following Article which, if approved, will be a new Article V, as follows:

Following consideration by the Senate, and upon approval by a majority of the members present at a Senate meeting, a proposed Amendment to the Constitution shall be submitted by the Secretary to the entire Senate membership for voting by mail ballot. The ballot shall include a complete statement of the proposed amendment and shall be returned to the Secretary of the Senate within ten (10) days after it is mailed.
Seconded.

MOTION: Dr. Philip J. Hahn proposed an amendment to the Constitution, Article V, Section 3:

After the words: entire Senate membership (add) "and the Full Service Faculty".
Seconded.

Dr. Hahn stated he would comment on this **later**.

Mr. Reilly: If we remove this from the Senate and add Full Service Faculty, inasmuch as the Senate is composed of 50% administrative people then does this mean that all administrative people in the University and all Faculty members would vote on Constitutional Amendments?

Dr. Hahn: I don't know that this is the proper point for this.

Mr. Reilly is suggesting if the Full Service Faculty votes on Constitutional amendments and inasmuch as the Senate is composed of 50% of ex-officio members the administrators should also vote on this.

This raises the question of the function of the Senate, and the role of administrators in the Senate.

I propose that administrators in the Senate Mr. Reilly should be those who provide functions, The principal work of the Senate is educational and academic. We want to have their advice; yet the Senate is essentially a body of academic educators.

Therefore, it is important that these people, the Full Service Faculty become involved in the procedure.

Mr. Reilly: I think your statement was to the entire Faculty membership, wasn't it? By that then you mean that members of the Senate **who** are ex-officio would be included?

Dr. Hahn: No, I did not say that.

It would be the Senate membership and the Full Service Faculty and including students, if admitted, would vote on Constitutional Amendments.

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, December 3, 1971)
REPORT OF CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE CONT'D.: (Dr. Behen)
Dr. Hahn cont'd.:

If you are concerned about power around here I think you are wrong. What we need is to get a democratic process and participation of the elements in the University, I believe we all are in favor of this.

I think if you bicker about who are the ones you can think of all kinds of reasons why somebody **shouldn't** do or should do something about this.

Let's get this procedure going.

Mr. Reilly: I am not particularly opposed to what you are trying to do but I am trying to anticipate **some** of the problems you are going to get into when you try to implement this thing, That's all.

Dr. Hahn: What kind of problems?

Mr. Reilly: **There** are many. For example: ex-officio members voting or **not** voting, Chairmen of Departments voting, etc.

Dr. Pugsley: Ex-officio members of the Senate are included as members of the Senate.

Dr. Hahn: ~~My~~ I repeat, Mr. **Reilly** that all members of the Senate **would** vote on Constitutional Amendments and in addition Full Service Faculty **who** are not on the Senate.

It's clear, That's all there is to it.

Dr. Pugsley: The Proposed Amendment is to add the four (4) words: "and Full Service Faculty" following the word in the 4th line **member-**ship.

Dr. Dillon: I think that is where the confusion comes from. It is Senate membership plus other Full Service Faculty.

Dr. Pugsley: **That's** right.

Dr. Hahn: And other Full Service Faculty - you mean which?

Dr. Pugsley: You have made your Motion for Amendment, Dr. Hahn.

Dr. Hahn: I **don't** think Dr. **Dillon** would object if we left **it** the way **it** was. People aren't going to vote twice.

Dr. Dillon: I understand **it**. It has been clarified.

Dr. Vanaman: Asked for the wording once more.

Dr. Pugsley: in the 4th line - Section 3, Article V - to add the words following the word **membership** "and Full Service Faculty".

Dr. Vanaman: That is the way Dr. Hahn has moved **it**?

Dr. Pugsley: Stated that was the way Dr. Hahn had moved **it**.

QUESTION CALLED FOR.

Dr. Pugsley: IN FAVOR OF THE AMENDMENT:
AYES HAVE IT. AMENDMENT PASSED.

Now, back to discussion of Dr. **Behen's** Motion.

Dr. Hare: Moved the Question on the entire Sections,
Seconded.

This is to close debate; on the Motion made by Dr. Behen as amended

AYES: 53, NAY: 10.

MOTION TO CLOSE DEBATE PASSED.

BACK TO DR. **BEHEN'S** ORIGINAL MOTION AS AMENDED.
(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, December 3, 1971)

REPORT OF CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE CONT'D.: (Dr. Behen)

Dr. Jenkins: Asked for a point of clarification from Dr. Behen regarding Motion,

Dr. Behen: Referred to present Article V, **Amendments** in the Constitution of the Faculty and read Section 1 and Section 2.

Dr. Behen then offered his opinion, inasmuch as the sole purpose of the change (not considering Dr. Hahn's Amendment) was to remove from Article V requirements respecting Bylaws for it did not seem to us that they belonged in the Constitution; and to insure wider distribution by requiring the Proposed Amendment to be submitted to the entire Full Service Faculty.

We had in mind no change in the procedure by which an **Amendment** is adopted. I would, therefore, offer as an interpretation that the adoption of this Amendment would make no change in such procedure as has existed because it certainly was not our intention to do so.

Mr. Ives: I would like to point out that in Section 1 it says submit or refer. Can refer mean from the floor of the Senate? In other words, they can be proposed in the Senate and then referred to the Committee. Normal procedure.

Dr. Pugsley: QUESTION HAS BEEN CALLED FOR.

You are now voting to Amend Article V as **Amended** by the earlier Motion adding the words: and Full Service Faculty: and reflecting the addition that Dr. Behen made of the word "Senate".

Seconded.

AYES HAVE IT.

Dr. Behen: There is one change in the Amendment as distributed and this is not due to a typographical error but is designed as a clarification,

It represents no change in the Committee's thinking or intent but to avoid any possible confusion,

This is the Motion which will be made with respect to Article **III**, Section 2, In Line 2 it now reads: elected by each undergraduate School or College, etc.

The Motion as actually offered will be: elected by the students of each undergraduate School or College, etc. It has been our assumption that this would be understood.

MOTION: Dr. David M. **Behen** moved to Amend the Constitution by the addition to Article **III**, Section 2 of the Proposed Amendment as distributed which is as follows:

Student members with the right to vote shall be elected by the students of each undergraduate School or College. There shall be two each elected from the School of Business Administration, the School of Education, and the College of Arts and Sciences, and one each elected from the School of **Engineering**, the Technical and Community College, and the School of Music.

The Chairman of Student Council and the President of Student Government shall be ex-officio voting members. Student members shall be full time undergraduate students eligible for election to Student Government.

(CONT'D, NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, December 3, 1971)

REPORT OF CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE CONT'D. : (Dr. Behen)

MOTION CONT'D.:

(The following proviso is also part of **the** Motion, but **not** part of the Amendment, **becoming** effective if the Amendment is approved.)

THE CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE SHALL EDIT THE CONSTITUTION TO RECONCILE THE APPROPRIATE SECTIONS WITH THE AMENDMENT.

Seconded.

Mrs. Dykema: Suggested that the parts of our Constitution which require that the Senate pass by a majority vote any Constitutional **change** before it is sent out to the entire body of the Senate; that **the** majority of those in attendance at a particular meeting is to **avoid** bothering the entire body of the Senate with trivial matters. That **it** should be properly thought about and **then** sent out.

The objective is not to keep the Senate membership from expressing themselves, and **it** seems to me that unless you feel that this Amendment **is** so trivial that you do not need to know what the entire Senate **thinks** about it you certainly should pass **it** as **it** is.

Col. Wales: The Student Affairs Committee met on this Motion and we do endorse **it**. However, we feel that due to the possible **change** in enrollment in the Schools an Amendment would be appropriate. Therefore, Col. Wales moved the following:

MOTION: **Col. Wales** moved an Amendment in the 2nd sentence be reworded: (1) "that there shall be two elected from each of the three largest Schools or Colleges and one elected from each of the remaining Schools or Colleges" and (2) that Fall Quarter Full Time **Equivalent (FTE)** figures be employed in the determination of the **number** of student representatives per School or College.
Seconded.

Dr. Cohen: If the enrollments do change in such a **way** that there are 4 approximately equally large Schools then the proposed Amendment **would** not be relative; or if there are two approximately equally large Schools and then 2 middle type Schools.

An attempt to predict the future and make an Amendment now is unnecessary.

If **it** becomes necessary to change **it** we can change **it** when the time comes.

I don't see how we can predict all possible or even try to predict the changes.

Dr. Pugsley: Then reread the Amendment that Col. Wales proposed for all to hear.

Dr. Ronaghy: Could somebody tell us the size of the enrollment of the 3 Largest Schools at the present time?

Dr. Edgar: The 3 largest Schools right now: College of Arts and Sciences, School of Business Administration and School of Education.

Dr. Paraska: I can answer the question about student enrollment (FTE). For the Fall **Quarter** this academic year as follows:

1) College of Arts & Sciences FTE, 3170; 2) **Schl. of Business Administration**, 2656; 3) School of Education, 2110; 4) **Technical and Community College**, 2065; 5) **Schl. of Engineering**, 942; 6) School of Music, 329,

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D. : (Friday, December 3, 1971)
REPORT OF CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE CONT'D. : (Dr. Behen)

Dr. Paraska cont'd. :

I would like to continue in reference to this statement. I think that any Amendment that should be included in the Constitution, and I made this statement last Spring, should be worded in such a way that we don't have to tie Schools to figures and Schools to anything. It might happen that the T & CC would be dissolved just as the T & CC was organized,

We should work the Amendment in such a way that it does the job that we want done and yet doesn't tie to specific things and for this reason I would like to suggest another Amendment.

I don't know what the Parliamentary procedure is, whether the Amendment has to be voted **down** or whether I can offer an Amendment to an Amendment.

Mrs. Dykema: You can urge the group to defeat the Amendment that is before them.

Dr. Slavin: **Why** can't it be incorporated in the other one. If willing to accept it let him read it.

Dr. Paraska: Dean Paraska stated what he would incorporate as his Amendment:
Student members with the right to vote shall be elected by the students of each undergraduate School or College based on total student enrollment as of the Fall Quarter with one (1) student Senator per school for the first 1500 students or any portion thereof and one (1) additional student Senator for each 2000 additional students or major fraction thereof.
The Chairman of Student Council and the President of Student Government shall be ex-officio voting members.
Student members shall be full time undergraduate students eligible for election to Student Government.

By doing this, Dean Paraska stated, you are going to increase the number of student Senators by one (1). In other words, by this formula Arts & Sciences would have two (2), School of Business Administration two (2), School of Education two (2), T & CC two (2) based on present enrollment. The future enrollment would not necessitate an Amendment if the distribution of student Senators was not changed. School of Music would have one (1). Every School would have at least one (1) and the larger Schools two (2).

Dr. Hare: What does a major portion thereof mean?

Dean Paraska: Over half.

Dr. Pugsley: Dr. Paraska has told what he would offer as a substitute Motion in the event that this one is defeated. We are not here to discuss the merits of his future Motion. We are here to discuss the merits of the Motion that Col. Wales made and which I read to you earlier.

Col. Wales: Unfortunately I don't feel that I am in a position to speak for the Committee on this, It so happened that I was not present when the Committee considered this. Possibly a member of the Student Affairs Committee who was present could tell you a little more about it,

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, December 3, 1971)
REPORT OF CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE CONT'D.: (Dr. Behen)

Dr. Pugsley: The Chair wishes to ask Dr. Behen a question.

Were different kinds of formulas considered by the Committee in making this recommendation?

Dr. Behen: Not at this time. This is essentially the same Motion that was offered last year for Amendment. At that time a wide variety was noted.

The purpose of this Motion this time was essentially to reintroduce the Motion that was defeated last time, on 2 grounds. 1) On the ground that there seemed to be dissatisfaction with the results of the vote last time; in other words the narrowness of the vote; 2) that this is a different body. There has been some change in the membership and the Senate may feel the same this year as last year or it may feel differently.

We thought it would be wise to obtain the sentiment of the Senate on it.

Dr. Budge: I was at the Student Affairs Committee meeting Col. Wales was talking about,

The Student Affairs Committee (and I think the Motion was introduced by Dean Painter) thought this would be a fairer formula if the enrollment profile changed,

For example: should the T & CC increase the number of students enrolled. It is not designed to change the Motion, simply designed to make it fairer.

Dr. Baldino: We call ourselves a University Senate.

I think it would be a good idea if we gave serious consideration to equal representation by the Schools. In other words, 2 from each of the individual Schools of the University.

DL, Robinson: Is this an Amendment?

Dr. Baldino: To avoid the catastrophic situation that would develop every year as to what formula would be used I don't think it would be asking too much to consider giving equal representation to each of the Schools or Colleges.

Dr. Hankey: Wishes to speak in opposition to Col. Wales' Amendment on aesthetic grounds, The representation of 2 versus 1 overlooks what students can contribute to the Senate. I think the Senate could get more out of the students.

For example: if the enrollment should change, particularly in the upper division schools, particularly Education, Business Administration and they were to lose membership as T & CC gained it it would work badly for the Senate.

For this reason I think we should Defeat this Amendment and go closer to one on the order Dr. Baldino has suggested, equal representation.

Mr. Simko: As President of Student Government I am highly in favor of (Student) any Motion which allows maximum number of students voting on the Senate.

Reapportionment should be the charge of possibly one of the Committees of the Senate to see that the apportionment is followed through.

I understand there is a problem of how many faculty members from each School shall be represented on the Senate, (what proportion). I hope this is done today.

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, December 3, 1971)
REPORT OF CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE CONT'D.: (Dr. Behen)

Mr. Ives: If faculty representation is chosen proportionately according to the size of the School why should not the students?

Mr. Brachfeld: You are dealing here not with a true representation (Student) but with token representation, and as long as you can keep the **numbers** small as it is it **doesn't** really matter who is on the Senate from what School - whether it is 9, 12 or 14.

Dr. Richley: It is obvious that the clarification brought in by both of these Motions be included. Otherwise. we will be revising **every** year to suit the needs,

It would seem to me that there might be a little difficulty with the Motion brought by Col, Wales in the event of what was mentioned by Dr. **Cohen** - that there would be 2 Schools whose enrollments would be very close; but 2 Schools enrollment being about equal is about as possible as this Amendment being passed without further **argument**. I think the last Amendment proposed by Dean Paraska is extremely flexible and it does allow representation based on students.

Defeat the previous Motion so that we can pass this Motion.

Dr. Pugsley: QUESTION CALLED FOR.

You are voting on the Amendment submitted by **Col. Wales**.

NO'S HAVE IT.

THIS AMENDMENT DEFEATED.

BACK TO **THE** ORIGINAL MOTION.

MOTION: Dean Paraska moved the following **Amendment**:

Student members with the right to vote shall be elected by each undergraduate School or College based on total student enrollment as of the Fall Quarter with one (1) Senator per school for the first 1500 students or any portion thereof and one (1) additional student Senator for each 2000 additional students or major fraction thereof. The Chairman of Student Council and the President of Student Government shall be **ex-officio** voting members. Student members shall be full time undergraduate students eligible for election to Student Government.

Seconded.

Dr. Pugsley: It has been moved and seconded that the above Motion be an Amendment to the original Motion. Actually it is a replacement.

Dr. Baldino: Urged that **this** Motion be defeated.

Dean Scriven: Seemed more like a substitute Motion to him, rather than an Amendment to the original Motion.

Dr. Pugsley: Agreed with Dean Scriven.

Dr. Hurd: I wonder if the understanding of this is clear. As I look at this I believe that only two (2) Schools would qualify for 2 representatives.

ANS.: No - 4.

Dr. Hurd: If you require 1 for every 1500 students and then an additional Senator for a major fraction of 2000 that means you would have to have 2500 students in School to get 2 Senators.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONTD.: (Friday, December 3, 1971)

REPORT OF CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE CONTD.: (Dr. Behen)

Dean Paraska: You would have to have 2500 but as I pointed out originally that is the total students. If you want to change it to FTE then perhaps it would be changed to 1500. It was not to cut down student representation but to state a formula that could be followed next year, and the next, etc. It is a formula that will handle any situation.

Dr. Hurd: I still believe that only two (2) Schools would qualify for 2 Senators.

Dean Paraska: No - there are 4 that have over the required number.

Dr. Pugsley: Your Motion does not specify **FTE'S**.

Dr. Robinson: I would encourage again the simplistic formula - that an equal number of Senators from each School or College in the University.

Dr. Vanaman: I would question the mechanics of this. If these **voters** are to appear and vote we wait until we have exact counts in the fall and run an election and wait until we get them seated on Senate. It seems to me we ought to take some other time of the year to determine the formula and then vote immediately after the Fall **Quarter starts** to get the students in.

Dr. Paraska: Regarding Dr. Baldino's suggestion.

If it is the will of this body to have 2 representatives or Senators from each School or College and that is the simplistic approach; and it is clear-cut and never going to be argued I am not going to oppose it. I will go along with it but I do oppose the wording as it is in the original Motion. I was offering my Amendment to clarify it,

I don't believe this Amendment, or Dr. Behen's Amendment or anybody's has spelled out when the election would take place, but notice that the wording of what I offered is the same as it is for the Faculty. In other words, the election takes place based on what happened in the Fall Quarter,

This would not be a matter of concern. Next year's representation would be based on this Fall's enrollment I presume because the election of student Senators would take place in the Spring.

Dean Paraska: Stated he would withdraw his Motion if the simplistic formula was the one wanted (Equal representation).

Dr. Greenman: In support of what Dr. Baldino suggested,

It seems to me that the students in the Senate primarily function as representatives of the School and are here to do something in terms of the interest or role of that School and not to exert political power. Therefore, if you say 2 students from each School you are saying each School has an equal right to be **represented** in the Senate and there won't be any second class citizens.

Dr. Pugsley: QUESTION HAS BEEN CALLED FOR,
Voting on the Amendment submitted by Dean Paraska,
NOS HAVE IT.
THIS MOTION WAS DEFEATED.

Dr. Baldino: Suggested 2 elected from each undergraduate or College.

MOTION: Dr. Baldino moved an Amendment that two (2) student members with the right to vote shall be elected by the students of each undergraduate School or College.

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D. : (Friday, December 3, 1971)
REPORT OF CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE CONT'D.: (Dr. Behen)

MOTION: There shall be two (2) each elected from each under-graduate School.
CONT'D:

The Chairman of Student Council and the President of Student Government shall be **ex-officio** voting members. Student members shall be full time undergraduate students eligible for election to Student Government.
Seconded.

Dr. Pugsley: QUESTION HAS BEEN CALLED FOR.

You are voting on the Amendment that there be 2 representatives from each undergraduate School.

AYES HAVE IT.

Now back to the Original Motion. Any discussion now is on the Original Motion as amended.

MOVED THE PREVIOUS QUESTION. This is a call to eliminate debate

Mr. Brachfeld: A point of information, Mr. Chairman.

(Student) No where in this does **it** state how long a student will serve, whether **it** is a 2-year term, 1-year term, etc.

What is the status of this if passed by the Senate? When will **it** go into effect? When will the election be held?

Dr. Pugsley: This is a discussion of the Question here and I think **it** is no longer appropriate since the Question has been called for.

COMMENT: I understand if this is passed **it** does not take effect right away.

Dr. Pugsley: It has to go to the Senate and requires a 2/3 vote.

Dr. Hare: It will only go to the Senate and not to the Faculty.

Dr. Pugsley: This is a Motion to close debate.
Up to this time only points of information.
AYES HAVE IT. You have voted to close debate.

NOW THE VOIE OF THE AMENDMENT.

Dr. Behen: I want to call attention that the **affirmative** vote must not in this case be a majority of votes cast but a majority of the people here at this meeting.

Whatever the present assemblage is **it** will take half plus one to pass **it**.

Dr. Pugsley: This is the vote on the Amendment.

AYES HAVE IT.

Declared this carried by vote of **required** majority.

Dr. Behen: Mr. President, this **concludes** the Report.

Dr. Pugsley: Asked in terms of time (5:40 p.m.) if the group wished to continue.
They stated NO.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONTD. : (Friday, December 3, 1971)
REPORT OF CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE CONTD.: (Dr. Behen)

Dr. Kelley: Was to give a report regarding the Media Center for Dr. Eshleman but **we** did not get that **far**.

Dr. Kelley stated the Media Center last year in the Budget Hearings was asked by the Budget Committee to formulate a statement of policy upon which the forthcoming year's Budget could be based.

Dr. Eshleman has been working very hard getting his Budget **figures** together based on this policy statement which has been drawn up by the Media Center Committee.

He feels he is going to be left out in the cold if he doesn't get some sort of feeling from this group tonight as to whether or not his report on the policy statement is forthcoming and meets with approval and what are the needs.

He feels **it** is very urgent.

Dr. T. Miner: Could we have another Senate meeting before the Budget Problem becomes so severe for Dr. Eshleman?

Dr. Pugsley: You can so determine.

For the balance of the business you have not had the Report of the Senate Executive Committee, etc.

MOTION: Dr. Thelma Miner moved that there be a Senate meeting Friday, December 10, 1971 at 4:00 p.m.

Dr. Pugsley: You can move **it** but I don't think **it** will meet with any enthusiastic approval.

The President asked Dr. **Niemi:** do you have any **sug-**gestion about time?

Dr. T. Miner: I was only trying to get another meeting day.

Dr. Niemi: She asked the President at what point of time would Dr. Eshleman need his Budget figures ready for consideration. We will be having a meeting early in January - the first Friday.

Dr. Edgar: **This** is in time.

Dr. T. Miner: Dr. T. Miner withdrew her Motion.

Dr. Pugsley: The next Senate meeting is scheduled for January 7, 1972. The President wished everyone a **MERRY CHRISTMAS!**

Respectfully submitted,

Vera Jenkins
SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

December 7, 1971

TO: UNIVERSITY SENATE **MEMBERS**

FROM: VERA JENKINS
Secretary of the Senate

A REMINDER!

The **first** Senate meeting of the new year will be held on **Friday, January 7, 1972 - 4:00 p.m. IN THE SCHWEBEL AUDITORIUM OF THE ENGINEERING SCIENCE BUILDING (Room 273).**

AGENDA: A **continuation** of the agenda for the meeting held on Friday, December 3, 1971:

- 3) Report of Executive Committee of the Senate (Dr. Niemi)
- 4) Committee Reports:
 - 1) Media Center Report (Dr. Foster)
 - 2) Other Committee Reports
- 5) UNFINISHED BUSINESS
- 6) NEW BUSINESS
- 7) REMARKS BY PRESIDENT PUGSLEY

Senate Book

RECEIVED
YSU
NOV 29 1971
VICE PRESIDENT FOR
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

November 30, 1971

TO: UNIVERSITY FULL SERVICE FACULTY MEMBERS

FROM: VERA JENKINS
Secretary of the Faculty

Results of Balloting for YSU Faculty Appeals Committee:

FOR CHAIRMAN: FRANK J. TARANTINE (1-year term)

FOR COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP:

FREDERICK J. BLUE (3-year term)

THELMA S. MINER (2-year term)

JOSEPH KIPSCHNER (1-year term)

NOTE: GENERAL MEMBERSHIP: The person receiving the highest number of votes will be elected to a three (3)-year term; the person receiving the second highest number of votes will be elected to a two (2)-year term; and the person receiving the third highest number of votes will be elected to a one (1)-year term.

This is in accordance with the **recommendation** of the Faculty Appeals Committee approved and **passed** at the **Special Senate Meeting** of June 3, 1971.

V. J.



YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO 44503

December 8, 1971

Dear Vera Jenkins,

This is to notify you that I will be leaving The University at the end of the month. Please find a replacement for my place in The Senate from The School of Arts and Sciences.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Henry N. Fukui".

Henry N. Fukui
Assistant Professor
Chemistry Dept.
School of Arts and Sciences