MINUTES
ACADEMIC SENATE
May 21, 1980
ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

ATTENDANCE (See attached roster)
CALL TO ORDER
After establishing that a quorum was present, Dr. Jean Kelty called the meeting to order at 4:12.

Dr. Gratia Murphy addressed the problem of confusion over student representation on the Senate. The Charter of the Senate calls for student representation of 15 members. Two of those members are the president of student government and the chairman of student council. According to the Charter, students are responsible for setting up procedures for electing the other 13 members. Student government has determined that two of those 13 will be two of the cabinet officers for the student government president, the vice-president for student government and the secretary for academic grievances. The terms of the president, the chairman of the student council, and the two cabinet officers run until June 15. The election for at-large and school representatives was held yesterday (May 20), but the election results will not be made public until tomorrow, so those students are not here today because they do not yet know that they are senators. This is because the Charter of Student Council specifies that a certain amount of time must elapse between the closing of the elections and the announcement of the results. Those students will be present at the June meeting, as will the other four whose terms run until June 15.

NOMINATIONS FOR CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE
Dr. Kelty asked for nominations. Jean Kelty was nominated. Dr. Kelty reminded the Senate that it is required that there be two nominations because one will serve as vice-chairman of the Senate. Sid Roberts was nominated but declined the nomination. Lou Hill was nominated. It was moved and seconded that the nomination be closed. The motion was carried. Candidates: Jean Kelty and Lou Hill.

NOMINATIONS OF CHARTER AND BYLAWS
Dr. Kelty asked for nominations, reminding the senate that there must be six nominations, since there were three to be elected. Nominations were as follows: Gratia Murphy, Bill Jenkins, Paul Dalbek--declined, Bari Lateef, (at this point Dean Yozwiak observed that it would be helpful if the Senate knew who the hold-over members were; Dr. Abrams named them: L. Esterly, D. Hovey, and
R. Crum), Ikram Khawaja--declined, Charles Singler, Joan Phillip, Frank Tarrantine, Joseph Koss, James Daly. It was moved and seconded that nominations be closed; the motion carried.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Because there had not been enough turn around time between the meeting of May 7 and May 21, the minutes of May 7 were not yet back from the printer. A motion was made, seconded, and carried to suspend the reading of those minutes.

REPORT OF CHARTER AND BYLAWS
Dr. Abram reported. He recalled that in February he had directed the attention of the senators to the charge that had been given to Charter and ByLaws by the Senate Executive Committee to conduct a comprehensive survey of the appointed chartered committees. At that time he drew the attention of the senators to the ad hoc committee of Charter and ByLaws that was going to initiate that process. The ad hoc committee has been at work; however, Dr. Abram felt that it would be in the best interests of the new senate to wait until the next meeting for a detailed report. He encouraged input from all senators.

## REPORT FROM THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Dr. Feitler reported. The Senate Executive Committee has been and continues to be deeply concerned that there be adequate faculty representation in the selection process for a new Vice President for Academic Affairs. On February 29, 1980, the Executive Committee wrote to the Trustees and President Coffelt, requesting that the Academic Senate be permitted to recommend representatives for the screening process. President Coffelt responded and indicated that we could recommend names; however, no deadline was given for submitting these names. The Executive Committee had been led to believe that the selection of a committee would not begin until after the closing date for applications. The Executive Committee recommendations were not received by the President until after the deadline of May 10, according to President Coffelt. However, the Executive Committee believes that the Committee was selected prior to May 10th. More recently, Dr. Feitler asked President Coffelt to consider adding persons recommended by the Senate Executive Committee. He indicated that because the Committee had already begun its deliberations and because each school was represented he did not think it advisable to expand the Committee membership. Dr. Feitler did not have a specific recommendation or a further report at this time.

Dr. Kelty called for questions.

Dr. Kohn enquired to what extent the faculty's views would be represented in the Committee, and Dr. Feitler replied that to his knowledge there had been no procedures established to make those views known. Dr. Kelty asked whether that answered Dr. Kohn's question, and he replied that it did, but that it also concerned him; he felt that there should be faculty input. Dr. Kelty asked if Dr . Kohn wished to make a motion to that effect; Dr. Kohn indicated that he would be glad to but did not know how it would be implemented. Dr. Kelty then asked if Dr. Kohn wished to refer such a matter to the Executive Committee for implementation. Dr. Kohn replied that the procedure for implementation did not matter, as long as faculty input was conveyed to the screening committee and the board of trustees.

Dr. Kelty indicated that a motion was required in order for the Senate to consider the issue.

Dr. Kohn moved that the names of on-campus applicants for VicePresident of Academic Affairs be made known to the Senate so that the Senate could obtain an informal poll to be made known to the screening committee and to the board of trustees. The motion was seconded.

Dr. Kelty called for discussion. The question was raised concerning the limiting of the names to be supplied to those of on-campus applicants. It was suggested that perhaps the Senate should pass a motion in support of the Executive Committee's nominees who were to have been on the screening committee. Dr. Feitler felt that Dr. Coffelt had made his attitude toward this clear, as reflected in the Executive Committee report. Dr. Baldino asserted that we should place faith and trust in those presently working on this task; a motion such as the one suggested would be divisive. Dr. Alderman agreed with Dr. Baldino, pointing out that there would be great difficulties in any revision of the list of applicants at this point, and noting that problems of confidentiality might well be involved in allowing members of the Senate to review applications.

Dr. Kelty asked for further discussion.
Dr. Largent asked for a point of information. He wanted to know whether or not the motion was for the Senate to review a list of candidates only.

Dr. Kelty asked for the wording of the motion; Dr. Kohn referred to the secretary, who, since she does not take shorthand, did not have a copy of the exact language of the motion available at that time. Dr. Kelty summarized the motion as stated above, with Dr . Kohn's assent that this was accurate. Dr. Kelty asked if it was the intent of the motion that the dossiers or just the names be made public; Kohn replied--just the names.

Dr. Brothers observed that an applicant, whether on or off campus, had a right to request that his candidacy not be made public.

Dr. Baldino suggested that our most constructive action would be to support the Committee.

No further discussion following, the question was called. The motion failed.

Observing that the previous motion and discussion seemed to indicate dissatisfaction on the part of some senators with the method of selection of the new Academic Vice President, Dr. Roberts moved that the Executive Committee of the Senate try to obtain from the Search Committee a statement of procedures. The motion was seconded.

Dr. Largent expressed concern with the time frame involved.
Dr. Bosche spoke against the motion: it seems like a complaint that would not be effective.

No further discussion following, the question was called. For: 20
Against: 30 Motion failed.
REPORT OF ELECTIONS AND BALLOTING COMMITTEE
Dr. Throop reported. Results of election have already been given to the secretary to provide information for the attendance sheet for this meeting. Those results are available to all senate members in the secretary's records. In addition, Dr. Throop supplied a record of the minutes of the Elections and Balloting Committee for Spring Quarter, 1980. See attached sheet.

REPORTS OF OTHER SENATE COMMITTEES
Report of Continuing Education Committee
K. McKean reported. The Continuing Education Committee has finished a proposed statement on the Continuing Education unit and sent it on to Academic Affairs, which has adopted it, and it will be presented by Academic Affairs later in this meeting. Continuing Education is in complete and unamimous support of the motion that will be made by Academic Affairs.

Report of University Curriculum Committee--none
Report of Student Grievance Committee
Dr. Ritter indicated that the committee had only the written report. There were no questions.

## UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Dr. Kelty called Dr. Hill to begin; Dr. Alderman moved that the Senate reconsider the motion brought last meeting by the Academic Affairs Committee concerning teacher curriculum revision. The motion was seconded. Discussion: Dr. Alderman indicated that he voted against the motion as it was presented at the last meeting because of the question of the implications of this body voting to pass a motion which appeared to incorporate a written proposal from the Department of Secondary Education which the body of senators had not read. He understood that that problem was to be alleviated today and that the main issue could then be directly discussed.

Dr. Byo inquired whether that specific proposal had been seen by the appropriate committees. Dr. Hill indicated that Academic Affairs had seen the statement; the Curriculum Committee had not, since it is not part of their work.

A new senator requested a reading of the motion that was to be reconsidered; Dr. Hill indicated the the motion was very brief and would not be very helpful unless one had read the attachments to the agenda of the last meeting; the motion was "I move approval of Secondary Education's proposal," and there was a reference made to a series of courses which were attached to the agenda at that time.

Dr. Byo moved that this motion be tabled until the senators who are new have a chance to be fully apprised of the implications of the motion.

Dr. Kelty asked whether this motion to table the motion to reconsider had reference to any specific time; Dr. Byo indicated that it was simply a motion to table. The motion was seconded.

It was moved that the senate amend the motion by adding "table to the next senate meeting." Dr. Rand questioned whether a motion to reconsider was appropriate to a meeting to follow the one in which the motion was made. The parliamentarian indicated that it would be in order.

No discussion on the amendment following, the question was called and the amendment passed.

The motion to table until the next meeting; passed.
Dr. Hill requested that the senators refer to the agenda of the previous meeting for the next two items of business (7980-21 \& 7980-22). The first has to do with the Perspective in Human Values

Proposal; the second with a proposal for a Continuing Education unit. Dr. Hill summarized the content and purpose of the Perspective in Human Values Proposal, moving approval of the proposal subject to the conditions stated on page 10 of the agenda of May 7. The motion was seconded. The question was raised whether the meeting still retained a quorum, and a count was taken of those present who were not senators, enabling the chairman to conclude that there was indeed still a quorum present. The question was called and the motion passed.

Dr. Hill moved acceptance of the proposed statement on the Continuing Education unit as attached to the agenda of May 7 . The motion was seconded. No discussion or questions following, the question was called and the motion passed.

Before moving to the report from the Computer Committee, Jean Kelty, as Chairman of the Review Committee, read the following announcement: "On May 26, 1978, the Senate passed the following motion: 'One year from the date of appointment of the Joint Computer Committee, a review will be conducted by: The President of the Senate, the President of the University, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Director of the Computer Center, and a faculty person designated by the Faculty members serving on the joint committee. From this review, a report will be made to the Senate recommending that the Senate Computer Committee be reactivated or dropped from the Charter! As Chairman of the Review Committee I would like to announce to the Senate that our Review Committee defers to the findings of the Senate Computer Committee; in fact, has no objections to the recommendations which the Computer Committee makes to this meeting of the Senate. Furthermore, for the record, the Review Committee wishes to state that the results of the February, 1980 Senate Computer Committee survey, compiled and analyzed by Dr. Joseph A. Waldron, Criminal Justice, were considered favorable with regard to the usefulness of the Computer Advisory Committee. Though it was not our charge to evaluate this committee (that is, the CAC), we acknowledge the work of the Senate Computer Committee who initiated this survey of faculty and administrators."

## Report of the Computer Committee

Dr. Largent made the following motion: "Be it resolved that the Senate Computer Committee be continued in conformity with the Charter and ByLaws of the Academic Senate." The motion was seconded. Dr. Largent further commented that the review committee had felt that the SCC could serve positively, rather than negatively, and that the charge of the SCC would not conflict with that of the Computer Advisory Committee. No discussion or questions following, the vote was taken and the motion passed.

## Report of the Individualized Curriculum Program

No members of this committee were present to report.
NEW BUSINESS--none

## ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
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SENATE ELECTIONS AND BALLOTING COMM:


Minutes, Spring Quarter, 1980

On Monday, May 19, at 2:00 p.m. the Committee met in the Elementary Education Conference Room.

The minutes of the Winter Quarter, 1980, were approved.

Dr. Pei Huang's letter of resignation was read.
Sara Throop reported that after meeting with Jean Kelty, Chairman of the Senate, the unfinished balloting and election of departmental senators from the College of Arts and Sciences is being assumed by the Committee. In order to meet the deadline, May 21 , Dr. Kelt requested that ballots be sent on Thursday, May 15, delivered to the appropriate departmental secretaries, to be returned May 19, at l:30 pom. to the English Department. The ballots, counted on May 19, 1980, after 2:00 pom. could then be used to determine the Senators who could be notified to appear on May 21, 1980.

The Committee members reported the results of the Senate-At-Large and Departmental Senator elections. The results are attached.

The importance of maintaining a complete record of elections, including runners-up was discussed. During the year it has been necessary to use this information as persons need to be replaced, due to illiness, resignation, leave, etc.

The Committee voted unanimously to meet with the Charter and By-Laws Committee to discuss:

## By-Law \#2

(b) "No person shall collect or count ballots in any election where he or she is a candidate." Is a member of $S . E \& B$ thus disqualified from being a candidate for the Senate or for reelection to S.E. \& B? (We suggest that "collect" be eliminated).
(c) ". . . nominating ballot . . . all persons shall have the opportunity to appear on a subsequent electoral ballot . . ." (The Committee, after one year, has found that nominating ballots are virtually identical to those used in the election, since many nominees received only one nomination). The Committee endorses the next sentence "In all elections, every effort will be made to secure at least twice the number of nominees as there are positions."

Any person whose name is not withdrawn is automatically nominated thereby eliminating the nominating abllots.

The Committee thanked Dr. Mervin Kohn and Dr. John Cernica for their efforts in calculating the Apportionment of Faculty Seats (Bylaw 3, Section 2).

The Committee recommended that, in the future, the data provided by the office of the Vice President, Personnel Services, be listed by colleges of facilitate computation.

Dr. Kelty's request for a report on the possibility of secretarial help for committees was discussed. It was agreed that forms for:

1. Withdrawal
2. Nomination of Senators-At-Large
3. Election of Senators-At-Large
4. Notification of Senators-At-Large
5. Nomination of Departmental Senators
6. Election of Departmental Senators
7. Notification of Departmental Senators Results
8. Nomination of Senate Elections and Balloting Committee
9. Election of Senate Elections \& Balloting Committee Results
10. Notlfication of Results
11. Nomination of Executive Committee
12. Election of Executive Committee
13. Notification of Executive Committee Results
14. Election of Chairman \& Vice Chairman of the Senate
15. Election of Charter \& Bylaws Committee
should be typed and retyped by said secretarial help, if available, in the fall. In addition, less secretarial help is needed to prepare communications during winter and Spring Quarters.

It was agreed that Merv Kohn's suggestion that the multiple copies of elections all be sent to the chairman of the Committee has worked well.

It was agreed that, ordinarily, all envelopes and ballots from the previous Spring could be discarded by the end of Summer I. All tally sheets, however, are to be retained for the duration of the elected term covered by the ballot.

The Committee suggests that reproduction costs connected with elections not be billed to the Elections and Balloting Committee or the Committee member's Department.

Dr. Cernica called for an organizational meeting of the Senate Elections and Balloting Committee for Thursday, June 5, at 4:00 p.m. in the Elementary Education Conference Room.

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

TO $\qquad$ DATE 22 May 1980

FROM_Larry E. Esterly, Parliamentarian for
Senate Meeting of 21 May 1980
SUBJECT: Clarification of Parliamentary Procedure Used at Senate Meeting
$\quad \begin{aligned} & \text { of } 21 \text { May } 1980\end{aligned}$

Relative to the motion offered by Dr. Byo to "table" the motion offered by Dr. Alderman to "reconsider" the Academic Affairs Committee motion of 7 May 1980, (Agenda \# 7980-19,) and the subsequent motion offered by Prof. Di Edwardo to amend Dr. Byo's motion, it is the understanding of the chair (Dr. Kelty) and of the parliamentarian (Prof. Esterly) that the intent of Dr. Byo and Prof. Di Edwardo, supported by their remarks on the floor, technically was not to offer a motion "to lay on the table" (which by Robert's Rules may not be qualified as to a specific time when a tabled motion is to be removed from the table; and which may not, in any way, be amended) but to offer a motion to "postpone" debate on and final determination of the motion to reconsider to a specific later date (the Senate meeting of 4 June 1980) so that members, particularly new members of the Senate, might come to a better understanding of the issue.

On the motion to "postpone" see, Robert's Rules of Order, Section 14, pp. 150-16l as compared with the motion "to lay on the table," Section 17, pp. 177-185. On the motion to "reconsider" see Section 36, pp. 265-284. Robert's Rules of Order, revised edition, New York: Scott, Foresman, 1971.

Based on final form of attendance sheet.
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Grum, Ralph
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Talton-Harris, Alfred
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Barsch, William
Fold, Kathylynn
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Kennedy, Dorothy


## ADMINISTRATION

Alderman, Taylor
Binning, William
Cummings, Lawrence
Dodge, Robert
Gillis, Bernard
McBriarty, Charles
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Fitzpatrick, Tim Hartsoe, Desiree Horton, J. Tiudak, John Kangas, Rainer Salta, Ed
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| ---: |
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*In second year of term

