

*Note: Please get agenda items for the December 2 Senate meeting to Bege Bowers, English Department, by 10:00 a.m. Thursday, November 19.*

**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**  
**October 14, 1998**

**OVERVIEW:**

Major topics presented/discussed: need for a procedure for minor course changes in semester conversion (p. 1); *Charter* amendment to permit elected/appointed committees (pp. 2-3); *Bylaws* addition defining the membership and role of the General Education Committee (pp. 3-7).

Policy changes:

- (1) The first steps were taken to amend the Senate *Charter* to permit elected/appointed committees (see below, pp. 2-3); the proposed amendment will now be voted upon in a mail ballot according to the procedures outlined in the Senate *Charter*.
- (2) The Senate approved a *Bylaws* insertion defining the membership and role of the General Education Committee (contingent upon mail-ballot approval of the *Charter* amendment described in policy change number 1; see below, p. 3).

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Jim Morrison, chair of the Academic Senate, called the meeting to order at 4:09 p.m.

**MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS:**

Minutes of the 14 October 1998 Senate meeting were approved as distributed.

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

1. The Senate Executive Committee met last week and reviewed what needs to be done to complete elections for Fine and Performing Arts senators and for unfilled positions on the Elections & Balloting Committee, the Senate Executive Committee, the Charter & Bylaws Committee, and the General Education Committee (if the Charter & Bylaws revisions are approved).
2. The Executive Committee also reviewed snags in the forms for conversion to semesters. The committee lauds those who developed the forms but recommends creating a form/procedure for making minor changes. The fast-track form does not now permit changes in course descriptions, even for a single word or for updating professional jargon. Is it wise or efficient to “punish” people for clarifying old descriptions? Syllabi, goals, etc. are now required for even minor changes. In addition, the forms for new/revised courses suggest a 40-word limit on course descriptions, a limit that does not make sense for all courses; descriptions should fit the course. Furthermore, it is not logically consistent for new descriptions to be limited to 40 words while old, fast-track descriptions are not. Thus, the **Executive Committee is asking the Curriculum and Programs committees to meet**

**quickly, organize, and take up with the Executive Committee the problems with the forms.**

3. The Executive Committee reviewed what needs to be done in terms of Senate committee structure and charges this year. **All committees need to select a chair soon and let Bege Bowers and Jim Morrison know who the elected chair is; also let us know when you are meeting so that representatives from the Executive Committee can meet with the committees on occasion.** The Charter & Bylaws Committee needs to review the *Charter and Bylaws* in its entirety for changes necessitated by the move to semesters; these changes could be made at one time rather than piecemeal. Furthermore, committee charges and names need to be reexamined--do they meet the changing nature of the University? For instance, it's not clear what the role of the Integrated Technologies Committee has been these past few years; University Outreach may not be consistent with changes in the University; some committees may need to be disbanded; new committees may be needed.
4. The Ohio Faculty Council met with Chancellor Chu and Matt Filipic. Topics of discussion included (1) a new version of the survey of faculty activities (which replaces the old faculty workload forms), though it is not clear what the information will be used for, and teaching is reported automatically; and (2) other measures of performance (not just institutional but individual as well). How can we demonstrate to others (the governor, the public, legislatures) what we do and the outcomes? The next OFC meeting with the chancellor will be November 13.

**CHARTER & BYLAWS COMMITTEE:** Duane Rost, reporting for Dale Harrison, who was out of town, presented the two matters attached to the November 4 agenda, p. 4. Any action taken on item 2 is contingent on passing and ratifying the amendment proposed in item 1.

1. After reading the section of the Senate *Charter* that outlines the procedure for amending the *Charter*, **Rost moved that Article IV, Section 1, of the *Charter* be amended to add "elected/appointed committees" to the introduction of the section and as item (c).** See the exact wording attached to the agenda, p. 4.

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

Paul Sracic: Am I to understand that as the *Charter* is currently written, the General Education Committee, as currently formed, is actually an illegal committee, and that what we are trying to do is to pass an *ex post facto* amendment to make a committee legal that is not legal under the *Charter*? Is that proper procedure?

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

Sracic: Will new elections be held for the General Education Committee to be re-formed?

Rost: Without moving into the second amendment on the agenda, I draw your attention to the proposed bylaw, which I will present immediately after the current amendment, by which there

will be an election for membership on the General Education Committee. Yes, members will be elected and appointed.

Tom Shipka: I speak in favor of approval of this proposal. Those of us who participated in the lengthy debate over general education heard concerns and fears about the power of the General Education Committee; the clear language delineated here should help allay at least some of the fears expressed along the way. To have this language in our *Charter and Bylaws*, to make this committee a standing committee accountable to the Senate, is an important precedent to establish as we move full-scale into a new general education program.

**A vote was taken, and the proposal to amend Article IV, Section 1, of the *Charter*, adding “elected/appointed committees” to the introduction of the section and as item (c), passed.**

2. Amending the *Bylaws* is not as involved as amending the *Charter*. After reading the rules for amending the *Bylaws*, **Rost moved that we insert a new Bylaw 7 to define the membership and role of the General Education Committee and that we renumber the remaining bylaws.** See the exact wording attached to the agenda, p. 4.

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

Rost: We would like to address several items. The Charter & Bylaws Committee has added the stipulation that the provost’s appointments be “subject to ratification by the Senate Executive Committee”; that was not part of the original language referred to the Charter & Bylaws Committee. The committee has also added language about the staggered terms and how long people serve. In addition, there have been questions about whether the charge of the General Education Committee expressed in item c (that it “review and recommend policies regarding general education”) overlaps with that of the Academic Standards Committee. Charter & Bylaws did not attempt to resolve that issue; we would leave both charges in at this time. Also, the committee feels there should be an appeals process (as with programs and curriculum); we are assured that the committee is working on an appeals process and that it will be brought forward soon.

### **Proposal to Amend the Main Motion**

Tom Maraffa: **I move that we amend the language of item (a) in the proposed bylaw by removing “and subject to ratification by the Senate Executive Committee” so that the language will be consistent with what was passed by the Senate last spring.** The Charter & Bylaws Committee dealt with this issue and voted 2/2 not to do that even though there were five members present.

**The motion was seconded, and discussion on the amendment followed:**

Sracic: I oppose the amendment; I don’t see why the Senate would want to cede power to the provost. This is a representative body representing the interests of University faculty. I see no problem with having appointments to this powerful committee run past the Senate Executive Committee. To cede that power as a matter of expediency because we have already done it that way just goes back to my earlier question about acting *ex post facto*. I think the proposed amendment is a bad idea.

Charles Singler: I was chair of the Academic Standards Committee last year, and this was debated in our committee last year. The language “and subject to ratification by the Senate Executive Committee” was not included because we felt very specific academic areas needed to be addressed. Sometimes, the democratic process does not yield the most suitable persons to represent an area. The provost could use his authority to choose people upon recommendations from a number of sources--the General Education Committee, deans, or individuals themselves--for the expertise they bring to these areas. The five appointees constitute a minority of that committee; I would support the removal of that expression.

Lowell Satre: I am a member of the Charter & Bylaws Committee. I would like to oppose the amendment. What Dr. Singler has brought up about the provost’s having the option to appoint whoever he thinks is necessary to the process still continues even if we pass this bylaw as recommended. The provost can get input from anyone he wants. He is free to appoint whomever he wants to appoint. The only change here is that the Senate Executive Committee has to approve it. We are not usurping the power of the provost to recommend.

Janice Elias: I was wondering if people here feel our Senate committees get formed too quickly and move too rapidly and that we need something to slow down the formation of a committee and getting it operating. I believe there are three months of the year when the Senate Executive Committee does not meet. You might want to keep that in mind.

Bill Jenkins: The previous General Education Committee recommended this appointment by the provost primarily with the notion that the people in the five areas should be interested in general education and ready and willing to promote general education. Our concern was that people not be appointed just because they come from a certain area. Our concern in terms of possible ratification by the Senate Executive Committee relates to that particular issue. The previous General Education Committee supported appointment by the provost, the concept was passed without that phrase by the Senate last spring, and it was supported by the present committee and the provost. I strongly support passage of this amendment to go back to the previous form.

Sracic: I second what Dr. Satre said. Does Dr. Singler feel that the Executive Committee is unqualified to judge the qualifications of those who will first be recommended or nominated by the provost? Or is it just that democracy is too slow a process, and we want to expedite things? Democracy *is* a very slow process, but it is also a very valuable process.

Barbara Brothers: I have a question for those who have spoken in favor of the amendment. As Lowell Satre says, the proposed amendment does not change who gets the right to make the recommendation. I am not sure why I am being told to vote for this.

Rost: Speaking as a senator from my department and College, I oppose the amendment. I’m concerned that the Senate not totally abdicate its responsibility for the academic matters of the University. If there are no checks and balances, the provost will have control of a major academic matter: the general education requirements. I have been asked, “Don’t you trust the provost?” I trust the current provost. I do not trust the next provost, because the Senate will not be responsible for selection and hiring of the next provost. On the issue of trust, it would seem appropriate for the provost to trust the faculty elected to the Senate Executive Committee and be willing to respect their judgment.

Tom Shipka called the question.

**A vote was taken, and the motion to strike “and subject to ratification by the Senate Executive Committee” was defeated.**

### **Further Discussion of the Main Motion**

Shipka: As I look at the structure of the proposed bylaw, it seems that all of the paragraphs use “shall” except paragraph (e). Could we edit (e) to say “**shall place** the approved courses into the GER program and **serve** as an advisory body . . .”?

Rost : I will consider that a “friendly” amendment.

Bob Hogue: I have a point of order--until amendment 1 has gone through all the hoops it has to go through, including being presented to the Board of Trustees, it seems to me there are no “elected/appointed charter committees.”

Rost: I attempted to address that at the beginning with the statement that the second item (the proposed bylaw) is contingent upon the first (ratification of the amendment to Article IV, Section 1, of the Senate *Charter*).

Singler: I ask for clarification. In the general education package passed in May 1998, a number of items were included that I don't find in your committee's motion. I will cite two: the fact that course proposals for general education would have to go through a step-by-step procedure (through the college curriculum committee to the Gen Ed Committee to the University Curriculum Committee and all academic units); the assessment of the gen ed courses at the end of a 3-year cycle; etc.

Rost: I have yet to see a copy of what was passed in May and June.

Singler: I will get you a copy.

Rost: I would like to see a copy of it from the secretary rather than the committee. [Note from Bege Bowers: I did not compile the copies, which were distributed by General Education Coordinator Bill Jenkins. One correction to those copies was made at the very end of the October 14 Senate meeting; please see the minutes of that meeting.]

Rost: We were aware of the discussion about the sequence for approving proposals. In addressing whether the General Education Committee would usurp the activities of the University Curriculum Committee, we understood that the Senate wished that the General Education Committee not usurp those activities. Item (c) of the proposed bylaw says the “General Education Committee shall review and approve for general education *certification*. . . .” Our intention was that a course will be treated by the University Curriculum Committee like any other course; it will then go to the General Education Committee for approval of certification. Concerning assessment after 3 years, we did not include 3 years per se. Item (d) says that the “General Education Committee shall develop assessment plans and procedures. . . .” We felt those plans would address that question. The structure and points here were provided to us by GER Coordinator Bill Jenkins, and we have built on that.

Jenkins: Certain elements of what was passed are in effect. Whether they get put into the *Charter* is another matter. We did not feel they were *Charter* elements. Procedures for approving courses and programs are already appended to the Senate *Charter and Bylaws*. We

felt that GER courses would be subject to the procedure that has already been established. In regard to the 3-year assessment, we felt that it should not appear in the *Charter*, but it is certainly in effect. If the GER Committee wanted to change that, the matter would have to come back to the Senate. We felt that the responsibility for recommending policies was the important thing that should go in the *Charter and Bylaws*.

If you did not get a copy of the general education model, which I mailed to the Senate mailing list, contact me.

Brothers: It seems that we need *two* bylaw changes since another bylaw gives the right or responsibility for general education to the Academic Standards Committee. I do not understand how we can vote on one bylaw without voting on the other. It seems that the bylaws should be acted upon simultaneously so that if the proposed bylaw passes, we do not end up with two bylaws that contradict each other. If the proposed bylaw passes, it gives the same responsibility to two committees.

Rost: According to existing Bylaw 6.2. i.2, the responsibility of Academic Standards “shall include the making of recommendations concerned with University general requirements; undergraduate college degree requirements; the grading system; honors criteria for dean’s list and graduation.” It is my feeling that Bylaw 7 as proposed would mean that two bodies could make recommendations about general education requirements. I do not feel that the responsibility for making such recommendations is exclusive and that only one committee can possibly make them. Charter & Bylaws did not see the overlap in responsibility of the two committees as a problem, but we can address it if the Senate wishes us to.

Brothers: I do see it as a problem. If two different groups are looking at requirements, how is that not duplication? How does that not engender confusion and conflict?

Rost: Confusion and conflict are certainly possible, but the wording has to do with “making recommendations” to the Senate. We can have more than one body making recommendations to the Senate. Those two recommendations need not agree. We have people with differences of opinion all of the time. If Bylaw 6 said that Academic Standards has the authority to certify general education courses, then we would have a conflict of who has the authority. As it is, neither of these committees has the ultimate authority. The Senate has ultimate authority to consider recommendations from either body.

Sracic: I understand the need to debate the amendment to the *Charter* and the proposed bylaw together, but I do not think it is proper for the Senate to make speculative votes, and that is what the vote on the bylaw would be. **I make a motion to table the vote on the bylaw.** The motion was seconded.

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

A vote was taken, and **the motion to table proposed Bylaw 7 was defeated.**

Allen Hunter: Point of information: If this comes into effect, how will it affect the current General Education Committee? Will we have to go through new elections and appointments, or would current members be “grandfathered in”?

Rost: We would need to start over. We would need to elect from the colleges. The provost would need to provide his nominees. From a practical standpoint, I suspect that would be a rather seamless transition. I do not see a major problem.

Shipka: I call question.

A vote was taken, and **the motion to insert proposed Bylaw 7 [with the amended wording for item (e): “The General Education Committee shall place the approved courses into the GER program and serve as an advisory body to the Coordinator of General Education”] and renumber the remaining bylaws passed.**

**ELECTIONS AND BALLOTING COMMITTEE:** Julian Madison reported that he has been conducting elections or soliciting nominations for several elections: Senate chair, the Ohio Faculty Council, the Charter & Bylaws Committee, the Senate Executive Committee, and the Elections and Balloting Committee. He has extended the deadline for ballots until Friday, November 6. Winners will be contacted on Monday. If you did not receive a ballot, let Madison know (ext. 1602).

Morrison: Ballots for Senate chair, Ohio Faculty Council, and Charter & Bylaws should have been received by everyone. The others apply to the respective colleges for which there are vacancies.

Tom Shipka offered his department’s assistance in completing the elections. Some ballots did not have Madison’s return name and address.

**ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE:** Louise Pavia reported that the Academic Standards Committee met on October 16 and October 30. The first meeting was an organizational meeting. The second focused on criteria for admission related to early admissions opportunities and Senate Bill 140 students and on determination of a withdrawal date for the semester system. Discussion of these two items will continue at the November 6 meeting. The committee plans to present proposals regarding these two issues for the December Senate meeting.

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

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:** None.

**NEW BUSINESS:** None.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Tom Shipka moved that we adjourn. The motion was seconded, and the meeting adjourned at 4:59 p.m.