

Note: Please post agenda items for the December 2 Senate meeting to Regis Brown, English Department, by 10:00 a.m. Thursday, November 15.

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
CHARTER 16 1098

OVERVIEW:

Major topics presented/discussed: work for a procedure for future course changes in summer session(s); 15 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 topic will relate to amending the Senate Charter to permit elected/appointed committees (see below, pp. 2-3). The proposed amendments will allow us to vote upon a final ballot according to the procedure outlined in the Senate Charter.
- (2) The Senate approved a Bylaws amendment defining the membership and role of the General Education Committee (contingent upon final ballot approval of the Charter amendments described in policy change number 1, see below, p. 3).

CALL TO ORDER:

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

MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

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

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

- 1. The Senate Executive Committee met last week and reviewed what needs to be done to complete revisions for the Fair and Performing Arts, sciences and for modified positions on the Election & Balloting Committee, the Senate Executive Committee, the Charter & Bylaws Committee, and the General Education Committee (pp. 2-3). Bylaws addition defining the membership and role of the General Education Committee (pp. 3-7).
- 2. The Executive Committee also reviewed topics for the future for conversion to sessions. The committee leads those who developed the forms but recommends creating a form procedure for making other changes. The last track items are not present because no new descriptions, even for a single word or updating professional degree. It is not an efficient way to "update" people for changing old descriptions? Syllabi, grade, etc. are not required for every course change. In addition, the forms for new/retired courses suggest a 40-word limit on course descriptions, a limit that we do not make sense for all courses. Descriptions should fit the course. Furthermore, it is not logically consistent for new descriptions to be limited to 40 words while old, less track descriptions are not. Thus, the Executive Committee is asking the Curriculum and Programs committees to meet quickly, organize, and take up with the Executive Committee the problems with the forms.
- 3. The Executive Committee reviewed what needs to be done in terms of Senate committee structure and changes this year. All committees need to select a chair and vice and Regis Brown and Jan Morrison know who she elected that is. Also let us know when you are meeting so that descriptions from the Executive Committee can meet with the committees in session. The Charter & Bylaws Committee needs to review the Charter and Bylaws in its entirety for change necessitated by the items in session; these changes could be made at one time rather than piecemeal. Furthermore, committee chairs and names need to be reexamined so they more clearly denote the University? For instance, it's not clear what the role of the Integrated Technologies Committee has been these past few years. University Outreach may not be consistent with changes to the University; some committees may need to be disbanded, some committees may be merged.

*The Office of the General Education Committee will review the Charter, adding "shared appointment committees" in the introduction of the General Education Committee and that we restructure the membership and role of the General Education Committee and that we restructure the membership. See the exact wording attached to the agenda, p. 4.

CHAIRMAN & SENATE COMMITTEE: Susan Best, reporting for Dina Hoffman, who has not yet been provided the final minutes attached to the November agenda, p. 4. Any action items on agenda 2-3, contingent on pending ratifying the amendment proposed in item 1.

- 1. After reading the minutes of the Senate Charter that outlines the procedure for amending the Charter, they moved that Article IV, Section 1 of the Charter be amended to add "shared appointment committees" to the introduction of the agenda, p. 4.

The motion was seconded, and discussion followed.

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

Jan: The General Education Committee currently does not even contain the majority 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 consultation with the current General Education Committee. The intention is to go ahead with forming the committee now to go on with business. I certainly do not feel that the Senate is being held hostage, or that because the committee exists we have to make it happen. I think this is a legislative change to the Charter.

Jan: Will we discuss the bill for the General Education Committee to be added?

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

Tom Slight: I would like to voice my approval of this proposal. Those of us who participated in the lengthy debate over general education based courses and have done their part of the General Education Committee, the clear language and that we should be legally adding at least some of the items expressed along the way. To have this language on the Charter and Bylaws, to make this committee a standing committee accountable to the Senate, is an important procedure to establish as we move full scale into our general education program.

A vote was taken, and the proposal to amend Article IV, Section 1 of the Charter, adding "shared appointment committees" in the introduction of the General Education Committee and that we restructure the membership and role of the General Education Committee and that we restructure the membership. See the exact wording attached to the agenda, p. 4.

CHAIRMAN & SENATE COMMITTEE: Susan Best, reporting for Dina Hoffman, who has not yet been provided the final minutes attached to the November agenda, p. 4.

The motion was seconded, and discussion followed.

Jan: We would like to address several items. The Charter & Bylaws Committee has added the stipulation that the proposed "appointments be subject to confirmation by the Senate Executive Committee"; that was part of the original language referred to the Charter & Bylaws Committee. The committee has also added language about the suggested name and how long people serve. In addition, there have been questions about whether the change of the General Education Committee proposed in item 4 that "revise and recommend policies regarding general education" reading with that of the Academic Standards Committee. Charter & Bylaws did not attempt to resolve that issue, we would have both done that at this time. Also, the committee feels that should be an agenda process (with program and curriculum), we are assured that the committee is working on an agenda process and that it will be brought forward soon.

Proposed to Amend the Main Motion

Tom Morrison: I have that we amend the language of item 1 in the proposed bylaws by inserting "and subject to confirmation by the Senate Executive Committee" so that the language will be consistent with what was passed by the Senate last spring. The Charter & Bylaws Committee dealt with this issue and voted 2-2 so to do it even though there were five members present.

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

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

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

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

Janice Ellis: I was wondering if people here had not been committed yet before you could get quality and better service and that we need something to show down the formation of a committee and getting a system. I believe there are three months of the year when the Senate Executive Committee does not meet. You might want to keep that in mind.

Bill Hinkle: The present General Education Committee recommended this approach to the process generally with the notion that the people in the five areas should be determined by general education and each act willing to promote general education. This choice is the people who are appointed just because they come from certain areas. The current process of possible individualization by the Senate Executive Committee relates to that particular issue. The present General Education Committee supported appointment to the process, the concept was passed without that given by the Senate last spring, and it was supported by the present committee and the present. I strongly support passage of this amendment to go back to the previous Senate.

Jan: I would like Dr. Saxe and Dr. Single lead the Executive Committee to expedite to judge the qualifications of those who will be recommended or nominated by the process? Or is it just that democracy is to give everyone and to want equal rights? Democracy is a very slow process, but it also is very suitable process.

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

Jan: Speaking as a member from my department and college, I oppose the amendment. I'm concerned that the Senate will abdicate its responsibility for the academic status of the University. If we are not to check and balance, the process will have control of a major academic matter: the general education requirement. I have been asked, "Does this vote pass the process?" I want the content process. I do not want the vote process because the Senate will not be responsible for selection and hiring of the next process. On the issue of trust, it would seem appropriate for the process to treat the faculty elected to the Senate Executive Committee and be willing to respect that judgment.

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

Further Discussion of the Main Motion

Single: As I look at the structure of the proposed bylaws, it seems that all of the paragraphs are "shall" except paragraph 1. Could we add to it say "shall place the approved courses into the general program and serve as an advisory body..."?

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

Bill Hinkle: There is a general order and amendment. I had some thought about the longer I have go through including before presented to the Board of Trustees, I am sure to have some "shared appointment committees".

Jan: I am surprised to believe that the language with the amendment that the second time the proposed bylaws is contingent upon the final ratification of the amendment to Article IV, Section 1 of the Senate Charter.

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

Jan: I have to vote in a way that was passed in May and June.

Single: I ask for your views.

Jan: I would like to vote in a way that is the necessary rather than the committee. I don't know Regis Brown. I don't know the system, which was distributed by the General Education Committee Bill Hoffman. One concern is how you can be made at the very end of the October 16 Senate meeting, plus you are the minutes of that meeting.]

Jan: We were aware of the situation about the request for appointing positions. In addressing whether the General Education Committee would amend the University Curriculum Committee, we understood that the Senate wished that the General Education Committee amend those 40 articles. Item 1 of the proposed bylaws says the "General Education Committee shall review and approve for general education certification..." Our intention was that a review will be done by the University Curriculum Committee like any other committee. It will then go to the General Education Committee for approval of certification. Concerning appointment after 3 years, we did not include 3 years per se. We are sure that the "General Education Committee shall develop curriculum plans and procedures..." We did these plans would address that question. The minutes and plans have been provided to us by GEC Committee Bill Hoffman, and we have built on that.

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

If you did not get a copy of the general education needs, which I included in the Senate meeting file, contact me.

Rebecca: It seems that we need two bylaws changes once we have given the right of responsibility for general education to the Academic Standards Committee. I do not understand how we can vote on one bylaws without voting on the other. If the proposed bylaws changes, it gives the same responsibility to two committees.

Jan: Regarding existing Bylaws 4.1, 2.2, the responsibility of Academic Standards shall include the making of recommendations consistent with University general requirements, undergraduate college degree requirements, the grading system, better criteria for their and performance." It is my feeling that Bylaws 7-a proposed would mean that we had to make recommendations about general education certification. 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 vote the voting in responsibility of the two committees as perhaps, but we can address it if the Senate wishes to.

Jan: I think it is a problem. If one different group looking at appointments, how is that not duplicate? How does that not duplicate confusion and conflict?

Jan: Confusion and conflict are certainly possible, but the voting has to do with "making recommendations" to the Senate. We can have more than one body making recommendations to the Senate. These two recommendations need to have. We have people with different views of what all of the items. Bylaws said that Academic Standards has the authority to certify general education courses, that 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.

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

Rebecca: A motion to table is not a binding proposal requires a 2/3 majority.

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

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

Jan: We would have to vote on it. The process would need to resolve his question. From a practical standpoint, I suspect that would be a rather sensitive transition. I do not see a major problem.

Single: I ask for questions.

A vote was taken, and the motion to amend proposed bylaws 7(a) was amended reading for item 1: "The General Education Committee shall place the approved courses into the GEC program and serve as an advisory body to the Committee of General Education" and amend the existing bylaws proposal.

ELECTIONS AND MAKEUP COMMITTEE: Mike Maloney reported that he has been conducting elections in relating committees for several decisions. Senate chair, the Ohio Faculty Council, the Charter & Bylaws Committee, the Senate Executive Committee, and the Election and Balloting Committee. He has been consulted for bylaws and rules, November 6. Whom will be contacted on Monday. If you did not receive a ballot, he Maloney knows you are 100%.

Rebecca: Ballot for Senate chair, Ohio Faculty Council, and Charter & Bylaws should have been received by everyone. The others apply to the respective colleges for which they are trustees.

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

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

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

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS: None.

NEW BUSINESS: None.

ADJOURNMENT: Tom Slight moved that we adjourn. The motion was seconded, and the meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.