



93 pages

SENATE ACTIONS

- **Motion to vacate the seats of Senators Hamed and Ida for excessive absences without notice failed..... 5**

- **Approved a motion to refer back to the Graduate Faculty its the motion to change the bylaws of the Graduate Faculty..... 10**

- **Approved a motion, as amended, from the Academic Policy Committee to create two new colleges from the schools currently in the College of Fine and Applied Arts. *College number one would encompass the Myers School of Art; School of Communication; School of Dance, Theatre, and Arts Administration; and School of Music. College number two would encompass the School of Social Work; School of Family and Consumer Sciences; and School of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology* 17**

- **Approved a motion, as amended, from the Curriculum Review Committee to approve a list of curricula changes. 21**

- **Discussed, but was unable to act on, a motion from the Student Judicial Policy Committee to modify the University rule 3359-41, the Student Code of Conduct. 22**

Any comments concerning the contents in *The University of Akron Chronicle* may be directed to the Secretary, Richard Stratton (x7440).

facultysenate@uakron.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting held May 1, 2008 3

Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of May 1, 2008

- A. Report of the Senior Vice President and Provost 28
- B. Report from the Graduate Council 29
- C. Bylaw changes from the Graduate faculty 30
- D. Report from Academic Policies Committee 31
- E. Addendum to APC Report 32
- F. Report from the Curriculum Review Committee 33
- G. Report from the Athletic Committee 38
- H. Report from the Faculty Research Committee 39
- I. Report from the General Education Advisory Committee 40
- J. Minutes from the Ohio Faculty Council meetings 41
- K. Report from the University Council Exploratory Committee 49
- L. Report from the ad hoc Student Discipline Procedures Committee 50
- M. Summer Graduation Statistics 51
- N. Proposed Changes to the Student Disciplinary Code 55
- O. Changes to April Chronicle 92

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of May 1, 2008

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, May 1, 2008 in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education (BCCE). Senate Chair Harvey Sterns called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m.

Of the current roster of fifty-three Senators, 35 were present for this meeting. Senators Elliott, Gandee, Gerber, Gilliland, Kelly, Ofobike, Plummer, Sotnak and Vierheller were absent with notice. Senators Carroll, Clark, Elbuluk, Gamble, Ida and Moritz were absent without notice.

I. Approval of the Agenda – Chair Sterns verified a quorum and called the meeting of the May 1st Faculty Senate meeting to order. Senator Hajjafar moved approval of the agenda (seconded by Senator Halter). The agenda was approved.

II. Approval of the Minutes – Chair Sterns asked for consideration of the minutes of the minutes of April 3rd, 2008. He asked Senator Stratton to describe the corrections that were received prior to the meeting.

Senator Stratton stated that Senator Rich sent some corrections for pages 13 and 14. He found numerous typographical and punctuation errors. Since there were none of great substance and to save time these will be reported in an appendix. See appendix O.

Senator Gerlach noted the following errors. On “Page 12, third line from the top, my reference to Gouverneur Morris should be spelled ‘G o u b e r n e u r’ not ‘Governor’ but Gouverneur. On page 13, top of the page beginning in bold with my name, I think it should read ‘Mr. Chairman I move that we accept the report’ period. Capital ‘I’ ‘It’s just that we can’t do anything more than that’ period. ‘By accepting it we understand that they are going forward with it.’ It should be three sentences not one. Finally on page 16 the paragraph beginning with my name line 4 I think it should read ‘We read about this in the newspaper’ then comma ‘the talk about how there was’ etcetera. And then at the bottom of that paragraph I think I should have said, if I didn’t, ‘I support the motion’, not the vote. Thank you.”

There being no further corrections, the minutes were passed as corrected.

III. Chairman’s Remarks & Special Announcements – Chair Sterns began his remarks by noting this was the last meeting of the year for the Faculty Senate and offering his sincere thanks to all who have participated in our deliberations this year. He especially thanked our Executive Committee who is hard working and continuing to carry the responsibility and will be doing it during the summer. And he acknowledged Heather’s remarkable role of keeping all of us in movement. So he extended a special thank you to Heather.

“This has been a memorable week for all of us. It started with our North Central visit. I think all of us have learned more about ourselves in getting ready for the process and experiencing the two days of our visitations. I think we can think about what has been accomplished and how we are moving forward. I

wish that we had completed all of the tasks that we wanted to, but I think we've all agreed that we're moving in the right direction. And I feel that we have much to feel good about this year in terms of our accomplishments. Again I'd like to thank all of you and especially to thank President Proenza and Provost Stroble for your cooperative support of what we're doing. I think what we're doing here is very important. I think we all now realize that a strong Faculty Senate is essential for the operation of our university and I think we've learned in the last few days that that really is an important principle. At least I had that reinforced."

He then announced the "death of a good colleague, Dr. Dale L. Coons, who was Professor Emeritus of Special Education and passed away on April 8th. Dale retired from UA in 1995 after twenty-two years of service; he came to The University of Akron after a long career at Peabody College in Nashville. He earned his Master's in 1966 and his Ph.D. in 1969 at Indiana University at Bloomington. For any of you who knew Dale, you will know that he also had an acting career in regional theatre. He also for many years operated a special camp for children with developmental disabilities that was under the College of Education." The Senate observed a moment of silence after which Chair Sterns continued his remarks.

"Dr. Gerlach has asked that I make a report on attendance issues for people who have been in violation of the attendance rules. There are three individuals who fall under that; Senator Broadway who had unexcused absences on November 1st, December 6th and February 7th. Senator Hamed who had unexcused absences on November 1, December 6, February 7th and March 6th and Senator Ida unexcused absences on September 3rd, November 1 and February 7th."

Senator Gerlach indicated that Senator Ida was also absent on April 3rd.

Chair Sterns: "So there is the report on those individuals and their attendance. There were some other senators that did not come to the special meeting, but I have decided that we can report on who those are, but that a special meeting is a different category."

Senator Gerlach asked if the Chairman or the Executive Committee had any recommendations to the Senate about action.

Chair Sterns responded that he was asked to report on the absences. If senators feel action should be taken, they are free to make a motion.

Senator Gerlach rose to regretfully "move that the Senate declare these persons' seats vacant." He suggested they be filled by their respective constituencies in the spring elections. Senator Bohland provided the seconded.

Senator Rich: "I would simply like to point out that the bylaws empower the Senate to expel these members; they do not oblige the Senate to do so."

Senator Broadway noted that the rule indicates, according to an email he received, the Senate may expel any senator who is absent without notice for more than three meetings during an academic year. He has been absent without notice for three meetings, not more than three meetings.

Senator Matney asked the names be read again.

Chair Sterns repeated the original list: Senator Broadway, Senator Hamed and Senator Ida. He asked if Senator Broadway was asking the Senate to remove his name.

Senator Broadway responded the Senate body can do what it pleases. However he did not stand in violation of the rule in his interpretation.

Senator Rich: “Senator Broadway is absolutely correct. One would have to miss more than three meetings in order for the Senate to be authorized, that is be empowered to expel the senator. If it is true, and I gather it is, that Senator Broadway has not missed four but only three meetings, it would be an error for the Senate to attempt to expel him, it doesn’t have that power.”

Chair Sterns asked if Senator Gerlach wished to revise his motion accordingly.

Senator Gerlach: “Yes, I do. I had remembered that the rule said three or more but if that’s not the case, I trust Senator Rich’s correctness. So yes, I’ll revise the motion to apply accordingly to exempt Senator Broadway from the motion.”

Chair Sterns clarified that the motion will apply to Senator Hamed and Senator Ida.

Senator Elman indicated she would have those who are affected make a statement, in case there were extenuating circumstances.

Senator Wilburn asked if the senators affected had been notified, as he remembered Senate had requested.

Chair Sterns indicated the Senators affected had been notified. There being no further discussion a vote was called. The outcome of the voice vote was in question, so Senator Gerlach called for a division of the house.

Chair Sterns: “Okay, we’ll have to have a division of the house. May we have by the show of hands all of those in favor of the motion? Okay, those opposed please raise their hands. Okay, the Chair rules that **the motion fails**” on a vote of 7 in favor and 19 opposed.

III. Reports –

a. Executive Committee – Senator Stratton: “The Executive Committee met on April 22nd. On the agenda were the following items. Chairman Sterns received a letter addressed to himself and the Executive Committee. The letter indicated a faculty member desired to enter a grievance under section 3359-20-036 of the university rules. Under those procedures a written complaint must be filed with the Chair of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities committee. The letter was sent to the Executive Committee because of some confusion about the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee membership. The Executive Committee is working expeditiously to try and clarify that confusion. Second item was that we received

and discussed a proposal from the Graduate Council to change the requirements for granting ad hoc status; that item is on our agenda for later today. We also received the final agenda for the Higher Learning Commission, NCA focus visit and set the agenda for today's meeting. Afterwards we also drafted and sent out the letters to the colleges requesting the results of their Senate elections for the spring term.

On April 28th the Executive Committee met with the Higher Learning Commission consultant evaluation focus team, Dr. Elaine Kline and Dr. Kenneth Ruit to discuss shared governance on campus and to also avail them of the Senate resolution of April 2008. That is my report for today. Are there any questions?" There being no questions for the Secretary, **Chair Sterns** invited President Proenza to address the Senate.

b. Remarks from the President– President Proenza: "Thank you Mr. Chairman, good afternoon colleagues. I just have a few select comments and updates for you this afternoon. First as the Chairman advised we were occupied earlier this week with the NCA reaccreditation focus visit, the Provost will speak I'm sure in considerable detail about that. It has already been noted of course in her communication to campus. I simply want to say thank you to her for leading the effort. Thank you to all of you who participated so actively in the self study and the visits and so much of the life and work of the university. Included among that group is of course our student senators and I want to thank Kyle Bohland and his colleagues and to congratulate Kristen Bowman for her election as ASG president for next year. Thank you both and I know you will be eager to hear more from the Provost about that.

As I think you also know we recently hosted a visit on the campus of Chancellor Fingerhut. He came in on the afternoon of Thursday, spent a good bit of that afternoon with us, had dinner with the Trustees, met the next morning with a number of groups and other members of the Akron community. He voiced not only very strong support for the general direction that The University of Akron has been following for the last many years and the success that we've enjoyed but particular support for some of the partnerships we are forging with the three Akron hospitals and the medical in school in some selected opportunities that are before the Third Frontier Commission for possible funding. I see some of you here who were able to meet with him and I hope that you also might wish to report on that to the full Senate, Mr. Chairman if you have not already had plans to do so in other regards.

We recently had the opportunity to recognize faculty staff and contract professionals who are celebrating milestones in terms of service to the university. The honorees included two people who have been with us for forty years; Dr. William Francis, associate dean of the college of Arts and Sciences and Mary Jo McCracken, professor of Physical Health Education, Sports Science and Wellness Education. And of course, we recognized the fifty-five years of service that Zippy has provided to the university as well as those who had served five, ten, twenty etcetera. I know that some of you in this room either in formal service or in continued service have given many many years as I know Senator Gerlach has certainly and my colleague in general counsel, Mr. Mallo. Congratulations and thank you all for that service.

In a few days, May 12th, several faculty and students will be honored and the fifth annual University Park Alliance luncheon on May 12th. Awards will be presented to those whose work has contributed significantly to the revitalization of University Park. Also coming up fairly shortly is Founder's Day when the Alumni Association will present outstanding teacher and outstanding researcher awards at our annual traditional annual Founder's Day ceremony and that's tomorrow actually it's that quickly. We also will honor some staff members and contract professionals with shared leadership awards and one department will receive the unit shared leadership award.

We're coming indeed not only to just the final meeting of the Senate but indeed to finals week and to commencement next, not this Saturday but the following Saturday and Sunday from now. There are three commencement ceremonies, two on Saturday and one on Sunday. And it's a special time because we will be awarding as best we can tell the largest number of degrees in the last ten years and that's an exceptional notice to us about the accomplishments of our students but about the success that our students are enjoying and the contributions which The University of Akron will make through these kinds of graduation rates to the overall strategic plan of the state of Ohio to increase the overall educational attainment of Ohioans. Thank you for a tremendous academic year in so many ways. I continue to be so pleased to hear about the accomplishments of each of you and through you the empowerment of students to continually shine and win regional, statewide and national competitions in so many disciplines; we do that so very well. Thank you also to Economics for bringing together the 18th Grunenbergl Lecture, it was very special indeed. And for once we're going to depart with one tradition at commencement, as you may know since we started being together I have given all of the commencement addresses, but on Saturday we will be honoring with an honorary degree the President of Lorain Community College Dr. Lloyd Church. As you may know together with Lorain and two other institutions we have formed a partnership called the Innovation Alliance. And so we have planned not only to honor Dr. Church for his leadership of his college and of many important factors in Northeast Ohio but we've invited him to offer the commencement address at that ceremony. That makes it possible for me to only write two talks this year rather than three, that's welcome. Finally, some time ago you asked that I raise the issue with our Board of Trustees about House Bill 315 which of course would create a dedicated revenue stream to help fund STRS healthcare. I have done so. They are, I think, inclined to be very supportive. They have asked us to provide some additional financial information before they consider it fully so that they understand the fiscal implications and so forth. So I will come back with additional information as soon as that information is available and appropriately presented to the trustees for their review and action. Mr. Chairman I think that concludes my report, I'm happy to take any questions that the Senate may wish to address."

There being no questions for President Proenza, **Chair Sterns** invited Vice President and Provost Elizabeth Stroble to address the Senate.

c. Remarks from the Provost – Provost Stroble: "Well the single most important thing I had to report on today came out in E-mail digest. I don't have a lot more details from this because you don't get anything in writing from the team for a matter of weeks. Those of you who are in accredited programs know that a self-study process takes place, we've been working on that. Then you do the sight visit, we did that Monday and Tuesday and then I asked if I could be part of the exit interview when they met with the President Tuesday morning. I took notes furiously, what you get is mostly the summary of those notes. And the most significant statement is really what's in bold; and this could be in quotation marks because I knew I wanted to capture their exact words and it was so gratifying when they said: 'conditions have been met and all of the mandates of the focus visit have been satisfied.' Now note, that does not mean that the governance work of the university is complete. None of us would have believed that on our account much less hearing it from objective reviewers. But they did feel that we had made enough progress that we could consider the focus visit to have done what it needed to do. And then if you'll note we're required to do a progress report in three years. That's sort of the next step on the road to when we have a full and complete visit in five years which would be our usual cycle. They come every ten years and in five years we'll be due

for that next piece. The way NCA works, every single visit is cumulative and part of the record for the next visit. So when they come in five years they'll have the result of this focus visit, they'll have the results of the 2003 visit, they'll have the results of the progress report and all of that becomes part of the ongoing review and record for a visit five years from now. So you know no good university's work is ever done. We're certainly not done with governance and we knew that, that's why we knew based on your resolution at the last Faculty Senate meeting that the University Council work truly does need to have an end date and a time when we consider it that we're ready to vote on it. So I'm working with the University Council Exploratory Committee to assure all of us that really is what's going to happen and I think that plus the evidence in the case studies really brought to them the level of certainty to say that we had met the requirements of the visit. Just as a reminder, when they came in 2003, here is the wording of the concern that was noted: 'criterion two: demonstrates the criterion requires institutional attention commission follow-up' and here we see exact quote, 'the role of the faculty in institutional governance is uncertain based on the election for faculty collective bargaining'. So the rationale for the visit was 'because of the uncertainty of the outcome of the contract negotiations for the new faculty collective bargaining unit a focus visit is recommended to assess the nature of the relationship and roles of the faculty in shared governance'. So my sense from answering a lot of their questions, which kept coming back to is there greater certainty now about how works than there was in 2003? And I think that the answer that they came to was yes. Is there complete and perfect certainty? No. But they expect in three years by the time we write a progress report that there will be much greater certainty and I think for all of our sakes it would be a good thing that that's the case. So that's where it turned out. We will get a draft report from them you know some time in the next two months, I would guess. We will only be able to make corrections of fact. So if they reported the name of the university wrong or had people's names misspelled or the overall enrollment or what date we were founded, those kinds of factual matters, then we would correct that on the record. No matters of interpretation. You know, that they will issue their findings. Then ultimately it will go to the NCA meeting of the review board in November and we will get the results back then about whether their report has been endorsed. Then on our NCA website with NCA the results of the focus visit will be posted and then we'll be on our way to do the things that we need to do to write the progress report. So I'll be glad at the end to answer any questions about that.

I did not include other items on the report because by comparison they don't feel as significant to me although they bear a lot of significance for the work that we're just starting to do. We're always in motion around here. And even those case studies describe us being in motion; whether it's University Council or Integrated Biosciences Ph.D., or the consideration of a new organization of the College of Fine and Applied Arts, these are all rather fluid and dynamic processes and those case studies just caught us at a moment in time in those governance processes. So two groundbreakings, one that happened this week and one that will happen next week that are just some nice moments in time. Wayne Campus broke ground for their second building, they've always only had one. And so they really needed student space, if you've visited there lately their enrollments growing and they have a lot of relationships with public schools to do dual enrollment and now Seniors to Sophomores and they really didn't have adequate space for student organizations or dining or a bookstore or a student lounge, all the kinds of things that make a place more student friendly and give it student life. They have always called the plan for this building "Building H". And that was it. Now it's called the Student Life Building. So it's a better name but I quipped at the groundbreaking yesterday that I would always think of it as H for home, a home for students. And I think it will be that, and I think it's a great building which they broke ground on yesterday.

And next week, we as partners with the city of Akron, National Inventor's Hall of Fame and Greater Akron Chamber and Akron Public Schools and Akron Tomorrow, a whole host of organizations, will break ground for a new school that will be built in the National Inventors Hall of Fame, Science Technology, Engineering and Mathematics for Middle Schoolers, with an opening of Fall 09. So a great project that lots of people on campus have been a part of and it's always nice when that tangible event happens where you break ground in this case kind of do renovation and an addition to that building so that we can serve students in many more ways than we can today. So that finishes my remarks and I want to thank everyone for a really productive year. If we look back over those minutes and all the actions that have been taken this year it has been substantial. I think you have wonderful leadership in Faculty Senate that includes Executive Committee as well as all of you and I thank you for being great partners."

There being no questions, **Chair Sterns** proceeded to the committee reports.

d. Committee Reports – **Chair Sterns** reported that as Secretary Stratton mentioned in his report, the Executive Committee is in the process of convening the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. In the process to reactivate this committee, we found some individuals were not elected and a number of individuals were appointed contrary to the rules. Thus not every single college is represented. Currently we have seven individuals. The chairman determined that is sufficient for the case that is coming forward. So he reported to the Senate that the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee is activated and the case is going forward. We're doing the best we can to meet the timelines, although it is more slowly than desired.

The Senate then turned to the report of the **Graduate Council** and asked Senator Leigh to report. See appendix B.

Senator Leigh: "Hello, I'd like to report on the first part of the meeting and then Dr. Mark Tausig is here and he'll be answering some questions and has some other information as well. So I have printed out for everyone just a quick review of what we completed this year. The Curriculum Committee which is under their own report has reported back to Graduate Council that they have met to review and approve 72 of 73 reviewed options. The Student Review Committee has had no report this year. The Graduate Faculty Membership Committee has met and approved 34 of the faculty applicants. Dr. Newcombe has requested a 2 percent funding increase for graduate assistant stipends, no word back on when or where that money is going to come from. Dr. Tausig has provided the college deans with results from the Program Review Committee, and is waiting on comment back from them. And Dr. Tausig has suggested that a responsible conduct of research be implemented for the graduate students, which I believe has also been sent out to faculty and deans.

And then on the side, I am the Graduate Student Government president and I would like to report on its activities. One, the organization has been revived; we recently held an all day colloquium here on campus and we had 127 in attendance. That included six speakers from our community and campus. We were able to give out eleven research grant awards to graduate students. We had six different departments represented in those eleven awards and we have had a successful election for president and vice president. So this should be happening again next year. And I'd like to thank the Senate for all the time and patience

for my comments and a few people on campus that have helped as well, Dr. Tausig as our advisor, Kyle Bohland who helped me get settled into all the meetings and learn what I needed to do and Dr. Fey and Dr. Newkome for all the financial and support for what we able to do this year. And thank you for your time.”

Chair Sterns: “We have before us a change in the bylaws of the Graduate Faculty which needs to be approved by the Faculty Senate. I asked Dr. Tausig to be with us today in case there were any questions, you all have the bylaws revision, if not it’s available on the table. Are there any questions? This comes as part of the report of the Graduate Council. Are there any comments or questions regarding the revisions?” See appendix C.

Senator Stratton: “Section D (2) (c) of the Graduate Faculty Bylaws indicates that those who are hired and have their Ph.D. in the last year get a five year membership on the graduate council if they apply for it. My question is, what happens to individuals who are hired and their Ph.D. is more than a year old and do not meet the current guidelines for graduate faculty status? What assurances are there that those individuals would be able to teach graduate level courses? In the past some departments have used the ad hoc standing to be able to do that.”

Chair Sterns asked permission for Dr. Tausig to be able to speak to the Senate. It was granted.

Dr. Tausig: “The change in the Graduate Faculty Bylaws that was approved by the Graduate Council and also Graduate Faculty doesn’t address that particular issue. Nothing has changed about that circumstance. There is a provision for newly minted doctoral graduates to be appointed at level one or level two for professional development purposes. If a new faculty member is hired whose degree is more than one year old, if they’ve been out for one year they can start as though they already have one year one publication and then they if they’re level, if they want level two they need to continue to publish at a prescribed rate as the bylaws indicate. So that’s not being changed by this.”

Senator Stratton: “But that doesn’t answer the question. The question is if you hire somebody that’s been out for say two years, or three years, who doesn’t have the required list of publications; in the past we’ve been able to give them ad hoc status in order to be able to teach. Now they’re regular faculty, they’re not able to get ad hoc status. What process is there to allow that individual to teach?”

Dr. Tausig: “In the past they were incorrectly given ad hoc status. They are eligible to receive regular appointment based on that number of years out from their degree, and then they need to meet their requirements for that level faculty status for their renewal.”

Senator Erickson: “I still am a little confused. Somebody asked me about people who might come from industry for example where they are not allowed to use a process where they could get academic publications. Now are you saying that when they come in they have a different status and they have to move part of ... We went through all the rules we could not see where that was covered by the present rules and so we changed it. It may have been unclear but how does somebody in that situation...”

Dr. Tausig: “It is not, it is not my belief that the change that has been proposed has anything to do with that situation. There was never provision in the.... Maybe I should describe the changes that we actually made

and that might explain this to you. The bylaw section that was revised initially said ‘adjunct, part time visiting and other faculty members’ and what we discovered was that regular full-time tenured faculty, in fact they were all tenured, were applying for ad hoc graduate faculty status which essentially gave them level one status because they had no publications, apparently, to go through the regular graduate faculty category one or two criteria. To me that meant that we no longer had a graduate faculty. The point of the graduate faculty requirements was to insure the quality of the graduate faculty and this of course has been with us for many many years that for level one it’s required for appointment status to have at least one publication in five years. And level two requires four publications in five years. What was happening was that former graduate faculty, let’s say who weren’t able to meet that requirement were applying as ad hoc temporary graduate faculty and in essence they were given graduate faculty status without meeting the criteria for graduate faculty status and so the changes that were made to the bylaws were intended to do two things; eliminated the word other because people were arguing that the meaning of other meant other faculty who were in a circumstance where they couldn’t meet the criteria; whereas I read it in the graduate school to mean other types of adjunct part time faculty. The other thing that the graduate council has proposed and added to the bylaws was a statement that says full time, tenure track faculty members are expected to apply for full time graduate faculty membership and so the intent was to make it clear that full time, tenure track faculty are not eligible to be appointed as ad hoc temporary faculty. So I don’t see, I don’t know if that affects an incoming faculty member who has been out for a few years or came from industry, there are provisions in the bylaws that...”

Senator Erickson: “Well that’s what we couldn’t find, provisions in the bylaws. Clearly this particular way of interpreting the bylaws for the change would cover those situations. But there could be two situations: one where you’ve got faculty coming in from nonacademic backgrounds, what happens to them? We couldn’t find anywhere in the bylaws, except in this one place here where you deal with that. The second one if you have somebody is who has been doing work for the institution. I know in this regard that the Provost, the President do not have to meet these requirements. What about people below that level who have had release from teaching duties to serve the institution and they come back and they have to wait however long it is to get that first publication before they can teach on the regular faculty or not. Clearly, before they could apply under this provision. So I’m saying is that there seems that by making this change some departments are going to find themselves in some difficulty when people come back from institution assignment and are needed to teach graduate level classes. Now we couldn’t find in the bylaws sections that would deal with those situations.”

Dr. Tausig: “I think you’ve actually raised many many points. It’s the fact that you don’t find any specific provisions in the bylaws of the graduate faculty is because it’s clear that in order to be appointed to the graduate faculty, by and large you need to publish and if you come from institutions or some other organization where you haven’t published in referred journals, or the kind of things that can substitute for that, you cannot be appointed to the graduate faculty. Now let me say this, there’s still discretion as I interpret the bylaw, even as changed, that would allow me or Dr. Newkome to approve appointing somebody as an ad hoc graduate faculty member if there was a circumstance such as the some of the ones that you described. What this is designed to address is to prevent full time, tenured faculty members from asking for ad hoc graduate faculty status without publishing.”

Senator Lillie: “I was at the graduate faculty meeting where this was discussed at some length. I thought it was a very useful meeting. There were a lot of things clarified, but towards the end of the meeting, I think it was Vice Chair Kerns was able to quote a statement from the graduate bylaws to the effect that if the graduate faculty in a particular department elect to recommend someone for full category one or two status, that person may then apply for the regular status, regardless of publication record. So is that the case and if so, would that satisfy sort of the special cases that might come up?”

Dr. Tausig: “That is so and in fact the other difference that you should know is that applications for membership in category one, category two go to the faculty members on the Graduate Council Membership Committee, not through the Graduate School Office and those people would be responsible for determining whether or not the rationale that was provided for that appointment in the absence of publications was reasonable and then they would make that appointment and so you’re right.”

Senator Lillie: “And so if I may follow up, just briefly because the issue of teaching has popped up. If the graduate faculty in department A felt strongly that doctor so and so, even in the absence of actual publications was such an excellent teacher that they felt it would be appropriate for that individual to have the five-year appointment, they could make that recommendation which would then go through the regular process that every other recommendation would go through and if the graduate council then ultimately the vice president and dean said in that particular case yes, we agree with the rationale that would be the five year period.”

Dr. Tausig: “That’s right.”

Chair Sterns: “Dr. Tausig, are there any opportunities for any kind of emergency appointments to teach a specific course?”

Dr. Tausig: “For regular full time faculty members, under certain circumstances yes. But the principle of this is to prevent this option from arising. There are approximately I think twenty faculty on campus who now have this ad hoc graduate faculty status and so we’re not talking about huge number of faculty but...”

Senator Rich: “Dr. Tausig I’m just curious about this, it has nothing to do with law faculty, but do I understand you correctly to say that someone who is expressly declared to be ineligible for ad hoc status could nevertheless be given ad hoc status?”

Dr. Tausig: “The variations in people’s performance, obligations, and duties on campus are quite extensive and complicated and there are occasions when it is sensible to give someone a temporary appointment for a semester or for a year. And yes, we have that responsibility.”

Senator Rich: “So I understand your answer to be yes, someone expressly declared by these rules to be ineligible may nevertheless be appointed?”

Dr. Tausig: “That’s right.”

Senator Rich: “I think we’re perilously close to the point of saying that these rules are whatever Dr. Tausig says they mean.”

Senator Gerlach: “Mr. Chairman, point of order. It is not clear to me that we have a motion, a specific motion on the floor for discussion. I have not heard anyone make a motion that we adopt this and this comes from the Graduate Council and not from a committee of the Senate so would not be a specific motion and subject to proceed.”

Senator Lillie: “I thought I heard our Chair state that this was a motion coming from a committee and therefore it did not need...”

Chair Sterns: “My interpretation is the relationship that we have with the graduate council is that of a committee. If I’m in error...”

Senator Gerlach: “I don’t think so. The Graduate Council is to report to us and we are to act on its recommendations, but I don’t think the bylaws truly identify it as a committee. Well let’s clear up and have a motion to adopt this.”

Chair Sterns: “Would you please make that motion.”

Senator Gerlach: “I will yes.” Senator Matney provided a second.

Senator Gerlach then asked if the entire sheet represents a complete motion and if all of this material is part of the motion.

Dr. Tausig explained that the word “other” was to be deleted and the last two sentences at the end of that paragraph are added.

Senator Gerlach: “Oh I see. I see the type is a little bit different. Alright, this may not be germane to the exact vote and it has to do with something that was reported on Dr. Tausig and this is by Miss Leigh. At the bottom of that page of report of the Graduate Council it says ‘Dr. Tausig has suggested that a responsible conduct of research implemented for the graduate students’. That doesn’t make grammatical sense, a responsible conduct code? Or what does that mean? Can we hear that explained?”

Chair Sterns: “I think we need to focus on the motion first.”

Senator Bohland: “I just wanted to voice my recommendation. I don’t think I’d like to make a formal motion yet, but maybe the Faculty Senate would consider that we send this to the Graduate Council with all of our recommendations of all these little loopholes and then they can all be addressed and so then we can have a full motion that will address all the loopholes written down and then there’s not all these questions and we talked about stuff that’s written on the paper as a rule.

I make it a motion to refer to Graduate Faculty.” Senator Gerlach provided the Second.

Senator Huff: “Just for clarification, a minute ago you said something about publication or equivalent. And I wanted to just clarify if there was an understanding of different situations for fine and performing arts?”

Dr. Tausig: “The bylaws clearly recognize that in different disciplines there are different ways of showing your scholarship or productivity and every department has actually it’s own set of rules as to what constitutes criteria for these levels and those have to be at least equivalent if not more difficult than what the graduate faculty establishes.”

Chair Sterns: “I’d just like to make a point as Chair, that the discussion that we’ve had today and the answers to these questions does provide legislative intent. So keep in mind that some of the issues that have been raised, answers have been provided. I think we’re ready to vote, are we ready to vote on the motion to refer?” **The motion passed.**

“I’m not sure that I fully understand what we are being told to do. So can we have some clarification so that Dr. Tausig goes away with good instructions?”

Senator Bohland: “The intent of my motion was that the Faculty Senate list the shortcomings of this current bylaw change or even ask for the additional information that’s been cited so we could just have a more informed vote. If it’s the former I guess we need to add some things to this certain part of the bylaws then I wanted the Faculty Senate to recommend certain questions be answered so that graduate council has directions as to what we’re looking for and then they present that back to us.”

Senator Gerlach: “In short Mr. Chairman, Dr. Tausig and his colleagues will have to consult the minutes of this meeting for the questions that were raised to guide them as to what should be included in a revision of any sort of this statement so as to make it clearer at answering the questions that were raised.”

Senator Erickson: “Perhaps Senator Rich might expand a little on what he was saying, because as I understand it as saying that the rules as presented doesn’t make enough sense so perhaps if ...”

Senator Rich: “As I said there were essentially two questions raised. The question I raised was whether the rules as stated mean what Dr. Tausig says they mean? That problem can be solved I think by either changing the rule so they expressly state what Dr. Tausig said is their intent, bringing them into alignment or by changing the statements about what it is they are supposed to mean. But I do think that when we make rules like this they should say what is meant and if we mean that someone can be appointed, then the rules should not say they are ineligible to be appointed. The second set of questions, which I did not address, but I believe to be the import of other statements was that these rules may not make adequate provision for certain kinds of emergencies or special needs and as to which needs, which emergencies, I think some of the questions that were raised which will be reported in the minutes may provide guidance on that, I have some sympathy for Dr. Tausig in trying to understand exactly those were based on the very limited debate, the motion to refer back may have been a little premature.”

Senator Bohland: “So far I’ve had, there’s been three general questions; Senator Erickson had two questions, whether somebody in industry who has been working on some private research that has not been published but has done significant research could be granted graduate faculty membership, the second point was whether working in an administrative role for a significant amount of time, could be appointed as graduate faculty and then Senator Lillie had a concern that was brought up by the committee itself that said there was a nomination process that the graduate faculty of a certain department could make

an exemption to these kinds of publications and then that could be approved by the Dean of the Graduate School. Then I think the third or the fourth issue if you take Dr. Erickson's as two, the fourth issue was if there was an emergency provision for somebody to teach one class, one year for something. So those are the four concerns I've heard so far."

Dr. Tausig: "Let me say first of all to Senator Rich that I'd be most happy to abide by the letter of this law, this revision. The other thing I need to say is that the graduate faculty is only suggesting these changes for these specific reasons. It is not engaged in a general rewriting of the bylaws and so that it addresses all conceivable options that it hasn't addressed yet in the bylaws. And so I'm sure this makes sense, I guess I'm trying to think now that you're referring this back to the graduate faculty, you're asking graduate faculty to reconsider the entire structure of the bylaws which was not the point of what this bylaw change was intended. It's up to the graduate faculty if they want to reconsider the rest of the bylaws but I'm not sure that the referral back to the graduate faculty for these particular changes that have been approved includes those things."

Senator Bohland: "I agree, I just think that the intent of the specific change that you're looking for, that graduate faculty was looking for, was not to deal with these other issues, but making this change makes these other issues very important because in the current reading it says 'other faculty can be appointed' and so making this change eliminates the four other concerns that I mentioned earlier."

Chair Sterns: "Well I would like, as Chair I would like to send a message to the graduate faculty that we wish to beg their indulgence to clarify on these points. The job of the Faculty Senate is to clarify and to make sure that any resolution that comes forward is clear and fits with our university operating procedures. And so that's our purpose."

Senator Rich: "When Dr. Tausig says that he'd be happy to live with these rules as written, I think it needs to be pointed out that that would mean that there would not be the flexibility to appoint someone on an ad hoc basis for an emergency situation. So although Dr. Tausig may be happy to live with that the question for this body is would the rest of the members of this body be happy to live with that?"

Dr. Tausig: "And again I'm not sure that it's this body's obligation to discuss that or to make recommendations about that. The graduate faculty are the ones who can alter the graduate faculty bylaws."

Senator Lenavitt: "I think it's exactly what this faculty's responsibility to discuss, at any point that we do in fact change any portion of the bylaws you're changing the bylaws. So I think the issue of specificity and what conditions would exist that would enable as my colleague someone from the College of Fine And Applied Arts as an example, might have an expertise in some kind of technical area to be asked by another colleague to teach, but they don't have graduate status but because they are full time faculty and they are tenured, they would not be able to get ad hoc status to teach. To say it is not our responsibility, we are the only group on campus whose responsibility it is to protect the quality of the academic programs, graduate or otherwise so that's totally unacceptable to me."

Dr. Tausig: "I didn't mean that faculty shouldn't direct this. But I think it's there's a Graduate Council and then there's Graduate Faculty and I think those are the proper bodies to address this."

Senator Rich: “Now I’m at loss to understand whether Dr. Tausig’s position is that the Faculty Senate need not approve these changes under the Faculty Senate bylaws as adopted by the Board of Trustees. Is that the position you’re taking?”

Dr. Tausig: “No I think I’m trying to say that if the Faculty Senate feels that there should be some further changes then the ones that were proposed/approved by the Graduate Council and the Graduate Faculty then I need to go back to the Graduate Faculty and the Graduate Council with those changes and start the process over again.”

Senator Rich: “Just so we’re clear, this body was not responding to something that was not being proposed to this body for adoption. What was being proposed in the view of the members of this body created some problems that need to be addressed.”

Dr. Tausig: “Well I don’t know if that’s the case.”

Senator Rich: “Well I understand that you disagree with it, with what the member’s have expressed as point of view but I do think that they have expressed this point of view.”

Chair Sterns: “And given the existence of the governance structure that is in place, we want to work with you as much as possible to provide a positive outcome, but I think what we’ve seen happen here today is perfectly appropriate. We’ve considered the changes, people have raised questions about these changes, we’re asking for clarification hopefully that will happen and we will take it up as soon as we possibly can so we will accomplish what will happen. I personally feel this is well within the prevue of the Senate. This is the only body that can pass academic issues and I’m sorry that we have this difficulty but it needs to be clarified.”

Senator Bagatto: “As a former representative on the graduate council, it may not have been mentioned but as far as what I can see from what Dr. Tausig is saying that there is this loophole which certain faculty are using, in my opinion, to teach graduate classes inappropriately. They are not qualified. They’re not following the guidelines and what Dr. Tausig and the Graduate Council are trying to do is to close that loophole. It doesn’t stop the flexibility of granting special circumstances but it in a sense is, and I understand the comments and I…”

Chair Sterns: “I thank you for your comments. I think now as Chair I asked for clarifications so that Dr. Tausig would have a clear expression of what the body was concerned about I think we’ve given him more than adequate feedback and instruction. We have gone beyond, the motion to refer has happened. I think you probably know more now than you want to know but I think the intention is for a good purpose so I think as far as I’m concerned discussion is over.”

Dr. Tausig: “Can I expect a written list of the..”

Chair Sterns: “Yes, you’ll have our minutes.”

Senator Lillie: “Yes, just in response to that, I think Senator Gerlach made a comment that the minutes will reflect all of the concerns in as much detail as possible and if I can I would be happy to help to clarify those but I think that’s where that will come from.”

Chair Sterns: “Thank you very much and we appreciate you coming. I’m sure you were thrilled at the opportunity, but it important for communication that we have this full discussion. So thank you.”

Senator Gerlach: “Mr. Chairman, while we’re still on the topic though generally of Graduate Council business, I would like an explanation of this the report that reads: ‘Dr. Tausig has suggested that a responsible conduct of research implemented for the graduate students.’ That is a grammatical imperfect sentence, what does it mean?”

Senator Leigh: “Yes I’d like to address a typo on my document that I handed out to the Senate today. Although I spoke correctly I did not type correctly please forgive me. As one of the comments at one of the more recent council meetings, Dr. Tausig has suggested that a ‘responsible conduct of research’ be implemented for graduate students. There are not further details on that. My idea is that it’s being thrown around and discussed and further comments from the minutes of the Graduate Council continue say that ‘this would be an official policy of the Graduate Council that they would like all institutions to implement. Many questions still need to be answered; how would the university do this, who would pay?’ And that’s hopefully answering Senator Gerlach’s question.”

Senator Gerlach: “Well Mr. Chairman, if I may ask it makes a little bit better sense now, where would the word be implemented but what is a responsible conduct of research? Is this a code of conduct, a standard of conduct?”

Chair Sterns: “Well I would be willing to answer it but I think Dr. Tausig should have the honor.”

Dr. Tausig: “I think I would call it a responsible conduct for research policy. There is a national concern that all graduate training include some familiarity with graduate students in the responsible conduct of research which includes protection of human subjects, protection of animals, authorship rights, plagiarism so forth and so on. So we are hoping to explore ways in which we can bring that to campus.”

Senator Gerlach: “Thank you, policy explains it all.”

Chair Sterns asked Dr. Ramsier to report on the **Academic Policies Committee**. See appendix D.

Dr. Ramsier: “Academic Policies Committee presents a report with two items; number two is for information only; number one is the primary issue. We continued our review of the proposal from the President and the Provost for the reorganization of the College of Fine and Applied Arts. We looked at the Provost’s budget request that would provide funding for the part of the reorganization. And we met yesterday so our original report does not have the information from that meeting, so please turn to the addendum to the APC report now this is the important part. We met yesterday to consider the input that we requested from all the schools in the College of Fine and Applied Arts. Written feedback addressed pros and cons of the proposal to reorganize the college. There was a college wide referendum; we were given the results of the

balloting: 114 votes were cast out of 164 possible, which is a seventy percent response rate; 92 votes were for the proposal as it stands, 22 were against. We also invited to our meeting representatives from all the schools to come so we could hear their positions and ask questions. We had a very positive discussion, twelve people attended from the schools as well as two members of our own committee who are also from the College of Fine And Applied Arts. So in summation of our discussion, in my words, after years of discussion the college is ready for action. The proposed reorganization represents a compromise of ideas and points of view and holds great potential for increasing the visibility of and support for the disciplines represented in the college. The Academic Health Center discussions also make this proposal timely and strategic, and it does not disrupt the structure or function of the schools involved. Therefore,

The Academic Policies Committee moves that the Faculty Senate approve the proposal, in principle, for the formation of two new colleges from the existing College of Fine and Applied Arts as follows:

College number one would encompass the Myers School of Art; School of Communication; School of Dance, Theatre, and Arts Administration; and School of Music. College number two would encompass the School of Social Work; School of Family and Consumer Sciences; and School of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology. Thank you."

Chair Sterns noted this motion comes to the Senate as a motion from a committee and asked for discussion.

Senator Gerlach: "Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know what the particular thinking is, why the School of Speech Language Pathology and Audiology is not properly regarded as aligned to the School of Communication? It sounds like Speech Language Pathology and Audiology has a great deal to do with Communication, so why is it proposed that they be separated into two different bodies?"

Chair Sterns asked and was given permission for Interim Dean Lynn to address the Senate.

Interim Dean Lynn: "The School of Speech Language Pathology and Audiology has not indeed had much in common with the School of Communication for several decades. The School of Communication comprises several programs; business and organizational communication, interpersonal communication and public relations and electronic media. The department of Speech Language Pathology and Audiology has to do with mediation of folks who have disorders of communication speech, language or hearing. They really don't have much in common."

Senator Gerlach: "Mr. Chairman, it's not whether they have so much in common as they would be in the same department. I remember the time when they were separated and the special audiology came into being. But I say is this not still somehow related in general terms to communication? And if it is, why shouldn't it be with this other college instead of with the school of social work, family and consumer sciences and so on, that's what I want to know."

Dean Lynn: "Speech Language Pathology and Audiology is a professional program, it really is an Allied Health program. Communication has two major components; part of it..."

Senator Gerlach: “It used to be called the Department of Speech it seems to me.”

Dean Lynn: “That was three decades ago.”

Senator Gerlach: “Yes I know. Well we’re still speaking. Mr. Chairman, so we are adding a proposal that these two colleges be created out of these different departments. What is each of these colleges to be titled? What are they’re names to be? The college of, the college of...”

Dr. Ramsier: “This motion is intended to, as the committee discussed, get off the dime and move forward with something. Once we have the two colleges, approved in principle then the details need to be worked out. This is the first step.”

Senator Hallett: “I’m here to represent the School of Speech Language Pathology and Audiology, and I’d just like to say that we fully support this idea, we’d like to move quickly as you mentioned. We need to establish firm deadlines as soon as possible for example if this proposal is approved we’re hoping to advertise for a dean by fall of 2008 and we’re hoping to put a transition team in place to hopefully complete the transition by June 2009. We’ve been working on committees for the past two years and we’ve had plenty of faculty participation, therefore we would like to move forward as quickly as possible.”

Senator Rich: “So then I wonder since all this work was done, why a name couldn’t be arrived at? It does strike me as odd that we’d be approving a creation of an unnamed college.”

Chair Sterns: “Well the committee tells us that the intention is to in principle establish this division and they had enough trust in this body to be able to deal with ambiguity, I don’t know if that should prevent us from taking action.”

Dean Lynn: “In response to that question. If for example this body voted no on the proposal and we were asked to come up with a different organization the names might be different. You can’t name something that you don’t have.”

Chair Sterns: “I’m assuming also that maybe this is always dangerous, in principle the college groups that were formed would have a chance to have a discussion about what the name should be.”

Provost Stroble: “I think it is significant that the overwhelming vote of the faculty, staff involved is to move forward and they were not bothered by making the recommendation and working out the name later. Similarly they were not bothered by this particular organization and are fully supportive of this organization, so I would suggest it would be wise to defer to the faculty who are most involved and impacted by this decision.”

Senator Gerlach: “Well Mr. Chairman I’m opposed to approving anything in principle. That is a mere bit of arch that will cover all kinds of things. I assume that the proper names of these two colleges might be the College of Fine Arts and the College of Applied Arts. Those two names seem to fit the descriptions of the two groups.”

Provost Stroble: “They will not be happy with that, I can tell you.”

Senator Gerlach: “Until I hear further, I’m still utterly opposed to this, why? When I came to this university in 1962 all of this stuff was subsumed in the College of Arts and Sciences. And we had a penchant for empire building, bureaucracy after bureaucracy, college after college, and with the bureaucracy goes money. Yes, the faculty wanted this, the faculty wanted that, the administration wanted this, the administration wanted that. I think that the College of Fine and Applied Arts ought to be left to function as a College of Fine and Applied Arts. There’s nothing wrong with this. But I’d like to know too incidentally how much more this is going to cost us? To set up a separate dean and all the bureaucratic machinery that goes with this. Is this the proper use of funds of this university in this time of shortages? I think not. And so my initial response is no to this, and it will continue to be no until such time if you approve this thing in principle and they come back with full details they better show a better argument than they have today.”

Senator Matney: “Well I’m not sure I can satisfy all of Senator Gerlach’s concerns and he does raise some important issues. I’ve been involved as a member of the Academic Policies Committee and the discussion and I was impressed with the degree to which everyone seems to have compromised to come to an agreement on how to restructure these schools to create two colleges. I’m certainly sympathetic to the idea of non proliferation of administrations, but in this case I think it makes a certain amount of sense.

Therefore I’d like to make a motion to amend the motion that may or may not satisfy Dr. Gerlach. *‘Whereas consensus has been reached on the need to form two Colleges after long deliberations and with the understanding that the goal of the reorganization is to strengthen the academic mission of all affected Schools and in light of the report submitted by the APC and the recognition of the need to move with reasonable expediency on the matter of the formation of the colleges, I move that the Faculty Senate, request it’s Executive Committee to begin work at their earliest convenience, preferably during the summer of 2008, with the Office of the Provost and the Dean of the College of Fine and Applied Arts, and with any other campus bodies that the EC deems appropriate, to expedite the formation of these two new colleges. In particular the Faculty Senate recommends that two transition teams be formed, one for each of the new colleges, which will then be charged with establishing a detailed plan for the transition, selecting names for the new colleges, formulating budgetary requests and timelines for the transition, and with ensuring that there will be substantial faculty input by the affected Schools, among other issues relevant to the organization process’.*”

(Senator Bohland seconded)

Senator Gerlach: “Mr. Chairman is that an amendment or a substitute motion? It seems to me it sounds like a substitute motion.”

Chair Sterns: “No I feel it is an amendment because it brings forward once the two colleges established it provides a mechanism for further development, refinement and carrying forward. So I feel that is appropriate as an amendment.” There being no further discussion, the vote was called. Chair Sterns ruled that the ayes have it. **The amendment passed.**

There being no further discussion on the main motion, the vote was called. Again the Chair ruled that **the motion passed.**

Chair Sterns asked for the report of the **Curriculum Review Committee**. See appendix F.

Dr. Ramsier: “Curriculum Review Committee brings forward the following proposals as listed for approval by Faculty Senate except we detected a clerical error in our work, and from this list we need to withdraw the sequence of proposals from the College of Engineering on page 3 labeled EN-08-90 all the way through and including EN-08-104. These are all coupled to a proposal for a new program in Aerospace Engineering and we determined after they got on this list that there are still general education issues with this set of proposals and we need to withdraw it and send it back to committee. So I respectfully submit this list minus those specific engineering proposals which we will address in the future.”

There being no discussion on the motion, **Chair Sterns** called the vote and **the motion passed**.

Senator Lenavitt: “Before Rex goes up, as a longstanding member of the College of Fine and Applied Arts I would like to thank both he and the committee in their wisdom of finally working through the minutia. I don’t think anybody knows better than I what they’ve gone through the last few years to try to get some level of continuity and to get some level of unity. While the unity is not totally as is the case with our council, we are on the road to something that is very important and anybody who would like to know more can talk to me inasmuch as when I was working on Dr. Stroble’s convocation address I did a lot of research about the institution and the process. I came in 1969, we had just turned to a state institution from a municipal institution and the monies flow as to where the departments resided. Because it wasn’t a state institution and because people who could afford it wanted to have their children do certain things and colleges resided in specific places. And the College of Arts and Sciences did not want certain things. So anything that was left over was the family arts, the performing arts and music, the language arts and it all got put into this eclectic group the College of Fine and Applied Arts. We have grown immeasurably on this campus and we now have a big boy school and we better start finding big boy toys. We need to focus and this is a perfect opportunity for people who have historically been in my college, who have a science background, and have been unable to create the identities necessary to do their professional research. And now they’re going to have that opportunity because they will have a credible group around them to have an identity. In the College of Fine Arts or whatever it is going to be, has a greater opportunity to better represent the cultural aspect of this campus and importance a culture of this campus. I believe that everybody will be a lot better off. They have greater opportunity to exist. So I would like to thank Rex and the committee for getting past the work of the last three years and getting people to start thinking. Thank you very much.”

Chair Sterns asked for the report of the **Athletics Committee**. See appendix G.

Senator Lillie: “We have a written report from the Athletic Committee. There is a typo in the first line. The word ‘I’ should be removed. This is just a listing of some of the things we talked about in the Athletics Committee over this past year. After today the student athlete code of conduct that the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics has been working on for about a year now is at the point where it’s about ready to be submitted to the Athletic Committee and the Senate and so as that proceeds we’ll let you know how it works out in that regard.”

Senator Bove for the report of the **Student Judicial Policy Committee**. See appendix L.

Senator Bove: “Thank you chairman. In many regards the light is at the end of the tunnel. I have submitted a written report and my apologies for springing it on you with such short notice. Before I continue I’d like to thank a few people: Mr. Dale Adams, the chair of the Student Code of Conduct Review Committee, thank you very much; as well as Dr Fey, Denine Rocco, Melissa Alford-Snyder and John Reilly who worked diligently with us through this whole process and it’s been quite a windstorm of a month regarding these issues. As promised last meeting, the ad hoc committee met with Dr. Fey and representatives of Student Judicial Affairs. We were able to sit down at several meetings and come to consensus on several different issues. There still remains some points that we couldn’t come to complete agreement on and Senator Rich will address some of those specifics. There is a couple of ways to proceed but I’d like to open it up for some questions.” *Senator Bove moved, on behalf of the committee, to accept the version of the Student Code of Conduct presented in the Student Judicial Policy Committee report.*

Senator Lillie asked for clarification that the motion’s intent is to accept the Student Judicial Policy Committee report that was sent to the Senate listserve, since there are other versions from other sources. Senator Bove concurred and Senator Rich highlighted the differences between this version and the version of the proposed code from the Office of Student Affairs.

Senator Rich: “The document that constitutes the report of this ad hoc committee is what the ad hoc committee is recommending the Faculty Senate adopt. It includes some significant changes to the university regulations that govern the student conduct and the disciplinary process. Most of the issues were, as the chairman of the committee has just indicated, resolved through discussions with representatives of the Student Affairs. There were some issues where there continues to be disagreement. The committee is actually recommending something different from what Student Affairs recommended to us and I just want to point out those things. Apart from this the only changes that were made from the most recent document in which everyone agreed were stylistic or points of clarification. (See appendix N for detailed changes) The substantive changes that are in here fall into three categories. The first has to do with the definitions of offenses that would warrant the imposition of sanctions through the student judicial process. The committee was concerned about predicating disciplinary sanctions on violations of rules where the student did not necessarily have any sort of culpability and so there are several, and I’ll tell you exactly which ones they are in a moment, there are several definitions of violations where the committee has inserted some language requiring that the student has some sort of culpability in order to be subject to sanctions. These are all in section 3359-41-02, which is the definition section of student misconduct. [Section (B)] ‘Furnishing false or misleading information to university officials or on university records’, the committee has inserted the word ‘knowingly’ in front of ‘furnished’ so it now reads ‘Knowingly furnishing false or misleading information to university officials or on university records’. The committee did not think it was appropriate to impose disciplinary sanctions on someone who had merely made a mistake in providing information to the university thereby either mislead a university official or made a false statement innocently. Similarly under [section] I the ‘Use, possession, manufacturing, cultivating or distributing of marijuana’ etcetera the committee inserted ‘knowing use possession’ etcetera. One who unknowingly possess marijuana, and that is of course possible, should not be liable to sanctions the committee concluded. [Section] J, ‘Use, possession’ etcetera ‘of alcoholic beverages’ the same thing, it should be ‘knowing’. [Section] O, ‘Disruption or obstruction of teaching, administration of disciplinary hearing, other university activities’, etcetera the committee inserted the words ‘willful, reckless, or negligent’ so that there has to be some sort of culpability in

order for the person to be liable to these kind of sanctions. [Section] T, 'Failure to comply with directions of university officials, law enforcement officers', etcetera the committee inserted the word 'willful'. For a person who fails to comply with the directions of a university officer because he or she did not hear the direction or in good faith misunderstood the direction would not be liable to sanctions under this. And finally [section] V, 'Violation of any published university policy, rule or regulation'. This is one where the committee did compromise significantly and we're not entirely happy with this. Anyone who's ever checked the website that lists all the university regulations will know that there are many many such regulations, some of which really I think should not be subject to disciplinary sanctions for noncompliance has its own consequences. For example if you register late for a course you have technically violated a university regulation. It takes care of itself or at least it ought to take care of itself because that means you don't get into the course or if you don't withdraw in time there are consequences to that. But strictly speaking this would make a violation of the very many university regulations potentially subject to disciplinary sanctions. So the committee at the very least decided that some sort of culpability should be required as a condition for subjecting the student to disciplinary sanctions for noncompliance and so the committee added after 'violation of any published university policy rule and regulation' the words 'committed intentionally, knowingly, recklessly or negligently'.

The second category in which the committee recommendations differ from that of Student Affairs has to do with the burden of proof. The proposed change would make the burden of proof in all instances a '*preponderance of the evidence*' and what that means is that based on the evidence, the hearing board concludes that it is at least slightly more likely than not that the student committed the violation. The committee concluded that that burden of proof was not adequate where severe sanctions are being imposed, specifically dismissal from the university or suspension from the university. So the change that the committee has made would require that there be not merely a '*preponderance of the evidence*' but '*clear and convincing evidence*' of a violation in order for a student to be either dismissed or suspended from the university so '*clear evidence*' means that on the basis of the evidence it's highly probable that the student committed the violation that is alleged.

And then finally in the final section, which concerns informal resolution of allegations of academic misconduct, the committee eliminated the word 'confidential' to modify the meeting between an individual faculty member and the student. I'm sure that this is really a change in substance because I don't think the implications of this word were really intended, we didn't talk about this, we noticed it only later. But the reason we're deleting the word 'confidential' is we don't want to preclude the faculty member from reporting to student Judicial Affairs admissions that the student may have made about the misconduct. I think the intent was that this would be a one on one meeting, not that it would be a confidential meeting so we deleted the word 'confidential' in that provision. Those are the changes, that the committee made, that are of any substance to the document that was, after this round of several meetings, submitted by Student Affairs to the committee."

Chair Sterns: "A point of information I think for all of us, the committee is suggesting these changes. Now have those changes been accepted by the university?"

Senator Rich: "What I'm saying is that these are changes that the committee made to the documents. They are recommending that the Senate adopt as modified by the committee. These are points of disagreement between Student Affairs and the committee. What I've tried to do is explain where we differed and why we recommended something that is somewhat different from what Student Affairs recommends."

Chair Sterns asked and was granted permission for Dr. Fey to speak.

Dr. Fey: “Thank you Mr. Chairman. As I comment on this I would like to echo Senator Bove’s really wonderful comments about the hard work of all these committee members and specifically as a newcomer to the institution I really want to say how much I appreciated getting to know and work Senator Bove and Senator Rich and Senator Gamble as well as Senator Lillie. So thank you all for your hard work and of course our student government representatives have been terrific to work with. All that being said, we agreed there were 140 parts or points to this proposal worked on by the original committee that Senator Bove spoke about, and when it got down to working with the ad hoc committee there were about 18 serious points of difference that needed to be worked out. Through their hard work we got it down to really three or four as Senator Rich just commented on now. We in Student Affairs have had some serious arm wrestling among ourselves and with the great help of our legal counsel, General Counsel’s Office, Senator Rich I think you’ll be happy to hear that I believe we are in agreement on ‘willful’. Virtually every one of them you’re talking about, with the extended language that you mentioned. We completely agree that the word ‘confidential’ should not be in there; it’s already covered by FIRPPA so that needed to be stricken from it. And I think the issue now rests on the standard of evidence. As I mentioned this to Senator Rich, I don’t think I have the ability to discern between ‘*preponderance of the evidence*’ and ‘*clear and convincing*’. I’ve listened to everyone around me and I think at this point we have to go back to work this thing through with the ad hoc committee. We want to continue to dialogue and try to find a way to reach a consensus on it. We’re not there yet, but we wanting to work in absolutely good faith with the committee. If you pass what you have then we’re gonna still need to work together with this to try to come to some kind of understanding. I don’t know if it’s in your procedures or not to give this subcommittee authority to go forward with us and try to reach agreement for August or in August. We’d like to ask that. I would like to say one final thing that we in Student Affairs and as a university representatives will be presenting it to the Board, General Counsel’s office still has to provide the legal advice to the Board from their vantage point, they may not be in full agreement with what we are working out with the subcommittee. So just let me put that on the table but we have pretty substantial agreement with almost everything the standard of proof is still the one we have to arm wrestle about. Thank you.”

Senator Bohland: “I move to amend committee’s motion to accept all proposed changes from the ad hoc committee save for any change that deals with the burden of proof and that we send we send those changes only back to the ad hoc committee to work out with the office of Student Affairs.”

Chair Sterns: “Just to clarify, you’re suggesting that the preponderance of evidence will go back for further discussion, everything else come forward. Is that correct?”

Senator Bohland: “Correct.”

The motion was seconded by Senator Oswald.

Senator Rich: “I’m not sure I understand the intent of the motion. The Faculty Senate does not meet again until September. I don’t know whether Vice President Fey was suggesting that action could await September, if not, then I’m not clear whether the motion is intended to authorize the ad hoc committee to act in the place of the Senate. So I do know the motion needs to be clarified.”

Senator Bohland: “My motion was to bring Dr. Fey’s point to the Senate and that was that we accept all the agreed upon changes save for that one. The ad hoc committee go back and meet with Student Affairs to see if there could be consensus among the committee and Student Affairs on this issue and that they would present this change back to Faculty Senate when we met next.”

Chair Sterns: “Or it could come to the Executive Committee during the summer, on behalf of the Senate.”

Senator Rich: “I’m told that it’s necessary to make these changes before September, so I don’t think we can avoid this question. This is going to forward to the Board with one standard of proof or another, I therefore oppose the motion.”

Senator Lillie: “That may in the end be the correct thing to do, I’m not sure but what I heard was that from Dr. Fey that the anticipated date of needing to move this forward would be August in which case if the intent of Senator Bohland’s motion, as I understand it, is to allow the Executive Committee of the Senate to act on behalf of the Senate over the summer then possibly that date might be met by this motion.”

Senator Rich: “I remain opposed to the motion because as I understand the effect of the motion would be to change the ‘*clear and convincing*’ language back to ‘*preponderance*’ and only if the Executive Committee then acts in the place of the Senate to change it over the summer would it then be ‘*clear and convincing*’ evidence, if that’s not the intent of the motion then I speak again that the motion needs to be clarified.”

Senator Bohland: “The intent of the motion is not to change it but to keep it in its original state at ‘*preponderance*’ until the ad hoc committee could work it out with Student Affairs to come up with ... to work out the differences and then present, if the deadline is August, present to the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate to work on behalf of the full body of the Faculty Senate before the Board meeting and they could officially change it to ‘*clear and convincing*’ or ‘*preponderance*’ or no change, whatever that committee’s works out with Student Affairs.”

Senator Rich: “We’re talking about a change in any event. The question is: are we going to change it to ‘*preponderance*’ or we going to change it to ‘*clear and convincing*’ evidence. That’s what we need to deal with here. I remain opposed to this motion.”

Chair Sterns asked and was granted permission for Dr. Fey to speak.

Dr. Fey: “Thank you Mr. Chairman. And thank you Senator Bohland for trying to help me out. I think it’s fine as long as the Senate and the subcommittee know the university is still not on the page with ‘*clear and convincing*’. That if you approve ‘*clear and convincing*’ it’s got to go to the Board for approval anyway and they give us these next couple of months to try to hammer it out. The Board will hear the recommendation as it is. So if you vote up it will be ‘*clear and convincing*’. We, the university and the counsel, will have to give our recommendation to the Board, I’m hoping that we can get to a point with your folks to be where it needs to be before the Board needs to make the decision they need to make. I think we’re okay with you need to make the decision you need to make and I’ll still work with this committee see if we can arrive at reasonable compromise or whatever.”

Senator Gerlach: “Mr. Chairman, according to the report of this ad hoc committee the draft was sent out on April 29th, today is May 1st. How many people in this chamber have received and read it all through to know? I’m utterly opposed to voting on anything because I have not gone through to read it. I would like to take Senator Rich’s comments in consideration before I put my stamp of approval on this. The Senate cannot act and there no reason in the world why we have kept this going for months, it’s been delayed and delayed and delayed and now we are to rush because the Board of Trustees has got to do it. They don’t have to do it that early, they can wait on us for a change. We’ve waited and waited for this, and in order to make my point further, Mr. Chairman I raise the point of order, I call for quorum and require this body to adjourn forthwith.”

Chair Sterns ruled that the Senate lacked a quorum. There was some discussion about other business on the agenda and the ability of the Executive Committee to act on behalf of the Senate during the summer. The Chair declared the Senate adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Verbatim transcript prepared by Heather Loughney
Transcript edited by Richard Stratton,
Secretary of the Senate

APPENDICES TO MINUTES

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF MAY 1, 2008

APPENDIX A

▪ April 30, 2008

▪ emaildigest@uakron.edu

The logo for "E-mail Digest" is displayed in a white serif font on a dark blue rectangular background.The text "SPECIAL EDITION" is displayed in a white sans-serif font on a dark blue rectangular background.

■ ■

Accreditation site visit news .We now have completed the site review of the 2008 focused visit of the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association. Yesterday morning, President Proenza and Provost Stroble met with our two consultant-evaluators to discuss their experiences in this visit and to learn of their findings. **It is with pleasure and pride that we report that the consultant-evaluators found "conditions have been met and all of the mandates of the focused visit have been satisfied."** Their written report will explain their recommended findings and include some suggestions for our continued improvement. The report will be completed in the coming weeks and submitted to the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association for formal approval. The consultant-evaluators — Dr. Elaine Klein of the University of Wisconsin, Madison, and Dr. Kenneth Ruit of the University of North Dakota — provided many positive comments about The University of Akron. They noted the usefulness of the self-study materials and particularly "admired the case studies" as an effective means of illustrating governance in action at UA. They expressed gratitude for the access to and the availability of students, faculty and staff who could respond to their questions. Appreciation for the University's hospitality and welcoming environment was also noted. We are, as they noted, still in transition from models of institutional governance that pre-dated collective bargaining representation of the faculty to new structures and mechanisms for sharing leadership and governance of the institution. Drs. Klein and Ruit stated that we should be proud of our progress. They also will recommend that the institution submit, in three years, a progress report that can demonstrate further evidence that our evolving processes and structures have been established and function effectively as a "system of regulated processes for participatory governance of the institution." The continuous improvement of The University of Akron requires our very best efforts, and our continued commitment to engagement as a community on behalf of those we serve. Congratulations to all for this positive recognition of the progress we have made and the great work yet to come. ■ ■

APPENDIX B

Graduate Council Report to the Faculty Senate May 2008

The Graduate Council has held regular meetings and the following items have been discussed.

- The Curriculum Committee has met to review and approve 72 of 73 reviewed
- The Student Review Committee has had no report
- The Graduate Faculty Membership Committee has met and approved the 34 faculty applicants
- Dr Newkome has requested a 2% funding increase for graduate student assistant stipends
- Dr Tausig has provided the college deans with results from the Program Review Committee
- Dr Tausig has suggested that a Responsible Conduct of Research policy be implemented for the graduate students

Respectfully submitted by:

Alyison M Leigh
GSG President

APPENDIX C

3359-24-01 Bylaws of the graduate faculty

- (6) Adjunct, part-time, visiting, and other **emeritus** faculty members shall be eligible for ad hoc temporary “Category I” appointment to the graduate faculty. Such an appointment shall be given for the performance of specified graduate faculty functions (e.g., for teaching specific master’s or doctoral level courses and serving on specific master’s or doctoral committees). **Full-time, tenure-track faculty members are expected to apply for full-time graduate faculty membership. New full-time, tenure track faculty not hired in the fall semester shall be eligible for ad hoc temporary “Category I” appointment until the following fall.**
- (a) Ad hoc temporary functions shall exclude:
- (i) directing of doctoral dissertations or master’s theses, and
 - (ii) service as the representative of the graduate school on dissertation committees.
- (b) The vice president for research and dean of the graduate school shall make such an appointment for a specified period of time to fulfill specified function(s), normally for a period of one academic year. Faculty shall be nominated for such an appointment by the full-time graduate faculty in the department/school, the department chair/school director, and the collegiate dean, and must possess the appropriate terminal degree, documented experience, and other credentials relevant to performance of the specified graduate faculty function(s), as defined by departmental/school guidelines.
- (c) An ad hoc appointment may be renewed, but only on a case-by-case basis.

Passed by Graduate Faculty April 16, 2008.

APPENDIX D

Academic Policies Committee Report May 2008

1. The Academic Policies Committee (APC) has continued its review and discussion of the Provost's proposal and supporting documentation for reorganization of the College of Fine and Applied Arts (FAA).

The Provost additionally provided us with a copy of her FY 08-09 budget request which indicates the following allocations for the newly proposed Office of the Dean for the health and human services college: operating funds; one-time funding for new office expenses; permanent personnel dollars; and funds for a Dean search. This request also includes continuation of dedicated funding for the Dean of FAA, a slight increase in permanent personnel dollars for FAA, and funds for a Dean search.

At the time this report is being written, APC has one more meeting to consider feedback requested from all of the Schools in FAA about the proposed reorganization. The results of these considerations will be conveyed at the May Faculty Senate meeting.

2. The APC is in receipt of a proposal jointly signed by the Deans of the College of Arts & Sciences, College of Engineering, College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering, and the Graduate School for a "University of Akron Magnetic Resonance Center (MRC)". Review and discussion of this proposal will begin in Fall 2008.

APPENDIX E

Academic Policies Committee Report

May 2008

Addendum

The Academic Policies Committee solicited input from the Schools of the College of Fine and Applied Arts. On April 30, 2008, we met to consider the input. Written feedback from four schools was received, which focused on perceived “pros” and “cons” of the proposal. We also considered the results of a referendum from the college bargaining unit faculty, contract professionals and staff. This process yielded 114 ballots cast out of 164 possible (70% response rate), with 92 votes FOR the proposed reorganization and 22 votes AGAINST. Finally, we invited representatives from all of the schools in the college to meet with the committee and engaged in a very positive hour-long discussion with twelve attendees.

In summation, after years of discussion, the college is ready for action. The proposed reorganization represents a compromise of ideas and points of view, and holds great potential for increasing the visibility of and support for the disciplines represented in the college. The Academic Health Center discussions also make this proposal timely and strategic, and it does not disrupt the structure or function of the schools involved.

Therefore,

The Academic Policies Committee moves that the Faculty Senate approve the proposal, in principle, for the formation of two new colleges from the existing College of Fine and Applied Arts as follows:

1. A college encompassing the Myers School of Art; School of Communication; School of Dance, Theatre, and Arts Administration; and School of Music
2. A college encompassing the School of Social Work; School of Family and Consumer Sciences; and School of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology

APPENDIX F

Curriculum Review Committee Report

May 2008

The Curriculum Review Committee brings forward the following proposals and requests their approval by the Faculty Senate:

- AS-08-008 Create new French BA track—French and Francophone Studies
- AS-08-012 French and Francophone Studies Certificate
- AS-08-054 Pre-Law Philosophy Minor
- AS-08-058 Revisions of the Interdisciplinary Anthropology Major
- AS-08-066 Course addition: Women and Gender in Middle Eastern Societies, 3400:499
- AS-08-067 Course addition: Women and Gender in Middle Eastern Societies (3400:599)
- AS-08-069 Course addition: Graduate Rdg. Sem.: The Middle East (3400:612)
- AS-08-070 Ad course: Race, Nation and Class in the Middle East, 3400:498
- AS-08-071 Ad course: Race, Nation, and Class in the Middle East, 3400:598
- AS-08-083 Change Course Title, Description and Number of 3400: 472 Latin America: Origins of Nationality
- AS-08-084 Course deletion: 3400: 572 Latin America: Origins of Nationality
- AS-08-085 Change Course Title, Description, and Number of 3400: 473 Latin America: The 20th Century
- AS-08-086 Course deletion: 3400: 573 Latin America: The 20th Century
- AS-08-087 Course addition: 3400: 377 History of Women in Latin America
- AS-08-088 Course Addition: 3400: 418 History of Brazil Since 1500 (undergraduate level)
- AS-08-089 Course Addition: 3400: 518 History of Brazil Since 1500 (graduate level)
- AS-08-094 Course Chg. 3400:610 Comparative Studies in World Civilization
- AS-08-101 Change of Title 3230:398 Anthropological Research Methods
- AS-08-102 New Special Topics Course in Biological Anthropology
- AS-08-107 Retitle 3230:359 Anthropology in the 21st Century
- AS-08-108 Retitle 3230:460 Qualitative Methods: Basis of Anthropological Research
- AS-08-111 Course name chg: 3400:301 Mao's China (old) to Modern China (new)
- AS-08-112 Course Name Change: 3400:303 Japan (old) to Modern East Asia (new)
- AS-08-113 Name chg. of 3400:400 Women in Revolutionary China
- AS-08-114 Name chg. of 3400:500 Women in Revolutionary China
- AS-08-119 World of Homer
- AS-08-120 Archaeology of Pets
- AS-08-121 Time Before History
- AS-08-123 Course name changes
- AS-08-126 Change in the award of credits in related disciplines toward the History major
- AS-08-127 3300:251 Topics in World Literature
- AS-08-129 New Course: History and Film, 3400:410
- AS-08-130 New Course: History and Film, 3400:510
- AS-08-131 Reactivate 3400:417 and update course name and bulletin description

<u>AS-08-132</u>	Reactivate 3400:517 and update course name and bulletin description
<u>AS-08-136</u>	Research Methods for the Social Sciences Proseminar
<u>AS-08-137</u>	3230:470 Research Methods for Social Sciences Proseminar
<u>AS-08-149</u>	Update Bypassed Credit Offering
<u>BA—08-11</u>	6400:538 International Banking
<u>BA-08-01</u>	6200:627 Survey of Federal Taxation - Course Change
<u>BA-08-02</u>	6200:531 Taxation II - Course Change
<u>BA-08-04</u>	6200:640 Advanced Auditing
<u>BA-08-05</u>	6200:631 Corporate Taxation I
<u>BA-08-06</u>	6200:637 Contemporary Accounting Issues- Course Change
<u>BA-08-07</u>	6200:695 Graduate Internship in Accounting - Course Change
<u>BA-08-08</u>	6200:301 Cost Management and Enterprise Resource Planning - Course Change
<u>BA-08-09</u>	6200:408 International Financial Reporting and Analysis- Course Change
<u>BA-08-10</u>	School of Accountancy BS Degree - Program Change
<u>BA-08-12</u>	6400:415 Risk Management and Insurance
<u>BA-08-13</u>	Risk Management: Property and Casualty Insurance
<u>BA-08-14</u>	6400:416 Enterprise Risk: Derivatives
<u>BA-08-15</u>	6400:438 International Banking
<u>BA-08-19</u>	Corporate Finance Requirements
<u>BA-08-20</u>	6400:485 Financial Strategy
<u>BA-08-21</u>	Graduate Certificate in Healthcare Management
<u>BA-08-22</u>	6500:656 Management of Global Supply Chain and Operations - Course Change
<u>BA-08-23</u>	6500:342 Labor Relations — Course Change
<u>BA-08-24</u>	B.S.M. - Information Systems Management Option—Program Change
<u>BA-08-25</u>	B.S.M. - e-Business Technology Option — Program Change
<u>BA-08-26</u>	6500:471 Management Project—Course Change
<u>BA-08-27</u>	B.S.M. - e-Business Technology Option—Program Change
<u>BA-08-28</u>	6500:420 Management of Telecommunications —Course (Title)Change
<u>BA-08-29</u>	Program Change for BSM-Supply Chain Operations Management Concentration
<u>BA-08-30</u>	6500:695 - Prerequisite Change
<u>BA-08-32</u>	6600:445 Creative Marketing Laboratory
<u>BA-08-33</u>	6600:490 Marketing Strategy
<u>BA-08-34</u>	Direct Integrative Marketing MBA Concentration
<u>BA-08-35</u>	6600:630 Marketing of Services
<u>BA-08-36</u>	6600:655 Marketing Communications
<u>BA-08-37</u>	6600:615 Database Marketing
<u>BA-08-38</u>	Program Change for MSM
<u>BA-08-40</u>	New Course-650:520
<u>BA-08-41</u>	Bachelor of Science Degree in Business Administration-General Business (602000BS)
<u>BA-08-42</u>	Business Minor for Engineering Majors—New Program
<u>BA-08-44</u>	Calculus Requirements for Graduation—Program Change
<u>BA-08-46</u>	Course Change - 6500:640
<u>BA-08-47</u>	Course Change - 6500:645
<u>BA-08-48</u>	Course Change - 6500:646

<u>BA-08-49</u>	Accelerated MSM - ISM Program
<u>ED-08-10</u>	Postsecondary Teaching Certificate
<u>ED-08-11</u>	Certificate in Technical & Skills Training
<u>ED-08-14</u>	5100:300 as a corequisite or prerequisite to 5500:360
<u>ED-08-22</u>	Additional method of demonstrating competency in reading, mathematics, and written expression for admission to C&I.
<u>ED-08-23</u>	Correct pre-req error and bulletin description for 5610:487 Student Teaching: Moderate/Intensive Educational Needs
<u>ED-08-24</u>	Correct prerequisite for 5500:693 (Field Experience)
<u>ED-08-25</u>	Change co-req for 5500:360 Educational Planning: Instruction, Assessment & Classroom Management
<u>ED-08-27</u>	Update Courses for Licensure in Dance (Pre-K-12)
<u>ED-08-30</u>	Sport Studies Program Change
<u>EN 8-45</u>	Adding 4400:589 Design of Electric and Hybrid Vehicles
<u>EN 8-46</u>	Changing the course number 4400:675 System Simulation to 4450:575
<u>EN 8-47</u>	4400:570 Embedded Systems Interface
<u>EN-08-100</u>	Aerospace Systems Engineering I
<u>EN-08-101</u>	Aerospace Honors Project
<u>EN-08-102</u>	Aerospace Systems Engineering II
<u>EN-08-103</u>	Object Oriented Design and Management
<u>EN-08-104</u>	Freshman Internship
<u>EN-08-55</u>	4450:620 Real-time Scheduling
<u>EN-08-56</u>	Change 4450:643 Frame based Expert System Design to 4450:543 Frame based Expert System Design
<u>EN-08-57</u>	Name and course number change: From 4450:610 Computer Algorithm I to 4450:510 Embedded Scientific Computing
<u>EN-08-90</u>	Aerospace Systems Engineering
<u>EN-08-91</u>	Tools for Aerospace Systems Engineering
<u>EN-08-92</u>	Aerospace Systems Engineering Project Management
<u>EN-08-93</u>	Aerospace Structures
<u>EN-08-94</u>	Avionics I
<u>EN-08-95</u>	Aerospace Materials
<u>EN-08-96</u>	Avionics II
<u>EN-08-97</u>	Aerospace Computations
<u>EN-08-98</u>	Aerospace Systems Manufacturing
<u>EN-08-99</u>	Aerospace Design Project
<u>FAA-08—69</u>	7910:200 Sophomore Jury changes
<u>FAA-08-012</u>	Program changes to BFA in Dance
<u>FAA-08-016</u>	Program changes to BA in Dance degree
<u>FAA-08-022</u>	7400:529 Nutrition in Medical Sciences II Clinical
<u>FAA-08-028</u>	BS Dietetics - Coordinated Program
<u>FAA-08-034</u>	Reactivate 7800:490 Workshop in Theatre Arts
<u>FAA-08-039</u>	Add 7800:573 Methods of Teaching Secondary Theatre Arts
<u>FAA-08-040</u>	Reactivate 7800:590 Workshop in Theatre Arts

<u>FAA-08-042</u>	Elimination of clinical and nonclinical options for BA and BAT degrees
<u>FAA-08-043</u>	7700:210: change in prerequisites and course description
<u>FAA-08-044</u>	Change to 7700:215: Add 7700:210 as prerequisite
<u>FAA-08-045</u>	Prerequisite change for 7700:230 Language Science and Acquisition
<u>FAA-08-060</u>	Add 7800:472 Methods of Teaching Elementary Theatre Arts
<u>FAA-08-061</u>	Add 7800:473 Methods of Teaching Secondary Theatre Arts
<u>FAA-08-062</u>	Dance Minor revision
<u>FAA-08-063</u>	7920:490/590 Workshop in Dance prerequisite change
<u>FAA-08-066</u>	Add prerequisite to 7920:141 Pointe I
<u>FAA-08-067</u>	Prerequisite change for Choreography I
<u>FAA-08-068</u>	7900:103 Dance Orientation course description
<u>FAA-08-070</u>	7910:201 Freshman Jury and Interview course description change
<u>FAA-08-073</u>	Delete Dance Philosophy & Criticism II
<u>FAA-08-088</u>	Program change for BA in Dance with a Business Cognate
<u>FAA-08-093</u>	Change Prerequisites for 7100:491 Architectural Presentations
<u>FAA-08-096</u>	Change prerequisites for 7100:410 Methods of Teaching Elementary Art
<u>FAA-08-097</u>	Change prerequisites for 7100:411 Methods of Teaching Secondary Art
<u>FAA-08-099</u>	Change 7100:384 Graphics Review credit requirement
<u>FAA-08-100</u>	Update changes in BFA in Graphic Design Program
<u>FAA-08-101</u>	Add 7100:309 Greek Art to BA in Art History
<u>FAA-08-102</u>	Update changes to BA in Art History
<u>FAA-08-104</u>	Change degree requirements to BA in Theatre
<u>FAA-08-106</u>	Course deletion: 7700:461-801
<u>FAA-08-107</u>	Delete 7100:180 Fundamentals of Graphic Design
<u>FAA-08-108</u>	Restructure Public Relations Major
<u>FAA-08-109</u>	Restructure Public Relations Minor
<u>FAA-08-110</u>	Add new course in Contemporary Public Relations
<u>FAA-08-111</u>	Change number for 7600:628
<u>FAA-08-112</u>	Change prerequisites for 7600:404
<u>FAA-08-113</u>	Change prerequisites for 7600:403
<u>FAA-08-114</u>	Change prerequisites for 7600:309
<u>SC-08-07</u>	Surveying Engineering Technology
<u>SC-08-18</u>	Fire Protection Minor
<u>SC-08-19</u>	Fire Protection Technology Certificate
<u>SC-08-22</u>	Emergency Management Certificate
<u>SC-08-27</u>	Health Information Technology (Associate of Applied Science)
<u>SC-08-28</u>	Medical Assisting Technology
<u>SC-08-29</u>	Certificate Program in Residential Inspection
<u>SC-08-30</u>	Technical Report Writing 2020:222 Bypass Credit
<u>SC-08-31</u>	Early Childhood Development
<u>SC-08-33</u>	AAS Construction Engineering Technology
<u>SC-08-34</u>	EET BS Degree Update
<u>SC-08-36</u>	Criminal Justice Minor
<u>SC-08-38</u>	Forensic Study of Behaviors Certificate

<u>SC-08-39</u>	AASMET
<u>SC-08-44</u>	Emergency Management Minor
<u>SC-08-47</u>	Community Services Technology
<u>SC-08-49</u>	Certificate in Geographic and Land Information Systems
<u>SC-08-50</u>	Geographic and Land Information Systems (GIS/LIS)

APPENDIX G

Yearly Report of the Athletic Committee
2007-08
Faculty Senate
The University of Akron
May 1, 2008

The Athletic Committee met three times during the past academic year, all during the first semester. Among the items discussed were:

- Dr. Karyn Katz, Associate Dean of the Honors College made a brief presentation about the Honors College and the role it has with regard to student athletes. I
- The Committee discussed ways to ensure that more faculty and staff become aware of the ways in which athletics supports the academic mission of the university.
- Discussion of Athletic Department initiatives
 - Committee members asked for and received updates on the Class attendance policy of the Athletic Department and on the effectiveness of the new policy on approved absences from class for University-sponsored events. Both appear to be operating as expected.
- Knight Commission Report
 - The report on faculty involvement in athletics, released by the Knight Commission on October 15, 2007, was discussed in general. The committee discussed the findings of the Commission and ways in which the Athletics Committee might be involved in collecting and reporting (to the Faculty Senate, and in collaboration with the Faculty Athletic Representative) information about ways in which faculty and staff are effectively involved with student-athletes in ways which strengthen the academic function of The University of Akron and which promote effective involvement by faculty and staff.
 - The Committee agreed to encourage its members to report events to the Athletic Committee chair that members see as useful or meaningful interactions with student-athletes or the Athletic Department, which can be summarized and reported periodically to the Faculty Senate.
- The committee also heard reports from members who are working on issues involving women in athletics and nutrition in athletics.

Respectfully submitted,
Timothy Lillie, Chair, 2007-08

APPENDIX H

Final Report
Faculty Research Committee
Laura Gelfand, Chair

April 20, 2008

This year the FRC made some important changes. The Senate approved a change in committee membership so that members must have Graduate Faculty status if appropriate for their discipline and/or college.

We also changed the number of grant competitions to two, an Academic-Year Grant that was awarded in the fall and the Summer Fellowship Grant. Additionally we increased the amount of these awards to \$6000 and \$10,000 respectively. We plan to maintain this next year.

For the Summer 2008 competition we received 61 proposals and fully funded 16 of these thanks in part to George Newkome who supplied about \$2000 in additional funding.

We received far more proposals this year than we have in the past and we were able to award fewer of them. The FRC Chair and committee have spoken with the Director of the Office of Research and Sponsored Services, Katie Watkins-Wendell, about searching for increased funds for the committee. We are hopeful that these will be forthcoming.

A sub-committee of the FRC has also been assembled and it will be working on revising the ways in which proposals are evaluated in order to make the process more streamlined and equitable. We will present our results to the FRC in the fall for their approval.

We will host our first annual fall symposium November 14, 2008 in the Student Union. This will offer an opportunity for the University community to hear those who have received academic-year and summer grants will present the result of their research. Additionally, in the fall we will host grant-writing workshops for prospective applicants.

The Chair looks forward to working with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate this summer when they make their decisions about committee membership. This committee cannot function well without complete representation of academic disciplines within its ranks. I look forward to seeing the situation improved in the near future.

Respectfully Submitted
Laura Gelfand, Chair

APPENDIX I

General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) Report May 2008

In addition to working on other curriculum proposals and providing feedback to their originators, the following two issues have been the primary focus of GEAC's recent efforts:

1. Curriculum proposal AS-08-105 from the Department of History involving proposed changes to the World Civilization courses, 3400:385-391. GEAC has not received a revised curriculum proposal which addresses our concerns, and therefore no further action has been taken.

2. We found three General Education courses in the Natural Sciences which are listed in the undergraduate bulletin as meeting the Ohio Board of Regents laboratory requirements that actually do not currently meet the criteria. To rectify this situation, we met with Dr. Robert Mallik, Chair of the Physics department, and Dr. Timothy Vierheller, Professor of Physics at Wayne Campus and Faculty Senator. We collectively resolved the matter through the following actions:
 - A. "Music, Sound and Physics", and "Light": The Physics Dept. on main campus will extend the lab sections from one to two hours in the schedule of classes and add more activities or enhance those currently performed in order to make sure that the students have two supervised hours of lab each week to meet the OBR criteria.

 - B. "Descriptive Astronomy": A curriculum proposal is needed to implement required two-hour lab sections for each student each week as these do not currently exist. The twelve to fifteen proposed labs (i.e. about one lab per week during the semester) should be described in the proposal. Resources required (personnel and space) should also be addressed in the proposal. This proposal will be submitted by early Fall 2008 and acted on as swiftly as possible within the curriculum proposal system in order to have the new labs in place in Spring 2009 on both the main and Wayne campuses.

APPENDIX J

APPENDIX K

University Council Exploratory Committee Report to the Faculty Senate The University of Akron May 2008

The University Council (UC) Exploratory Committee continues to incorporate constituency feedback into our “Principles and Structure” document.

We have also discussed the Faculty Senate meeting of April 4, 2008, including the Resolution passed concerning our committee’s work and the offer of the Provost to provide our committee with resources over the summer. The committee Co-Chairs met with the Provost to discuss this further.

As a committee we decided the following:

1. Agreed to meet up to three times every two weeks from mid-May to late July.
2. To complete our own committee work on the current (April 1, 2008) document (which we are now calling “Principles and Structure”) by the end of May. Ms. Karen Greene, Administrative Assistant Senior from the Office of the Provost, will provide support.
3. To assign representatives of each constituency the task of communicating the completed document and receiving detailed and substantive feedback by the end of July 2008. We hope that some constituencies might be able to provide feedback earlier.
4. While collecting feedback, this committee will begin work on the “rule format” of this document with help from individuals knowledgeable in this area.
5. The UCEC committee will work on revisions to the Principles and Structures document – based on feedback from constituency groups – primarily in September, and map any changes onto the rules document for consistency.
6. Present both documents at the October Senate meeting (a date which will allow for students to be meaningfully involved, since they will not be here over the summer). All constituents would simultaneously receive the documents for consideration. The committee intends to provide documents that can be approved by their constituencies and the upper-level administration, and that can then be put into effect as soon as possible.

Respectfully submitted by:

Timothy Lillie and Rex Ramsier
Co-Chairs, University Council Exploratory Committee

APPENDIX L

Report of the Ad hoc Student Discipline Procedures Committee

May 1, 2008

As promised at the April Faculty Senate meeting, the Senate ad hoc Student Discipline Procedures Committee met several times with Dr. Fey and representatives from the Office of Student Judicial Affairs regarding the revisions to the Student Code of Conduct.

The meetings took place on April 8th, April 15th and April 23rd. We were able to come to a consensus on many issues, but not all. The ad hoc committee received the final draft from the Office of Student Affairs and Student Judicial Affairs on the morning of Tuesday April 29th. We reviewed the revisions and amended some to include (1) language that qualifies intentionality regarding misconduct and (2) a stronger burden of proof for sanctions that may lead to suspension or expulsion from the university. The document was then distributed electronically to the senators for review.

The ad hoc Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate adopt the current revised Code of Student Conduct that was distributed via the senate listserv.

Respectfully submitted,
Frank J. Bove, Chair

APPENDIX M

Stage	Marching/ OtherDegree <u>The Graduate School</u>	Number of Degrees:	NumberConferred MarchingNotGraduating	In Absentia	Across
	Doctorate Candidates				
1	Doctor of Philosophy Total Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences	23 23	23 23	0 0	0 0
1	Doctor of Philosophy Total College of Engineering	10 10	10 10	0 0	0 0
1	Doctor of Philosophy Doctor of Education Total College of Education	12 4 16	12 4 16	0 0 0	0 0 0
1	Doctor of Audiology Total College of Fine and Applied Arts	6 6	6 6	0 0	0 0
1	Doctor of Philosophy Total College of Nursing	1 1	1 1	0 0	0 0
1	Doctor of Philosophy Total Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering	20 20	20 20	0 0	0 0
	Total Doctorate	76	76	0	0
	Masters Candidates				
1	Master of Applied Politics	3	3	0	0
1	Master of Arts	24	24	0	0
1	Master of Public Administration	6	6	0	0
1	Master of Science Total Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences	35 68	35 68	0 0	0 0
1	Master of Science in Chemical Engineering	1	1	0	0
1	Master of Science in Civil Engineering	2	2	0	0
1	Master of Science in Electrical Engineering	12	12	0	0
1	Master of Science in Engineering	11	11	0	0
1	Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering Total College of Engineering	7 33	7 33	0 0	0 0
1	Master of Arts in Education	61	61	0	0
1	Master of Science in Education	29	29	0	0
1	Master of Science in Technical Education Total College of Education	1 91	1 91	0 0	0 0
1	Master of Science in Accountancy	3	3	0	0
1	Master of Business Administration Total College of Business Administration	38 41	38 41	0 0	0 0
1	Master of Arts	9	9	0	0
1	Master of Arts in Family and Consumer Sciences	3	3	0	0
1	Master of Music	20	20	0	0
1	Master of Science in Nutrition and Dietetics	1	1	0	0
1	Master of Social Work Total Fine and Applied Arts	1 34	1 34	0 0	0 0
1	Master of Public Health	2	2	0	0
1	Master of Science in Nursing Total College of Nursing	36 38	36 38	0 0	0 0

Across Stage	Marching/ Other	Number of Degrees:	Number	Number	In Absentia
	Marching/ Other	Degree	Conferred	Not	
			Marching	Graduating	
Undergraduate Degrees					
Baccalaureate Candidates					
Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences					
1		Bachelor of Arts	72	72	0
1		Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Anthropology	8	8	0
1		Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies	1	1	0
1		Bachelor of Science	30	30	0
1		Bachelor of Science in Computer Science	3	3	0
1		Bachelor of Science in Labor Economics	1	1	0
1		Bachelor of Science in Political Science/Criminal Justice	13	13	0
		Total Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences	128	128	0
College of Engineering					
1		Bachelor of Science in Biomedical Engineering	5	5	0
1		Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering	2	2	0
1		Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering	2	2	0
1		Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering	6	6	0
		Total College of Engineering	15	15	0
College of Education					
1		Bachelor of Arts in Education	6	6	0
1		Bachelor of Science in Education	13	13	0
1		Bachelor of Science in Technical Education	1	1	0
		Total College of Education	20	20	0
College of Business Administration					
1		Bachelor of Science in Accounting	31	31	0
1		Bachelor of Science in Business Administration	7	7	0
1		Bachelor of Science in Business Administration/Advertising	4	4	0
1		Bachelor of Science in Business Administration/Finance	9	9	0
1		Bachelor of Science in Business Administration/International Business	9	9	0
1		Bachelor of Science in Business Administration/Marketing	26	26	0
1		Bachelor of Science in Management	6	6	0
		Total College of Business Administration	92	92	0
Fine and Applied Arts					
1		Bachelor of Arts	11	11	0
1		Bachelor of Arts in Business and Organizational Communication	32	32	0
1		Bachelor of Arts in Family and Child Development	10	10	0
1		Bachelor of Arts in Fashion Merchandising	3	3	0
1		Bachelor of Arts in Interior Design	1	1	0
1		Bachelor of Arts in Interpersonal and Public Communication	1	1	0
1		Bachelor of Arts in Mass Media - Communication	20	20	0
1		Bachelor of Arts/Social Work	9	9	0
1		Bachelor of Arts in Speech - Language Pathology and Audiology	2	2	0
1		Bachelor of Arts in Theatre Arts	2	2	0
1		Bachelor of Fine Arts	8	8	0
1		Bachelor of Music	1	1	0
1		Bachelor of Science in Dietetics	1	1	0

		Number of Degrees:		Number Conferred		In Absentia	
Across Stage	Marching/ Other Degree	Marching	Other Degree	Marching	Not Graduating		
Total Fine and Applied Arts		101	101	0	0	0	0
College of Nursing							
1	Bachelor of Science in Nursing	54	54	0	0	0	0
Total College of Nursing		54	54	0	0	0	0
Summit College							
1	Bachelor of Science in Construction Engineering Technology	4	4	0	0	0	0
1	Bachelor of Science in Electronic Engineering Technology	2	2	0	0	0	0
1	Bachelor of Science in Emergency Management	8	8	0	0	0	0
1	Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering Technology	6	6	0	0	0	0
1	Bachelor of Science in Surveying and Mapping Technology	2	2	0	0	0	0
Total Summit College		22	22	0	0	0	0
Total Baccalaureate		432	432	0	0	0	0
Associate Candidates							
Summit College							
	Associate of Arts	9	9	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Business in Business Management Technology	10	10	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Business in Computer Information Systems	14	14	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Business in Hospitality Management	2	2	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Business in Marketing and Sales Technology	4	4	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Business in Office Administration	1	1	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Science in Community Services Technology	6	6	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Science in Construction Engineering Technology	7	7	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Science in Criminal Justice Technology	13	13	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Science in Drafting and Computer Drafting Tech	2	2	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Science in Early Childhood Development	4	4	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Science in Electronic Engineering Technology	4	4	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Science in Emergency Medical Services Tech	1	1	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Science in Fire Protection Technology	6	6	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Science in Geographic and Land Information Sys	1	1	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Science in Manufacturing Engineering Tech	1	1	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Science in Mechanical Engineering Technology	2	2	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Science in Medical Assisting Technology	1	1	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Science in Paralegal Studies	1	1	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Science in Radiologic Technology	27	27	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Science in Surgical Technology	20	20	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Science in Surveying Engineering Technology	2	2	0	0	0	0
Total Summit College		138	138	0	0	0	0
Wayne College							
1	Associate of Arts	10	10	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Science	3	3	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Business in Business Management Technology	8	8	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Business in Health Care Office Management	2	2	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Business in Office Technology	2	2	0	0	0	0
1	Associate of Applied Science in Social Services Technology	1	1	0	0	0	0
Total Wayne College		26	26	0	0	0	0
Total Associate		164	164	0	0	0	0

0	<u>Total Undergraduate</u>	596	596	0	0
0	Total Degrees for The University of Akron	979	979	0	0

APPENDIX N

PROPOSED CHANGES
TO THE STUDENT CODE
OF CONDUCT

APPENDIX O

IV. Unfinished Business - Chair Sterns first took up the bylaw amendments as the first item of unfinished business. Copies of the changes are in last month's Chronicle and Heather distributed copies of the changes to Senators who requested them. These changes received their first reading at the March meeting of the Senate, so this constitutes the second consideration of bylaws as required in our own bylaws for change.

Senator Rich: "What I'm going to do is to move the adoption of each of the amendments separately so that it can be debated separately and approved or disapproved. (see appendix H)

The first amendment concerns paragraph C.1. ¶The purpose of this amendment is to change the requirement for election of officers of the Senate to require a simple majority of those present and voting. I therefore move that paragraph C.1 be amended by deleting from the second sentence the words "require a majority vote of the membership of the senate.;" and substituting the words "be by majority vote using a secret ballot.;" and delete the next sentence. "The election of officers of the senate shall be by normal democratic procedures utilizing the secret ballot."

Senator Matney provided the seconded. There was no discussion and the **motion passed without dissent.**

Senator Gerlach: "Mr. Chairman, I think something very specifically should be done in the minutes to indicate that the constitutional requirement of sixty percent of the members voting passed this. ¶That's what is required, so however you want to do by indicating no dissent or whatever."

Senator Rich clarified the requirement as sixty percent of those voting and recommended that ~~we do it~~ be done by voice vote and, if there is dissent, then by division of the house. The Senate agreed.

Senator Rich: "The second proposed amendment is to paragraph C.2. ¶The purpose of this amendment is to provide for continuity by retaining the ex-Chair of the Faculty Senate in the Faculty Senate and as member of the Executive Committee for a period of one year. Accordingly I move to insert at the end of that paragraph C.2.;" "¶Upon the expiration of the chair's term of office, the ex-chair shall for one year be a voting member ex officio of the senate if he or she otherwise would not be a member. During that period, the ex-chair shall also be a voting member ex officio of the executive committee.""

Senator Bohland provided the seconded. There was no discussion and the **motion passed without dissent.**

Senator Rich: "The third proposed amendment is to paragraph F.9.b. The purpose of this amendment is to eliminate from the Student Affairs Committee's responsibilities ~~of the making of~~ of recommendations concerning the recognition of student organizations, which the Student Affairs Committee has in fact never done and the Faculty Senate has never done. Accordingly, I move to amend paragraph F.9.b by deleting the second sentence fragment, "Recommend to the senate the extension of official recognition of student organizations.""

Senator Bohland provided the seconded. There was no discussion and the **motion passed without dissent.**

Senator Rich: "The next proposed amendment is to paragraph H.5.c. This proposal would eliminate term limits on Senate membership. Accordingly, I move to delete paragraph H.5.c. and to reletter the succeeding paragraphs."

Senator Gerlach provided the second. There was no discussion and the **motion passed without dissent.**

Senator Rich: “The fifth and final proposed amendment is to paragraph H.6.a.3 and 4. The purpose of these amendments is to clarify the requirement for the election of senators when multiple seats are to be filled in a single election. Currently the bylaws require that each winning candidate receive a majority of the votes cast, which is impossible. The purpose of the amendment is to establish a feasible requirement that I think is what must have been meant. Accordingly, I move to amend paragraph H.6.a.3 by inserting at the beginning of the paragraph, “In elections with only one seat at stake,” and changing the “E” in “Each” from upper to lower case; and deleting from the next paragraph, paragraph 4; the words “the winning candidates shall be decided in order of total votes cast for each candidate until all seats are filled;” and substituting for them; “each winning candidate must receive a number of votes exceeding half of the total number of ballots cast;” and in the next sentence deleting the words “majority of votes cast” and substituting the words “sufficient number of votes.”

Senator Erickson provided the second and **Chair Sterns** asked for discussion or questions. He noted that this is an important change, to be able to elect people properly in the future.

Senator Bowman: “I just had a question, maybe I’m not reading this correctly but it says each winning candidate must receive a number of votes exceeding half the number of total ballots cast”. So if one person wins more than half how can the second person still get more than half of the votes cast?”

Senator Rich: “These are ballots where you’re voting more than once because you’re filling more than one seat. The problem is it used to be worded in terms of votes cast; you count the number of votes. If they’re filling two seats and the number of people voting is 200, no one’s going to get more than [the number required].... But that’s why we’re changing it from votes cast to ballots cast; Each person voting casts one ballot; You cast multiple votes but they’re on one ballot.”

There being no further discussion, the **motion passed without dissent.**