

DRAFT
Ferris State University
Academic Senate Meeting
December 1, 2009
West Campus Community Center

Minutes

I.	Action Items: Minutes	
	A.	Moved (Sen. Haneline) and seconded (Sen. Sanderson), and passed unanimously to approve the minutes of November 3, 2009.
	B.	Moved (Sen. Haneline) and seconded (Sen. Sanderson), and passed unanimously (with edition) to approve the minutes of the Academic Program Review Council report on November 17, 2009.
II.	Action Items: Educational Doctorate in Community College Leadership	
	A.	Moved (Sen. Jewett) and seconded (Sen. Heaphy) to reconsider the proposal for an Educational Doctorate in Community College Leadership.
	B.	Moved (Sen. Alspach) and seconded (Sen. Thapa), and passed unanimously to postpone discussion of this proposal to the next Senate meeting.
III.	Action Items: Academic Program Review Council General Recommendations	
	A.	Sen. Haneline (Chair of the Academic Program Review Council) recommended postponing discussion of the General Recommendations from the APRC from this year's reviews to the next Senate meeting.
IV.	Action Items: Charter Revision	
	A.	Sen. Rewers, chair of the Charter Revision Committee, explained that the committee had examined the Charter line by line and was prepared to make recommendations. She referred the Senators to the table of issues that the committee had addressed. The process will be to address the recommendations one Article at a time.
	B.	There were no recommendations for revision of the Table of Contents, the Preamble or Article I.
	C.	Moved (Sen. Skrocki), seconded (Sen. Sun) and passed unanimously to revise Article II, Functions, as recommended by the committee.
	D.	Moved (Sen. Skrocki), seconded (Sen. Sun) and passed unanimously to revise Article III, Representation as recommended by the committee.
	E.	Moved (Sen. Skrocki), seconded (Sen. Sun) and passed unanimously to revise Article IV, Nominations, Elections and Referenda as recommended by the committee. Several observations were made for further review.
	1.	Sen. Jorsch pointed out that senators representing the part-time faculty could not be elected until the fall when they were officially hired.
	2.	Sen. Haneline observed that the Charter does not specify requirements for electors.
	F.	Moved (Sen. Skrocki), seconded (Sen. Dakkuri) and denied (12 aye, 15 no) to amend Article V, Section 1 to establish term limits for Senate Officers.
	G.	Moved (Sen. Jewett), seconded (Sen. Heaphy) and passed unanimously to amend Article V, Officers and Duties, Section 1 to include the phrase "nominated and" in the second sentence before the word 'elected'.
	H.	Moved (Sen. Skrocki), seconded (Sen. Sun) to amend Article VI, Executive Committee, Section 1 to establish the Executive Committee at seven (7) members.
	1.	There was much discussion on the intent of establishing a number of members on the Executive Committee, and on the definition of 'Immediate Past President'.
	2.	Sen. Haneline moved to amend (seconded by Sen. Jewett) the motion to remove Article VI, Executive Committee, Section 1 from discussion of Article VI. The motion to amend

		passed unanimously. There were no further recommendations for change in Article VI.
	1.	Moved (Sen. Skrocki), seconded (Sen. Sun) and passed unanimously to amend Article VII, Sections 2 through 5, Duties of the Members of the Senate as recommended by the committee.

Reports

A.	Pres. Griffin made the following reports to the Senate.	
	1.	In response to Sen. Jorsch’s request, a list of all part-time faculty has been provided to the Senate.
	2.	Thanks to Sen. Rewers who assisted in distributing materials to the Senators in preparation for today’s meeting; in the absence of Administrative Assistant Paula Hadley, who is out on medical leave.
	3.	There will be a 10 minute discussion period for each item under Old Business, in order to allow time for discussion of the New Business items on the agenda.
B.	VP Berghoef made the following reports to the Senate.	
	1.	Two-thirds of the Academic Senate Committee Chairs met for lunch on Nov. 17. Items discussed include the following:
	a.	Succession plans (chairs)
	b.	Adding members: midstream timing and committee composition relating to college composition
	c.	Agenda for the year for each committee
	d.	Overlapping committee issues; including, technology needs and timely access to the website
	e.	Reporting schedule to the full Academic Senate
	2.	Recommendations for next year include:
	a.	Chairs meeting earlier in the academic year
	b.	Sending chair-elect or secretary to the meeting, if chair is unable to attend
	c.	Starting the meeting earlier in the designated meeting time during lunch
	d.	Holding the meeting at The Rock Private Dining Room
C.	Sec. Alspach thanked Sen. Rewers for her assistance in getting materials to Senators to prepare for the day’s meeting, during the medical leave of Administrative Assistant Hadley. She asked Senators to notify her if they preferred receiving Senate materials electronically.	

Committee Reports

A.	General Education Task Force (Don Flickinger)	
	1.	Flickinger reminded Senators that the Philosophy statement for General Education is a core principle, designed to speak to what General Education does. The draft presented (see handout) is ‘not ready to be chiseled in the wall yet’. The process being followed is similar to the process used to redesign the University Mission Statement a year ago. He recalled a metaphor used by former General Education Assessment chairman Robert von der Osten; the Gen. Ed. Philosophy statement is a ‘quagmire that you flail at in searching for your values.’ (see handout)
B.	HLC Update (Robbie Teahen)	
	1.	Teahen announced that Christine VonderHaar would assume leadership of the Higher Learning Commission project (see attached).

Attendance:

Present	Griffin, Berghoef, Alspach, Jewett, Isler, Heaphy, Dakkuri; Abbasabadi, Brandly, Boncher, Cline, Colley, Compton, Drake, D. Haneline, D. Hanna, Jorsch, Klatt, Lashaway-Bokina, Liszewski, Lukusa, Luplow, Nash, Purvis, Rewers, Sanderson, Skrocki, Smith, Sun, Taylor, Thapa, Topcu , Wagenheim
---------	---

Absent	Beistle, DeKoster, H. Hanna, Lovsted, McLean, Prakasam, Speirs
Ex Officio / Guests	Eisler, Erickson, Burcham, Teahen, Flickinger, Cron, E. Haneline, Johnston, Nicol, Cooper, McKean, Schmidt, L. Johnson

Old Business:	
A.	New Degree - Educational Doctorate in Community College Leadership
1.	Moved (Sen. Jewett) and seconded (Sen. Heaphy) to reconsider the proposal for an Educational Doctorate in Community College Leadership.
a.	Sen. Jewett explained that he felt the Senate had pushed too fast to a vote on this proposal at the last meeting. In light of the changes the proposers had made, he was persuaded that the proposal merited further consideration.
b.	Mike Cooper confirmed that the omnibus resolution by the Board of Trustees to incorporate the FSU/GR campus into the University as the College of Professional and Technological Studies had provided a location for this unique interdisciplinary program. Housing the program in CPTS provides balance so that no single college within the program can push an agenda. He provided a PowerPoint program answering the concerns raised by the Senate at the last meeting and a handout diagramming the structure of the program.
c.	Sen. Abbasabadi questioned the locating of the program in FSU/GR.
	Cooper noted that the University Curriculum Committee had recommended housing the program in the College of Business, the College of Education and Human Services, or the College of Professional and Technological Studies. The selection of the CPTS site responded to this recommendation.
d.	Following the argument that the program is intercollegiate, Sen. Haneline suggested a revision in the documents provided to name the appropriate structure in the curricular process as a 'program' curriculum committee rather than a 'college' curriculum committee.
e.	Sen. Abbasabadi expressed his concern with the narrowness of the term 'community' in the title; he argued that this term choice isn't a positive one since it suggests that graduates are not capable of leading at other institutional levels.
	Cooper replied that the program intended to target an audience with unique concerns and constituencies. Sen. Boncher supported this analysis, commenting that the whole curriculum for the degree is aimed at community college issues; and, she argued that this concern was being raised too late in the process now.
f.	Sen. Wagenheim questioned the logistical issues associated with housing the program in Grand Rapids in the CPTS when the faculty members and director are located on the Big Rapids campus.
g.	Noting the time limit for discussion of this item, Sen. Alspach moved to postpone discussion to the next Senate meeting. The motion to postpone was seconded by Sen. Thapa and passed unanimously.
B.	Academic Program Review Council – General Recommendations (Doug Haneline): Noting that Senators did not have copies of the General Recommendations to examine, Sen. Haneline suggested that discussion of these recommendations be postponed to the next Senate meeting (see Action Items above).

New Business: Charter Revision	
A.	Sen. Rewers, chair of the Charter Revision Committee, explained that the committee had examined the Charter line by line and was prepared to make recommendations. She referred the Senators to the table of issues that the committee had addressed. The process will be to address the recommendations one Article at a time.
1.	Sen. Dakkuri noted that the 'rules' were an appendix, not intended to be considered part of the

		Charter.
		Sen. Rewers reported that she had been advised that the Policy and Procedures portion of the document had been added to the Charter for convenience in distribution to Senators. She offered that her committee would be making a proposal regarding these addenda later.
B.		There were no recommendations for revision of the Table of Contents, the Preamble or Article I.
C.		Moved (Sen. Skrocki), seconded (Sen. Sun) and passed unanimously to revise Article II, Functions, as recommended by the committee.
	1.	Sen. Jorsch questioned the reference to 'collective bargaining agent' as referring to the Ferris Faculty Association. He wondered if adjunct, part-time and full time temporary faculty were included in the membership of the Academic Senate.
		Sen. Rewers confirmed. The effect of this addition to the Charter would be to separate the areas of interest of the Academic Senate from those of the bargaining unit. Senate representation is addressed in Article III.
D.		Moved (Sen. Skrocki), seconded (Sen. Sun) and passed unanimously to revise Article III, Representation as recommended by the committee.
	1.	Sen. Dakkuri cautioned that a new unit would need to include a minimum number of faculty before a Senate seat was assigned. He envisioned a "Center" of one faculty member seeking representation, resulting in a person 'guaranteed' a seat in Senate.
		Sen. Haneline suggested that such a new unit could be joined with another unit for the sake of representation apportionment.
	2.	Sen. Dakkuri moved to amend the motion to specify that a unit petitioning for a Senate seat must include the title of its College and a minimum number of faculty. The motion died for lack of a second.
E.		Moved (Sen. Skrocki), seconded (Sen. Sun) and passed unanimously to revise Article IV, Nominations, Elections and Referenda as recommended by the committee. Several observations were made for further review.
	1.	Sen. Jorsch pointed out that senators representing the part-time faculty could not be elected until the fall when they were officially hired. Would this issue be addressed in Policy and Procedures?
		Sen. Isler reminded that the Policy and Procedures document was beyond the scope of the Charter Revision Committee.
	2.	Sen. Haneline observed that the Charter does not specify requirements for electors.
		Sen. Rewers offered that this specification might go to Procedures, as part of the process for electing Senators.
F.		Moved (Sen. Skrocki), seconded (Sen. Dakkuri) and denied (12 aye, 15 no) to amend Article V, Section 1 to establish term limits for Senate Officers.
	1.	Sen. Isler noted that the establishment of term limits for officers had been recommended to the Charter Revision Committee by a parliamentarian.
	2.	Sen. Haneline asked if the intent of the revision was specific to two consecutive terms in a specific office?
		Sen. Alspach asked if the revision was applied per office, or to serving on the Executive Committee as an officer?
		Sen. Haneline collected a series of comments from member of the CRC into a consensus that the intent was to limit a Senate to two years in an office, not on the Executive Committee. In effect, according to this recommendation, a Senator could serve two years consecutively in each of the elected positions on the Executive Committee.
	3.	Sen. Berghoef asked for a rationale for establishing term limits on officers.
		Sen. Rewers noted that this recommendation had originally been designed to elicit discussion and a decision from the whole Senate.
	4.	Sen. Sanderson asked if the Senate had had a President serve more than two consecutive

		terms.
		Sen. Dakkuri noted that this situation has occurred in the history of the Senate.
	5.	Sen. Purvis moved, seconded by Sen. Haneline, to amend the motion to specify that a Senator could serve one additional consecutive term in an office. After discussion of the intent of the recommended wording in the original motion, this amendment was withdrawn as redundant.
	6.	Sen. Heaphy expressed concern that the motion on the floor, as it was being clarified, could allow for circumvention of the intent to 'get new blood' in the Executive Committee.
	7.	Sen. Wagenheim asked if the intent of the motion should be extended to College representation, too.
	8.	Sen. Haneline pointed out that in practice the Executive Committee changes by virtue of the fact that officers are elected, not appointed. From his perspective as appointed chair of the Academic Program Review Council for a lengthy period, he agreed that it is a good idea for more people to get a broader view of issues. However, practice shows that we don't elect the same officers year after year.
	9.	Sen. Dakkuri agreed with the CRC that establishing term limits would make room for other Senators to take leadership roles.
G.		Moved (Sen. Jewett), seconded (Sen. Heaphy) and passed unanimously to amend Article V, Officers and Duties, Section 1 to include the phrase "nominated and" in the second sentence before the word 'elected'.
H.		Moved (Sen. Skrocki), seconded (Sen. Sun) to amend Article VI, Executive Committee, as recommended by the Charter Review Committee. Approval to amend Sections 2 through 6 passed unanimously.
	1.	There was much discussion on Section 1 on the intent of establishing a number of members on the Executive Committee, and on the definition of 'Immediate Past President'.
	a.	Sen. Jewett observed that the number of members on the Executive Committee had never been previously established. He targeted the term 'immediate', but opined that, while he didn't know the history for including the term, he felt the intent was to include 'the' past president, not all past presidents. He understood the importance of continuity if the Executive Committee changes significantly. Without term limits, referring to the previous discussion and vote, he saw no need for the past president to serve unless the whole Executive Committee changes. He suggested that the intent be understood to mean the outgoing president serving for one year, but if the president were re-elected, there would be no need for the 'immediate' past president to serve on the Executive Committee.
	b.	Sen. Haneline considered the term 'immediate' to mean for one year. The question was whether the Charter should specify seven members on the Executive Committee. In that case, 'immediate' would indicate whoever was before this president, regardless of whether the person was re-elected to the position.
	c.	Sen. Jewett saw the situation differently. He argued that if the president is re-elected, s/he is the immediate past president, elected into a new term. He reminded Senators that during the election meeting there is a period when there is no president until officers are elected to lead the newly elected Senate.
	d.	Sen. Sanderson observed that this interpretation would allow a person to serve in two roles at the same time.
		Sen. Isler noted that this issue was the 'hottest' issue identified by Senators for the CRC to address. She felt that it needs to be clarified.
		Sen. Berghoef agreed that, while we didn't know the history of this term's inclusion, we need to address the issue as the role is enacted now. He also wondered why the term 'past' president was not considered sufficient, what prompted the inclusion of the term 'immediate past' president.
	e.	Sen. Heaphy argued that a person can't serve in two positions on the Executive Committee at the same time.
	f.	Sen. Jewett moved, seconded by Sen. Sanderson, to amend the section to include the term "last year's" following 'immediate'. The motion to amend was withdrawn after further

		discussion.
	g.	Sen. Klatt saw the wisdom of establishing the Executive Committee at seven members, arguing that the need for a tie breaking voter was justification.
	h.	Sen. Jewett noted that the past president might possibly no longer be a member of Senate.
	i.	Sen. Klatt questioned why this was an issue; what problems had caused it to come up in the CRC recommendation?
	j.	Sen. Sanderson opined that the term 'immediate' had been intended to guarantee continuity from one Executive Committee to the next. If the president succeeds himself, she felt that need no longer existed.
	k.	Sen. Dakkuri explained that the need to serve on the Executive Committee as the immediate past president' had been imposed on him when the president succeeded himself. He focused on the issue of establishing a number of members for the Executive Committee, arguing that it needs to be consistent from one year to the next, not six or seven depending on who is elected president.
		Sen. Sun reported that the CRC wasn't sure why 'immediate' had entered the Charter, but he presumed it was to guarantee continuity. He agreed that it didn't make sense for one person to hold two positions at the same time on the Executive Committee.
	l.	Sen. Haneline reported that an online search defined an immediate past president as 'a person who just completed his/her term of office.'
		Sen. Rewers asked what if the last year's president no longer serves on the faculty, moves away, etc.
	m.	Sen. Nash suggested that the decision before the Senate now is to determine what we want on the Executive Committee.
	2.	Sen. Haneline moved to amend (seconded by Sen. Jewett) the motion to remove Article VI, Executive Committee, Section 1 from discussion of Article VI. The motion to amend passed unanimously.
		President Eisler sought clarification of the discussion; confirming that Senators meant 'President of the Academic Senate', not 'President of the University'
		Sen. Dakkuri noted that earlier in the Charter, the distinction was made so that further references to the President meant 'of the Academic Senate'.
		Sen. Isler pointed out that the entire discussion focused on the Executive Committee of the Senate; the President of the University is not a member of the Executive Committee.
	I.	Moved (Sen. Skrocki), seconded (Sen. Sun) and passed unanimously to amend Article VII, Sections 2 through 5, Duties of the Members of the Senate as recommended by the committee.
	1.	Sen. Haneline asked if the intent of the recommended revision of Section 1 allowed a Senator to miss two meetings unexcused.
		Sen. Rewers directed him to Section 5 which describes the ability of the Senate to remove a Senator for cause under this Article.
	2.	Sen. Abbasabadi asked if the recommendations constituted 'a strategy to get rid of people we don't want' in the Senate. He wondered how the Senate would respond if he decided to boycott the meetings as a protest. He supported leaving the language from the original, arguing that Senators tend to be the busiest people on campus, active and committed, so they should be able to miss Senate meetings to serve the University in other ways.
	3.	Sen. Sanderson wondered what constituted an 'excused absence' and who decides?
		Sen. Rewers noted that Senators communicated with the Administrative Assistant if they were going to miss a Senate meeting. This communication was considered appropriate for an 'excused absence' to be listed.
	4.	Sen. Dakkuri observed that, while some people would like to establish strict rules on attendance, 'we act more loosely in other ways'. He suggested that officers could talk with the missing Senator to discover reasons for his/her absence and encourage his/her participation. It is ultimately the Senate who decides what is an 'excused absence'.
	5.	Sen. D. Hanna calculated that the recommendation would result in four absences per term of office, or an average of one absence per semester. He felt that the language suggested was

		too restrictive. He opined that the elections process would take care of members not participating.
	6.	Sen. Haneline asked if voting this recommendation down would result in maintaining the current language of the Charter. Article VII, Section 1.
	J.	Moved (Sen. Skrocki), seconded (Sen. Isler) and passed unanimously to amend Article VII, Sections 2 thru 5 as recommended by the Charter Revision Committee, with the editorial revision of the word 'voluntary' to 'volunteer' in Section 2 (as suggested by Sen. Haneline). There is no change to Article VII, Section 1.
	K.	Moved (Sen. Isler), seconded (Sen. Sun) and passed with one No vote to amend Article VIII, Sections 1, and 3 thru new Section 13 as recommended by the Charter Review Committee.
	1.	Sen. Rewers noted that the recommendation to add a new Section 2 to this Article will require decision-making from the Senate. The rest of the recommendations for revision in this Article were more clearly identified.
	2.	President Eisler reminded Senators that the last Charter revision was dated Spring 2003. The language change in old Section 7 (concerning a Conference Committee to resolve differences between the President of the University and the Academic Senate) might make it difficult for him to recommend the revised Charter to the Board of Trustees.
		Sen. Isler confirmed the committee's recommendation to add 'recommendation' and change 'or' to 'and' before 'decision' to more accurately reflect the function of the Academic Senate.
		President Eisler objected to this recommendation.
		Sen. Rewers referred the body to the Preamble which articulates the relationship between the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees.
		President Eisler reiterated his concern with triggering a Conference Committee on any recommendation.
		Sen. Dakkuri supported the CRC's recommended revision, repeating that the Academic Senate has no decision-making power, 'all we can do is recommend'.
		Sen. Rewers and Sen. Purvis pointed out that this section specifies limitations for the invoking of a Conference Committee in line 2: "a policy, priority, procedure, curriculum, or activity governed by this Charter and requiring board of Trustees approval..."
		President Eisler understood that this section would not refer to a decision to hire.
		Sen. Berghoef confirmed that a hiring decision would not be an appropriate situation for invoking a Conference Committee.
	3.	Moved (Sen. Dakkuri), seconded (Sen. Abbasabadi) and passed with one No vote to amend Article VIII, new Section 8 to read "a recommendation of the Senate".
		President Eisler agreed that the selection of one term helped clarify the intent of this provision.
	4.	Moved (Sen. Isler), seconded (Sen. Sun) to address the CRC's recommendation of a new Section 2 for Article VIII.
		Sen. Haneline urged Senators to remember problems in voting from past years.
		In the interest of time, it was moved (Sen. Abbasabadi), seconded (Sen. Purvis) and unanimously passed to postpone discussion of this motion, and the remaining recommendations of the Charter Revision Committee to the next Senate meeting.

Announcements		
A.	FSU President David Eisler	
	Pres. Eisler distributed copies of the Opening Statement and PowerPoint slides for his presentation on the budget. He encouraged Senators to participate in Budget discussions.	
B.	Provost Fritz Erickson	
	1.	Provost Erickson observed that 'we are in a time crunch' regarding the Educational Doctorate proposal. He offered to work with the President of the Senate to find a resolution to the concerns raised by the Senate about this new degree. However, he thanked Senators for their careful deliberation of the proposal.

	2.	He thanked the members of the General Education Task Force for their continuing work.
	3.	He thanked the Academic Program Review Council for their thoughtfulness in allowing the process to conclude effectively.
C.		President Rick Griffin declared 'we all need a break'.

Open Forum		
A.		Sen. Sun asked if Senate could schedule a special meeting next week.
		Sen. Haneline agreed that the Educational Doctorate, the APRC recommendations, and the remaining items coming from the Charter Review Committee needed to get done before the end of the semester.
B.		Pres. Griffin called a special meeting of the Academic Senate for Tuesday, Dec. 8 to consider these three items only.

The meeting was adjourned at noon.

Sandy Alspach, Secretary

Richard Griffin, President