

**Ferris State University
Academic Senate Meeting
December 8, 2009
West Campus Community Center**

Minutes

I.	Action Item: Minutes	
	A.	Moved (Sen. Haneline), seconded (Sen. Sanderson) and passed unanimously to approve the minutes of the December 1, 2009 meeting.
	B.	Motion to establish an Educational Doctorate in Community College Leadership, postponed from the December 1 meeting, was passed (on voice vote).
	Charter Revision Recommendations were deliberated, with the following revisions to the Charter earning Senate support.	
	C.	Moved (Sen. Skrocki), seconded (Sen. Isler) and passed unanimously to accept the amendment to Article VI, Executive Committee, Section 1 of the Academic Charter as follows: "The Executive Committee of the Senate shall consist of the following members: President, Vice President, Secretary, and three (3) members elected at large from the Senators."
	D.	Moved (Sen. Isler), seconded (Sen. Haneline) and passed with one nay to amend Article VIII – Organization and Procedure, Section 2 as follows: "Candidates seeking an executive position will not be considered officially nominated until such nomination occurs at the first meeting. Campaigning may not be done through the Senate office."
		Moved (Sen. Heaphy), seconded (Sen. Jewett) and passed with three nays to remove the following sentence from Article VIII, Section 2: "Election results will be determined by the majority votes of members present at the first meeting."
		Moved (Sen. Haneline), seconded (Sen. Jewett) and passed unanimously to amend the last sentence of Article VIII, Section 2 as follows: "Candidates must be present to accept their nomination, or provide documentation attesting to their willingness to accept."
	E.	Moved (Sen. Rewers), seconded (Sen. Jewett) and passed 18 aye, 6 nay to add Article VIII, Section 3 as follows: The President, Vice President, and Secretary positions will each be determined by the majority of votes received.

II.	Action Item: Postponed Motion, Educational Doctorate in Community College Leadership	
	A.	Mike Cooper, Interim Director for the program, reviewed key issues and updated the Senate on revisions to the proposal.
	1.	The program will be housed for the first three years (the first cohort group) in the College of Professional and Technological Studies (CPTS).
	2.	Procedures for monitoring the program will align with all campus curricular processes, since the omnibus agreement was recently made to incorporate CPTS into all University structures.
	3.	The program curriculum committee (parallel to College Curriculum Committees) will be interdisciplinary; including representatives from the Colleges of Arts and Science, Business, and Education and Human Services as well as CPTS, the University Graduate and Professional Council and the program director.
	4.	The program will report annually to the Senate and to the Provost, with the first report due at the end of summer 2010.
	5.	The program will complete the Academic Program Review process at the end of the first cohort class, roughly three years from launch. The APR will focus on location as well as success of the program, providing potential to move the program to another college.
	6.	Cooper noted that CPTS has a physical location in Big Rapids, as well as Grand Rapids

			and other 'off-campus' sites.
		7.	Cooper reviewed the blended delivery nature of the program. The first cohort would begin in summer '10 with two courses, each opening with a face-to-face component. As the program proceeds, other courses would include face-to-face components.
		8.	Contact with students during the virtual components of the program would be similar to other programs currently using online formats, including the MBA, the MISM, and Allied Health programs. Cooper described these online courses as "in some ways more robust for access to and contact with students".
			Cooper reiterated the unique position of Ferris to meet an industry need.
		1.	He invited Senators to the website for the program for a report of community college needs made in a 2007 Iowa State study.
		2.	He reminded Senators that 87% of community college leaders hold doctoral degrees; 52% of these leaders are 65 or older; so, there is a pending shortage of doctorally-degreed community college leaders as these leaders retire.
			Cooper emphasized the strategic benefits for Ferris to offer this degree.
		1.	Ferris' history and legacy with community colleges provides an extensive network of connections for potential students.
		2.	Ferris will benefit by placing leaders in community colleges who have unique allegiance to Ferris State University.
	B.		Sen. Purvis thanked Cooper for his review. However, noting the changes in the proposal over the last eight weeks, he felt the process had been 'rushed'. He also expressed concern about housing the program in CPTS. He observed that there had been no discussion within CPTS about championing this program, and resources in CPTS were already strained. He felt that if "we get one chance to launch this (program)", CPTS needs to get the 'house in order' first.
			Provost Erickson answered, commenting that he had come into this process late and agreed that it would be nice to take more time developing the details. But, "either we do this now, or we don't do it". He called the proposal a challenge to respond to new opportunity, and observed that he had been drawn to Ferris because of its ability and desire to be nimble in situations like this one. He noted that some of the protections are in place in the proposal to return to the Senate to address issues as they arise.
	C.		Sen. Haneline said, "Since I spoke steadily against (this proposal) in November, I have made a list (of arguments)."
		1.	Discussion has focused more on structure than the curriculum. A recent New York Times article announced that Harvard was growing a program in Educational Leadership, its first new program in 74 years. Sen. Haneline argued that if Harvard is doing the same thing Ferris is considering doing, maybe that's not all bad.
		2.	Sen. Haneline said that the oversight issues "have been resolved to my satisfaction". But, he offered two caveats.
		a.	"It is important that we not be cheap about this. We will draw people who might not otherwise think of Ferris."
		b.	He cautioned against putting CPTS in a bad situation. He reminded senators how different things are at CPTS; where the main campus has developed gradually, they have tried to keep up. Imposing a doctoral program on CPTS implies a financial burden which must be met. "This is the cost of doing a doctoral program".
	D.		Sen. Jorsch argued that the claim of a need for this program hadn't persuaded him. He made an analogy with the Russian history "bubble" and asked "once you fill the bubble, then what?"
			Provost Erickson countered that the program is based on a cohort group; "if we don't have a cohort, we don't do the program." He sees that philosophy driving the program into the future.
	E.		Sen. Abbasabadi cited Section 19 of the Faculty Association contract which establishes the number of temporary faculty at 15% before full-time, tenured faculty are hired. He argued that CPTS doesn't have full-time faculty to meet this contractual obligation.
			Cooper explained that this issue was not taken into account when developing the program; the value of the program outweighed this constraint.
			Sen. Haneline supported Sen. Abbasabadi's argument as legitimate; however, he reminded the Senate that other programs began with temporary faculty, notably Optometry.

F.	Sen. Isler reported discussion within the Executive Committee about requesting reporting sooner than the three-year timetable presented, especially regarding housing the program.
	Cooper answered all of these concerns with the promise to make sure resources, structures, and quality were in place before launch. He explained that some decisions will have to be made 'as we go, as in any business'. He does not feel that the program is in a bind or in a rush for this summer.
	Sen. Jewett moved the Previous Question; which passed, ending debate.
	The motion to establish an Educational Doctorate in Community College Leadership passed on majority voice vote.

Attendance

Members present	Abbasabadi, Alspach, Beistle, Berghoef, Brandly, Colley, Compton, Dekoster, Drake, Griffin, D. Haneline, D. Hanna, Heaphy, Isler, Jewett, Jorsch, Klatt, Lashaway-Bokina, Liszewski, Lukusa, Luplow, McLean, Nash, Prakasam, Purvis, Rewers, Sanderson, Skrocki, Smith, Sun, Topcu, Wagenheim
Members absent with cause	Boncher, Dakkuri, Lovsted, Taylor
Members absent	Cline, H. Hanna, Speirs, Thapa
Ex Officio and Guests	Erickson, Teahen, Flickinger, Burcham, Pilgrim, Cron, E. Haneline, Nicol, Oldfield, M. Cooper, J. Schmidt

III.	Action Item: Senate Charter Revision Committee Recommendations, continued from December 1	
	A.	Sen. Rewers referred Senators to the handout listing Charter Recommendations.
	B.	Moved (Sen. Skrocki), seconded (Sen. Isler) to amend Article VI, Executive Committee, Section 1 to read, "The Executive Committee of the Senate shall consist of the following members: President, Vice President, Secretary, and three (3) members elected at large from the Senators."
	1.	Sen. Jewett explained his concern with the current inclusion of 'Immediate Past President' on the Executive Committee. However, he worried that if there were a 100% turn over of Executive Committee members, the proposed language would not provide for a returning member for continuity.
	2.	Sen. Skrocki defended eliminating the 'Immediate Past President' from the Executive Committee since it made a mandate that couldn't be enforced if, for example, the former President was no longer a Senator or had retired or was no longer at the University.
	3.	Sen. Isler pointed out that there was no prohibition in the wording from the Executive Committee seeking the advice of former members.
	4.	Sen Abbasabadi moved to amend, seconded by Sen. Prakasam, to include "Immediate Available Past President" (on the Executive Committee).
	a.	Sen. Haneline asked whether the amendment meant "immediate" or "immediately".
	b.	Sen. Drake noted that the Executive Committee can invite anyone for advice, so this position is not necessary.
		A motion to call the question failed to win 2/3 support.
	c.	Sen. Sun opined that if the members of the Executive Committee didn't know about an issue, they shouldn't have been elected.
	d.	The amendment failed (unanimously).
		The motion passed unanimously.
	C.	Moved (Sen. Isler), seconded (Sen. Haneline), to amend Article VIII, Organization and Procedures, Section 2 to read, "Candidates seeking an executive position will not be considered officially nominated until such nomination occurs at the first meeting. Campaigning may not be done as part of the executive senate duties. Election results will be determined by the majority votes of the members present at the first meeting. Candidates must be present to accept their nomination."

		1.	Sen. Haneline wondered about the need for the second sentence in the proposal.
			Sens. Rewers and Isler explained that candidates had requested campaign materials to be sent to all Senators from the Senate office, using the administrative assistant's time. In one case, individuals were campaigning and telling others that someone had 'dropped out'.
			Sen. Berghoef opined that there was a valid case to be made for nominating candidates before the first meeting.
			Sen. Rewers noted that there was no system in place for nominating candidates prior to the first meeting, so the Charter Revision Committee did not address that issue.
			Sen. Haneline agreed that individuals who had been nominated prior to the first meeting should have a right to send campaign emails. However, the proposed motion only identifies official 'nomination' at the first meeting.
			Sen. Heaphy expressed discomfort that a candidate might not be present to accept nomination.
			Sen. Rewers agreed that it was important for a candidate to be present to be nominated.
			Sen. Berghoef reminded Senators of his situation last April when he sought the Vice Presidency but had committed to attend a conference in El Salvador at the time of the first meeting. He also noted that language that required presence to accept nomination might not account for a death in the family or similar cause for missing the meeting. He re-iterated his support for a pre-nomination process.
		2.	Sen. Haneline moved to amend, seconded by Sen. Jewett, to add "or, provide documentation attesting to their willingness to accept" to the last sentence. The amendment passed on voice vote.
			Sens. Nash and Brandly expressed concern about the majority vote requirement.
			Sen. Alspach encouraged Senators to consider officers separately from members-at-large in the voting process.
			Discussion ensued about the meaning of 'majority'. Sen. Haneline pointed out that the new Section 3 and Section 4 as proposed would distinguish the voting mechanisms so that officers would require a majority for election while members-at-large could be elected by plurality.
		a.	Sen. Jewett argued that 'majority' implied 'of votes cast'.
		b.	Sen. Purvis reminded Senators of discussion five years ago attempting to clarify the meaning of 'majority'.
		c.	Sen. Haneline recalled the provision that a quorum must be present to conduct business, therefore, a majority 'of those present' can elect.
		d.	Sen. Skrocki pointed out that there is no provision for 'proxy voting', so these would be Senators present at the first meeting.
		e.	Sen. Sun wondered if a majority would be necessary to elect.
		3.	Sen. Heaphy moved to amend, seconded by Sen. Jewett, to withdraw the third sentence of the proposed wording, "Election results will be determined by the majority votes of members present at the first meeting."
		a.	Sen. Isler noted that, without this sentence in the section, the ambiguity of 'proxy voting' remains.
		b.	Sen. Jewett observed that any election would require a quorum anyway.
		c.	Sen. Heaphy pointed out that specifications for electing Executive Committee members were provided in the proposed new Sections 3 and 4.
			After some discussion, the call for the Previous Question passed. The amendment failed: 8 ayes, 17 nays.
		4.	Sen. Sun moved to amend, seconded by Sen. Purvis, to remove the word 'majority' from the third sentence, "Election results will be determined by the votes of the members present at the first meeting."
		a.	Sen. Berghoef asked if the intent of the amendment was to eliminate the possibility of proxy voting.
			Sen. Rewers affirmed that intention, as she understood it.
			After the call for the Previous Question passed, the amendment passed with 1 nay.

		5.	Sen. Smith moved to amend, seconded by Sen. Lashaway-Bokina, to remove the second sentence in the proposal, "Campaigning may not be done as part of the executive senate duties." Sen. Smith considered the wording too vague.
		a.	Sen. Jewett argued for the proposal, concerned that the administrative assistant would be asked to do the candidate's 'dirty work'.
		b.	Sen. Sanderson suggested clarifying the statement to focus on the Senate office, rather than an individual.
		c.	Sen. Rewers repeated that she had been told that parties seeking to run were being told that others weren't running.
		6.	Sen. Alspach moved to amend the statement to read "Campaigning may not be done through the Senate office" and Sens. Smith and Lashaway-Bokina supported the new wording, withdrawing their amendment. The Alspach amendment passed unanimously.
		Article VIII, Section 2 was approved as amended with 1 nay: "Candidates seeking an executive position will not be considered officially nominated until such nomination occurs at the first meeting. Campaigning may not be done through the Senate office. Election results will be determined by the votes of members present at the first meeting. Candidates must be present to accept their nomination, or provide documentation attesting to their willingness to accept."	
	D.	The Senators addressed the proposed Section 3 for Article VIII: "The President, Vice President, and Secretary positions will each be determined by the majority of votes received in one (1) round of voting for each position. In the event of a tie, there will be a re-vote of the tied candidates."	
		1.	Sen. Isler moved to amend, changing the word majority to plurality, seconded by Sen. Sanderson.
		a.	Sen. Haneline spoke against the amendment, arguing that he had a problem with the President of Senate being elected with less than a majority of Senators' support.
		b.	Pres. Griffin yielded the gavel to VP Berghoef to speak to the amendment. He supported Sen. Haneline's argument, noting that he felt that it might be held against a President who didn't have the majority of the Senate behind him (in discussions with the Administration).
		Sen. Klatt called the Previous Question on the amendment which passed, ending debate on the amendment. The amendment failed on voice vote.	
		2.	Sen. Rewers moved to amend to strike the phrase "in one (1) round of voting for each position" and the second sentence, "In the event of a tie, there will be a re-vote of the tied candidates", seconded by Sen. Jewett.
		a.	Sen. Wagenheim asked what procedure would be followed if the count ended in a deadlock.
			Sen. Isler suggested that the Election Committee could make procedures to account for this situation, but these details did not have to be in the Charter.
		b.	Sen. Liszewski reminded the Senators about the time constraint of the first meeting, since some newly-elected Senators needed to get to classes at noon. It has occurred that some votes have been taken after several Senators have left the meeting.
			Sen. Prakasam suggested that voting might be speeded up by using 'clickers'.
		c.	Director Schmidt offered that President Clinton never won by a majority of votes cast; by analogy, the Senate needs some procedure for dealing with ties or the absence of a majority.
		d.	Sen. Sun argued for the amendment, trusting the Election Committee to create procedures to remove the lowest vote getter where there are more than two candidates.
		After the Previous Question was called and supported; the amendment passed on voice vote. The amended motion was passed with 18 ayes and 6 nays: "The President, Vice President, and Secretary positions will each be determined by the majority of votes received."	

	E.	Sen. Isler moved, seconded by Sen. Skrocki, to insert a new Section 4: "At large members shall be elected by single ballot with the opportunity to vote for three (3) members. In the event of a tie, there will be a re-vote of the tied candidates."
	1.	Sen. Haneline observed that a tie still makes this vote difficult and sought clarification.
		Sen. Jewett offered that if the vote would result in more than three candidates being elected, that is, there is a tie for the third position, then there would be a re-vote. Taking this statement as a motion to amend, the Senate voted it down with 9 ayes and 12 nays.
	2.	Sen. Haneline offered to insert the following wording for clarity: "The three candidates with the highest votes will win. Voting will continue until three people receive the highest number of votes." Sen. Skrocki seconded.
	a.	Sen. Berghoef noted that the suggested wording would solve the issue of re-voting of the top two vote getters were tied.
		Sen. Haneline noted that we need to adjourn in three minutes to vacate the room by 10:30.
		Sen. Heaphy called the Previous Question, which passed. The amendment failed on voice vote.
Pres. Griffin postponed further discussion on Charter revision until the January meeting.		

The meeting was adjourned at 10:31.

Sandy Alspach, Secretary

Richard Griffin, President