

**DRAFT**  
**Ferris State University**  
**Academic Senate Meeting**  
**January 12, 2010**  
**West Campus Community Center**

**Minutes**

I.	Action Items	
	A.	Moved (Sen. Haneline), seconded (Sen. Sanderson) and passed unanimously to approve the minutes of the December 8, 2009 meeting. Attendance will be updated before posting.
	B.	Moved (Sen. Haneline), seconded (Sen. Klatt) and passed unanimously to endorse the General Recommendations of the Academic Program Review Council.
	Charter Revision Recommendations were deliberated, with the following revisions to the Charter earning Senate support.	
	C.	Moved (Sen. Isler), seconded (Sen. Sanderson) and passed on voice vote to accept the addition to Article VIII, Organization and Procedure, Section 4 of the Academic Charter as follows: "At large members shall be elected by plurality vote on a 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."
	D.	Moved (Sen. Rewer), seconded (Sen. Isler) and passed unanimously to amend Article VIII – Organization and Procedure, renumbering beginning with Section 5 through Section 15 as follows:  <b>Section 5.</b> In the event a position on the Executive Committee, other than the position of president, becomes vacant, a replacement shall be elected by the Senate at the next regular meeting, such meeting being presided over by the President or the highest-ranking continuing officer. The succession plan for a mid-term vacated President’s position is described in Article V, Section 3.  <b>Section 6.</b> Regular meetings of the Senate shall be held each month during the fall and spring semesters of the academic year at such time and place as is determined by the Executive Committee. The President, in consultation with the Executive Committee, shall call additional meetings during summer and semester breaks as are necessary to fulfill Senate responsibilities and functions. The Senate may authorize its Executive Committee to fulfill these obligations.  <b>Section 7.</b> The President may call for special meetings of the Senate, and shall also call for such meetings at the direction of the Executive Committee, or in response to a petition by one-third (1/3) of the Senate membership. Members shall receive an advance notice of a special meeting of at least twenty-four (24) hours.  <b>Section 8.</b> Special meetings shall not be called in lieu of a regular meeting nor shall regular meetings be designated as special meetings.  <b>Section 9.</b> The quorum necessary for the conduct of business by the Senate shall be a majority of the members of the Senate, and at least one (1) member from each of the majority of the units defined in Article III, Section 1. Formal action of the Senate shall be determined by a majority vote.  <b>Section 10.</b> In the event that a decision of the President of the University and a recommendation of the Senate are in conflict regarding a policy, priority, procedure, curriculum, or activity governed by this Charter and requiring Board of Trustees approval, a Conference Committee comprised of three persons appointed by the President of the

University and three members of the Senate appointed by the Executive Committee of the Senate shall be formed. This Conference Committee shall meet in a timely fashion, solely to resolve the specific issue in dispute and report the results of its deliberations to the President of the University and to the Senate. Conference Committee Process:

1. The Senate Executive Board and the office of the President of the University will have ten (10) working days to select the Conference Committee members.
2. After appointment the Conference Committee will have five (5) working days to meet, discuss and report the results of their deliberations to the President and the Academic Senate.
3. At the first meeting of the Conference Committee both the President of the University or a designee and the President of the Senate or a designee, will be present to give the charge to the committee.
4. The Conference Committee will select a spokesperson at the first meeting.
5. At the conclusion of their deliberations the Conference Committee spokesperson will provide the President of the University and the President of the Academic Senate a written report of their deliberations.
6. The Academic Senate will meet to vote on endorsement of the report within ten (10) working days of its release.
7. If the Senate does not endorse the Conference Committee Report the Senate Executive Committee will prepare a Senate position paper to be approved by the Senate within ten (10) working days.
8. The President of the University will provide the Senate position paper to the Board of Trustees Academic Subcommittee at their next meeting.
9. The Academic Senate President and other Executive Committee members will attend the Board of Trustees Academic Subcommittee meeting to address the issues provided in the position paper.
10. The Academic Senate President will be present at the Ferris State University Board of Trustees meeting where the vote on the issue at hand is held. The Academic Senate President will present the views of the Senate as an agenda item prior to the vote.

**Section 11.** Whenever any resolution, recommendation, opinion, or report adopted by the Senate is submitted to the President of the University, any member who is in disagreement may submit a minority recommendation, opinion, or report to the President of the University. The President of the Senate shall be provided with a copy of the minority action by its sponsor and shall disseminate the document to the Senate.

**Section 12.** Any College, department, Senate committee, representative unit as defined in Article III, Section 1, or the President of the University may recommend matters to be considered by the Senate. When a matter is so recommended, it shall be referred to the Executive Committee.

**Section 13.** Any member of the Senate may on personal initiative present a motion at a Senate meeting that a matter be placed on the agenda. If the motion is passed by the Senate, the matter shall be placed on the agenda for discussion and disposition at the next regular Senate meeting.

	<p><b>Section 14.</b> All records of the Senate enumerated in Article V, Section 4, shall be open to any member of the representative units, and in no manner shall the records of the Senate be considered private.</p> <p><b>Section 15.</b> Except when superseded by this Charter or by special rules adopted by the Senate, the rules of parliamentary law as contained in the most recent edition of <i>Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised</i> shall govern the conduct of meetings of the Senate and Senate committees. In order to facilitate this process at Senate meetings, a Parliamentarian shall be appointed by the Executive Committee following the organizational meeting.</p>
E.	<p>Moved (Sen. Rewers), seconded (Sen. Isler) and passed with one nay to amend Article IX, Senate Committees, as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>ARTICLE IX – SENATE COMMITTEES</b></p> <p><b>Section 1.</b> It shall be the function of the Executive Committee to appoint the faculty members of all Senate committees, subject to the requirements of state and federal regulatory bodies or law. All electors of the representative units shall be eligible to serve on such committees. Committee membership should be representative of a majority of the units, with no one unit having majority of membership, comprising the Senate, unless such representation is incompatible with the function of the committee. Ex-officio members will be assigned as needed.</p> <p><b>Section 2.</b> The Senate shall determine the composition, mission, and function of each committee. The Senate shall supervise the activities of these committees and determine changes in the composition, mission, and function.</p> <p><b>Section 3.</b> At the beginning of each academic year, the members of each committee will – elect a chair for that year.</p> <p><b>Section 4.</b> Reports of all committees shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate. The President of the Senate will transmit the reports to the President of the University and other appropriate offices.</p> <p><b>Section 5.</b> All requests for changes in composition, mission, or function of any committee established under provisions of this Article shall be submitted to the Senate for its approval.</p> <p><b>Section 6.</b> There shall be an elections committee as defined in Article IV, Section 2.</p>
F.	<p>Moved (Sen. Rewers), seconded (Sen. Isler) and passed unanimously to amend Article X, Amendment, Section 1, as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>ARTICLE X - AMENDMENT</b></p> <p><b>Section 1.</b> Proposals to amend this Charter may be submitted to the Senate by any of its members or by a resolution adopted by a majority of the members of any representative unit defined in Article III, Section 1. With the approval of the Senate, the proposed amendment shall be placed upon the agenda for consideration at the next regular meeting. If the proposed amendment is adopted by the Senate, it shall be submitted in a referendum to the eligible electors as defined in Article IV, Section 12. If the amendment is approved in the referendum, it shall become a part of this Charter, subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees.</p>
G.	<p>Moved (Sen. Rewers), seconded (Sen. Isler) and passed unanimously to separate the Policy and Procedures from the Charter.</p>
H.	<p>A motion by Sen. Alspach, seconded by Sen. Berghoef, to create a Standing Charter and Procedures Review Committee was postponed to the February meeting.</p>
I.	<p>A motion by Sen. Prakasam, seconded by Sen. Topcu, to recommend inserting the term</p>

		'globalized' into the General Education Philosophy statement was tabled to the February meeting.
--	--	--

II.	Open Forum	
	A.	Sen. Haneline asked for a show of hands from Senators who used Facebook or LinkedIn networking websites. He observed that the institution continues to encourage development of online instruction. He shared a conversation in which he had learned that the largest growth in users of social media is in the age demographic of 45 or older. He opined that the Senate as a unit should investigate how to use these tools.
	B.	Michael Wade, assistant director of the Office of Multicultural Student Services, encouraged Senators and their students to attend events scheduled during the upcoming Martin Luther King Jr. Celebration Week. He distributed an invitation letter and a flyer of the events. He emphasized that this year's celebration aims to focus on ways to get involved in expanding inclusion in America since the Jim Crow era of racial segregation. Participants will be encouraged to donate nonperishable food and personal needs items at several locations around campus.
		Guest Fred Heck asked if there would be sign-in sheets for classes at the event locations. Mr. Wade agreed to arrange it.

III.	Officer Reports	
	A.	President Griffin reported on Paula Hadley's recuperation from surgery, noting that "we don't realize how much she does for us until we have to do it alone."
		1. He announced that Sen. Kim Beistle has agreed to chair the Elections Committee. She would be working with the Executive Committee to populate her committee in the coming weeks. She asked Senators to "watch for an email invitation".
		2. He announced that Robert Loesch has agreed to serve as Parliamentarian for the spring semester. Dr. Loesch stated that his role is to consult with the President to insure efficiency and fairness in the business of the Senate. He distributed a short quiz on Parliamentary Procedure, and he advised Senators that all the statements on the quiz are false, according to Robert's Rules, Newly Revised.
	B.	Vice President Berghoef reported that all Senate committees are now full, or not taking new members.
		1. He called for self-nominations for the remaining seat on the Student Fees Committee. Sen. Sun, who sits on that committee, explained that the Committee advises President Eisler directly on changes or raises in student fees.
		2. He thanked Ted Halm for facilitating the posting of documents for this Senate meeting on the Senate website.
	C.	Secretary Alspach reported that she had sent congratulations and thank-you notes on behalf of the Senate. If Senators wish a note sent, they should let her know the recipient(s) and the nature of the note.
		1. She asked Senators to notify her if they wished to continue to receive Senate materials in "hard copy", observing that more than half of the Senators had requested to be taken off the "big white envelope" mailing list. She also asked for feedback on the electronic posting of documents at the Senate website. She and Paula Hadley will be working on updating the website when Paula returns to work.
		2. She asked to be copied in emails requesting 'absence with cause'. Some Senators had requested to be excused using the Calendar function for the December 8 special meeting, but this information only went to Hadley so it was not reflected in the Minutes for the December 8 meeting. The Minutes will be updated before final posting on the Website.

IV.	Committee Reports	
	A.	Leonard Johnson reported on behalf of the University Curriculum Committee. He provided a

		handout of all actions taken by the UCC in the last month.
		He reminded Senators that proposals for curriculum action for Fall 2010 should be received by the UCC by the end of January. All curriculum action for Fall 2010 must be approved by the Senate at the March meeting, to ensure that changes can be made in the Banner system before students begin the open registration period after Spring Break.
	B.	Assoc. VP Roberta Teahen reported on behalf of the Higher Learning Commission Committee.
		She distributed a handout and highlighted the progress on the timeline preparing for the HLC site visit in Spring 2011. She noted that Spring 2010 will be a key period for the Committee.
		Sen. Sun asked if the data on the handout had been collected by Institutional Testing and Research. Teahen clarified that the data had come from the Financial Aid office.
	C.	Fred Heck reported on the behalf of the General Education Task Force. Copies of the Philosophy draft were distributed to the Senators: "General Education at Ferris State University challenges students to develop and integrate the knowledge, skills, experiences and values necessary for personal and professional success in a diverse and dynamic world."
		Heck noted that two terms had fallen out of the draft: "citizenship" and "globalized". He said that the Task Force will be meeting again before a final draft is presented to the Senate. He asked for feedback on the draft statement.
	1.	Sen. Dakkuri commended the Task Force on producing a brief Philosophy statement. He strongly recommended staying with the statement as presented; otherwise, he felt that "we open the door to additions that make a statement of a very specific nature that will make the philosophy statement cumbersome".
	2.	Sen. Prakasam referenced the Globalization Initiative on campus. He suggested that the word "globalized" be inserted before the word "world" in the Philosophy statement. He distributed copies of a petition to that effect.
		Sen. Sun asked for clarification of the difference between "globalized" and "diverse".
		Sen. Prakasam responded that, while the term "diverse" is truly a dynamic term, the term "globalized" suggested the connections between countries in today's world in a new sense.
		Heck asked if using the term "interconnected" would capture the spirit of Sen. Prakasam's observation.
		There was brief discussion of the impact of the term "globalization".
		Sen. Thapa opined that the phrase "globalized world" was a redundancy. He preferred "interconnected" or "interdependent".
		Heck asking if "globalized society" would be an appropriate alteration.
		Sen. Prakasam argued that "globalized" is a key term being used around the world for a broader perspective than suggested by the term "society".
		Heck noted that Sen. Haneline was keeping a record of this discussion for the Task Force.
		Sen. Boncher offered "population" as an alternative term choice.
		Sen. Dakkuri reminded Senators about his initial statement, requesting the Task Force to keep the statement simple without serving specific purposes. He argued that the statement should be up to the reader to interpret.
		Sen. Prakasam countered that the draft statement might have been OK for the '60's or even the '80's, but we need to be thinking about the future.
		Sen. Smith agreed with Sen. Dakkuri that the draft statement's language is enough; any more specificity would leave someone out.
	3.	Sen. Hanna asked for a rationale for removing the term "citizenship" from the statement.
		Heck explained that the Task Force felt that the term "personal success" subsumes "citizenship". There were comments from others to this effect.
		Sen. Jorsch agreed that the statement should be generic. He felt that the learning outcomes coming from the statement could get more specific.
		Sen. Sun asked if "success" was appropriately singular. Sen. Haneline responded that

		the statement is grammatically correct.
		Sen. Haneline closed the discussion with a description of the process going forward. This statement will be “shopped around” to others, like Student Affairs. He reminded Senators that the statement is the beginning for a larger task to identify outcomes and courses that addressed them. He felt it was important that “we get this right as a foundation for what is coming.”
Attendance (Roll Call)		
Senators present	Abbasabadi, Alspach, Beistle, Berghoef, Bokina-Lashaway, Boncher, Brandly, Cline, Colley, Compton, Dakkuri, Dekoster, Drake, Griffin, D. Haneline, D. Hanna, Heaphy, Isler, Jewett, Jorsch, Klatt, Liszewski, Lovsted, Lukusa Barnett, Luplow, McLean, Nash, Prakasam, Purvis, Rewers, Sanderson, Skrocki, Smith, Speirs, Sun, Taylor, Thapa, Topcu	
Senators absent with cause		
Senators absent	Wagenheim, H. Hanna	
Ex Officio and Guests	Eisler, Erickson, Teahen, Cron, Edgerton, E. Haneline, Oldfield, Schmidt, Heck, Johnson, Wade	

V.	Old Business	
	A.	Sen. Haneline moved, seconded by Sen. Klatt, to endorse the Academic Program Review Council General Recommendations.
		Sen. Haneline highlighted that these recommendations transcend units, for example, data ought to be consistent “no matter where you cast your net into the stream”. He emphasized that the Council is not pointing fingers or directing to a solution with these Recommendations, and he invited questions.
	1.	Sen. Dakkuri asked for background on items 3 and 4: 3. “The College of Allied Health Sciences, the College of Arts and Sciences, and other colleges that may be involved, need to work together so that students needing lab science courses can get them at Ferris in a timely fashion.” 4. “The College of Allied Health Sciences, the College of Arts and Sciences, and other colleges that may be involved, need to work together so that students needing on-line Cultural Enrichment courses can get them at Ferris in a timely fashion.”
		Sen. Haneline summarized a history of conversations between units, so that students don’t get pushed to take requirements at other places.
	2.	Sen. Brandly asked about item 6: “Review of the programs in this cycle reveals great disparities among colleges regarding criteria used for the granting of release time. APRC recommends the development of more uniform time release criteria across the institution.” He questioned whether colleges should have choices.
		Sen. Haneline cited use of resources and fairness issues behind this recommendation. He gave an example of a Program Coordinator for twenty majors getting the same one-quarter release as a Program Coordinator for several hundred majors. The Council wondered if release time is the only compensation alternative, or if a stipend might be considered. He suggested using a business model, but not necessarily only one model.
		Sen. Sun noted the disparity in academic advising assignments in the College of Arts and Sciences, where an advisor might be asked to advise more than 30 students without any compensation or release.
		Sen. Dakkuri felt that item 6 may be beyond the charge of the APRC. He thought that this item could also be extended to consider other assignment issues like promotion, where there might be an argument for inconsistency even within a College.
		Sen. Haneline acknowledged Sen. Dakkuri’s concern “with due respect”, reminding all Senators that “we are in the advice business; we are simply noting a disparity. Our goal is aimed at improvement of learning outcomes.”
	3.	Sen. Sun addressed item 2: “An effort needs to be made to assure that institutional data is of a more uniform quality. In a number of instances in this review cycle, disparities existed between the data provided by the program and the data provided by Institutional Research and Testing. Wherever the same data is accessed from, the data received should be the

		same.” He observed that IR&T staff were always nice, but seemed rushed and busy. He opined that, since we are making data-based decisions, input and output have to be right. He recalled his question earlier in the meeting to Assoc. VP Teahen about HLC data. He wondered if IR&T was short-staffed.
	4.	Sen. Purvis observed that item 1 was the same as last year’s APRC recommendation. He wondered if there had been no improvement: “The University needs to develop comprehensive and ongoing equipment replacement and maintenance schedules on behalf of the many academic programs that rely on equipment for instructional purposes. It is true that many programs are successful at securing equipment donations, but these donations do not always occur when they are needed. And a program that relies on equipment for instruction should not be penalized because donations are not available. Any approach should be pro-active and take into account the multiple sources of equipment, including Perkins funds and industry-institution partnerships.”
		Sen. Haneline explained that this recommendation recurred because of the nature of program review coming in six-year cycles: the Council doesn’t see the same programs every year. The problem hasn’t gone away.
	The motion passed unanimously.	
	B. Sen. Rewers continued discussion of amendments to the Charter.	
	1.	Sen. Isler moved, seconded by Sen. Sanderson, to add Section 4 to Article VIII, Organization and Procedure, as follows: At large members shall be elected by plurality vote on a 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.
		Sen. Sun questioned the nature of the tied vote; what if the first and second highest vote getters were tied?
		Sen. Alspach opined that the issue would only arise if the tie were for the third position. Sen. Berghoef agreed that a re-vote would only be necessary if the third place candidates were tied.
		Sen. Dakkuri elaborated that if the tie occurred between the first and second vote getters, or between the second and third vote getters, there would be no need for a re-vote.
		Sen. Haneline reminded Senators that “we’re all trying to avoid an infinite number of re-votes.”
		Sen. D. Hanna argued that there was no need for changing the current system; three separate ballots for members-at-large have served the Senate well. Sen. Thapa agreed.
		Sen. Jewett reminded Senators that the voting for member-at-large used to be done on plurality. There have been occasions where using the individual ballot system had led to the Senate electing a member-at-large without a quorum of votes as Senators left the meeting to attend to other business.
		Sen. Dakkuri agreed, and he suggested that the Senate should hold a meeting in May fully devoted to the election of the Executive Committee.
		Sen. Jewett argued that, if the April meeting began promptly at 11:00, there would be no need for a special meeting. He expressed concern that the business of the ‘out-going’ Senate had been allowed to carry over into the hour established for the organization of the new Senate. He hoped that by streamlining the method for counting votes on a single ballot, this situation could be avoided.
	The motion passed on voice vote.	
	2.	Sen. Rewers moved, seconded by Sen. Isler, to adopt the recommended revisions to Sections 5 through 15 of Article VIII, as newly numbered by the passage of Section 4.
		She pointed attention to the inclusion of Policy 1.1, Conference Committee Process, into the Charter.
		Sen. Abbasabaddi suggested that Section 10.1 be clarified to read “The Senate Executive Board and the office of the President of the University will have ten (10) working days to

		select the Conference Committee members.”
		The motion passed unanimously.
	3.	Sen. Rewers moved, seconded by Sen. Isler, to adopt Article IX, Senate Committees, as amended.
		Sen. Haneline asked for the rationale for changing the language from “a majority of units” to “multiple units”.
		Sen. Isler explained that there were cases where units didn’t have numbers to fill committees, citing the College of Professional and Technological Studies (CPTS) as an example.
		Sen. Sanderson asked if two committee members from the same unit would constitute a majority on the committee, citing the example of the APRC. Sen. Haneline clarified that the APRC has nine members, no more than two from a single unit, by committee design.
		Sen. Dakkuri asked for clarification of the term “multiple”; would this be interpreted as three or more?
		Sen. Isler gave the example of the University Graduate and Professional Council (UGPC) where there may need to be more representatives from a single college with several graduate or professional programs
		Sen. Rewers explained that the intent of the revision language was to achieve diversity of representation.
		Sen. Dakkuri expressed concern that later interpretations of the language might not achieve that goal; he preferred attaching a number, at least three, or accepting the language of “majority” as clearer.
		Sen. Haneline pointed to the pragmatics of recruitment to committees from smaller units, like University College or CPTS.
	a.	Sen. McLean moved to amend Section 1, seconded by Sen. Boncher, to read “a majority of the units, with no one unit having majority of membership...” The amendment passed unanimously.
		Sen. Purvis noted that the sentence in Section 1 used the term “should”, indicating that diversity in representation was desirable, but not mandatory. Sen. Jewett concurred that the choice of “shall” indicated an imperative but the term “should” did not. Sen. Purvis observed that there was no real need for the inclusion of the phraseology concerning “majority”, given the use of the term “should”. Sen. Hanna agreed that the choice of “should” was appropriate, but noted that if a committee member does not participate, the unit loses representation.
		The amended article passed with one nay.
	4.	Sen. Rewers moved, seconded by Sen. Isler, to amend Article X, Amendment as recommended by the Charter Revision Committee.
		Sen. Abbasabaddi asked for the rationale for the revisions recommended. Sen. Isler spoke to the last line of Section 1, explaining that any amendment would have to be approved by the President of the University to be recommended to the Board of Trustees. Sen. Abbasabaddi argued that the first person to be consulted on amending the Senate charter would be the President of the University anyway, so he questioned removing the President from the language of the Section. He supported adding the “approval of the Board of Trustees” to the Section. He noted that Article II Section 1 includes the President of the University in the Functions of the Academic Senate. Sen. Haneline understood that the intent of the revision was to give the Senate opportunity to go to the Board of Trustees if the President of the University disagreed with a Senate recommendation.
		Sen. Hanna expressed concern that the recommended revision in Section 1 filtered any amendments to the Charter through the Executive Committee. He wondered about the effect if an Executive Committee were ‘run by’ a single college. Sen. Abbasabaddi concurred, reading the recommendation to empower the Executive Committee unduly. Sen. Dakkuri asked if this revision had been requested by any members of Senate. Sen. Isler reminded him that the Charter provides for the Executive Committee to set the agenda



			for Senate business, but Senators retain procedures for bringing issues to the Senate. Sen. Haneline agree that any Senator can make a motion at a meeting
		a.	Sen. Abbasabaddi moved to amend the recommendation for Section 1, seconded by Sen. Dakkuri, to read "Proposals to amend this Charter may be submitted to the Senate by any of its members or by a resolution adopted by a majority of the members of any representative unit defined in article III, Section 1. With the approval of the Senate, the proposed amendment shall be placed upon the agenda for consideration at the next regular meeting. If the proposed amendment is adopted by the Senate, it shall be submitted in a referendum to the eligible electors as defined in article IV, Section 12. If the amendment is approved in the referendum, it shall be come a part of this Charter, subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees."
			The amendment passed with 30 ayes and 2 nays.
			Article X as amended passed unanimously.
		C.	Sen. Rewers moved, seconded by Sen. Isler, to separate the remaining Policy and Procedures from the Charter. The motion passed unanimously.
		D.	Sen. Alspach moved, seconded by Sen. Berghoef, to establish a standing Charter and Procedures Review Committee (see handout).
			Parliamentarian Loesch suggested that this committee is usually called the Rules Committee.
			Sen. Haneline suggested that the chair of the committee should be the Secretary of the Senate.
		1.	Sen. Hanna moved, seconded by Sen. Dakkuri, to amend the proposal to define the committee as five (5) Senators, representing five (5) separate units.
			The amendment passed unanimously.
		2.	Sen. Abbasadabbi moved, seconded by Sen. Dakkuri, to postpone discussion of the proposal to the February meeting.
			The motion to postpone passed unanimously.
		E.	Sen. Prakasam moved, seconded by Sen. Topcu, to recommend inserting the term "globalized" in the General Education Philosophy statement.
			He spoke to the importance of the term "globalization" in discussing current issues.
		1.	Sen. Dakkuri moved, seconded by Sen. Jewett, to table the motion.
			The motion to table passed unanimously.

VI.	Administrative Reports		
	A.	University President Eisler noted the lateness of the hour and simply welcomed the Senators back for the spring semester.	
	B.	Provost Erickson highlighted academic issues since the December meeting.	
		1.	He applauded the work of the Academic Service Learning (ASL) projects in 12 classes in the Fall semester.
		a.	He commended the work of Christine Bailey and her students in PLSC 121 to collect and deliver donations to Walter Reed Veterans Hospital.
		b.	He commended the work of Wendy Samuels' SOWK Interviewing class to mentor with middle school students and bring them to campus for a day.
		2.	He thanked the College of Business for hosting 600 high school students in DECA on campus.
		3.	He reported that Ferris has received a number of accolades across the nation for the development of the Educational Doctorate in Community College Leadership program. He anticipates that the Higher Learning Commission will sanction this new degree at their Feb. 8-9 visit to campus. There have been many contacts inquiring about the program, and he will keep the Senate informed about the progress of this initiative.
		4.	He congratulated the Welding Engineering program for receiving both TAC and ABET accreditations, the only Welding Engineering Technology program in the country with both accreditations.

	C.	Senate President Griffin thanked Sen. Rewers and the Charter Revision Committee for their commitment and work to review and revise the Senate Charter.

VII.	Open Forum	
	A.	Sen. Heaphy reminded Senators about the University budget meetings next week.
	B.	Sen. Prakasam announced the coming panel discussion sponsored by the Globalization Initiative.
	C.	Sen. Dakkuri encouraged all Senators to review the revisions to the Charter in total. He expressed concern with representation on the Executive Committee, recalling that not long ago the Executive Committee had three members from a college with less than 10% of the university faculty.
	D.	Sen. Jewett thanked Sen. Haneline for delaying the Academic Program Review Council General Recommendations to this meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at noon.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sandy Alspach, Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Richard Griffin, President