

Oakland University Senate
April 15, 2010
Minutes

Members present: Awbrey, Berven (K), Connery, Doman, Eis, English, Giblin, Gilson, Grimm, Grossman, Guessous, Hanif, Hastings, Hightower, Insko, Izraeli, Jackson, Jhashi, Keane, Kim, Kruk, Larrabee, Latcha, Leibert, Lemarbe, Licker, Mabee, Marks, Medaugh, Meehan, Miller, Mitton, Moudgil, Norris, Osborne, Pedroni, Piskulich, Riley-Doucet, Russell, Schartman, Schweitzer, Southward, Spagnuolo, Sudol, Switzer, Tanniru, Tissot, Tracy, Voelck, Walters, Wells

Members absent: Bertocci, Chamra, Chen, Chopin, Cole, Folberg, Free, Mili, Moran, Penprase, Polis, Williams

Summary of Actions

1. Informational Item:
 - Undergraduate Admissions Criteria Revision -- Ms. Reynolds
 - Provost Update -- Mr. Moudgil
2. Approval of minutes of 3-18-10. Ms. Gilson, Ms. Piskulich. Approved.
3. Motion to approve new M.A. in Communications program. Mr. Grimm, Ms. Jackson. Second reading. Approved.
4. Motion to approve a policy for removal of a member of a Senate committee. Mr. Tracy, Ms. Miller. Second reading. Approved.
5. Motion to approve the constitution of the OUWBSOM. Ms. Osborne, Mr. Tracy. First reading.
6. Motion to approve a new Doctor of Medicine program. Mr. Tracy, Mr. Russell. First reading.
7. Motion to approve a new Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies program. Mr. Tracy, Mr. Licker. First reading.
8. Motion to approve a new Master of Science in Mechatronics program. Ms. Miller, Ms. Piskulich. First reading.
9. Motion to staff Senate standing committees. Mr. Grimm, Ms. Jackson. Approved.
10. Motion to hold a Senate meeting in May. Approved.

Calling the meeting to order at 3:15, Mr. Moudgil invited Ms. Reynolds to present revisions to undergraduate admissions criteria. Ms. Reynolds observed that major changes are planned for high school graduation requirements beginning with the 2012 class. Referring to a [handout](#), she pointed out the following changes: four years of math, including completion of Algebra 1 and 2; a math class during senior year; and one on-line learning experience. With the class of 2016, two years of a foreign language will be required. Ms. Reynolds anticipates that our applicant pool will consist of better-prepared students, that high school g.p.a.s will be more reflective of our students' college preparation skills, and that ACT scores will be used more actively for

reviewing and confirming college readiness. Adjustments, therefore, are necessary in our admissions guidelines to be consistent with the changes in high school requirements. She asserted that the admissions office would review students with strong high school g.p.a.s (e.g. 3.5) but relatively low ACT scores (a composite score below 18). All students applying with a composite score below 18 will be reviewed for possible conditional admission. A pilot program has been developed for conditionally-admitted students to offer academic engagement activities, including mandatory advising, enrolling in COM101 and a writing class during the first semester. Attendance at a series of writing seminars in the Writing Center will also be required, along with the successful completion of 12 credits in the first semester. For the incoming class in 2010, we have admitted 50 students with conditional admission in this pilot program and the admissions office is confident that the regular interaction with support staff will greatly help in easing the transition to college and will allow monitoring of academic progress. In conclusion, Ms. Reynolds described the admissions changes as aligned with the holistic view of looking at multiple factors in determining admissions to the university, guidelines and general principles approved by the Senate in 1985. The adjustments will be made with the entering class in 2011 and reflected in the 2011-2012 catalogue. Lastly, Ms. Reynolds noted that discussions regarding the adjustments took place with the Student Academic Support Committee, the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction, and the Academic Council.

Mr. Larrabee wondered whether fewer students would apply to OU, given that K-12 lacks adequate funding from the State. Ms. Reynolds responded that discussions regarding those concerns have taken place on the state level, particularly with Michael Flanagan, Superintendent of Public Instruction, but that data from other states have shown that the impact on student numbers has been mitigated. She reasserted that better preparation remains at the forefront in college admissions.

Mr. Moudgil then briefly noted that the Statement on Academic Freedom endorsed by the Senate was conveyed to the president, and that, in consultation with the Steering Committee, a committee will be convened to consider that statement, along with one that was approved by the Board of Trustees in 1985, with the aim of creating a consolidated statement to be presented to the Senate at a later time. He also noted that the Senate's endorsement last month of a resolution to support the Michigan Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators was mentioned by the president in a message to the campus community regarding emergency preparation.

After the roll call, Ms. Gilson moved to approve the March [minutes](#). With a second from Ms. Piskulich, the Senate approved the minutes as written.

Old Business

Mr. Grimm moved the first item:

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees approval of a [program leading to the Master of Arts in Communication](#).

Ms. Heisler addressed the minor changes to the proposal since the first reading: clarifications to the assessment portion, which the Assessment committee approved, and the requested changes to the Library funds. The Senate voted unanimously to approve the program in Communication.

Mr. Tracy read the second item of old business:

MOVED that the Senate approve the following policy for the removal of a member of a Senate committee.

In the event that a chair of a Senate committee wishes to remove a committee member for inappropriate conduct, he/she must make that request in writing to the Senate Steering Committee, via the Senate Secretary. This request should provide a detailed rationale; it is appropriate to include documentation that may substantiate the request.

If the majority of the Steering Committee members agree that the chair's request should be granted, a member of the Steering Committee will meet with the committee member. At this meeting the committee member will receive a copy of the chair's request and be given a choice of formal responses:

- The committee member may resign from the committee. If this option is taken, reference to the removal may not appear in subsequent review letters.
- The committee member may rebut the charges and request a review by the Senate Steering committee. In the event that the committee member requests a review, a meeting with the committee member, the chair of the committee, and the Senate Steering Committee will take place. The committee member may request that a university employee be present as an advocate. Witnesses may be invited to help verify or disprove statements. If witnesses are to be invited, the Steering Committee must be given sufficient notification so that the principals can be informed in advance of any witnesses that will appear.

If the Steering Committee decides that there is insufficient cause for removal, it will inform the committee chair and the committee member in writing. If the Steering Committee agrees that it is appropriate to remove the faculty member, it is authorized to do so, and will proceed to fill the vacancy using normal procedures. In the event that the committee member resigns or is removed from the committee, future Senate Steering Committees may refuse to consider the faculty member for service on Senate committees.

Without further discussion, the Senate voted to approve the policy, with one abstention noted (Mr. Medaugh).

New Business

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees approval of the new [Constitution](#) of the Oakland University William Beaumont School of Medicine.

Ms. Osborne made the motion, with a second provided by Mr. Tracy. Ms. Gillum, on behalf of the founding dean, Mr. Folberg, along with the administrators, faculty, and staff from the School of Medicine, thanked the university community for welcoming them to the campus. The Constitution is the first step in engaging the SOM faculty in the governance process. The SOM considers this version to be subject to periodic updates and revisions, as all unit constitutions are. She noted that the present document is a basic foundation and was modeled on the constitutions of other units, and that the process of crafting the document was guided and informed by members of the Steering committee, individuals who served on various committees, and those who participated in a special constitution committee. Because the academic environment will change rapidly with students entering the school in just over a year, Ms. Gillum emphasized that the SOM will work hard to help the faculty develop the right systems and organizational models. As a researcher, she said that she looked at archived copies of first constitutions at OU and noted that each one evolved over time and was integrated into the university structure through periodic review and revision. She mentioned that the two health schools, whose constitutions were closely considered, recognize the voice of their faculty and students. The SOM intends to do the same as the school is launched. In addition, the SOM faculty is looking forward to being a part of Oakland and to being good university citizens. She then showed a slide of other medical schools in the preliminary accreditation status category, and only two have adopted constitutions at this point. She pointed out that Florida National, which admitted students in 2009, is still in the process of drafting their constitution and by-laws. In comparison, the SOM received its accreditation status in February, just two months ago, and that it will be another year until students are admitted. She is pleased with the progress made on the constitution and by-laws, particularly in comparison with peer institutions. She then thanked the Senate for its consideration of the constitution and asked the members of the SOM to stand for recognition.

Ms. Jackson asked whether the version she is familiar with was the same document sent to the review bodies, as it does not include a list of school committees. Ms. Gillum indicated that it was the same version and that it was accepted as adequate for this stage of the school's development. According to Ms. Gillum, that type of information will be included in the by-laws. Despite there being problematic issues, Ms. Jackson believes that they can be easily resolved. She questioned the role of Beaumont physicians as senators, for example, in the context of the role that faculty play at OU in teaching, research, and service. Ms. Jackson expressed great concern about the lack of an active role by the faculty assembly in the SOM. Ms. Gillum pointed out that the faculty assembly does have a major role in the SOM, and that it was the assembly that approved the constitution. She added that it was a good faith effort to include all faculty, whether based at Beaumont or at OU, in the faculty assembly. Ms. Jackson remarked that provisions in the SOM regarding the eligibility of faculty to serve as Senate representatives cannot contradict the University Senate. She also questioned how "major role" is being defined, since out of the fifteen standing committees in the SOM, nine were appointed by the dean, six were elected, and none reported to the faculty assembly, only to the dean or to an associate dean.

Mr. Moudgil observed that the number of representatives eligible to serve on the University Senate was of concern to the Steering committee and that he has repeatedly stated that the SOM would be allowed no more than two members. Ms. Jackson clarified that the number is not the issue, but rather, that the way the SOM constitution is currently written. It would allow Beaumont physicians to become members of the University Senate, individuals who do not hold

the titles required by the Senate Constitution. Mr. Moudgil agreed that only those on the OU payroll should be eligible. Ms. Gillum added that the SOM asked for a dialogue with the SPRC but was not granted a meeting; she further stated that it was not the intention of the SOM to take over Oakland University. Mr. Moudgil asked if by-laws could be available by the time of the second reading, as well as a response to the apportionment issues.

Mr. Russell stated that it was clear that changes were necessary before the SOM document could be approved. He referred to article 2, paragraph 2, and article 6 of the current document, which contained language making all faculty from Beaumont eligible. He suggested that adding the title “clinical” could serve to make the appropriate exclusions. In addition, he noted that the provost cannot determine the number of Senators from any school or unit, and that the University Constitution stipulates the number of representatives. If the apportionment method were applied to the way the document is currently written, according to Mr. Russell, the SOM would have 22 representatives, and the rest of the university 27. He agreed that clinical faculty members are essential for the School, and suggested that the president could appoint three clinical faculty as his representatives.

Mr. Grossman sought clarification on the date of ratification by the SOM faculty; Ms. Gillum noted that she would revise the cover page to indicate that a second version of the document was indeed ratified on February 3, 2010. Noting that visiting faculty are excluded from membership in the University Senate, Mr. Grossman observed that this reference should also be changed by the second reading. Ms. Gillum said that she could not make such a promise, but Mr. Grossman reiterated that the Senate could not in good conscience approve a document that violates its own constitution. He also noted a typo in Article 2, item 4, part A (“Department of Biomedical Science” lacking its plural).

Mr. Moudgil stated that the SOM needs support from the university, and also asked Ms. Gillum to make the appropriate changes in the document, noting the suggestions of Ms. Jackson, Mr. Russell, Mr. Grossman and others.

Ms. Gillum then presented material on the Doctor of Medicine program after Mr. Tracy moved the following (with a second from Mr. Russell):

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees approval of a [program leading to the Doctor of Medicine \(M.D.\) degree.](#)

Ms. Gillum acknowledged the number of individuals who worked on the program proposal and expressed her gratitude for all the assistance that the SOM received. She talked about the LCME review, noting that the School received preliminary accreditation status, without deficiencies and with six strengths. To her knowledge, no other school has received that degree of positive response. The SOM worked for a high level of quality in all areas to receive that honor. The outcome of the NCA review was also positive, with approval given in all areas with no additional statements. The SOM program has undergone review by the relevant Senate committees: Assessment, Graduate Council, SBRC, and SPRC. The Assessment committee noted that the proposal “meets and exceeds” the NCA’s criteria, and the SBRC likewise

completely supported the proposal. Ms. Gillum noted that the SOM asked for a meeting with the SPRC, but was not granted that opportunity.

According to Ms. Gillum, the proposal provides details on the organizational structure of the school, including its important committees. Responding to the concerns in the SPRC report, she said that it is possible to agree to disagree, and that the SOM will need to run some of its committees differently than the rest of the university because of the legalities that medical schools are bound by. The SOM can acknowledge these differences, but it may not be able to change them. She addressed a specific issue in the SPRC report that criticized the lack of cultural and ethnic diversity for our students at the Beaumont location. Ms. Gillum characterized this claim as an opinion, and noted that gender and religious diversity exists at Beaumont, and further dismissed the notion that the only way to experience diversity is within the Detroit city limits. Those sorts of opinions, according to Ms. Gillum, worry the SOM, as they are inherently limiting to faculty and students. She summarized by stating that the collective experience of those in the School has contributed to a quality proposal.

Ms. Jackson observed that there is a misunderstanding about the issue of appearing before the SPRC. 99% of program proposers do not appear before the committee, but are only asked to attend a meeting if there are questions that remain unanswered. She asserted that no slight was intended. Ms. Jackson also stated that if one has a concern, it does not follow that one is against the proposal. The role of SPRC is to see the broader implication of any program on the university as a whole, and concerns were raised about the role of the faculty assembly along with what it may mean to have 378 SOM faculty at OU, only six of whom are paid by Oakland. The intent of the SPRC was to make sure that the ramifications of those concerns were fully understood before the approval of the proposal.

Mr. Russell expressed his full support for the proposal, and noted only two minor points: one had to do with the nomenclature used for full-time lecturers on page six of the proposal, the other involved the number of faculty required for accreditation. Ms. Gillum clarified that there are a total of 19 faculty members; six are based at OU. She added that faculty will be added rapidly.

Mr. Grossman also confirmed that by-laws should be referenced somewhere in the constitution, and then asked about the significance of the shaded portions of the proposal. Ms. Gillum said that nothing was intended to be shaded in the document. He asked several more questions: whether the LCME required the review criteria for faculty, whether there was an appendix with courses listed, and whether Graduate Council approved the proposal. Ms. Gillum responded that LCME did require the material on faculty, but was unaware of the circulation of the appendix material. Ms. Jackson stated that Graduate Council approved the first year of the SOM curriculum.

Mr. Mitton then suggested that the LCME guidelines be made available for review, and Ms. Gillum agreed that this would be helpful and would make the website available. Mr. Meehan expressed his view that the concerns of the SPRC could be addressed in writing by the SOM and be made available to the Senate. Ms. Jackson said that the SOM had responded in writing, but noted that the issues raised were those that remain unaddressed. Mr. Meehan suggested that additional dialogue take place between the SPRC and the SOM prior to the next meeting because

the concerns raised are very important, particularly regarding the definition of SOM faculty. Mr. Moudgil encouraged further communication for the benefit of all parties.

Mr. Tracy made the next motion, which was duly seconded by Mr. Licker.

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and Board of Trustees approval of a [program leading to the Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies](#).

Mr. Sudol made offered initial remarks intended to contextualize the proposed program within the strategic planning of the College. He distributed a handout titled “Liberal Education: America’s Promise” (LEAP), a document produced by the Association of American Colleges and Universities. Mr. Sudol noted that student outcomes are emphasized in the document, and are aligned with the same ideas that govern our revised general education program. Traditionally, liberal education has been crafted by a program of general education and a major field of study. According to Mr. Sudol, what is proposed here is to offer an additional path by allowing the substitution of a major by either two minors or an interdisciplinary concentration. The handout included a description of a new book on interdisciplinary studies authored by Julie Thompson Klein, professor at Wayne State University, who also acted as a consultant on the new program. Mr. Sudol also recognized the faculty members who served on the program committee: Ken Elder, John Klemanski, Stacey Hahn, Rob Kushler, Kathleen Moore, Eric LaRock, Cindy Sifonis, and Sally Tardella.

Mr. Sudol acknowledged the perceived similarity with the Bachelor of Integrative Studies program, but he also emphasized that the two programs are inherently different. Ms. Moore then outlined the highlights of the new program. She began by reminding the Senate of the Master of Arts in Liberal Studies program approved in 2001 that laid the foundation for a rigorous interdisciplinary liberal studies experience at OU. Under the leadership of Natalie Cole, its founding director, the MALS program quickly obtained full membership in the American Graduate Liberal Studies Programs. She noted that interdisciplinary programs are a College growth priority, and cited the recent initiatives in quantitative biology, engineering biology, actuarial science (partnering with business), and a revised distribution requirement within the College. According to Ms. Moore, the committee began working in 2006 by reviewing existing liberal studies programs. It was frustrating to learn that there were no standard models, so the committee decided to come up with its own recommendations: a foundation of two courses, LBS100 Exploration of the Arts and Sciences and LBS200 Interdisciplinary Approaches to Liberal Studies for a total of 8 credits. The core components would be in either an interdisciplinary concentration (e.g. urban studies, criminal justice) or a combination of two Arts and Sciences minors (with possible exceptions to be approved by a faculty executive committee). Another methods course at the 300-or 400-level is required, as well as an intensive two-semester capstone, Senior Thesis I and II.

Ms. Moore then presented a chart that outlined the differences between BALS and the BIS programs. She remarked that the BALS program is aimed toward beginning college freshmen, in contrast to the BIS program, whose committed mission is to serve transfer students or non-traditional students. In addition, the independent major in the College is a very small program, with one or two students at any time, and is very specific to each student. Students in the BALS

program will create a community of students. The minimum for the BALS program is 44 credits and can go above 56 credits, depending on the minors chosen. BIS entails a minimum of 28 credits. Ms. Moore then went on to discuss budgetary implications, noting a request for a dedicated faculty member in the third year of the program, funding for a faculty director, and overload for faculty teaching in the program. Significant funding is earmarked for faculty and graduate student development of interdisciplinary teaching and research, and for graduate students who will function as teaching assistants. The budget will be revised annually to reflect the actual situation.

According to Ms. Moore, it is anticipated that this program will attract creative, high-achieving FTIAC students who do not want to be put into a disciplinary box. In addition, the program will generate alumni with skills and knowledge to deal with a challenging, fluid future. An overarching goal is to encourage the university community to break down disciplinary silos and cross boundaries.

Mr. Grossman inquired whether BIS has written a letter of support. Ms. Moore said they had not, but that the concerns raised have been addressed, for example, the issue of taking a minor outside the College. Mr. Leibert noted that some of the language seems baffling, such as the term "outcomes," which was not defined in the presentation. Ms. Moore replied that the term refers to the outcomes approved by the Assessment committee for the program. Mr. Leibert also noted terms such as "benchmarking," "best practices," "leveraging," "scaffolding," and "deep structuring." Ms. Moore said that those terms refer to the LEAP material, and that the proposal itself is not comprised of such complex terminology. Mr. Leibert then asked about the employability of graduates of the program; Ms. Moore believes that the highly-motivated students expected in the program will go on to graduate and professional schools. She noted that the students who expressed the greatest interest in interdisciplinary studies in a 2008 high school survey were those with the highest ACT scores. She further noted that many Oakland County employers value the skills of critical thinking and writing, and that graduates will be well prepared to pursue jobs in a variety of fields.

Mr. Larrabee wondered about the lack of a letter from BIS, and suggested that their concerns be shared with the Senate so that Senators feel satisfied with moving the program forward. Mr. Moudgil asked whether other review committees have weighed in, to which Ms. Moore replied that SPRC recommended approval, whereas SBRC has not. Ms. McMillon, chair of Senate Budget Review, remarked that the committee had raised several questions about the program but that the proposers had not yet responded to them. Ms. Moore was surprised by that. Ms. McMillon said that the short blurb-like responses that had come back were not satisfactory. Ms. Moore asked if she could meet with the committee to discuss. Ms. McMillon indicated that written responses would be required in advance of a potential meeting.

Mr. Kruk applauded the goals of the program, and added that he would like to see a language requirement, among other things. He expressed concern, however, about students who would seek to take the path of least resistance and find an outlet in what he characterized as "ridiculous programs" such as Basketweaving 101. Ms. Moore said that rigor at the 300-level was taken into account for the program core, but that the faculty committee overseeing the program will need to take ownership of this. She does not see this program as any type of "short cut." Mr. Russell, a

member of UCUI, noted that the committee spent most of its time on the impact of the program on BIS. Questions raised by UCUI were satisfactorily answered by the proposers, according to Mr. Russell, and it was clear that BIS and BALS are two distinct programs that will attract different types of students. Mr. Grimm then asked who would teach LBS100 and LBS200. He noted that interdisciplinarity is itself a type of disciplinarity, and said that he, for one, could not teach those courses. Ms. Moore replied that the same situation was encountered with the MALS program, but that it ultimately has worked, with 18 faculty members from 10 departments to date developing exciting interdisciplinary courses. She also noted that interviews with new faculty have revealed a nearly universal interest in teaching interdisciplinary courses. Ms. Hay asked Ms. Moore to return to the slide in her presentation that listed the core classes, and clarify whether humanities courses were included in the program. Ms. Moore confirmed that humanities courses were included, and would certainly be part of general education. Ms. Awbrey then expressed that in the interest of time she would enter into the discussion of the BALS program at the next meeting.

Ms. Miller moved the next item, with a second provided by Ms. Piskulich.

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees approval of a [program leading to the Master of Science in Mechatronics.](#)

Mr. Das gave a short introduction, noting that the word Mechatronics denotes that two departments are involved – mechanical and electrical/computer engineering. He then gave the floor to Mr. Cheek, who explained the prevalence of mechatronics in the devices we use everyday based on control systems with microchips. The program involves multidisciplinary topics, with theory as well as hardware implementation. The combined areas of study will be a better fit for industry needs, particularly in the future of hybrid vehicle systems. He described his recent participation in a test of a new lane-keeping assist device that will correct a vehicle's veering out of a designated lane. He then highlighted the degree requirements for the program, and noted a lack of such programs both state- and nation-wide. They are far more common in Europe, Japan, and Australia. Budgetary needs of the program involve one new faculty member in the first year. In summary, the proposers believe that the program will quickly become self-sustaining.

Mr. Moudgil asked whether the Senate review committees had submitted their recommendations. It was confirmed that Graduate Council, SPRC, and SBRC recommended approval. The Assessment Committee would be reporting shortly.

Mr. Grossman expressed concern that this final program proposal was not on the agenda posted to the Senate website 32 hours ago. Ms. Jhashi explained that the SBRC made its report available to the Secretary only the night before, and that in the interest of getting the program launched for the fall semester, she asked the Steering committee members on short notice to give the program a place on the agenda. Mr. Tracy confirmed that the Steering committee had objection. Mr. Grossman found it troubling that one couldn't adequately prepare for the meeting given the late

posting, but added that Senators could give the program a thorough review before the next meeting.

The last item of new business was approval of a motion to staff Senate Standing committees. The motion was made by Mr. Grimm, duly seconded by Ms. Jackson, and approved without discussion.

Academic Computing Committee

Susan Evans (CAS -- Studio Art) -- 2009-2011
Darrin Hanna (SECS) -- 2009-2011
Meghan Harris (SON) -- 2009-2011 *Chair*
Andrea Kozak (CAS -- Psychology) -- 2009-2011
Julia Rodriguez (Library) -- 2009-2011

Xiaodong Deng (SBA) -- 2010-2012
John McEneaney (SESH) -- 2010-2012
Sara Maher (SHS) -- 2010-2012
Yang Xia (CAS -- Physics) -- 2010-2012

Academic Conduct Committee

Anne Becker (CAS -- Communication & Journalism)--2009-2011
Meghan Harris (SON) -- 2009-2011
Beth Kraemer (Library) -- 2009-2011
Mike Latcha (SECS) -- 2009-2011 *Chair*
Mark Navin (CAS -- Philosophy) -- 2009-2011
James Quinn (SEHS) -- 2009-2011
Barb Penprase (SON) -- 2009-2011
Rachel Smydra (CAS -- English) -- 2009-2011

Dominique Daniel (Library) -- 2010-2012
Fred Hoffman (SBA) -- 2010-2012
John Kim (SBA) -- 2010-2012
Laszlo Liptak (CAS-Mathematics and Statistics) -- 2010-2012
Aldona Pobutsky (CAS-Modern Languages & Literatures) -- 2010-2012
Hoda Abdel-Aty-Zohdy (SECS) -- 2010-2012
(1 vacancy)

Academic Standing and Honors Committee

Rebecca Gaydos (CAS-Linguistics) -- 2009-2010
Dan Ring (Library) -- 2009-2010

Ji-Eun Lee (SEHS) -- 2010-2012
Xia Wang (SECS) -- 2010-2012

Assessment Committee

Carrie Motyka (SON) -- 2008-2011 *Chair*

Fran Meuser (CAS--Modern Languages & Literatures) -- 2008-2011
Aaron Bird (SHS) -- 2008-2011
Beth Kraemer (Library) -- 2009-2012
Austin Murphy (SBA) -- 2009-2012
Pat Piskulich (CAS-Political Science) -- 2009-2012
Senkar Sengupta (SECS) -- 2009-2012
Robert Van Til (SECS) 2009-2012 at-large

David Kidger (CAS-Music, Theatre, Dance) -- 2010-2013
Cynthia Miree-Coppin (SBA) -- 2010-2013 at-large
Annette Osborne (SEHS) -- 2010-2013

Athletics Committee

Erica Ruegg (SEHS) -- 2008-2011
Sheldon Gordon (CAS-Biological Sciences) -- 2009-2012
Chris Stiller (SHS) -- 2009-2012
Buck Dillon (SBA) -- 2010-2013

Budget Review Committee

Shea Howell (CAS -- Communications & Journalism) -- 2009-2011
Sandy Pelfrey (SBA) -- 2009-2011
Mike Latcha (SECS) -- 2009-2012
Kevin Murphy (SBA) -- 2009-2012

Dan Aloï (SECS) -- 2010-2013
Gwen McMillon (SEHS) -- 2010-2013 *Chair*

Campus Development and Environment Committee

Mark Isken (SBA) -- 2009-2011 *Chair*
Michael Long (SEHS) -- 2009-2011
Sharon Mills-Wisnecki (SON) -- 2009-2011

Claude Baillargeon (CAS-Art History) -- 2010-2012
Annie Gilson (CAS-English) -- 2010-2012

General Education Committee

Henry Aigbedo (SBA) -- 2009-2011
Tim Larrabee (SEHS) -- 2009-2011 *Chair*
Lorenzo Smith (SECS) -- 2009-2011
Lynne Williams (SHS) -- 2009-2011

Kathleen Battles (CAS-Communications & Journalism) -- 2010-2012
Debra Bernstein-Siegel (CAS-Music, Theatre, Dance) -- 2010-2012
Ray Liedka (CAS-Sociology/Anthropology) -- 2010-2012
Laura Pittiglio (SON) -- 2010-2012
(1 Vacancy)

Honorary Degree Committee

Aldona Pobutsky (CAS--Modern Languages & Literatures) -- 2008-2011

Mary Zeppelin (SEHS) -- 2008-2011

Rasul Chaudhry (CAS-Biological Sciences) -- 2009-2012

Kanako Taku (CAS-Psychology) -- 2009-2012

Mike Polis (SECS) -- 2010-2013

Ron Tracy (SBA) -- 2010-2013

Library Committee

Bill Cramer (Library) -- 2009-2011

Caroline Jumel (CAS-Modern Languages & Literatures) -- 2009-2011

Mary Lewis (CAS-Psychology) -- 2009-2011 *Chair*

Shawn Lombardo (Library) -- 2009-2011

Karl Majeske (SBA) -- 2009-2011

Rob Anderson (CAS-English) -- 2010-2012

Amy Baner-Berceli (CAS-Biological Sciences) -- 2010-2012

Kris Condic (Library) -- 2010-2012

Florence Dallo (SHS) -- 2010-2012

Dominique Daniel (KL) -- 2010-2012

Youngjoo Kim (SEHS) -- 2010-2012

Marisa Ferrari (SON) -- 2010-2012

Barbara Oakley (SECS) -- 2010-2012

Planning Review Committee

Frances Jackson (SON) -- 2008-2011 *Chair*

George Stoffan (CAS-Music, Theatre, Dance) -- 2008-2011

Alberto Rojo (CAS-Physics) -- 2008-2011

Debatosh Debnath (SECS) -- 2010-2013

Tom Discenna (CAS-Communications & Journalism) -- 2010-2013

Paul Licker (SBA) -- 2010-2013

Research Committee

Laila Guessous (SECS) -- 2009-2011 *Chair*

Sumit Dinda (SHS)--2009-2011

Barbara Harrison (SON) -- 2009-2011

Ravi Khattree (CAS-Mathematics & Statistics) -- 2009-2011

Hongwei Qu (SECS) -- 2009-2011

Natalie Cole (CAS-English) -- 2010-2012

Rob Nehmer (SBA) -- 2010-2012

Jo Reger (CAS-Sociology/Anthropology) -- 2010-2012

Student Academic Support Committee

Derek Hastings (CAS-History) -- 2008-2011

Stephen Filler (CAS-Modern Languages & Literatures) -- 2008-2011 *Chair*

John Corso (CAS-Art History) -- 2009-2012

Julie Ricks-Doneen (SEHS) -- 2009-2012

Darrell Schmidt (CAS-Mathematics & Statistics) -- 2010-2013

Rosalind Woodson (SON) -- 2010-2013

Teaching and Learning Committee

Fred Hoffman (SBA) -- 2009-2011 *Chair*

Lisa Levinson (CAS-Linguistics) -- 2009-2011

Fritz McDonald (CAS-Philosophy) -- 2009-2011

Addington Coppin (SBA) -- 2010-2012

Robert Sidelinger (CAS-Communications & Journalism) -- 2010-2012

(1 vacancy)

University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction

Michael Mitchell (CAS-Music, Theatre, Dance) -- 2008-2011

Jia Li (SECS) -- 2008-2011

Jim Nugent (CAS-Writing & Rhetoric) -- 2008-2011

Charles McGlothlin (SHS) -- 2009-2012

Nancy Brown (SEHS) -- 2009-2012

Joel Russell (CAS-Chemistry) -- 2009-2012

Seong Cho (SBA) -- 2010-2013

Paul Kubicek (CAS-Political Science) -- 2010-2013

Laura Pittiglio (SON) -- 2010-2013

The Senate then approved a motion to hold a meeting in May to consider specifically the four items of new business from today's meeting. A date will be identified and announced. Mr. Tracy moved to adjourn, Ms. Miller provided a second, and the meeting concluded at 5:15.

Respectfully submitted,
Tamara Machmut-Jhashi
Secretary to the University Senate