Ohio University Faculty Senate
Monday, December 5, 2016
Margaret M. Walter Hall, Room 135, 7:10pm
Meeting Summary

MEETING AGENDA

I. President McDavis and Executive Vice President and Provost Benoit
II. Roll Call and Approval of the November 7, 2016 Minutes
III. Chair’s Report – Joe McLaughlin
   - Updates and Announcements
   - Policy Review – Faculty Senate Rules of Order & Voting
   - Upcoming Senate Meeting: January 9, 2017, 7:10PM, Walter Hall 235
IV. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee – Charles Buchanan
   a. Resolution to Revise Credit Hours for Certificates—First Reading
V. Finance & Facilities Committee – Susan Williams
VI. Promotion & Tenure Committee – Ben Bates
VII. Professional Relations Committee – Sherrie Gradin
VIII. New Business
IX. Adjournment

Meeting called to order by Joe McLaughlin (Faculty Senate Chair) at 7:10PM

I. President McDavis
   ❖ Topic 1: Sanctuary University. McDavis addressed topics associated with declaring OHIO as a sanctuary university. McDavis noted that there have been many positive, useful discussions among faculty and among the administration. While faculty and administrators are supportive of some ideas that have been discussed, McDavis argued that it is too premature for OHIO to take action given the number and scope of unknowns. Yet, McDavis emphasized that it is a topic worthy of discussion. McDavis sent letters to Senator Brown and Senator Portman; the letters expressed concerns about possible futures and praised the positive impacts of the DACA program. In the letters, McDavis offered to be a resource to discuss OHIO’s experiences with students enrolled through the DACA program. McDavis noted that OHIO needs to continue to have discussions while we watch for potential changes in federal policy and consider how those changes may impact OHIO’s operations, students, and stakeholders. For example, McDavis noted that it will be important to consider potential implications for federal funding.
   ❖ Topic 2: House Bill 48 Conceal Carry. House Bill 48 (Conceal Carry) was passed by Ohio’s House of Representatives in November 2015. The bill had hearings in the Senate last week; the fourth and fifth (final) hearings are scheduled for this week. All information indicates that the bill is likely to pass; there is no reason to believe that the Governor will not sign it into law. Broadly, the bill would allow people with concealed carry licenses to bring handguns to certain gun-free zones including college and university campuses. At the time of the Faculty Senate meeting, the bill allows each university’s Board of Trustees to decide if their university will allow and conceal-and-carry and each university’s rules and penalties. McDavis stated that OHIO intends to collect input from constituencies and stakeholders across all campuses before making recommendations to the Board of Trustees. Specifically, plans are to develop a summary of opinions using input collected from the various senates, surveys, open forums, etc. and to provide the summary to the Board of Trustees.
   ❖ Topic 3: Speakers on Campus. After the most recent elections, OHIO has hosted a few speakers on campus. These speakers have discussed various issues; some opinions have been controversial. McDavis mentioned that he has heard from some who expressed concerns. McDavis noted that OHIO
is an academy of ideas with a strong, proud history of hosting a variety of speakers on campus. Many speakers may have perspectives and opinions that may be controversial to some. OHIO’s tradition to allow for open forums in which people can freely express themselves is a positive attribute that is a foundation of the university.

- **Topic 4: Ohio State.** McDavis noted that our hearts go out to all those at Ohio State. McDavis contacted Ohio State’s President to express our sentiments and support. McDavis assured senators that OHIO has made efforts to prepare for a variety of scenarios; there are plans in place to address situations effectively.

I. EVPP Benoit

- **Topic: US News & World Report Rankings.** Prior to the most recent Board of Trustees meeting, Benoit organized information for a presentation to the Board about the U.S. News & World Report rankings. For the Faculty Senate meeting, Benoit provided specific information about one of the ranking categories: Faculty Resources. The following provides a summary of Benoit’s explanation of select measures:
  - **Percentage of Full-Time Faculty.** This measures the percentage of faculty who are employed by the university full-time. The measure’s weight within the Faculty Resources category is 5%; its weight among all items used to calculate the overall ranking is 1%. For OHIO, the measure includes both Group I and Group II faculty. Benoit noted that examination of the data identified an increase in part-time faculty, which can largely be attributed to the rapidly growing online programs offered by the College of Health Sciences and Professions. However, OHIO’s ranking for the percentage of full-time faculty stayed the same from the previous year (95%). Benoit also noted that the number of full-time faculty increased for most units.
  - **Percentage of Full-Time Faculty with Terminal Degrees.** This measures the percentage of full-time faculty who have terminal degrees. The measure’s weight within the Faculty Resources category is 15%; its weight among all items used to calculate the overall ranking is 3%. Benoit noted that examination of the data identified missing data in the information provided for the ranking. Specifically, 45 faculty members who were categorized as not having a terminal degree had missing data; these faculty members do have terminal degrees. Benoit noted that one possibility for the missing data is that new faculty members may be ABD at the time of hire. Later, this information is not updated after the faculty member earns his / her degree. Benoit estimated that OHIO’s percentage would have increased approximately 4-5% if the missing data had been corrected. OHIO will work to keep more accurate records.
  - **Others Measures.** Benoit noted other measures – such as faculty-to-student ratio and faculty compensation – that remained the same or improved as compared to the previous year.

Benoit addressed some conclusions that were drawn from the data; she argued that characterizing Faculty Resources as representing a decrease in academic quality is incorrect. She explained these measures do not capture academic quality. Instead, U.S. News & World Report is measuring faculty as resources. Benoit argued that OHIO has several items as part of its dashboard that are better measures of academic quality. Benoit also suggested other qualitative measures capture academic quality: Presidential Teacher Awards, Provost Awards for Excellence in Teaching, research awards, $66 million in state-sponsored, federal-sponsored, and grant funding, Ohio Newsmakers, being named among top producers of Fulbright students by the Chronicle of Higher Education, Provost undergraduate research fund, Innovation Strategy funding, etc. Benoit concluded that the work faculty and students do inside and outside the classroom to shape educational programs and enrich educational experiences are measures of academic quality.

**Questions and Discussions**
A senator mentioned rumors he had heard regarding substantial future budget cuts and asked if these rumors were true. As a second question, the senator asked for discussion about what the administration sees as future budget challenges. Benoit said she has not used the word “cuts” and explained that there was a recent message about the budget shared across campus. The message in Compass stated “As is typical at this point in the process, conservative revenue estimates combined with desired expenditure growth produced a revenues and expenses gap of approximately $25M, which is similar to where we were last year at this time.” Benoit remarked that, at this point in the process, OHIO is better at determining expenses than forecasting revenue. For example, the cost of healthcare is generally a very predictable expense. The process is currently focused on the task of determining how to balance revenue and expenses; the task involves monitoring costs and identifying existing / new revenue sources. Benoit noted that OHIO has been very productive in this task. In terms of future challenges, Benoit stated that OHIO needs to focus on future sources of revenue and revenue growth as well as managing costs. As examples, OHIO will need to effectively argue for funding from the State of Ohio, which includes both SSI and capital investment funding. OHIO will also need to continue its efforts to compete effectively for tuition revenue in a highly competitive marketplace.

In response to remarks about the rumors, Benoit stated that Deans and other unit administrators have not been told that 10% budget cuts are required. Deans have been asked to be more efficient / effective with respect to managing costs as well as develop existing and new sources of revenue. Deans have been asked to address budget deficit projects; several options are available to do this such as reallocating current resources and/or identifying new sources of funding. Benoit noted that it is possible that some Deans may be leaning toward considering cuts to address unit budget deficit projections.

McDavis remarked that there have been budget discussions at the state level. For example, there has been some discussion that other state expenses such as Medicaid could absorb more funding from the state, which may translate into less funding for higher education. As such, McDavis suggested that rumors may reflect discussions about possible funding reductions at the state level. McDavis noted that higher education has not been told of cuts from the state yet also acknowledged that specific funding from the state is not currently known. Based upon the current metrics used for funding, OHIO is doing very well; expectations are that this will continue.

Benoit also noted that there have been some discussions about slowing down the progress toward completing some initiatives. OHIO has several new initiatives; some may need to be prioritized to address potential budget issues.

A senator asked about the provision in HB 48 that reduces the violation from a felony to a misdemeanor. McDavis explained that if the Board of Trustees does not take action, then the penalty is reduced from a felony to a misdemeanor. If passed, this will be part of the law; OHIO cannot change that. On the other hand, if a Board of Trustees does take action, then the institutional penalties may be different according to the institution’s policies. Benoit noted that the situation becomes more complex when you consider co-located campuses if the two or more institutions have different policies; this could be a problem. McDavis asked faculty and other constituencies for insights, input, and ideas and remarked that OHIO will likely to have people with opposing views on the issue.

A senator mentioned that faculty on Southern campus have been trained as first responders. McDavis noted that this is a great idea.

A senator thanked Benoit for clarifying some measures used in the US News & World Report ranking. The senator remarked that some appear to be relatively easy fixes while others may not so. As such, the senator asked what the University is doing to improve the U.S. News & World Report ranking. Benoit explained that OHIO purchased a supplemental report to provide more details about the measures and comparative rankings; OHIO had not done so before. This
additional information will enable a more detailed scrutiny of the data and a better understanding of the rankings. Benoit also cautioned against chasing the ranking; some measures are contradictory to each other and some measures may not be consistent with OHIO’s values. Benoit remarked that recent news stories have even suggested that a few universities may have misrepresented some of their data in order to improve their institution’s rankings. This is not something OHIO has any intention of doing. Benoit noted that OHIO should provide data that is as error-free as possible yet should avoid making changes that are contrary to what OHIO values as a university.

• A senator thanked Benoit for clarifying selected measures and for mentioning the positive impact of several exceptional OHIO professors. As a follow-up to explanations about the Faculty Resources category, he asked about the other measures not discussed. Specifically, he noted that the two primary measures discussed – percentage of full-time faculty and percentage of full-time faculty with terminal degrees – only accounted for 20% of the Faculty Resources category. He said that he, given what she presented, he failed to see why OHIO had dropped 85 places in the rankings in four years and 40 spots in the latest year. Benoit noted that two of the measures not discussed in her presentation are related to class size: percentage of undergraduate classes with fewer than 20 students and percentage of undergraduate classes with more than 50 students. These have a large influence on the ranking for Faculty Resources category. Benoit remarked that the State of Ohio has driven all universities across the state to improve efficiency by having larger classes when appropriate yet improving efficiency negatively impacts a university’s ranking. The administration has examined the relationship between changes in class sizes with retention and between changes in class sizes and graduation; no relationships were found.

• A senator asked if there were university rankings other than the U.S. News & World Report rankings of universities. Benoit stated that there are other rankings such as international rankings and a ranking by Forbes. Although U.S. News & World Report is a well-known name among rankings, it is also important to note that one of the magazine’s goals is to sell magazines. Universities may focus on different rankings and include those in admission / recruitment materials. Benoit argues that any university should focus on the rankings that most accurately capture and reflect the university’s values.

• A senator asked if there are factors other than class size that were not discussed yet were included in the Faculty Resources category. Benoit confirmed that there are no other measures in the Faculty Resources category not discussed. The senator noted that class sizes in the senator’s college have increased; this trend may be a concern to many. Benoit noted that increasing class size does make a difference in some classes. However, other classes may be taught in larger classes without a loss in academic quality – assuming the instructor adjusts the class structure to be appropriate for the size. Benoit noted that it is important to create class sizes that are most effective for the educational experience.

• A guest faculty member asked for additional details about concerns with declaring OHIO as a sanctuary university. McDavis explained that, when a university becomes a sanctuary, the expectation is that an undocumented student may attend and work without fear of retributions. However, if there is a change in the law and a university declares that it is a sanctuary, then the result may be that the university could risk federal funding. Federal funds may include Pell grants that students may use to help with the cost of tuition and/or University federal funding for programs and faculty research. As such, McDavis argues that OHIO should wait to see what the costs may be before declaring itself as a sanctuary university.

• A guest faculty member mentioned that OHIO could respond with something less than officially declaring OHIO as a sanctuary university. McDavis and Benoit agreed. The guest noted that there is something to be said for being prepared. The guest mentioned a few concerns, which were consistent with statements made in an op-ed article in the New York Times written by Evan McMullin. The guest quoted the article. Referring to president-elect Trump, the article states: “He
had questioned judicial independence, threatened the freedom of the press, called for violating Muslims’ equal protection under the law, promised the use of torture and attacked Americans based on their gender, race and religion. He has also undermined critical democratic norms including peaceful debate and transitions of power, commitment to truth, freedom from foreign interference and abstention from the use of executive power for political retribution.”

The guest stated that no one knows what will happen and argued that there is an extraordinary situation in which a president-elect does not seem to believe in the norms of democracy. The guest agreed with McDavis that it is too early to make decisions given the unknowns, yet suggests that OHIO should make all efforts to prepare for the future. The guest noted that he imagines the presidents of Ohio’s universities may be put into a position in which they will need to respond with respect to both financial pressures as well as upholding university’s values. The guest asked if the presidents have been engaged in conversations to discuss possibilities.

McDavis explained that he has been part of conversations with the other presidents from Ohio’s universities as well as conversations with presidents of select land grant universities. Discussions have been about what universities believe and what universities can do. As such, McDavis stated that conversations are happening now yet also noted that these conversations may not be happening publicly. This is largely because discussions are speculative; no one knows what will happen in the future.

• A senator asked what faculty can do now to support and help students. The senator remarked that some have immediate concerns and worries. Students look to the University’s leadership to make statements proactively. The senator further remarked that the University should not wait to be reactionary to changes. McDavis agreed. The senator asked what the University is doing to be prepared to do now.

McDavis said his goal was to express OHIO’s perspective in his recent Thanksgiving message and noted that it is important for OHIO to reinforce our values. These should be voiced publicly. In addition, leaders across the university are having individual and group conversations with students and others. Benoit said that OHIO is already doing some of the behaviors that are included in the call to become a sanctuary university; many are already in place and part of OHIO’s traditions and culture. Benoit noted that there is no intention to change those. OHIO has also extended opportunities, resources, and support to students – or anyone who has concerns – to reinforce the inclusiveness and diversity of our university community. Currently, OHIO is trying to navigate what it would be to be labelled as a sanctuary university.

McDavis shared a story about a conference call several of the university leaders had approximately three days after the election. During the conference call, several issues were discussed including how to support individual students and student groups who might have concerns. The leaders on the conference call decided to take two immediate actions: to reinforce OHIO’s values in the President’s Thanksgiving message and to provide extended support to students through student-focused offices. Benoit remarked that she has heard several stories about faculty who have been reaching out to students. McDavis argued that assisting our students, reinforcing a message of diversity and inclusion, and acting to support our communities is a shared responsibility; faculty, staff, and administrators have been reaching out to students who we believe might be impacted by what is to come. OHIO is having internal conversations about the what-if scenarios to be prepared for future possibilities.

• A senator asked about conversations with deans, chairs, and/or school directors regarding issues related to diversity and inclusion. The senator noted that it is good that faculty have been supportive yet it is unclear about what the leadership of the academic units have been told or have done. McDavis said that the administration is trying to make sure that academic leadership feels
empowered to have a voice to help students. Benoit noted that we create the inclusive community – every one of us.

I. Craig Bantz, Office of Information Technology

- **Topic 1: Phishing Schemes.** Bantz explained that OHIO has seen a rise in fraudulent e-mails trying to get users to provide personal information. Emails may ask for sensitive information including W2s, social security numbers, tax records, etc. As one response to these threats, the Office of Information Technology (OIT) restricted access to My HR to only on-campus addresses. However, Bantz noted that this restriction has been a problem for some faculty who want to access from off-campus systems. As such, OIT is launching a change to the system that will give up some convenience for increased security. The change is a two-factor engagement, which refers to using “something you know” (e.g., your password) and “something you have” (e.g., a text to your phone). For access to My HR, the two-factor engagement will be going live as an optional enrollment through March 2017. After March 2017, it will be mandatory. The timing coincides with the new W2 releases. OIT will offer 24-hour phone support and in-person support during business hours. Bantz stated that the benefits for signing up early include increased protection, less wait if you have problems, and access to My HR off-campus. Bantz noted that OHIO is likely to increase the instances of two-factor engagements across other systems such as those with access to highly sensitive information.

Questions and Discussions
- A guest thanked Bantz for his work and asked if the two-factor solution would require cell phone service. Lack of cell phone service could be a problem is some regional areas. Bantz said that cell service would be a great solution but not required; there are other options available including a phone application or a call via a landline.

II. Roll Call and Approval of the November 7, 2016 Minutes

- Roll call (K. Hartman)
- Minutes were approved by a voice vote.

III. Chair’s Report (Joe McLaughlin)

- **Topic 1: Updates and Announcements**
  - **Resolutions.** McLaughlin stated that the Provost has signed all three recent resolutions.
  - **Bobcat Pledge.** McLaughlin shared that the Student Senate has been promoting the Bobcat Pledge, which is as follows:
    
    “I believe everybody has the right to live in a community where they are included, accepted, valued and respected. I pledge not to use demeaning language or degrade others. I choose to exercise my voice in ways that encourage dialogue and critical thought. I will stand up and intervene against discrimination.”

    McLaughlin encouraged faculty senators to participate in the pledge.
  - **Cultural Competency Courses.** McLaughlin announced that a faculty group has been formed to discuss the possibility of addressing cultural competencies within OHIO’s general education requirements. McLaughlin will be meeting with the group soon. The goal is to report to the Faculty Senate during the April 2017 meeting.
  - **Faculty Senate January meeting.** The next meeting of the Faculty Senate is scheduled for Monday, January 9. The meeting is scheduled on the first day of classes; it may or may not
cancelled. Considering House Bill 48 and sanctuary university discussions, there may be a need to meet on time-sensitive issues. McLaughlin stated that the meeting is scheduled as planned yet senators may receive an e-mail cancelling or changing the date. McLaughlin asked for a show of hands for those with teaching conflicts on the following Tuesday (January 17) or the following Wednesday (January 18). By a show of hands, there were approximately six senators with conflicts with either or both nights.

Topic 2: Policy Review – Faculty Senate Rules of Order & Voting

- McLaughlin provided a review of Faculty Senate voting policies and procedures. The discussion included options and general uses for each of the four types of voting: voice vote, rising vote, roll call vote, and ballot vote.
  - Please refer to Appendix A for a quick reference of the Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure.

- McLaughlin reviewed language in the Handbook that explains OHIO’s policy for change of instructor, time, or place of meeting (refer to language below). McLaughlin reminded faculty senators that changes should follow the policy.

  IV.A.2. Change of Instructor, Time, or Place of Meeting
  Change of instructor, time, or place of a meeting for a scheduled class may be made only with the approval of the department chair or director of the school who shall report in writing all such changes to the dean and to the Registrar.

Topic 3: Upcoming Senate Meeting: Monday, January 9, 2017

Questions and Discussions
- None

IV. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee (Charles Buchanan)

- Resolution to Revise Credit Hours for Certificates—Second Reading and Vote
  - The resolution is offered by EPSA to fix minimum and maximum hours for graduate certificate programs including graduate interdisciplinary certificates, graduate specialized certificates, and graduate specialized stackable certificates. Changes between the first and second reading include an addition to the language that asks UCC and EPSA to discuss a process by which exceptions to these limits might be granted and report back to the Faculty Senate by the April 2017 meeting.
  - Please refer to Appendix B for the full-text of the resolution.
    - Resolution as amended passes by voice vote.

Questions and Discussions
- None

V. Finance & Facilities Committee (Susan Williams)

- Topic 1: Faculty Benefits. Williams stated that the Benefits Advisory Committee (BAC) met to discuss recommendations to the Total Compensation Committee for the next year only. The recommendations are (1) a change in the prescription plan, (2) combining the faculty and staff plans to avoid the tax, (3) the dependent eligibility audit, and (4) an increase in the long-term disability plan to increase the maximum to $20,000 per month.
Topic 2: Elimination of Eastern Campus HMO. As it currently stands, this HMO will no longer be available starting next year. Williams attended a meeting on the Eastern campus earlier in the day. Faculty and staff members were very impassioned about their position and provided well-reasoned arguments. OHIO’s argument deals with issues of efficiency and fairness.

Questions and Discussions
• A senator said that there were several faculty and staff who have strong opinions about the changes; some are dissatisfied with the change. The senator asked if changes can be phased in over a three-year period rather than next year. Williams noted that some people who attended the meeting had done research about the impact of the changes and shared that the Benefits Office has expressed an interest to work with those negatively impacted. The senator explained that some are willing to pay the difference to keep the current plan yet there does not appear to be a willingness among the decision-makers to consider this option.

VI. Promotion & Tenure Committee (Ben Bates)
Topic: Appeals. Bates announced that the committee has met to discuss submitted appeals. However, confidentiality prohibits information sharing publicly.

Questions and Discussions
• None

VII. Professional Relations Committee (Sherrie Gradin)
Topic: Updates. Gradin shared that there are no updates since the last meeting. However, the committee has a few items in development for next semester.

Questions and Discussions
• None

VIII. New Business
Topic: Future Resolutions. McLaughlin asked faculty senators to share ideas about or requests for a Sense of Senate Resolution or other possible resolutions about declaring OHIO as a Sanctuary University or a Sense of Senate Resolution about House Bill 48 Conceal Carry. Although there are no resolutions currently in development, the Executive Committee is open to discussions.

Questions and Discussions
• A senator asked for an update about Presidential Search. McLaughlin said that there will be finalists from the search on campus early in the spring semester. There will be open forums. However, no dates have been determined for the visits or the open forums.
• A senator asked if the newspaper was correct in its reporting of the possible candidates. McLaughlin stated that he is unable to comment; he signed a non-disclosure agreement and is bound legally to respect confidentiality.

IX. Adjournment
• The meeting was adjourned at 8:48PM.
Appendix A

**Basic Rules of Precedence:**
1. When a motion is being considered, any motion of higher precedence may be proposed, but no motion of lower precedence may be proposed.
2. Motions are considered and voted on in reverse order to their proposal. The motion last proposed is considered and disposed of first.

**Common Motions in Order of Precedence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Privileged Motions: Motions of urgency entitled to immediate consideration.</th>
<th>INTERRUPT SPEAKER?</th>
<th>SECOND NEEDED?</th>
<th>MOTION DEBATABLE?</th>
<th>VOTE NEEDED?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) *Adjourn the meeting</td>
<td>I move that we adjourn.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) *Recess the meeting</td>
<td>I move that we recess until...</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Questions of Privilege (Noise, temperature, etc.)</td>
<td>I raise the question of privilege….</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsidiary Motions: Motions which alter the main motion, or delay or hasten its consideration.</th>
<th>INTERRUPT SPEAKER?</th>
<th>SECOND NEEDED?</th>
<th>MOTION DEBATABLE?</th>
<th>VOTE NEEDED?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4) Postpone temporarily</td>
<td>I move we table the motion.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Close debate</td>
<td>I move to close debate and vote immediately.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) *Limit or extend debate</td>
<td>I move that the debate on this question be limited to…</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) *Postpone to a certain time</td>
<td>I move we postpone this matter until…</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) *Refer to committee</td>
<td>I move we refer this matter to committee.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) *Amend</td>
<td>I move that we amend this motion by….</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Motions: Motions bringing substantive proposals before the assembly for consideration and action.</th>
<th>INTERRUPT SPEAKER?</th>
<th>SECOND NEEDED?</th>
<th>MOTION DEBATABLE?</th>
<th>VOTE NEEDED?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10) *Main motions and restorative main motions</td>
<td>I move that…</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Can be amended.
**Debatable if no other motion is pending.
The following motions can be offered whenever they are needed and have no order of precedence. They should be handled as soon as they arise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>INTERRUPT SPEAKER?</th>
<th>SECOND NEEDED?</th>
<th>MOTION DEBATABLE?</th>
<th>VOTE NEEDED?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incidental Motions: Motions that arise incidentally out of the business at hand. They relate to matters incidental to the conduct of the meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Appeal a decision of the chair</td>
<td>I appeal the chair’s decision.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Suspend the rules</td>
<td>I move to suspend the rules and….</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Point of order</td>
<td>I rise to a point of order.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Raise a question relating to procedure.</td>
<td>I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Withdrawal of a motion</td>
<td>I move to withdraw my motion.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Separate a multi-part question for voting purposes</td>
<td>I move division on the question.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Common Voting Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voting Method</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voice Vote</td>
<td>Vote by voice (aye, nay)</td>
<td>Voice vote is the most common method used. Presiding Officer calls for a vote and determines the result by a volume of voices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rising Vote</td>
<td>Vote by raising hands*</td>
<td>Rising vote may be used by Presiding Officer to verify an indecisive vote or in response to a call from a member of the assembly. Votes that require a definite number or proportion of votes is usually taken using a rising vote.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Roll Call Vote | Vote by aye/no or yea/nay after name is called* | Roll call votes are common when members of a group are representative of others. If a roll call vote is not specified in the bylaws, a roll call vote may be requested by a member of the group.  
  - The Secretary is responsible for reading the roll and recording the vote in the same name order of the roll call for attendance.  
  - During a roll call vote, a member of the group who does not wish to vote may remain silent or answer as “present” or “abstaining” in response.  
  - The Secretary is responsible for recording the roll call vote and for including the roll call vote in the Minutes. |
| Ballot Vote | Vote by secret ballot (written) | Ballot votes are common for elections. If a ballot vote is not specified in the bylaws, a ballot vote may be requested by a member of the group.  
  - Before a ballot vote, the Presiding Officer is responsible for providing careful instructions for how to prepare the ballot and making sure that everyone has one ballot.  
  - The Secretary is responsible for recording the vote and for including the numbers in the Minutes. |

*Note: For rising votes or roll call votes, a member of the assembly may change his/her vote until the vote tally has been announced to the group.
Other voting issues

- **Vote by unanimous consent.** This is a way in which the Presiding Officer may seek the assembly’s approval without taking a formal vote. Vote by unanimous consent is often used for routine, non-controversial matters such as allowing a member not on the agenda to make an announcement during a meeting. The Presiding Officer would state “If there is no objection, then…” before the matter. The Presiding Officer would then wait a short period of time for someone in the assembly to state “I object.” If there are no objections, then the Presiding Officer may move forward with the matter.

- **Vote by proxy.** Members of the assembly may designate another member of the assembly to vote on his / her behalf.
Appendix B

Resolution to Revise Credit Hours for Certificates
Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee
Faculty Senate

Whereas undergraduate certificates under semesters are fixed at minimum of 15 credit hours with no maximum, and

Whereas graduate certificates under semesters are fixed at a minimum of 14 credit hours and a maximum of 20 credit hours, and

Whereas the University Curriculum Council finds merit in expanding the variability of certificate programming offered at the graduate level, and

Whereas the University Curriculum Council desires certificate programs to be reasonably attainable for students working on a thoughtfully planned undergraduate degree,

Be it resolved that certificate programs be fixed at the following levels of semester credit hours beginning with next academic year’s catalog [changes from EPSA 2010 resolution noted in bold], and

Be it further resolved that the UCC Programs Committee and EPSA should discuss a process by which exceptions to these limits might be granted and report back to the Faculty Senate by the April 2017 meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificate Type</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Certificates</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Interdisciplinary Certificates</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Specialized Certificates</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Specialized Stackable Certificates</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>