

UNIVERSITY SENATE
Meeting Minutes
November 03, 2025

The University Senate was called to order at 3:30 p.m., in 322 McGuffey Hall on Monday, November 03, 2025. Members absent: Aubrey Crish, Isabelle Eaton, Josh Ederington, Carol Fabby

1. **Call to Order and Announcements and Remarks** – Nathan French, Chair of University Senate Executive Committee

- a. Welcome, everyone, to what is one of what may be several historic moments for our University Senate this academic year. What gathers us today is a matter of a change in state law and a matter of our own institutional policies. Following the passage of H.B. 96 and changes to the Ohio Revised Code made in Summer 2025, our University Senate was no longer permitted to have any authority delegated by the Board of Trustees on matters of curricular approval -- including approval or rejection of academic programs. This legal change invited the necessity of revising the University Senate's Enabling Act to align our powers of advice with the needs of our institution. Today's public hearing, pursuant to the University Senate's Enabling Act policies of amendment and included as part of the regular meeting of the University Senate, is intended to allow Senators and members of the university community the opportunity to engage with the Executive Committee of the University Senate on the revisions proposed by the Senate's *Ad Hoc* Committee on the University Senate Enabling Act. What is discussed today will inform the University Senate's vote on November 17, 2025 on the revisions proposed by the *Ad Hoc* Committee. Equally, comments made today will inform the ongoing work of amendment and renovation awaiting our University Senate for the rest of the calendar year. At our retreat in August, I challenged Senators that we must affirm that the University Senate is an indispensable part of the institution. Last week, that indispensability was brought into question when the Associated Student Government held substantial discussions in Executive Session as to whether to take up a request for the dissolution of this body. Prior to those discussions, I was invited to provide remarks to ASG and, in those remarks, I noted -- quoting former Miami Provost David Brown -- that any one of us can destroy or discredit this body. In that span of time, the University Senate Executive Committee has learned a great deal more about the origin of this legislation. We understand that it is not a result of any initiative from any political party, policy think-tank, or institution. It is not the result of an initiative from the Board of Trustees, the President's Executive Cabinet, or other administrative office. The discussion on the matter of this University Senate's dissolution emerged from a series of conversations among students deeply concerned about the University Senate. It falls upon all of us who may hear anything contrary to this to please halt such rumors. There are real harms, personal and professional, that can occur from such speculation and insinuation. Having met with the framers of the initial ASG legislation, I remain hopeful that this University Senate will continue to center shared governance at our institution. I have invited the ASG membership to work alongside us in a spirit of collaboration as we begin our work of

renovation and reform. In the interim, I have heard from numerous members of this body -- as well as the university community as a whole -- in resolute support of this Senate.

I thank them. There is much around us that seeks to divide us. Our conversations and our media are filled with narratives of public or institutional distrust. The roles of those constituencies represented by this Senate -- students, faculty, staff, and administrators -- feel, at times, jumbled or imbalanced. Our institution feels as if it is amid a moment of tectonic shift, perhaps a fundamental rearrangement of its historic position toward liberal education in the service of the mind, spirit, and civic life. I hope for this Senate to become a place of robust, engaged advice and dissent -- a rampart of shared governance -- whose voice is one worth hearing and engaging. To achieve that will require open discussions such as today's. Our public discussion today is part of the important work of the renovation of this body in order that it might provide timely, clear, and effective advice -- serving, if needed, as a conscience for our institution -- at a time when our institution works to recover the broader trust of the public whom it serves.

2. **Public Hearing Regarding The Revision Of The University Senate Enabling Act**

a. Proposed Revisions to University Senate Bylaws and Standing Rules

i. Ad Hoc Committee Members

1. Rosemary Pennington, Co-Chair, Member of Senate Executive Committee
2. Chelsea Green, Co-Chair, Chair of the Governance Committee
3. Kevin Reuning, representative from University Senate
4. Cheryl Young, representative from University Senate, presidential appointee
5. Tracy Haynes, faculty
6. Kevin Bush, faculty
7. Tom Poetter, past chair of University Senate Executive Committee (2022-2023)
8. Daniel Martin, undergraduate student
9. Kingsley Udeh, graduate student

ii. Committee's Charge:

1. Recognizing changes to the Ohio Revised Code made in Summer 2025, the University Senate convenes this *Ad Hoc* Committee on the University Senate Enabling Act to review ORC 3345.457, the University Senate Enabling Act, and any elements of the University Senate's Bylaws and Standing Rules that it deems relevant to the purposes of amendment and proposal. Specific attention is requested on the matter of University Senate committees and their service to the institution. This *Ad Hoc* Committee is also charged with reviewing shared governance policies at public institutions in Ohio and other public universities as it considers revisions to Miami University's Senate Enabling Act. If the committee considers it relevant, this committee may propose an alternative naming

of the University Senate. The committee is encouraged to consult with COAD, LEC, the Registrar, and other curricular bodies as it deems appropriate. The committee may consider how to establish criteria for fiduciary impacts as included in curricular presentations.

iii. Process

1. Reviewed ORC 3345.457, the most recent version of the Senate's Enabling Act, Bylaws, and Standing Rules
2. Reviewed shared governance procedures at other public institutions.
3. Consulted with Provost's office, Registrar, and Senate Parliamentarian.

iv. Our Suggestions

1. Revision of the introductory article of the Enabling Act to come into compliance with ORC.
2. Revision of Standing Rules to change the Senate's voting process.
3. Revision to the Council for Undergraduate Curriculum.
4. Minor revisions to clean up and/or update language.

v. Enabling Act - Introduction

1. University Senate is the primary University governance body where students, faculty, staff, and administrators debate University issues and **make recommendations** on the policies and actions to be taken by the institution. It is the legislative body of the University in matters **involving educational programs, requirements, and standards; employee welfare; and student conduct. It is the primary advisory body on the establishment and modification of academic programs, curricula, courses, general education requirements, and degree programs. University Senate reviews, discusses, and provides recommendations on policies, programs, and curriculum prior to their presentation to the Council of Academic Deans and, ultimately, the Board of Trustees.**

vi. Standing Rules - Voting

1. The final vote on any substantive issues to come before the University Senate shall be recorded by voice vote. These results will be reported in the meeting minutes circulated to the university community.
2. If the voice vote is indeterminate, the Parliamentarian or Secretary of the Senate shall ask for a show of hands. If a member of the Senate feels the vote is inconclusive or inaccurately called, they may call for a division of the house or a roll call vote.
3. For a roll-call vote, the Secretary of University Senate or the Parliamentarian of University Senate shall read the roll, rotating the alphabet by ten members with each vote, and each member present shall vote "aye," "nay," or "abstain". The Secretary or the Parliamentarian shall record these votes and also shall record absent members of the Senate as "absent."
4. Any senator may call for a roll call vote on any matter brought before the Senate.
5. A roll-call vote will be taken before the University Senate goes into executive session. The motion to enter executive session must include a

reason for entering executive session.

6. When considering curriculum and policy matters, the University Senate must be briefed on the budget implications for all curriculum and policy changes brought as recommendations to be considered on the floor of the Senate.
7. No same day votes will be taken on curriculum items that require budget projections.

vii. Council for Undergraduate Curriculum

1. Recommend adding a Fiscal Priorities Co-Chair as a member.
2. Require CUC to examine the budget implications of programs it reviews.
3. Require a yearly report/ presentation from CUC on what programs the council has seen as well as suggestions for revisions to the curricular review process.

b. Public Hearing:

c. Senator and Non-Senator Question and Comments

- i. Senator: I'm a University Senator, and I'm the ASG Senator who wrote the legislation encouraging the dissolution of the University Senate. I am not here today to ask that we dissolve. This University has shaped me as a person, and I owe it to this place to be more optimistic than I was just a week ago. I am here to share what I see for University Senate moving forward - and to listen with an open mind to what all of you see.

We as USenate have become an island among many burned bridges. We could keep blaming the Board of Trustees for having too much authority, blaming Ohio for its new laws, blaming students for thinking differently, blaming administrators for not listening enough, or blaming Executive Committee for not getting everything right

Or—we could do something harder.

We could ask ourselves: When are we, as a legislative body, going to take responsibility for ourselves? When is it on us?

Instead of on everyone else?

If we're willing to put all hands on deck—not just Exec but every single one of us—we can build a shared governance system that by the end of this spring is something other universities aspire to have.

If we're willing to put all hands on deck—not just Exec but every single one of us—we can build a shared governance system that by the end of this spring is something other universities aspire to have.

If we're willing to put all hands on deck—not just Exec but every single one of us—we can build a shared governance system that by the end of this spring is something other universities aspire to have.

It comes with a responsibility to take ownership and to engage with decision makers constructively. So how do we move forward?

First, let's pass the Enabling Act – we have to get it done by December.

Let's make today the day we take responsibility for the state of our own

legislative body.

Over the next two weeks, let's send a dove over every broken bridge, and, i'm sorry for my metaphors, but let's take a trip to Home Depot let's get some wood hammers and nails and let's get to work on rebuilding every bridge before that chance is gone.

Let's reform our procedures to prioritize detailed deliberation.

Let's empower you, as Senators, to bring your own ideas to the floor rather than having one committee doing it all.

And let's get to Joslin Senate Chamber—I know we can find that money somewhere. I know we can!

Most importantly, let's make it known that we intend to do the hard work, that we intend to put aside our grievances, and that we intend to build something truly indispensable—not just indispensable in name only.

This December, the Board of Trustees might ask us:

“What value does USenate bring to the table?”

Let's make sure we have a really good answer to that question. Thank you.

- ii. Senator: I currently serve as the Secretary of Community Engagement for the Associated Student Government. But I do not come here today in that capacity, I don't even come to you as a general student. I come to you as a colleague. As some of you know, I have the honor to serve as a Senator with you all on the University Senate. When I joined, my goal was simple: to offer a perspective that might aid our faculty. Ten Weeks in, I still hold that goal — but I've realized it may not come easily.

We live in a time where the powers that be are not deemed to be student centered or faculty friendly. Too often we dwell on what we can't do instead of innovating. My goal by coming and speaking today is to help all of us find a way where we can focus on what we *can* do.

Higher education is in a very dynamic stage at this moment in time. And there is something being diminished, the voices of our colleagues here today. You all have a job to do, to support and listen to students; and I can say confidently that over my four years here, the faculty has done an outstanding job in that area. But that means nothing if *you* are not listened to.

So what do we do from here? Make them listen to us. and that begins with the enabling act that we debate today. We are fighting an uphill battle, but this is our chance to make sure that this body — and the voice of its faculty — remains central to the shared governance of our university.

Ensure that our recommendations must be heard and considered, ensure that we are operating in the most efficient and effective way possible, work on building bridges and connecting our paths instead of focusing on the ones that have disappeared due to reasons out of our control.

Let's ensure our voices aren't just heard – they're impossible to ignore.

Thank you.

- iii. Non-Senator: I am the Speaker of the Student Senate for the Associated Student Government. Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you.

Today I am voicing my support for the Enabling Act as a positive first step towards grander reform in University Senate. Within the past week, I have engaged in countless conversations with student senators about University Senate's role in our collegiate experience. So why do students care? And why now? My answer to you is synergy.

Synergy is the interaction of two or more agents working together to produce something greater than they would have produced independently. For the past many years, ASG and University Senate have had minimal interaction, which I believe has been to the detriment of Miami. This year, we have governance. But there is still much room for improvement.

The only way to truly exhibit synergy is to work together, and to work together well. Last year ASG devoted ourselves to internal reform. We fixed our Internal Operating Budget, rewrote our Bylaws, and so on. Our processes are now efficient, effective, and allow us to focus on our primary purpose: to serve the Miami community. I believe the Enabling Act is University Senate's gateway to your own beneficial reform.

As your role becomes advisory, University Senate must reflect on what that means for your processes, and even reflect on the body's goals. To work together productively, our student government expects you to have clear direction, and desire to improve. We want to work with you, we want synergy. We want to do so in ways that are considerate, enlightening, and collaborative. Again, why do you care? We care because we are students seeking higher education, because we saw the opportunities available to us. Opportunities to grow as individuals, to expand our intellectual horizons, and to use our voices for what matters. We can't have those opportunities here without you all. We will fight for you all to have a voice and an impact, but you must be willing to commit to yourselves, too. Allow the Enabling Act and many further reforms to inspire you to be the advocate for higher education that this institution needs. I will leave you all with this: anyone can say they want to make improvements, to act. It's a lot harder to actually do it. But to be the person who acts? That's admirable. You don't have to do this alone, ASG is here to support you along the way. That's why we are here today. Now, are you willing to act? Are you willing to put in the work? Are you willing to stand and use your voice? I hope so.

- iv. Non-Senator: I have the honor and privilege of serving as the Student Body Vice President this year

The past week has been one of high emotion for everyone in this room and beyond, and to me, that's a powerful thing, a collective of people who care so much about this body and the power of voicing opinions in the constantly

evolving landscape of higher education that we find ourselves in today. Opening doors to conversations that previously had been locked shut. is the key to this
Everyone in this room deserves a voice that is heard

I believe we are all here today approaching this conversation with an open mind,
Not with malice, a secret agenda

the opposite, to amplify voices and engage in a productive conversation on the enabling act that can be a pivotal moment in the continuous representation of everyone on campus.

To foster an environment where students and faculty can participate in productive dialogue and where important decisions can be made on matters of university life aimed at better reflecting its population

I think of the metaphor of the frog in a boiling pot boiling to death because it doesn't notice the temperature is rising. Rather than sitting in the boiling water, we have the opportunity to jump out and re-empower a governing body that represents students and faculty alike

- v. Senator: I want to say thank you very much to the students who have spoken today and expressed concern in ASG last week. I am extremely moved by the students caring this much about the body and how this University works. I honestly didn't know, and it is beautiful to see. I have been in the Senate on and off since 2008, and over that time, I have seen new senators come in, and often they have expressed the same frustrations that I hear from you today, because the Senate is a tough place to be. Our power is constrained, and our voices are often not listened to. That may have something to do with the structure that the Senate is under, but it also has to do with actual constraints on its power, as we have passed resolutions that have not been listened to and etc. I think a lot of that ultimately is why the Faculty/ Librarians decided to vote to form a Union to have another voice, even though that voice also can be constrained. I want to say that I welcome these conversations. How we can build the power to do what we want to do together is the great question right now. So thank you so much.
- vi. Senator: Last week, when SEC became aware of the possibility of the discussion of the proposed legislature to dissolve the University Senate, we sent a memorandum to the ASG President Danny Martin, and we noted as part of our work in revising the enabling act -- which the task of the committee revising the enabling act is very narrow -- that part of our work is really going to be engaging with Senate at the winter retreat on several major possibilities. One part of that work will occur with the Nov 17th vote, which will include the removal of de-activated University Senate Committees from Senate Materials. That is also going to involve the possibility of forming new committees, particularly streamlining our process of recommendations, which have not been the most exciting over the last weeks. This also may include the improvement of our policies regarding producing a resolution and a sense of the Senate. I think we all need to be thinking about how we can make that more efficient. It may also

mean added engagement from the University Senate during our working sessions. We will also be bringing to the body to consider revision and necessary updates to webpages regarding Senate materials. Even if this enabling act moves forward, there is going to be a lot of work ahead for the Senate.

3. **Approval of University Senate Minutes**

- a. University Senate Full Meeting Minutes_10.20.2025 (Results: 55-Yes, 00-No, 00-Abstain)

4. **Consent Calendar:** The following items were received and accepted on the Consent Calendar:

- a. Curricular Items 10.22.2025
- b. Graduate Council Minutes 10.21.2025
- c. LEC Meeting Minutes 10.07.2025
- d. LEC Meeting Minutes 10.21.2025

5. **Provost Update:**

- a. Drafts of the Post-Tenure Review and Procedures for Disciplinary Action policies were provided within the agenda that was sent out. The Provost indicated that we have received very little feedback regarding them via the Google Form that was sent out with the agenda. The policies are close to being finalized. He is seeking comments, questions or feedback regarding the policies. There is a very short timeline to get everything done. Senate should expect to see drafts of additional policies coming forward the next time we meet.
- b. Senator Question and Comments
 - i. Senator: What about visiting faculty? Where do they fit in here? (A) Visiting faculty are not covered under SB1 or the House Bill. So we will continue to use our existing policy regarding Visiting Faculty. They serve at the will of the university so the question is typically if there are serious disciplinary issues, and then the question would be to determine if they will finish the academic year.
 - ii. Senator: Post Tenure review policy is basically straight from the Legislation. Regarding the disciplinary policy in the Collaborative Bargaining Agreement, there was a process in that about working with the Union as part of discipline, but I don't see that language in here, and didn't know if it should be? (A) I could be wrong, so I would need to double-check. We don't really work with the Union when it comes time for discipline; however, the faculty member can have a rep there with them at a disciplinary hearing if they want.
 - iii. Senator: It is laying out a process, but what would be worthy of discipline is very open-ended in the policy. (A) Discipline in my experience, only happens after a performance improvement plan has been put in place, and the issue has not been corrected. To go through and lay out everything that could result in disciplinary action would be impossible, in my opinion.
 - iv. Senator: The tenure process has been a two-step dance, with both the Chair and the Departmental Tenure Review team having a say. I didn't see that two-step process in this. It seems to me that there should be a Departmental Tenure

committee that would review this, and the same thing at the divisional level and the University Level. There should be a two-step process where faculty are involved in this step as well. We have faculty governance, and I am not referring to the Union. I am talking about the department governance structure. (A) Now that we have the Union and the Senate Bill, we no longer have the committee for Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and discipline is a management right. Discipline has never been a purview of the faculty. Besides, post-tenure review is not necessarily a disciplinary process.

- v. Senator: In the Tenure Review process, faculty were involved in that via committees. Is that still the case, and is it written in the policy? (A) Yes.

6. **Old Business:**

- a. S. Rec 26-04 Minimum Enrollment, Mike Crowder, Dean of the Graduate School; Professor; Director of Graduate Studies, M.M.Sc. Biomedical Science, and Jason Abbitt, Professor, EDP; Associate Dean of the Graduate School - ***Presentation Only: Discussion to Recommend or Not Recommend on November 03, 2025*** (Results: 44 -Yes, 05-No, 05-Abstain)
 - i. S. Rec 26-XX On the Minimum Enrollment Policy for the Graduate School
 - 1. BE IT HEREBY KNOWN that the University Senate, after thoughtful consideration, reflection, and discussion, has elected to RECOMMEND the Minimum Enrollment policy proposed by the Office of the Dean of the Graduate School and the Senate's Graduate Council.
 - ii. Senator Question and Comments
 - 1. Senator: My issue in the long run student who complete the 4 year term of the graduate appointment but need extra time to complete a dissertation and the university is going to soak 1 hour credit and international students coming into that program are going to have to pay up to \$1600 for this up charge and it is an hour that doesn't count towards the degree because the student already have all the hours. I couldn't come up with a friendly amendment, but I am disappointed in that.
- b. S. Rec 26-XX Administration of Graduate Awards, Mike Crowder, Dean of the Graduate School; Professor; Director of Graduate Studies, M.M.Sc. Biomedical Science, and Jason Abbitt, Professor, EDP; Associate Dean of the Graduate School - ***Presentation Only: Discussion to Recommend or Not Recommend on November 03, 2025*** - (Results: 17-Yes, 26-No, 12-Abstain)
 - i. S. Rec 26-XX On the Administration of Graduate Awards
 - 1. BE IT HEREBY KNOWN that the University Senate, after thoughtful consideration, reflection, and discussion, has elected to RECOMMEND the Administration of Graduate Awards policy proposed by the Office of the Dean of the Graduate School and the Senate's Graduate Council.
 - ii. Senator Question and Comments
 - 1. Senator: Why recommend rather than reservations? (A) The over comments we received asking it to be changed to considerations is why.

2. Senator: I am concerned about this for a variety of reasons. By treating internal and external grants the same, it potentially desensitizes people to try and get external support because it will not extend grad school time. I see this as an attempt to cut costs, and though I understand that we are at a time to cut costs. I think as it stands I can not support it.
3. Senator: I am deeply opposed to this. I think it will be deeply detrimental to our PHD program. If we are trying to become an R1 as I am not clear on that, but it seems like we are. Then we really have to support our grad program and in our field it can be challenging to be done in 4 years. I think with this and the new requirement that all of our grad students are going to have to teach a 2.2 load beginning immediately upon arrival to Miami and also finish in 4 years, I think it will destroy our graduate program.
4. Senator: I represent 2 graduate programs and they will also be detrimentally affected and we will be a lot less competitive for our PHD program going forward and similar to what the other senator mentioned.
5. Senator: Is this the same for international students?(A) It sounds like it is for everyone.
6. Chair of SEC: We will bring this back to the next meeting as a Non-Recommend.

7. **Student Governance Update:**

- a. Regarding the Enabling Act over the last week or so, it has proven that we should proceed through this entire undertaking with the love and honor that we hold so dear. To love every thought and expression without backlash and to remember we are all Redhawks. To me, this Enabling Act does that. It does express that level of love and honor that we are so desperately looking for. We should be saying Go Redhawks every time we step onto this campus and continue to engage with students, faculty, and staff.
- b. The newsletter is getting rolled out; it has been a long process, but it is getting out there.
- c. We are also working on ways to decrease noise fines and littering fines.

8. **Adjournment**