UNIVERSITY SENATE
Meeting Minutes
September 22, 2025

The University Senate was called to order at 3:30 p.m., in 111 Harrison Hall on Monday, September 22, 2025. Members absent: Ayodeji Adedeji, Adam Beisel, Lisa Boggs, Olga Brezhneva, Murat Dinc, Rosanne Gulley, Cynthia Johnson, Bill Modrow, Sam Morris, Rod Northcutt

1. **Call to Order and Announcements and Remarks** – Nathan French, Chair of University Senate Executive Committee
   a. The question of "academic freedom" is foremost on the minds of many of us this week, given the events that have affected university campuses across the country over the past two. The American Association of University Professors has followed the cases of at least 60 professors and teachers removed as a result of various social media posts. FIRE, the Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression, notes that this is a moment of expanding censorship of free expression on campuses, with one columnist arguing, "You can't fire your way to free speech …. Without free speech and academic freedom, higher education can't do its job."
   I am reminded of Craig Calhoun, an American sociologist, who once argued that the issue of academic freedom "is not just whether free speech is repressed, important and basic as that is, or whether individuals suffer in their careers for expressing controversial views. It is whether and how universities bring knowledge, diverse perspectives, and competing analyses into the public sphere …. The defense of academic freedom needs to be based on the effectiveness of academia itself in capitalizing on freedom and other conditions to deliver knowledge as a public good."
   Given this Senate's indispensable advisory responsibility on all matters related to Miami University, I hope you will all take a moment to consider how we might work to affirm the conditions needed to deliver knowledge as a public good.
   b. The University Senate's *Ad Hoc* Committee is established in full and is meeting. The membership:
      i. Co-chairs: Rosemary Pennington and Chelsea Green
      ii. Past-exec chair: Tom Poetter
      iii. U Senate reps: Cheryl Young and Kevin Reuning
      iv. Faculty reps: Tracy Haynes and Kevin Bush
      v. Undergrad rep: Daniel Martin
      vi. Graduate rep: Udeh Kingsley
   c. ASG Minutes - Several of you noted the inclusion of ASG consent calendar with our mailing. We are providing this to you as a way of strengthening lines of communication with ASG. We leave it to you and your constituents as to whether you will circulate those minutes further. We encourage you to review them each time.
   d. Dean Meetings – For the second year in a row, members of the Senate's Executive Committee have conducted meetings with the Dean's offices. We are doing this again this year and are grateful for their continued support for this body as it reimagines its role at Miami University

e. Senate Voting Mechanism – We have placed the inclusion of a new voting mechanism on hold again. We will await revisions from our colleagues on the Enabling Act committee before taking up the matter of our voting practices.

f. OFC – The Ohio Faculty Council met last week. We learned that it is not anticipated that the Ohio state legislature will return to higher education with as substantial a legislative focus in this session. As for any SB1-related litigation, SB1 will likely face legal challenge only after specific harm occurs – e.g., program elimination or faculty terminations. On the matter of HB 96 & Senates -- In the wake of HB 96, there is no expectation that the state legislature will seek the abolition of university or faculty senates.

g. Senate Two-Minute Addresses -- And, on a note about free speech, a reminder that all members of the public, including Senators, can address the Senate for two minutes. If you wish to have your remarks entered into the record as read, you must provide a draft copy of those remarks to Senators the week before our Senate meeting.[Clarification from Senate Executive Committee: To correct these remarks, per Senate policy passed in April 2024, if the speaker(s) desire(s) a transcript of the address be recorded in the appendix, a copy of the transcript of the address must be provided at least one hour before the start of the Senate. The transcript will be checked during the address by the Chair and any modifications noted for the record. If the Senate Executive Committee deems an address is unrelated to the University, neither the speaker(s) name(s) nor the transcript will be included in the appendix to the minutes].

2. **Approval of University Senate Minutes**
    a. University Senate Full Meeting Minutes_09.08.2025 (Results: 45-Yes, 00-No, 01-Abstain)

3. **Consent Calendar:** The following items were received and accepted on the Consent Calendar:
    a. Curricular Items 09.10.2025
    b. Graduate Council Minutes 09.08.2025
    c. LEC Meeting Minutes 09.02.2025

4. **Provost Updates**
    a. **HLC Site Visit** - Regarding the HLC site visit, I want to thank everyone who participated in the visit. From the exit interview that Greg Crawford and I had with the team is that it went very, very well. They didn't tell us about any problem. They did mention that academic freedom was coming up many times; all the members of the review team are from unionized campuses so they understand and have gone through a lot of the same things.
    b. **Provost Search** - A search firm has been established, and they will be on campus this week. I believe on Friday, the Senate Executive Committee will meet with them, so that is underway.
    c. **Board of Trustees** - The BOT was in Columbus last week for a retreat. I have received some emails regarding what the BOT thinks of the Senate, do we have any control over what they are doing if we don't like it, and if we are wasting our time in the Senate? I want to tell you that they were very open and supportive of me working with the Senate and that Senate wants to repair the relationship between the Board and Senate. They seemed very happy about me working with the Senate to try and find ways for faculty to get involved earlier so

that we are not voting no later in the process. I am working with Marko to develop a process on identifying curriculum earlier and make departments that could be impacted by what other departments are doing to make sure they are aware of the changes that are going through. I would encourage everyone to think about ways to engage early on and to be a part of the process of developing things. They really would really like to see Miami working more as one collaboratively and for silos to be torn down. That duplication of courses to strengthen one department over another will cause us not to be successful; instead we need to work together and share resources with one another. So it may be that for the next 9 months and 1 week, I will be known as Dr. No because I may say No a lot in COAD when proposals come through, when I think they will disadvantage one department over another.

d. *Polytechnic Discussion* - There was a board resolution, which passed a resolution for a streamlined process for academic unit restructuring. If you remember, early on when the union was voted in, the BOT basically sunsetted Senate Bylaw 8.A. "Guide for the Consolidation, Partition, Transfer, or Elimination of Academic Divisions, Departments, or Programs". They put forward a new streamline process, but only for the regionals. Since there is more of an urgency at the regionals in the formation of the Polytechnic. This is in the BOT minutes, and I will share those when they come out to Nathan. The Board retains full authority of this and the Senate does serve as an advisory committee so you will be involved in that part. I was asked to appoint a process coordinator and I asked Melissa Thomasson and she agreed to do it. With her being actively involved in THRIVE I thought she would be a good choice for this. Her role is to make sure that the decision-making process is fair and transparent, act as a liaison, gathering information and advisory feedback from all effective units and stakeholders including University Senate, and assist in the development of the formal final proposal. So the Board has a tight timeline for this and will move pretty quickly. We will keep you updated as we move forward.

e. **Departmental Consolidations** - I have heard through channels that Biology and Microbiology are looking at possibly consolidating and that maybe a possible consolidation is being investigated between Geology and Geography. I have the authority to basically handle these anyway I want. If this did happen, I would use the old version on how we would handle this. Meaning I will get names from Deans for Process Coordinators, then I would name a process coordinator, but it wouldn't be on a quick timeline and the goal to have it done by the end of the academic year, again, that is if we do that.

f. **Under Enrolled Majors** - We are required by SB1 to run a report every year to look at under-enrolled majors, so we did that after August to capture all the majors from this last academic year. Unfortunately, we did have some more majors popped up on the list and Marko is working with the Associate Deans and effective colleges, we can decide if we are going to sunset them or request an exemption. If we request an exemption, we will have to have justification for it. We just got the data late last week, so there is no urgency; we just need to get it done before the end of the year

g. Senator Questions and Comments:
   i. Senator: In the conversation around collaboration at the University, which I fully support, was there also a discussion regarding the budget models? (A) There

was conversation, and part of the perception is that the reason we are in the place we are in is because originally when the RCM budget was developed, everyone acknowledged that it would take strong leadership to ensure departments were not just creating new curriculum to grab credit hours for revenue. Which is where we failed miserably at. Any budget model can cause this to happen, they think we need accountability to figure out where there is demand. Your point is well taken and right now as it is difficult and right now it is swung towards majors, and I brought up problems with interdisciplinary programs or degrees that there is not a lot of incentive for people to offer courses to support another major. I also brought up the problem with Honors classes. There is no incentive for Honors, and we need to get things right for faculty that have productive mentoring for undergrads and graduate students. So all of those things were discussed and they did say that yes those are all important questions and we trust you will figure out how to handle it.

    ii. Senator: The problem is that SciVal does not actually include many of the venues where we publish, so we are not included in it. And then our departments lose out on funding. This feels fundamentally unfair.(A) I was not at SciVal, but I heard there were a lot of issues raised. I have not heard any after-meeting action yet but it is on the radar.

    iii. Senator: For things being sunsetted, will you clarify what process will be done by the end of year? Are you referring to having a coordinator in place by the end of year or it will be sunsetted by the end of the year? (A) The regional campus will be reorganized for the Poly and a plan will be finalized by the end of the calendar year. We will go through the process this year and if departments are going to be merged the plan will be finalized by the end of the academic year, so that the new budget model can be fixed for the next academic year.

    iv. Senator: Did I misunderstand are there programs on the main campus that are going to be sunset? (A) Majors, we have to give a report every year, so we have to give a report that certifies that we don't have any majors that have on average fewer than 5 graduates a year or have asked for and granted an exception. We have the next several months to decide to either sunset major or ask for an exemption which would have to be approved by the end of the academic year to be in compliance with the law. Right now we have just identified the majors and next we need to decide what we are going to do with that now.

5. **Student Government Update**
   a. I am Daniel Martin, President of the Student Body, and I wanted to give you a brief update on what we are doing.
      i. My cabinet chairs all the committees for the Senate.

1. Connections dinner, where we bring Students and Faculty together to learn more about proper etiquette
   ii. We have extended our consent calendar for you to review
   iii. We are conducting Senate elections for Student Senators.
   iv. Legislation on the floor,
      1. Renaming our funding committee,
         a. We just elected a new secretary of funding who handles our budget, as we want to make sure that the committee has help as we get a lot of questions about funding.
   v. We are working with the Office of Sustainability to encourage green events and funding. I refer to John Day when it comes to that, as John has more information regarding that project.
   vi. Safety and Transportation, we are working with bus routes and making safe rides more accessible to students.
   vii. Birdy Alarms and nightcaps for Halloween to help keep students safe while they are out.
   viii. Making sure we have a connection with the City Council, as we know that can be a point of strain between the two groups, but we want to open up that connection and line of dialogue.
   ix. We are always open to meeting with all of you
   x. We also invited the SEC to sit in on our meetings, and Scott Walter always comes to be with us to give us a fun executive face.
   xi. As we ramp up with our initiatives, I think it is important for you to know exactly what we are doing, like Chick-fil-A, for example, being added to Armstrong.
   xii. I want to make sure you are aware of the impact we have on campus.

6. **Special Reports**
   a. Miami Plan Update, Elizabeth Hoover, Director of the Office of Liberal Education
      i. Updates from the Office of Liberal Education
         1. Liberal Education Council
         2. Miami Plan Assessment
         3. Advising
         4. Miami Plan Innovation Lab (MPIL) and Curricular Ecologies Learning Lab (CELL)
      ii. Liberal Education Council
         1. Council Membership - The University Director of Liberal Education acts as ex-officio Chair of the Liberal Education Council.
            a. Chair, Elizabeth Hoover - Office of Liberal Education
            b. Secretary, Dorothy Falke - Office of Liberal Education
         2. Term Ends August 2026
            a. Edgar Caraballo (Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering - CEC) - At Large Member and Math/ Formal Reasoning

        b.   Caryn Neumann (Interdisciplinary and Communication Studies - CLAAS) - Humanities and Ethical Citizenship and Leadership

3. Term Ends August 2027
   a. Kathleen Knight Abowitz (Educational Leadership - EHS) Ethical Citizenship & Leadership and Intercultural Consciousness
   b. John-Charles Duffy (Comparative Religion - CAS) Humanities and Intercultural Consciousness
   c. Tracy Haynes (Biology - CAS) Senate Liaison and Natural Sciences
   d. Christopher Kelley (Political Science - CAS) Social Sciences and Global Inquiry
4. Term Ends August 2028
   a. David Daugherty (Mathematical and Physical Science - CLAAS) Natural Sciences
   b. Janice Kinghorn (Economics - FSB) HCWE Liaison and Study Abroad
   c. Robert Leonard (Information System Analytics -FSB) Mathematics/ Formal Reasoning
   d. Aaron Pergram (Music - CCA) Creative Arts and Intercultural Consciousness
   e. Anne Whitesell (Political Science - CAS) Social Science
5. Ex Officio Non-Voting Members
   a. Christa Branson - Associate Director of Academic Advising, College of Arts and Science
   b. Christopher Smith - University Libraries
   c. Courtney Thompson - Office of the University Registrar

iii. LEC Updates
1. Retreat 8/19, 11am-2pm
2. Meetings on Tuesdays 3:30pm-5pm
3. 4 meetings so far (8/26, 9/2, 9/9, 9/16)
4. FL25: Ideating body for the MiamiTHRIVE Miami Plan Revision Committee
5. LEC mindset on proposing courses during time of transition
6. Revised approach to MP Course Review process emphasizing formative feedback:
   a. Courses reviewed FL25 N = 30
   b. Courses approved n = 28; 42% Senior Capstone, 29% Signature Inquiry + Perspectives Area
   c. Courses denied n = 1
   d. Courses currently tabled n = 1

iv. Miami Plan Assessment
1. 5 Primary Methods:
   a. Course Proposal Review by LEC (indirect)

        b.   National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Survey (indirect)

        c.   Random & Period Evaluation of Existing Course Syllabi & Assignment Prompts (indirect)

        d.   Review of Student Artifacts (direct)

        e.   Student and Faculty Qualitative Assessment (indirect)

    2.   2025 MP Assessment **Report** approved by LEC September 2, 2025

    3.   2025 - 2026 Miami Plan Assessment **Plan** (not report) approved April 2025

    4.   2026 MP Assessment Report due SU26 for LEC approval FL26

   v.   2025 - 2026 Assessment Cycle: Data Collection Fall 2025

    1.   Method #3 Course Syllabi and Assignment Prompts

    2.   Random sample of syllabi and assignment prompts from one component of the plan.

    3.   Evaluating

        a.   Explanation of Miami Plan in syllabus

        b.   Promotion of Pillars

        c.   Promotion of requirement-specific student learning outcomes

    4.   Random sample of at least 30% of courses offered 202610 - Emails sent to chairs requesting above Week 4

   vi.   Method #3: Schedule - Currently Year 3 = See table in slide presentation

   vii.   2025 - 2026 Assessment Cycle: Data Collection Fall 2025

    1.   Method #4 Student Artifacts

    2.   Random sample of written assignments or project **prompts** that align with the MP Senior Capstone student learning outcomes *and* a random selection of **student artifacts**

    3.   Evaluating

        a.   Promotion of Senior Capstone student learning outcomes

        b.   Student achievement of Senior Capstone student learning outcomes

    4.   Random sample of at least 30% of courses offered 202610 - Emails sent to chairs requesting above Week 4

   viii.   Advising & Communication

    1.   Summer 2025 Student Petitions

        a.   *Expedited reviews for Student-Athlete Academic Support Services*

    2.   Formstack Migration

        a.   *Downtime upcoming end of September; clear messaging of date/time to Assistant Deans, LDAs, students*

    3.   University Petition Form

        a.   *FL25: FSB Transfer Credit Evaluation Form is currently piloting the Miami Plan Student Petition form integration*

        b.   *Soft launch across university SP26*

   ix.   Miami Plan Innovation Lab

1. Est. Fall 2022
2. Sandbox and community for faculty teams from across departments and divisions to create innovative courses for liberal education at Miami.
x. Lab-Designed Courses:
1. Are cross-disciplinary, multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary
2. Are designed around learner-centered pedagogy and student-driven learning experiences
3. Provide students with opportunities to tackle wicked problems
4. Support students in developing and applying skills and knowledge to the real world
5. Address curricular challenges at programmatic levels
6. MPIL designations team-designed:
   a. Perspectives Area(s) + Signature Inquiries
   b. Senior Capstone
   c. Legacy PA courses
xi. Summer 2025 & Fall 2025 MPIL Cohorts
1. CCA Interdisciplinary Senior Capstone
   a. Ann Elizabeth Armstrong (THE)
   b. Stephanie Danker (ART)
   c. Jeff Kruth (ARC)
   d. Molly Moran (ETBD)
   e. Aaron Pergram (MUS)
   f. Todd Stuart (AMAE)
2. World Languages and Cultures Course
   a. Mila Ganeva (GER)
   b. Anna Klosowska (FRE)
   c. Denis McCoskey (CLS)
   d. Mark McKinney (FRE)
3. American Civic Literacy Course
   a. John Forren (JCS)
   b. Kimberly Hamlin (HST)
   c. Carey Hardin (MJF)
   d. Chuck Moul (ECO)
   e. Flagg Taylor (Civics Center)
   f. Anne Whitesell (POL)
   g. Co-Facilitator: Nathan French
xii. As of September 2025:
1. Number of new courses designed in MPIL: **16**
2. Students served since Spring 2024 in newly-designed MPIL courses: **1000+**
3. Number of pre-existing courses revised in MPIL: **3**
4. Students served in 2 semesters after pre-existing course revised in MPIL: **1500+**
5. Number of faculty participants in MPIL: **80**
xiii. Curricular Ecologies Learning Lab (CELL)
1. The CELL program is an extension of the MPIL at the programmatic level.

2. Participation in CELL involves data-driven examination of a department's curricular ecology in relation to its programs, courses, resources, and connections with other units and divisions.
3. Departments who have participated:
   a. Anthropology
   b. GRAMELAC & FIC
   c. Biology
   d. Family Science and Social Work
   e. History
4. Currently participating:
   a. English
xiv. Please let us support you!
1. Visit the Office of Liberal Education website:
   a. https://www.miamioh.edu/liberal-ed/
2. Or email us directly:
   a. Dr. Elizabeth Hoover, Interim Director of Liberal Education (hooverea@miamioh.edu)
   b. OLE: miamiplan@miamioh.edu
xv. Senator Question and Comments
1. Senator: Are you speaking about the Syllabus language that we already provide to the students? (A) Yes, we don't want you to change anything as that is a part of the assessment.
2. Senator: I just want to say, as I am not sure if anyone in this room was asked to provide method 3, we have had a mad crazy amount in compliance already. I looked at the folder today and it is already populated with documents, so thank you for being on top of that.
b. Honors College Update, Zeb Baker, Honors College, Academic Deans
   i. For Fall 2025….
   1. 612 Incoming Honors College students (588 direct high school admits and 24 transfer students)
   2. 2064 Total Honors College Students
   3. 12.5% Undergraduate enrollment on the Oxford campus (16,455)
   4. 10.1% Total undergraduate enrollment (20,344)
   5. One-in-ten Miami undergrads are Honors College students.
   ii. Fall 2025 Recruitment Funnel
   1. 21,397 Applicants requested consideration for admission to the Honors College
   2. 26.1% Admit rate (5,591)
   3. 10.9% Yield rate (612)
   4. 14.2% First-time degree-seeking first-years
   5. 38% Domestic non-resident
   6. 4.46 Average high school GPA
   7. 30 Presidential Fellows
   8. 14.1% First Generation Students

9. 63.4% Female or Female-Identifying

 iii. Incoming Class of 2029 by Division

  1. CAS

   a. Total # of incoming Honors College Students = 264

   b. % of incoming Honors College cohort = 43.1%

   c. Total # of incoming Oxford undergraduates = 1800

   d. Honors % of total incoming Oxford undergraduates = 14.7%

  2. CCA

   a. Total # of incoming Honors College Students = 37

   b. % of incoming Honors College cohort = 6%

   c. Total # of incoming Oxford undergraduates = 268

   d. Honors % of total incoming Oxford undergraduates = 13.8%

  3. CEC

   a. Total # of incoming Honors College Students = 89

   b. % of incoming Honors College cohort = 14.5%

   c. Total # of incoming Oxford undergraduates = 474

   d. Honors % of total incoming Oxford undergraduates = 18.8%

  4. CLAAS (Nursing)

   a. Total # of incoming Honors College Students = 21

   b. % of incoming Honors College cohort = 3.4%

   c. Total # of incoming Oxford undergraduates = 178

   d. Honors % of total incoming Oxford undergraduates = 11.8%

  5. EHS

   a. Total # of incoming Honors College Students = 50

   b. % of incoming Honors College cohort = 8.2%

   c. Total # of incoming Oxford undergraduates = 591

   d. Honors % of total incoming Oxford undergraduates = 8.5%

  6. FSB

   a. Total # of incoming Honors College Students = 151

   b. % of incoming Honors College cohort = 24.7%

   c. Total # of incoming Oxford undergraduates = 1279

   d. Honors % of total incoming Oxford undergraduates = 11.8%

 iv. Overall Honors College Enrollment

  1. CAS

   a. Total # of Honors College Students = 988

   b. % of Honors College enrollment = 47.9%

   c. Total # of Oxford undergraduates = 6035

   d. Honors % of total Oxford undergraduates = 16.4%

  2. CCA

   a. Total # of Honors College Students = 161

   b. % of Honors College enrollment = 7.8%

   c. Total # of Oxford undergraduates = 1343

          d.   Honors % of total Oxford undergraduates = 12%
3. CEC
          a.   Total # of Honors College Students = 324
          b.   % of Honors College enrollment = 15.7%
          c.   Total # of Oxford undergraduates = 1710
          d.   Honors % of total Oxford undergraduates = 18.9%
4. CLAAS (Nursing)
          a.   Total # of Honors College Students = 53
          b.   % of Honors College enrollment = 2.6%
          c.   Total # of Oxford undergraduates = 640
          d.   Honors % of total Oxford undergraduates = 8.3%
5. EHS
          a.   Total # of Honors College Students = 206
          b.   % of Honors College enrollment = 10%
          c.   Total # of Oxford undergraduates = 2392
          d.   Honors % of total Oxford undergraduates = 8.6%
6. FSB
          a.   Total # of Honors College Students = 508
          b.   % of Honors College enrollment = 24.6%
          c.   Total # of Oxford undergraduates = 5066
          d.   Honors % of total Oxford undergraduates = 10%

v.   Honors Student Academic Performance
1. 3.76 Average cumulative GPA of continuing Honors students (1427)
2. 65.1% with cumulative GPAs above 3.75
          a.   95.4% of continuing Honors students have cumulative GPAs above 3.25 (1362)
3. 17.6% of continuing Honors students with perfect 4.0 cumulative GPAs (251)

vi.   Senator Question and Comments
1. Senator: What are the biggest challenges that you see in the next few years?(A) Continuing to balance the ambition versus what we can actually deliver due to the resources.
2. Senator: What is happening with the 1st year seminars? (A) There are 5 of them, we have filled every seat and they seem to be really enjoying them. We did have I believe a couple students transfer out but that is largely because of changes in their schedules, once they got here and changed their major.
3. Senator: Do you think you can scale it up? (A) I don't think so, as I think 5 is about where we are going to be. We have learned that it is better to do it in the fall, because the turnover for spring is very tight.
4. Senator: Is the offering going to change for what we have promised the incoming honors students? (A) I think the answer is no, and we need to

think about the ways we can deliver in the Honor College and less about what the University can do for them. One thing we are learning in the Honors College is that the landscape for workload that requires every single Honors College Student to do an Honors Senior project is not possible or workable. So we have created an off-ramp for those students who don't have an interest in doing the Senior project, which means they don't earn University Honors, and I know that is going to be an area we need to debate. I think that is an area that our Honors college advisory committee, Honors Student advisory board, and campus partners are all going to have to play an important role on what we are able to deliver and think about the ways we can make those things happen. Terms of ways to complete the requirements, like group projects for Senior projects and individual research is not done. And the focus is trying to get you used to working in teams, so maybe something team-based instead. I think that is something that we are really trying to explore right now.

5. Senator: With the budget model, do you expect an impact on that?(A) That has yet to be seen.

c. Proposed Policy Change: Teaching, Clinical Professors, & Lecturers (TCPLs), Amity Noltemeyer, Dean, College of Education, Health, and Society
   i. Senate Executive Chair
   ii. College of Education, Health, and Society (EHS) TCPL Cap
   iii. Policy Proposal - Limitation on Number of Lecturers and Teaching Faculty
      1. TCPLs may not exceed the following percentages of continuing faculty (full-time TCPL and Tenure/ Tenure Track) within each division:
         a. CAS: 23.0%
         b. CCA: 29.0%
         c. EHS: 40~~29~~.0%
         d. CEC: 29.0%
         e. FSB: 40.0%
         f. CLAAS: 29.0%
   iv. Context & Rationale
      1. EHS has many professional and clinical programs, with several coming on board in recent years
      2. Last cap increase was insufficient to support the needs and growth of these accredited programs
      3. This proposal requests raising the TCPL cap to 40%, aligning it with FSB
   v. Process & Feedback
      1. EHS Governance
         a. Silent on TCPL cap and faculty composition
      2. Divisional precedent
         a. Did not previously vote on faculty composition changes

3. Opportunities for input
                a. Presented at EHS Leadership Team Retreat and EHS Opening
                    Faculty/ Staff Meeting (and emailed slides to EHS listserv)
                b. Offered the opportunity for feedback in meetings and
                    afterwards
    vi. Senator Question and Comments
            1. Senator: I wanted to clarify that the Board has always held that right to
                set the caps, and the Senate's role has always been advisory. The Union
                did not remove that right; simply, the Board has asserted its right.
            2. Senator: You mentioned the line with FSB, what will your minimum
                be?(A) I want to say that right now because we did the numbers, the
                issue isn't right now but what will be coming and going. We want the
                flexibility to hire what we need down the road. We have not included
                VAPs in those calculations. So it would be up to 40% TCPL's, and up to
                60% for Tenure/ Tenure Track.
            3. Senator: I know in my department that we have lost tenure-track faculty
                and those lines we have never gotten back. So it seems like we could be
                trying to hire TCPL's instead of Tenure Track. Can you speak to that?(A)
                When those requests come up, and the hiring planning is put forward
                there are a variety of things we look to determine where those lines are
                going to be approved and it also goes through multiple levels for
                evaluations. I would say that I have looked at our numbers as a College
                and we have not had a large shift towards TCPL's. So I think it is based on
                the needs of the department, student needs and we have some
                departments that are growing very quickly, so we have had to have
                additional lines in. So sometimes that means other departments are not
                getting lines filled when there are rapidly growing areas. When you look
                at the percentage that are TCPL in our College, it has gone up slightly; in
                2024-2025 it was 27% and right now it is 30.86%. We also do a
                prediction based on what we know will be coming and going for next
                year and that prediction is 30.34%. There may be a slight percentage
                change based on the type of programs we are offering and where the
                growth has been.

7. **New Business**
    a. Senate Discussion & Recommendation: Teaching, Clinical Professors, & Lecturers (TCPLs),
        Nathan French, Chair of Senate Executive Committee *- **Presentation only; Discussion to
        Recommend or Not Recommend on *October 06, 2025***
            i. Template suggestion for us to use for Recommend / Recommend with
                Reservations/ Decline to Recommend
                    1. BE IT HEREBY KNOWN that the University Senate, after thoughtful
                        consideration, reflection, and discussion has elected to [RECOMMEND /

RECOMMEND WITH RESERVATIONS / DECLINE TO RECOMMEND] the [SUBJECT UNDER CONSIDERATION]

2. As the principal institutional advisory body on all matters of university business, including perspectives from faculty, staff, administrators, undergraduate students, and graduate students, the Senate adopted this stance through majority vote for the following reasons:

3. List reasoning here.

ii. What the template would like for this policy change:
1. S. Rec 26-XX
2. On the TCPL Cap Increase in the College of Education, Health, and Society
3. October 8, 2025
4. BE IT HEREBY KNOWN that the University Senate, after thoughtful consideration, reflection, and discussion has elected to [RECOMMEND / RECOMMEND WITH RESERVATIONS / DECLINE TO RECOMMEND] the decision by Office of the Dean in the College of Education, Health, and Society.
5. As the principal institutional advisory body on all matters of university business, including perspectives from faculty, staff, administrators, undergraduate students, and graduate students, the Senate adopted this stance through majority vote for the following reasons:a
6. List reasons here

iii. Senator Question and Comments
1. Senator: Do we need to give reasons if we are just approving? (A) I think we should have good practice of listing why we recommend something. I am willing to open that into a motion and vote in the future. We are working as a Senate Executive Committee, as we have been talking with the membership of the Ad Hoc Committee to move Senate earlier in the curricular process, so that if we recommend something then those that follow us in the process I would think would benefit from those notes. If we decline to recommend something I think those would also benefit from those notes. My suggestion to this body would be to always provide the reasons but we can vote without, Ibut given that we are now an advisory body I think that advice would be valuable.
2. Senator: What is the rationale for changing it from a SR to S. Rec?(A) In a resolution, it is suggested that we have reached a finale and with a recommendation, we can be re-opened at a later date.
3. Senator: I like the idea of putting the reasons, as it sets the stage and gives us a little more influence than what we have with just a recommendation.
4. Senator: If we are going to do this then our process will have to be different. This is a chance for us to have at least a one-way conversation

with the Board, as there may be some textual things that we may want them to know. For example, we have had a million questions about this Cap issue, but it doesn't tell me what the overall staffing plan looks like. So, it would be interesting if at the bottom if there was anything else that we would want the board to know or maybe ask questions about in the future as it is not a reason as to why we did or didn't vote. I am just thinking about another section at the bottom with additional comments? If we want to have productive material for them. (A) I don't think the Senate Executive Committee would be opposed to adding an additional line to the template for that. Language to the effect of Maybe additional notes or thoughts we wanted to share or Reasons and Relevant Considerations.

5. Senator: With us wanting to have a productive relationship with them there may be things we want them to know. A) I do believe that is reasonable.

6. Senator: Have we considered how this is going to be filled out?(A) One thought was after a presentation such as this we would present an initial poll of would this body Recommend/ Recommend with Reservations/ or Decline to Recommend. Then we take the 10 days to think about the reasons as to why that occurs. That allows for people time to bring these things to the concerns of the constituents and then if need to adjust when we reconvene we can change the vote at that time on the S. Rec. This is really a trial run on the process, to try to understand what our customary practice will become.

7. Senator: With this final section, we are staying, we are recommending but then giving reasons for. Then the second one is recommended with reservation, it seems like the first one should be Recommended with reason for and the 2nd one should be Recommended with Reservation and that would be considerations 1,2, and 3? Again, I like giving the reasons. (A) Recommend we could list pros and cons.

8. Senator: In our absence at the board meeting this represents everything that went behind the recommendation with reservation delivered. On matters that may affect everyone on campus are there opportunities that we may attend so that we can answer questions that the board might have so that we don't have this as our sole recommendations on matters? (A) There are 2 avenues for that in my understanding and one of those is that the Chair of this body addresses the Senate at each of their meetings. Another opportunity is as always public can come as I think it would be good for them to see the Senators' interest in this body. If there is an opportunity then for some Senators to address a public comment to the Board, then that would be welcomed as well.

9. Senator: In that 2nd paragraph, I think it needs to be simplified so it doesn't seem confrontational. (A) Okay, we can strike that.

10. Senator: Can we speed things along by sending out a Google Form? That way, when it comes time to vote, it may make this easier cause you could have a draft already been started based on the forms. (A) Tammy please make a note of that.

11. Senator: The part about Reservations, I can't wrap my head around. The reason is that we have made recommendations. (A) I think the issue here is the ability of this body to express disagreement openly with decisions that it does not approve of. There may be issues that are brought to this body that we don't agree with and we should be able to make that expression of the Senate known and pass that upward to the next body that is considering it. There was a time when if this body had said no, it would have stalled something, but we no longer have that delegated authority over curriculu,m but now we can decline to recommend something and let them know why. That is the best practice for advising that I can recommend.

12. Senator: Recommended with Reservations tells them yes from us but we want you to also think about this. That is my perspective.

13. Senator: I think we should vote on this and I agree with keeping the reservation on this.

14. Senator: Motion to table Results 15 -Favor, 24 Not Table, 2 Abstain

15. Senator: Voting to adopt this language for today for the TCPL: 45 in favor with 1 abstain

8. **Adjournment**