

**UNIVERSITY SENATE**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**October 20, 2025**

The University Senate was called to order at 3:30 p.m., in 111 Harrison Hall on Monday, October 20, 2025. Members absent: Adam Beisel, Amie Earls, Sam Morris, Bryan Van Scoy, Elise Radina

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

- a. Over the summer, Gallup research released the results and analysis of a survey that found that only 42% of Americans have "quite a lot" or a "great deal" of confidence in higher education. I thought of those numbers when, late last week, the Pew Research Foundation published the results of a survey on higher education conducted in late September. In a survey of 3,445 U.S. adults, Pew's researchers found that 7 in 10 Americans believe that U.S. higher education is headed in the wrong direction. Those results crossed the lines of party affiliation. The published, stated, and analyzed reasons for such distrust exceed our time to enumerate here. As you might imagine, such analyses often disagree and perhaps do a better job of reflecting the ideological, disciplinary, and political positions of their authors than they do of describing active conditions in higher education nationally and, too, on our campus, locally. I'd argue, though, that the question of "trust" is one that this body is navigating with each meeting. Over the last month, we've trusted our colleagues to review our University Senate's Enabling Act. In doing so, we operate in trust and faith with the Office of the Provost and with the Board of Trustees that our eventual revisions will be welcomed in a spirit of collaboration as we work to renovate a model of shared governance at Miami. At the same time, faculty, staff, and students on our campuses in Middletown and Hamilton are being asked by the administration to trust a new set of processes implemented as part of the polytechnic initiative. Last week, the Office of the President laid out to the University its hope for trust in the strategic initiatives that it continues to develop within and alongside MiamiTHRIVE. We often speak of trust in terms that are financial -- we earn trust, we invest trust. When we speak of trust, we do so as if we are "spending" it by "placing" it in the hands of another. Read generously, I think this means that we must think of trust as a shared act of stewardship and responsibility. At the beginning of the semester, I asked us to steward this body to become an indispensable part of this university. As our work has unfolded this year, I am learning, week-by-week and conversation-by-conversation that such indispensability requires this Senate to provide a place for trust to be earned, placed, and renewed. At a time of such tremendous change and challenge at our institution, I hope all of us are able to work to build trust with one another wherever we are. The public whom we serve is counting on it.

- b. **Canvas** - As I'm sure you're aware, there were major outages today affecting Amazon's Web Services. On campus, this greatly affected Canvas. I hope we have all been able to work through this challenge together today.
- c. **Ohio Faculty Council** - Ohio Faculty Council (OFC) met last Friday for two hours with Senator Pennington continuing her service as chair of that body. The Ohio Faculty Council represents Ohio's 14 public universities in order to "provide a forum for discussion and to advocate for the values of higher education." In that meeting, Senators from across the state discussed and compared how SB1 is being implemented, re-calculations of workload, and matters of how campuses are working through questions of collective bargaining, the centralization of campus decision-making, and the delicate balance of shared governance.  
 Several of our peer institutions noted their concern with a lack of consultation with shared governance bodies -- such as faculty and university senates -- on policies developed as part of the implementation of SB1. Other institutions, such as Kent State, however, had similar policies brought before their faculty senate and passed following collaborative working groups that involved the administration and faculty (inclusive of those in the bargaining unit).  
 Members then turned our attention to revisiting and renovating OFC's public engagement and messaging strategy. I would welcome thoughts from Senators that I might share in that regard. I encourage all of you to visit the OFC website and familiarize yourself with its recent activities.
- d. **ASG Cabinet Meeting** - Senators Travis, Boehme, and I -- along with Senator Walter -- had an opportunity to join the ASG Cabinet this weekend for their cabinet meeting. We discussed a number of challenges and opportunities that await our governance bodies this year. We also agreed that one item that we might immediately improve is collaboration in governance.  
 On that note, I want to encourage all of you -- as Senators -- to keep an eye on your inboxes in the weeks and months ahead. This is an active and well-organized student government that is fully prepared to engage in meaningful conversations that will improve our campus. As members of the ASG cabinet and others in student government identify initiatives and areas where they would like to act, you should anticipate that they might email you -- as Senators -- to understand how your constituencies and this body might assist their endeavors. Equally, they would welcome initiatives and ideas from this body to be brought to the student government.  
 If you have a question on how to engage with ASG, you are welcome to email student members of this Senate or the Senate's Executive Committee.  
 Your cooperation and ideas are welcome as we work alongside our fellow governance institutions on campus.
- e. **Student Trustee Application** - The Associated Student Government is seeking applications to fill the two student trustee positions on the Miami University Board of Trustees. For those unfamiliar, student trustees have been eligible to serve as non-voting members on the Board of Trustees since March 1, 1988 after a change to the laws of Ohio.  
 As noted on the application, Student Trustees are required to attend 5 Board of Trustees meetings per year with the full membership of the Board. Additionally, Student Trustees expect to meet with their co-trustee at least biweekly. Student Trustees act as the "eyes and ears" of the student experience and share these important insights accordingly to the Board.

Our colleagues at ASG have requested this announcement, and encourage all of us to identify students who might be interested in applying. The application includes a cover page with basic information, a resume, and 3 answers to short essay questions. If you need the link to this application, please email the Chair of the University Senate's Executive Committee.

2. **Approval of University Senate Minutes**

- a. University Senate Full Meeting Minutes\_10.06.2025 (Results: 53-Yes, 00-No, 02-Abstain)

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

- a. Curricular Items 10.08.2025
- b. LEC Meeting Minutes 09.23.2025

4. **Provost Updates**

- a. The Provost stated that he has received questions about the Trump administration's proposed "Compact for Academic Excellence in Higher Education" which was extended to nine institutions in early October. The Provost indicated that he was recently made aware that the "Compact" had been opened up to other universities to consider in an updated form, but that this new version seemed more vague. He stated that he was not aware of any institutions who had accepted the Compact, and he stated that PEC discussed that mostly there is confusion about the status of the Compact, generally. The Provost committed to keeping the Senate informed if anything changes, but he expressed his personal belief that he does not expect that Miami was seeking to take part in the Compact.
- b. The Provost reported that he has received an official request from Microbiology and Biology to have a process coordinator for a departmental merger. As part of the process he has asked Jessica Sparks to serve as the process coordinator and she has agreed.
- c. The Provost's office has received many questions regarding the regional campus reorganization and transformation into the Polytechnic Campus. Melissa Thomasson, the process coordinator, is holding open forums and collecting input from the faculty and staff. The Senate Executive Committee is being updated and there will be a presentation given to the Senate at some point in the near future.
- d. Senator Question and Comments
  - i. Senator: I have heard from a few people that there is a new minimum for the Miami plan courses, at 25. Is there any truth to that? (A) That is not a University policy. Colleges have been empowered to set minimum enrollments to match their faculty resources and workload. Individual colleges that have decided to implement that new minimum, but that is not a university-wide standard.

5. **Special Reports**

- a. Policy on Campus Affiliation, Program of Study (PoS) Assignment, and Cross-Campus Registration, Rachel Beech, VP Enrollment Management and Student Success
  - i. Purpose of the Policy
    - 1. Workday project has required the review of all practices and policies in the offices of the Registrar, Student Financial Assistance, and Bursar

- a. This policy establishes clear standards to align three key areas:
      - i. Student Campus Affiliation (Home Campus)
      - ii. Student Billing
      - iii. Primary Program of Study (PoS)
    - b. The goal of this work is to:
      - i. Enhance Institutional Integrity
      - ii. Ensure Compliance (e.g., federal IPEDS reporting)
      - iii. Reduce Loopholes leading to campus switching and billing issues
      - iv. Reduce Advising Confusion
  - ii. Primary PoS Determines Campus Affiliation & Billing
    - 1. A student's home campus location and billing will be tied directly to their primary Program of Study (PoS)
      - a. Administrative & Compliance Consistency: Supports functions like financial aid, billing, registration, and IPEDS reporting.
      - b. Reduces Impact of Campus Swirl: Prevents students from altering PoS or campus designation for cost advantage without understanding financial aid or reporting implications.
      - c. Equity & Clarity: Standardizes billing and creates clearer financial expectations for all students.
  - iii. Application Options for Incoming Students
    - 1. Students apply to a primary PoS and are reviewed based on the admission criteria for the campus housing that PoS.
      - a. The primary PoS will determine the appropriate Cost of Attendance/Financial Aid guidance provided.
      - b. Reduces last-minute application switching that causes registration holds, financial aid confusion, and advising inconsistencies.
      - c. Ensures accurate IPEDS cohort assignment from the beginning.
    - 2. Applications, regardless of submission portal, are managed through the same CRM, which allows for profiles to be reevaluated without a second full application if the student changes their PoS choice.
      - a. Creates a single student profile for better record maintenance and data consistency.
  - iv. Post-Matriculation Cross-Campus Secondary PoS
    - 1. Adding a secondary (+) PoS at a different location is by Exception Only and requires formal approval.
      - a. Ensures programmatic clarity and discourages practices that distort billing or undermine academic resource planning.
        - i. *Process to be developed with Academic Divisions, Provost Office, and Registrar.*
      - b. Students changing their PoS must be in good standing (16+

- hours, minimum 2.0 GPA).
- 2. Campus Change Advising
  - a. Regional students switching to an Oxford PoS must change to Oxford as their primary location.
  - b. Oxford students switching to a Regional PoS must change to the Regionals as their primary location.
- v. Legacy Continuing Students & Transition
  - 1. Students currently pursuing a PoS not congruent with their campus will be allowed to complete existing combinations but should not add new, misaligned configurations.
    - a. Students who add a new or different misaligned PoS will be held to the new policy rules.
    - b. Current students in good standing (16+ hours, 2.0+ GPA) who want to switch their primary PoS to one not aligned to their campus must change their campus location.
    - c. Ensures new PoS assignments are properly supported, billed, and reported under the correct campus location.
- vi. Configuration Flexibility for Exceptional Programs
  - 1. Programs with specialized structures or external requirements (e.g., Nursing, Social Work, certain interdisciplinary programs) may require cross-campus flexibility.
    - a. These will be designated as Exceptional Programs upon formal review and approval.
      - i. Structure assures that exceptions are intentional, documented, and technically supported within the Student Information System (SIS)
  - 2. Exception by Design, Not Default
    - a. Any cross-campus PoS configuration for an Exceptional Program must be explicitly designed and approved in collaboration with:
      - i. Academic Affairs
      - ii. Registrar's Office
      - iii. Bursar's Office
      - iv. Dean and Departmental Leadership
      - v. SFA Office
- vii. Senator Question and Comments
  - 1. Senator: We get a fair number of our majors that start out in Hamilton and then come here to Oxford. Is that not going to happen anymore? (A) They absolutely can still do that. They just won't be able to be in your program until they are in your program at the Oxford campus. So if a student applies to the regional campus, your program will not appear on the internal application. If they apply to your program, they will come up as Oxford Admins. Students could start at the regionals as undecided

and take 2 years there, of whatever credits they need, and then relocate as they have done. It is just not the same as before, where they would just change the campus, they will have to change their major to your program.

2. Senator: Students can not change their POS unless they are in good standing. There is always going to be a number of students who select the wrong major and do poorly. How are we going to handle that small select students?(A) Those students are always handled by exception. So those students are not performing well, we do try to get them to good standing before we shift their majors. We do monitor those students.
3. Senator: If a regional student that they haven't decided what they would like to do, but they wanted to take a few classes at Oxford, would that be the same process? (A) Students can enroll in any class as long as it is available to them and they meet the requisites for it. They will not be limited.
4. Senator: So it is fair to say that they could take classes for the first two years at the regionals, finishing all the classes without declaring a major? (A) Yes, they could. I think it would become an advising question at that point and partly an application question too.
5. Senator: So there will be no more change of campus form? (A) That change of campus will go away, so that a student can't have their campus and major separate from one another; they would just change their major. As long as they are eligible for that major change. I think you are also thinking about the permission to register form and what we are doing in Workday. We can build that into the prerequisites of the Oxford class., So as an original regional student, you have to have those 16 graded hours already earned and that 2.5 and if you have that then you can automatically register for those courses, and you would not have to ask permissions for them anymore. We are trying to remove that roadblock of having to go through that process. They do not have to declare their major to take a class, they can just sign up for it. They will still need to take those 9 hours at their home campus and then take 6 hours at Oxford, as long as they meet the prerequisites for the course that are outlined by the department and the 16 hours and 2.5 GPA they can get in.
6. Senator: So it is fair to say that the restriction to register across campuses without permission? (A) As long as they meet those prerequisites. We are really trying to remove barriers that would restrict students from continuing or graduating. This has been a really important part of the project. We are looking at this realistically from a place of which is whatever is easier for the student, we will err on making it easier for the student to progress and graduate. That is our goal.

Whatever is easier for students to progress and graduate and we are working to remove those barriers to make that change.

## 6. Old Business

- a. S.Rec 26-03 - EDP - Health Professions Education, Master of Education, Amity Noltemeyer, Dean, College of Education, Health, and Society, Darrel Davis, Chair and Professor, and Kevin Bush, Professor EDP and FSW - The curriculum document can be accessed at <https://nextbulletin.miamioh.edu/programadmin/> - click on 'title' and type '**Health Professions\***' in the Search section. Click on 'Health Professions Education, Master of Education'. - **Discussion to Recommend or Not Recommend on October 20, 2025** - (Results: 53-Yes, 00-No, 00-Abstain)
  - i. Question from Senator: Not knowing the faculty's experience in teaching healthcare professionals, I am wondering how they plan to approach physicians (MDs and MD/PhD combinations) - or if this is our responsibility at all. If you find this isn't appropriate to forward to EDP, that's fine, please let me know. The following comes from my background working with and training MDs and MD/PhD researchers and their research groups:
    1. MDs can take offense at being told they need to take a course on talking to their patients.
    2. Many have been working for a long time and feel they don't need to change, and others are simply arrogant. Most rely on their care team (PAs, nurses, PTs, techs, etc) to (take the courses to learn how to) educate their patients, families, and caregivers.
    3. If the Cleveland Clinic Administration wants to encourage (or require) MDs to take the course, it is my recommendation that our faculty get something in writing from Clev. Clinic so our program is successful.
  - ii. Response: Thanks for sharing the comment! We anticipate that students who enroll in the MEHPE program are doing so because they see this as an opportunity for professional development in an area for which they have a passion, given the amount of time and work it will take to complete. Potential students for the MEHPE program are also encouraged to attend a virtual open house before applying to the program in order to understand the nature of the program, including the coursework, expectations, and competencies covered throughout the program.

We met in person with program faculty, staff, and alumni from the Cleveland Clinic Foundation (CCF) to better understand the unique context of the MEHPE program. The audience for MEHPE is expected to be a mix of MDs and other healthcare professionals (PAs, nurses, PTs, techs, etc), and we heard from the faculty and alumni that there was value in having professionals with such diverse roles learning together. Additionally, the CCF faculty have been working with their MDs and MD/PhD students in the program for years and the CCF faculty are willing to mentor Miami faculty so that the program is successful.

The MEHPE focuses on helping professionals develop skills and competence in designing, delivering, and assessing instructional content for other professionals. MDs will not be required to take the program and our program does not focus on technical aspects of healthcare such as doctor/patient relationships. We have drafted statements of understanding and our legal team is working on developing those into an MOU that will be shared with the Cleveland Clinic. There will be a signed MOU in place before the program begins.

iii. S. Rec. 26-XX Senate Recommendation on EDP - Health Professions, Education, Master of Education

1. BE IT HEREBY KNOWN that the University Senate, after thoughtful consideration, reflection, and discussion, has elected to RECOMMEND WITH RESERVATIONS the proposed EDP – Health Professions Education, Master of Education.
2. The Senate adopted this stance through majority vote for the following reasons:
  - a. The Senate acknowledges this is an innovative effort by the faculty and leadership of the College of Education, Healthcare, and Society and welcomes this new partnership with the Cleveland Clinic.
3. And, in addition, we add the following relevant considerations:
  - a. The Senate encourages the University to understand how our emerging partnership with the Cleveland Clinic will differ from prior attempts at this program with other institutions.
  - b. The Senate suggests that decision-makers clarify the ultimate ownership of the curriculum and intellectual property.
  - c. The Senate expressed concern that this program will take 4 years to recoup startup costs, as a minimum.

iv. Senator Question and Comments

1. Senator: There is a typo to the name on the S. Rec?(A) Thank you. I will go ahead and fix this.
2. Senator: I don't understand the reservations?(A) We could change reservations to consideration.
3. Senator: How is SEC deciding to Recommend without Reservation versus Recommend with Reservation? (A) Based on the survey results that we are receiving back.
4. Senator: So are those three comments the summary of the comments you received in the survey?(A) Yes, they are a summary of the comments in a way that does not identify the Senator who made them.
5. Senator: It's still voting between 3 options, so if someone wants to vote without recommendations, we would need to vote it down first? (A) That is correct.
6. Senator: It seems like we should have a yes or no on recommendation, then to recommend with or without reservation.

7. Parliamentarian: There is a Motion that the body can make called a Quasi Committee Of The Whole. This is a motion that allows informal discussions to happen and for them to be non-binding. So it is a chance for us to really see where the votes really are. So it would be possible then to put 3 or 5 different options on the board for people to discuss and see what choices are most acceptable to you. Again, this is non-binding, so when we are out of the committee, you can actually vote however you want. It is the best way that we can come up with as to what is the will of the body. If anything does get changed, you would need an amendment to make those changes.
8. Senator: I think you should strike relevant, as I assume if you are expressing these reservations, then it is relevant. (A) I will update that.
9. Senator: If the wording at the top were changed to just recommend, and then just put considerations at the bottom? I don't know if that would ease some people's minds regarding the reservations. (A) That might work. We were thinking of this idea of Recommend with Reservations, because in the past, we have pushed things through that we voted affirmatively on that we have had reservations about. We pushed those items through because we had faith in what was told to us by the person presenting, even though we were concerned. That is why it is a third choice, with the Recommend, Recommend with Reservations, and Do Not Recommend. I believe it is an important choice that we have to make. This actually speaks to the importance of filling out the poll and asking Senators to prepare before the meeting. Which means, reviewing the packet, filling out the poll, as we are pulling all this information together based on what you tell us, and we can only do that if you participate in the process.
10. Senator: Can you recommend something with still having something that we want the board to consider? (A) That is the intent of what Recommend with Reservations is.
11. Senator: The survey that went out, could we receive that as a separate email for the polling? (A) Yes, we can send out a separate email
12. Senator: Could we do a yes or no with always sharing our comments? Maybe not even in a negative way, cause maybe we want them do more things like that. But, if there is an opportunity to add some context to a yes or no then I don't know that there needs to be a third option.
13. Senator: I personally agree with that. I have been here for 3 meetings total, and every single time we have talked about Recommend and Recommend with Reservations, it has gone on for at least 45 minutes. I personally feel like we should vote Recommend or Don't Recommend first, and then if there are reservations we can go through that afterwards. This is an extra step that always takes up a lot more time

than what is needed, because there is never going to be 100% consensus. We are getting lost in the language, and feel like we are not going to be able to use our time effectively here if every week we are debating the same question twice.

14. Motion Quasi Committee recommendation: Results: 55-Yes 00-No, 00 -Abstain
  - a. Vote for recommending or not recommending: Results: 52-Yes 00-No, 03 -Abstain
  - b. Vote on Recommend with Reservation
    - i. Consideration 1 - Passes with 5-nay, and 4-abstains
    - ii. Consideration 2 - Passes with 8-nay, and 4-abstains
    - iii. Consideration 3 - Did not pass with majority nay votes
  - c. Vote to come out of Quasi Committee: Results: 55-Yes 00-No, 00 -Abstain
15. Call to question
  - a. All those in Favor of adapting EDP - Health Professions Education, Master of Education: Results: 53-Yes 00-No, 00 -Abstain

## 7. **New Business**

- a. 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***
  - i. Policy Revision: Minimum Enrollment
    1. Fall and Spring:
      - a. Must be enrolled in at least one (1) graduate credit hour that contributes to their degree requirements.
      - b. Spring graduates may fulfill this requirement by winter-term enrollment in programs where required courses are offered in winter term.
    2. Winter and Summer:
      - a. Must be enrolled in at least one (1) graduate credit hour that contributes to their degree requirements in the graduation term, or the term immediately preceding.
    3. Rationale:
      - a. Incentivize student progress toward degree completion
      - b. Reflect the time, effort, and financial costs associated with providing student services through graduation
      - c. Alignment with state and nationwide practices.
    4. Key Considerations:
      - a. ~200 GR students annually graduate in a term with no

- enrollment or zero-credit-hour enrollment
    - i. ~50% occur in summer terms
  - b. Benchmarking:
    - i. Requirements commonly range from 1-3 credit hours
- 5. Minimum Enrollment - All graduate students must meet the following minimum enrollment requirement for the term of graduation.
  - a. Fall and Spring: Must be enrolled in at least one (1) graduate credit hour that contributes to their degree requirements. Spring graduates may fulfill this requirement by winter-term enrollment in programs where required courses are offered in winter term.
  - b. Winter and Summer: Must be enrolled in at least 1 graduate credit hour that contributes to their degree requirements in the graduate term, or the term immediately preceding.
- 6. For students in programs with a required clinical or internship experience that extends into their graduation term, the minimum enrollment requirement can be met by enrolling in the designated clinical or internship course(s), including those with zero-credit hours.
- 7. Students graduating in a summer term are advised (but not required) to enroll in a zero-credit-hour course during their graduation term in order to ensure the continuity of student status and access to institutional resources, such as advising, library services, and email accounts.
- ii. Senator Question and Comments
  - 1. Senator: For a student on a 2-year master's teaching assistantship who typically wouldn't graduate until the summer because it is a lot to teach a lot of courses and to also rewrite a thesis. So you are saying for those students they should have to pay for 1 additional credit in the summer? (A) In that scenario the answer is no, they would not. The reason being is because winter and summer graduates must be enrolled in one term unless they were enrolled in a procedure.
  - 2. Senator: So this would apply to someone who came back and they would only have to register for 1 credit? (A) Correct
  - 3. Senator: If students have completed all of their required hours, including dissertation hours, over the past couple of years, students have not been required to take extra courses, and they have not had to pay for an extra credit hour during their semester of graduation. So this new minimum enrollment would require the additional hour to be paid for, is that correct? It normally takes a year to complete a dissertation, often after all coursework is completed, and I don't think that it is fair that they have to pay. (A) We are one of the few Universities in the nation that will allow a student not to have to pay back tuition to have continuing status the entire time until they defend. We are not asking

for this right here in this policy. All schools that we have talked to would have required at least 1 credit hour in that semester that they would have defended. What is most common is continuous enrollment for the doctoral students, and we have programs here at Miami that include that as well.

4. Senator: However, what about students who have completed all their course and seminar requirements and are strictly focusing on their thesis or dissertation research? Do they need this 1 graduate credit, or does their independent study graduate credit cover it? In other words, are these groups of students required to have this 1 graduate credit hour in addition to their independent study hours or not? (A) The minimum credit hour requirement may be fulfilled by an independent study or a graduate research credit hour.
- b. 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
  - i. Key revisions
    1. Doctoral programs: Decreases eligibility for university support to a maximum of either 4 or 5 years
    2. Other amendments (unrelated to above)
      - a. Integrate info from Types of Awards policy, and add statement clarifying that a student only in a Graduate Certificate program is not eligible for GA.
      - b. Integrate info from OneStop tuition page regarding MDT rate programs.
  - ii. Background
    1. Average time-to-degree (yrs) 2020-present
      - a. GA funded limit = 6 years
        - i. BIO = 7.3
        - ii. CHM = 5.5
        - iii. CMSB = 5.7
        - iv. EEEB = 6.9
        - v. ENG = 6.9
        - vi. GLG = 5.5
        - vii. MBI = 6.2
      - b. GA funded limited < 6 years
        - i. EDL-Ph.D. = 7.3
        - ii. GTY = 6.0
        - iii. PSY = 6.0
      - c. No GA Funding
        - i. EDL-Ed.D = 5.0
    2. # degrees awarded (2020-present)

- a. BIO = 15
- b. CHM = 63
- c. CMSB = 17
- d. EDL-Ed.D = 89
- e. EDL-Ph.D. = 71
- f. EEEB = 26
- g. ENG = 43
- h. GLG = 18
- i. GTY = 23
- j. MBI = 17
- k. PSY = 71

iii. Rationale

- 1. Part of GA reform plan
- 2. Improve time-to-degree
  - a. Benefits student to enter career sooner
  - b. GA positions turnover faster = available to more students
- 3. Increase the availability and efficiency of graduate award funding.
- 4. Align with practice at other universities
  - a. Ohio CCGS schools: 4-5 years funding is most common
- 5. Increasing employment outside of academia
- 6. GAs enrolling in the required minimum cr hr (9hr/term) earns
  - a. 60 hours in 7 semesters
  - b. 90 hours in 10 semesters
- 7. Concerns raised:
  - a. Will require a shorter plan of study in several programs
  - b. Overall 5-year limit will impact programs with separate masters and doctoral programs
- 8. Implementation:
  - a. Applies to students admitted to a graduate program in Fall 2026 and after.
  - b. No change for current Graduate Students

iv. Policy Revision: Administration of Graduate Awards (Time limit amendment)

- 1. Time limits for students enrolled in a doctoral program are as follows, but individual academic programs may have additional limitations on funding eligibility:
- 2. Students admitted to a graduate program leading to a doctoral degree in Fall, 2026 and after are eligible for financial support from graduate assistantships up to:
  - a. Four (4) years beyond receipt of a master's degree,
  - b. Five (5) years of support beyond the bachelor's degree if admitted directly into a doctoral program, or any student

pursuing both master's and doctoral work in the same graduate field of study or academic department at Miami University.

- v. Senator Question and Comments
  - 1. Senator: Overall 5-year limit. If a student goes and does field work for a year. Do they still get 5 years for funding? Because, technically, you are in your 6th year when you come back, but you need that extra year of funding. How would that work?(A) It really depends on that year off. If that Funding is through the university, that would count towards the 5 years. It sounds unfair to allow an extra year of funding where there might be grant money available, and who decides who should get that money. There are cases where it is an advantage, and then there are cases where it is definitely a disadvantage to the student. That is our current policy and we didn't touch that part of the policy as we only changed was the 6 to 5.
- c. Ad Hoc Committee on the University Senate Enabling Act, Rosemary Pennington, past Chair of Senate Executive Committee, and Chelsea Green, Associate Clinical Professor Finance and BLS -  
***Presentation Only on "Revised Curricular Process": Discussion to Recommend or Not Recommend with vote on November 17, 2025***
  - i. Proposed Revisions to University Senate Bylaws and Standing Rules
    - 1. Ad Hoc Committee Members
      - a. Rosemary Pennington, Co-Chair, Member of Senate Executive Committee
      - b. Chelsea Green, Co-Chair, Chair of the Governance Committee
      - c. Kevin Reuning, representative from University Senate
      - d. Cheryl Young, representative from University Senate, presidential appointee
      - e. Tracy Haynes, faculty
      - f. Kevin Bush, faculty
      - g. Tom Poetter, past chair of University Senate Executive Committee (2022-2023)
      - h. Daniel Martin, undergraduate student
      - i. Kingsley Udeh, graduate student
    - 2. Process
      - a. Reviewed ORC 3345.457, most recent version of Senate's Enabling Act, Bylaws and Standing Rules
      - b. Reviewed shared governance procedures at other public institutions
      - c. Consulted with Provost's office, Registrar, and Senate Parliamentarian
    - 3. Our Suggestions
      - a. Revision of the introductory article of Enabling Act to come into compliance with ORC

- b. Revision of Standing Rules to change Senate's voting process
  - c. Revision to the Council for Undergraduate Curriculum
  - d. Minor revisions to clean up and/or update language
- 4. Enabling Act - Introduction
  - a. 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.**
- 5. Standing Rules - Voting
  - a. The final vote on any substantive issues to come before University Senate shall be recorded by voice vote. These results will be reported in the meeting minutes circulated to the university community.
  - b. If the voice vote is indeterminate, the Parliamentarian or Secretary of Senate shall ask for a show of hands. If a member of Senate feels the vote is inconclusive or inaccurately called, they may call for a division of the house or a roll call vote.
  - c. 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 Senate as "absent."
  - d. Any senator may call for a roll call vote on any matter brought before Senate
  - e. A roll call vote will be taken before University Senate goes into executive session, the motion to enter executive session must include a reason for entering executive session.
  - f. When considering curriculum and policy matters, 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 Senate.
  - g. No same-day votes will be taken on curriculum items that require budget projections.
- 6. Council for Undergraduate Curriculum
  - a. Recommend adding the Fiscal Priorities Co-Chair as member
  - b. Require CUC to examine the budget implications of programs it reviews

- c. Require a yearly report/presentation from CUC on what programs the council has seen as well as suggestions for revisions to curricular review process.
  - 7. Remaining Questions
    - a. Revision of process coordination at Miami
    - b. Question of whether student conduct should be in the Enabling Act
    - c. Inclusion of another undergraduate student on Senate Executive Committee - suggestion of student member of Board of Trustees.
  - ii. Senator Question and Comments
    - 1. Senator: Curriculum would proceed to COAD regardless of what we vote?(A) It would, but I am thinking about our new process and if we keep the recommendation with reservations. It is a moment that I think if we take and by presenting reservations that it could have a real impact that we have not had in the past.
- d. SR 26-01 Ad Hoc Committee on the University Senate Enabling Act, Rosemary Pennington, past Chair of Senate Executive Committee, and Chelsea Green, Associate Clinical Professor Finance and BLS - ***Presentation Only on "Enabling Act Revisions": Discussion and Senate Procedural Vote that will take place on October 20, 2025, on whether or not to Advance to a Public Hearing on November 03, 202*** - (Results: 53-Yes, 01-No, 01-Abstain)
  - i. SR 26-XX Senate Resolution to Advance Revised Enabling Act to Public Hearing
    - 1. BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED that the University Senate, after thoughtful consideration, reflection, and discussion has elected to accept the proposal presented by the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the University Enabling Act on October 20, 2025 for possible amendments to the language of the University Senate's Enabling Act responsive to ORC 3345.457.
    - 2. Pursuant to the Miami University Senate Enabling Act, Article VII, Sec. 3, this proposal will be presented at a public hearing on the amendments during a special meeting of the University Senate on November 3, 2025 with an anticipated motion to amend the *Enabling Act* in accordance with the proposal to follow at the University Senate's November 17, 2025 meeting.
  - ii. Senator Question and Comments
    - 1. No question or comments received from Senators
  - iii. Proposed Revision to Curricular Review Process
    - 1. Suggested Revision To the Curricular Approval Process
      - a. For New Programs
        - i. Senate receive MAPI report
        - ii. Informational presentation to Senate post-MAPI approval

- iii. Current practice for all levels of approval - Minus proposed change to CUC - until it reaches Senate
    - iv. Senate votes before curriculum goes to COAD
  - b. For Program Revisions
    - i. If revisions are cross-curricular, the CUC needs to review the proposal
    - ii. If revisions are not cross-curricular, follow the proposed curricular approval process from the departmental level to the BoT
- 2. Proposed Curricular Approval Process
  - a. New Program
    - i. MAPI (only for new programs) = University Senate provided MAPI report on any new programs that are approved to move forward.
    - ii. University Senate - Information only = Following MAPI approval, the new program will be presented to University Senate for informational purposes only before it moves on to the department.
    - iii. Departmental Curriculum Committee = Follows current practice
    - iv. Divisional Curriculum Committee = Follows current practice. Also prepares budgetary implication report for submission to Senate committee.
    - v. Council for Undergraduate Curriculum/ Graduate Council = Votes to recommend, recommend with reservations, not recommend curriculum before it moves to Senate.
      - 1. Provides reasons for vote.
    - vi. University Senate - Vote = Senate votes to – Recommend, Recommend with Reservations, Note Recommend – to COAD
      - 1. Senate will provide a report of reasons why it did or did not recommend
    - vii. COAD = Votes and sends program up to BoT, back to the division, or it dies.
    - viii. Board of Trustees = Current practice.
  - b. Revision to Current Program - (This process is to be followed only if the revisions are cross-divisional)
    - i. Departmental Curriculum Committee = Follows current practice

- ii. Divisional Curriculum Committee = Follows current practice. Also prepares budgetary implication report for submission to Senate committee.
  - iii. Council for Undergraduate Curriculum/ Graduate Council = Votes to recommend, recommend with reservations, not recommend curriculum before it moves to Senate
    - 1. Provides reasons for vote
  - iv. University Senate = Senate votes to – Recommend, Recommend with reservations, Not recommend – to COAD
    - 1. Senate will provide a report of reasons why it did or did not recommend.
  - v. COAD = Votes and sends program up to BoT or back to the division, or it dies.
  - vi. Board of Trustees = Current practice.
3. Senator Question and Comments
- a. Senator: Thank you for your work on this. My question is regarding the language on the enabling act. How does advisory on modifications of academic programs, curricula, courses differ from legislators of academic programs? (A) We were thinking more along the lines of the guts of a degree program. Also, sort of like the accreditation standards that programs might need to meet. We were talking about Accreditation requirements and who should be the one to determine how those are met and it seemed to be carved out from this statute.
  - b. Senator: What would the new voting method be? (A) It would be a voice vote, if inclusive then we would do a roll call vote or a division of the house, which is where we would get up and divide. We built that process in case the voice vote is inclusive.
  - c. Senator: Are there groups that we are changing their ability to do things? For example: SLC that governed in the past. (A) With this language included, that authority has been fully delegated.
  - d. Senator: I feel like when we have seen budgetary numbers, it is always by year X we will have X students and it is all kinds of made up numbers. Given that, I feel like this might be adding work for people who really aren't going to accomplish anything.
  - e. Senator: If student conduct has been delegated to SLC then why is it included in the enabling act here? Also, I believe that body is atomious? (A) That is because it is one of our committees and yes it is atomious. I think we have that conversation further down the road, so that we can focus on what we need to change

due to Ohio law. I would also encourage people to bring these conversations down the road or at the hearing. Our work today is to put this into public hearing.

**8. Student Government Update**

- a. Senate just passed legislation to encourage the College of Arts and Sciences to soften their language requirements, and the final language was that ASG will copy the language resolution to the Dean of Arts and Sciences, the BOT, and to President Crawford. So I would encourage you guys to get more student cross-collaboration.
- b. Chick-fil-a is coming on the 27th. So spend your money here at Miami everyone.

**9. Adjournment**