

Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Friday, January 20, 2017
3:00p.m. – 5:00 p.m., Adelbert Hall, Room M2

3:00 p.m.	Approval of Minutes from the December 5, 2016, Executive Committee Meeting, <i>attachment</i>	Peter Harte
3:05 p.m.	Provost's Announcements	Bud Baeslack
3:10 p.m.	Chair's Announcements	Peter Harte
3:15 p.m.	SOM Petition for Anatomy	Dan Anker
3:30 p.m.	Statement from Senate By-Laws Committee re Anatomy Petition	Ken Ledford
3:45 p.m.	FSCUE Proposals	Robin Dubin Jeffrey Wolcowitz
4:00 p.m.	SOM Executive Committee	Maureen McEney
4:10 p.m.	Proposed Language to Add Emeritus Faculty as Nonvoting Member of the Faculty Senate, <i>attachment</i>	Ken Ledford
4:15 p.m.	Minor Name Change- Ratification of Senate Vote	Peter Harte
4:20 p.m.	Revisions to Faculty Handbook re adding member from postdoctoral association to Senate	Ken Ledford
4:25 p.m.	Approval of Faculty Senate Agenda, <i>attachment</i>	Peter Harte

**Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the January 20, 2017 Meeting
Adelbert Hall, Room M2**

Committee Members in Attendance

Bud Baeslack, Provost
Peter Harte, SOM, chair
Juscelino Colares, LAW, vice chair
Roy Ritzmann, CAS, past chair
Cathleen Carlin, SOM
Gerald Mahoney, MSASS
Vasudevan Ramanujam, WSOM
Robert Strassfeld, LAW
Ibrahim Tulunoglu, SODM
Amy Zhang, SON

Others Present:

Jeremy Bendik-Keymer, chair, Personnel Committee
Robin Dubin, chair, FSCUE
Steve Hauck, chair, FSCICT
Paul Iversen, chair, FSCUL
Kenneth Ledford, chair, By-Laws Committee
Maureen McEnery, chair, Nominating Committee
Glenn Starkman, chair, Finance Committee

Guests:

Dan Anker, Associate Dean, Faculty Affairs and Human Resources, SOM
Mark Aulisio, SOM
Jeffrey Wolcowitz, Dean of Undergraduate Studies

Absent:

Barbara Snyder, President
Kimberly Emmons, CAS
Horst von Recum, CSE

Call to Order

Professor Peter Harte, chair, Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the December 5, 2016 meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee were reviewed and approved. *Attachment*

Provost's Announcements

The Provost reported that the President was in Naples, Florida attending a development event. He also reported that the CUE working groups are starting to meet.

Chair's Announcements

Professor Peter Harte reported that the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee submitted its recommendations on the university's Bias Reporting System and they will be considered at the February Senate meetings.

Prof. Harte also provided background information on the Petition for Anatomy. The Petition was presented to the SOM Faculty Council by Dean Pamela Davis in December of 2013. It was subsequently approved by the Faculty Council in April of 2014 and submitted to the Faculty Senate in May of 2015. Following a discussion of the proposal, the Executive Committee will consider the recommendation from the Faculty Senate By-Laws Committee pertaining to the Petition.

SOM Petition for Anatomy

Dan Anker, Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Human Resources, and Professor Mark Aulisio from the SOM, presented the *Petition for a Division of Anatomy* which proposes to convert the Department of Anatomy to a Division of Anatomy within the School of Medicine. According to Dean Anker and Professor Aulisio, the Department of Anatomy has evolved over time into a unit primarily focused on education. There is little research activity within the department. The SOM is proposing to convert the department into a "division" whose mission would be primarily education. This was stated to be permitted under the SOM By-Laws. Dean Anker and Prof. Aulisio pointed out that all faculty protections would remain intact the division and that faculty positions would not be eliminated. In the past the SOM dean had offered to transfer the remaining faculty members in the Department of Anatomy to another department but faculty in Anatomy preferred to stay as a separate unit.

A committee member asked whether there are other departments within the SOM that don't include research activity as an expectation. The response was that there are individual faculty members in departments who don't engage in extensive research but that most faculty members in departments do. Another committee member asked why it was claimed that the Anatomy Department faculty members do not have research programs, when two of the three tenured faculty members have active programs and publish regularly in top tier journals. Another committee member expressed a concern that the SOM By-Laws do not spell out the criteria for determining when a department can be converted to a division. *Attachment*

Statement from Senate By-Laws Committee re Anatomy Petition

The proponents of the Petition were excused and the Executive Committee discussed the Senate By-Laws Committee recommendation pertaining to the Petition. In its reading of the pertinent provisions of the Faculty Handbook, the Senate By-Laws Committee had concluded that the "Petition for a Division of Anatomy" was not in conformity with the Faculty Handbook and should not be considered. Professor Kenneth Ledford, chair of the By-Laws Committee pointed out that the Committee's recommendation did not reach the merits of the Petition, but focused on whether it is consistent with the terms of the Faculty Handbook. The Faculty Handbook provides that "*The*

department shall be the basic unit of those faculties so organized. Each member of the University Faculty holding a principal appointment in such a faculty shall normally have an appointment in a department." The Handbook also provides that the department "shall" be the focal point for an academic discipline and "shall" plan and provide programs for teaching and scholarly work, etc.... The Executive Committee discussed the recommendation from the By-Laws Committee and noted that not all schools are organized into subunits, but when they are, departments are the only subunits into which faculty appointments may be made. They also discussed the fact that without scholarly research productivity, it would not be possible for faculty to obtain tenure, implying that the proposed division could only make new appointments in the non-tenure track. The Executive Committee voted unanimously to endorse the recommendation to deny the Petition. The Executive Committee agreed that the next step would be for the Chair to write a letter to the Dean of the SOM, with a copy to the chair of the SOM Faculty Council, letting her know about the Executive Committee's decision.

Attachment

FSCUE Proposals

Professor Robin Dubin, chair of FSCUE, introduced Jeffrey Wolcowitz, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, who presented several Academic Standing Subcommittee proposals that had been approved by FSCUE. The proposals were:

1. Beginning fall 2017, students who withdraw after the 11th Friday of a semester may not enroll for the next two academic sessions, including the summer session. Exceptions may be granted by the Academic Standing Board.
 - The Executive Committee voted unanimously to include this proposal on the Faculty Senate agenda.
2. Beginning fall 2017, students placed or continuing on probation are required to review their course schedules with their deans in the Office of Undergraduate Studies before the end of the drop/add period in order to continue for the semester.
 - The Executive Committee voted unanimously to include this proposal on the Faculty Senate agenda.
3. Beginning fall 2017, academic probation will be a status recorded on the unofficial/advising transcript but not on the official transcript.
 - The Executive Committee voted unanimously to include this proposal on the Faculty Senate agenda.

The FSCUE proposals will be presented at the Senate meeting in the form of a Faculty Senate resolution. *Attachment*

SOM Executive Committee

Professor Maureen McEnery (SOM) presented a recommendation from the SOM Faculty Council to the Senate Executive Committee identifying the Faculty Council as the SOM Executive Committee for purposes of Senate By-Laws X. The Executive Committee voted to accept this recommendation (with 2 opposed). *Attachment*

Proposed Language to Add Emeritus Faculty as Nonvoting Member of the Faculty Senate

Prof. Ledford presented draft language adding the chair of the Emeriti Academy as a nonvoting member of the Senate for inclusion in the Faculty Handbook. A concern had previously been expressed that adding a new member to the Senate would increase the number required for a quorum. Prof. Ledford identified a current provision in Chapter 2 of the Faculty Handbook that provides that only voting members of the Senate would be considered when determining a quorum. The Executive Committee voted (with 1 opposed) to include the language adding the chair of the Emeriti Academy as a nonvoting member of the Senate, to the Faculty Senate agenda. *Attachment*

Minor Name Change- Ratification of Senate Vote

The Executive Committee voted to ratify the vote at the November Senate meeting approving a name change for the minor in Health Communications to a minor in Communication for Health Professionals. This item had not been discussed by the Executive Committee prior to the Senate vote.

Revisions to Faculty Handbook Adding a Member from the Postdoctoral Association to the Faculty Senate

The Executive Committee voted to forward to the Senate By-Laws Committee, draft language adding a member of the Postdoctoral Association as a voting member of the Faculty Senate. The language had been drafted by members of the Postdoctoral Association. *Attachment*

Approval of Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda

The Executive Committee approved the agenda for the January 31st Faculty Senate meeting. *Attachment*

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:00 pm.

PETITION FOR A DIVISION OF ANATOMY

The key rationale for establishing a Division of Anatomy would be to maintain a unit that has a strong, longstanding, and central educational mission but to recognize that it does not have a concomitant research mission.

It is therefore recommended that the Department of Anatomy be converted to a Division of Anatomy within the School of Medicine. The Division of Anatomy will be a division with departmental status, as defined in the SOM Bylaws.

The division will have primarily, but not exclusively, an educational mission and will participate in the administration, design, and implementation of teaching in the anatomical sciences in the School of Medicine. Its performance relative to other departments will be assessed primarily based on fulfillment of this educational mission.

The division will be headed by a Division Director appointed by the President of the University upon recommendation of the Dean and will follow the Case SOM faculty Bylaws Section 4:3 except that a local (internal) rather than a national search will be deemed satisfactory. The Division Director will have all rights and responsibility of a Department Chair as specified in the SOM bylaws and Faculty Handbook, including voting membership in the Basic Science Department Chairs Council.

All faculty who currently hold appointments in the Department of Anatomy will be eligible to maintain their primary faculty appointment in the Division of Anatomy at their discretion or may join other units of the University following the usual approval process for such transfers. Those Department of Anatomy faculty remaining in the Division of Anatomy will be permitted to maintain roughly their current effort distribution (teaching, research, clinical and service) if they so desire for the 2014-2015 academic year and with the Division Director's agreement beyond that time. Future promotion and tenure of such faculty will be judged by the same criteria as for members of departments as described in the SOM's Qualifications and Standards. Scholarly research and funded research activities will be balanced with teaching and service in consultation with the division director on an annual basis.

New faculty recruited to the Division of Anatomy will primarily have educational responsibilities, but effort dedicated to research may be negotiated between the faculty member and the Division Director at the time of hiring and will be honored by the Dean and the SOM. Existing guidelines for merit pay will be retained but will need to be revisited by the division's faculty if the Department of Anatomy's status changes.

The same bylaws and protections regarding faculty with appointments in departments in regard to faculty appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure will apply to faculty with appointments in divisions with departmental status. The same bylaws governing the creation and dissolution of departments will also apply to divisions with departmental status.

Pamela B. Davis, M.D., Ph.D.

Dean

Senior Vice President for Medical Affairs

Office of the Dean

10900 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44106-4915

Visitors and Deliveries
Biomedical Research Bldg., - Rm. 113

Phone 216-368-2825

Fax 216-368-2820

<http://casemed.case.edu>

April 30, 2015

Robert Savinell, PhD
Chair, Faculty Senate
c/o Rebecca Weiss, Secretary of the University Faculty
Adelbert Hall
7001

Re: Division of Anatomy

Dear Dr. Savinell:

At its April 28, 2014, meeting, the School of Medicine's Faculty Council voted, 22 in favor and 9 opposed, to recommend approval of the enclosed Petition for a Division of Anatomy. Faculty Council consideration of the proposal extended over many months and multiple meetings. The process included the establishment of a faculty ad hoc committee (which substantially revised my initial proposal), a committee including members drawn from the Council and from the Department of Anatomy itself. The ad hoc committee, chaired by Dr. Nicole Ward, herself a former faculty member in anatomy, solicited opinion from many faculty members, including the Department of Anatomy, and generated multiple drafts.

Faculty Council's recommendation to establish a division of anatomy culminates decades of discussions and debates among School of Medicine deans, Department of Anatomy faculty, and the broader faculty concerning the appropriate place of the discipline of anatomy in the medical school's academic structure.

I recommend approval of the Petition, the establishment of a division of anatomy, and the transfer of faculty appointments from the department to the division. No faculty positions, tenured, tenure track, or non-tenure track, will be eliminated or terminated as a result of the change.

You have recently received a proposed amendment to the Faculty of Medicine Bylaws intended to clarify the status of divisions generally. That amendment, which would also govern the School of Medicine's Division of General Medical Sciences, pertains to the proposed new Division of Anatomy. Now that the Bylaws proposal is under Faculty Senate review, consideration of this petition is now timely.

Some background and a brief history of the place of anatomy within the School of Medicine may assist the Faculty Senate in its consideration of the proposal to establish a division.

The discipline of anatomy, nationally, no longer has an active academic/research base. Of the top 30 medical schools, only 2 have departments of anatomy, and neither of these departments has an academic focus on anatomy per se. The Mayo Clinic's department of anatomy has 3 faculty members and is focused on medical education. UCSF has a department called anatomy but is focused on neurosciences. No other freestanding departments of anatomy based in Schools of Medicine are reported among top 30 medical schools in US News and World Report.



SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

CASE WESTERN RESERVE
UNIVERSITY

Robert Savinell, PhD
April 30, 2015
Page Two

The discipline of anatomy has been formally recognized in the School from its founding in the nineteenth century through the beginning of the twentieth. Since that time, as new disciplines have emerged and evolved from the field of anatomy, it remains important for the education of physicians but the discipline's central place for research purposes has dissipated.

In the 1980's, the Department of Developmental Genetics and Anatomy (its name between 1983 and 1988), prospered and maintained a research program relevant to the medical sciences in genetics. The department's research vitality significantly diminished following the separation of its geneticists and their establishment in 1987 of a separate Department of Genetics which developed into the current Department of Genetics and Genome Sciences. The department re-assumed its title of Department of Anatomy in 1988 and Dr. Barry Lindley was named Acting Chair at that time. The department continued its graduate program, with a more limited scope, while a new program was initiated in genetics.

Reflecting its diminished research mission, since 1987 the Department has been led by interim chairs, except for one four year period, as a succession of deans recognized more important research growth possibilities in other disciplines and chose not to make an investment in anatomy that would be necessary to recruit a permanent chair. During the 1990s some effort was made to create a department of cell biology and anatomy, but this did not come to fruition as the external identification and recruitment of an appropriate individual for a chair failed.

Dr. Joseph LaManna succeeded Dr. Lyndley as interim chair in 1993 and then was named permanent chair in 2004. At that time, attempts were made to recruit and reinvigorate research and develop a department in the basic science model. Dr. LaManna received a package, and appointed tenure track faculty related to neurological research. By 2007, internal and external reviewers of the department's graduate program recommended suspension of admission to the program due to the absence of a critical mass of funded faculty mentors or a critical mass of qualified applicants. When Dr. LaManna stepped down and joined another department in 2008, only one faculty member with a funded research program remained (in evolutionary biology and paleontology). With Dr. LaManna's departure, the Department's extramural funding declined by more than 95%. The main activity and focus of the department was teaching in the medical school curriculum and in an MS in anatomy program popular with medical students headed for surgery and post-baccalaureate students wanting to improve their records for medical school. Dr. Daniel Ornt, Vice Dean for Education, assumed the role of Interim Chair following Dr. LaManna and tried to reshape the department into one focused on scholarly activity related to medical education. This effort was unsuccessful. When Dr. Ornt departed, Dr. Cliff Harding was named interim chair in 2012.

We have made efforts to maintain the anatomy unit as a department. Ordinarily, we think of basic science departments as needing to sustain the vitality of their teaching program by active, in-depth acquisition of new knowledge in the field. Indeed, departments are expected to have both a discovery and an education component. Since there is no novel discovery pathway in the anatomy discipline per se, external reviewers in 2007 outlined two possibilities under which the department could be maintained as a separate entity. One was to develop a focus in paleontology and evolutionary biology, the other to develop a scholarly focus in medical education. Evolutionary biology has never risen to prominence in any of the SOM's

Robert Savinell, PhD
April 30, 2015
Page Three

strategic plans (or any other medical school's strategic plan, to my knowledge), and we do not have the funds to invest in non-priority areas. In addition, this focus does not have universal support among the members of the department. Medical education, however, is a major focus of the SOM and scholarly work in this area is important and mission-critical. The Mayo Medical School provides an example of such a department. I met with the department's faculty on multiple occasions to discuss, among other possibilities, a medical education focus. Some Anatomy faculty expressed their desire not to focus on scholarship in education, feeling that this would put them on a footing below other basic science departments.

An alternative approach was to combine the Department of Anatomy with another department in the hopes of catalyzing a new scholarly focus and creating critical mass. Providing a place for anatomists in this fashion is the most common approach taken by the top 30 medical schools in the US. Two departments presented themselves as opportunities for merger: surgery and pathology. After presentations by the chairs of these departments to the anatomy faculty, however, the anatomy faculty was unable to reach consensus regarding a merger. At the beginning of the 2012-13 academic year, the department of anatomy's Faculty Council representative asked the Council for assistance in convincing the Dean to invest new dollars in the department. The Faculty Council agreed that it would consider a proposal from the department outlining its collective vision for its future if that proposal had the unanimous approval of the department's faculty. No such proposal was provided.

In order to break the deadlock, meet the department faculty's expressed wishes to remain a distinct unit and to remain together, and to appropriately recognize the unit's mission of teaching and service, I proposed the conversion of the department into a Division of Anatomy in December 2013. The Faculty Council's ad hoc committee reworked my proposal and the Council recommended approval of the petition enclosed with this letter.

The status of anatomy in the School of Medicine has vexed the faculty and the dean for at least the past 25 years. The proposal before you represents the best efforts of faculty and administration, providing a sustainable academic home for anatomy for the twenty-first century. I know you will give the petition close scrutiny.

Please let me know if I can provide additional information.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Pamela B. Davis, MD, PhD

c: Dr. Robert Petersen, Past-Chair, Faculty Council
Dr. Mark Aulisio, Chair, Faculty Council
Dr. Clifford Harding, Interim Chair, Department of Anatomy
Nicole Deming, Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs and Human Resources, SOM

enclosures

May 1, 2015

Pamela B. Davis, MD, PhD
Dean, School of Medicine
BRB 105
4915

Dear Dean Davis:

At its April 28, 2014, meeting, the School of Medicine's Faculty Council voted, 22 in favor and 9 opposed, to recommend approval of the enclosed Petition for a Division of Anatomy.

You, as well as anyone, can appreciate the give and take, collegial compromise, and considered judgment that this vote represents. Taken as a whole, the process has spanned decades. Multiple deans and Faculty Council leaders made great efforts to reach a unanimous recommendation. But as in any group run by democratic principles, a time comes to take a vote and follow the will of the majority. We have reached that time regarding the future of Anatomy in the School of Medicine.

Last year's Faculty Council Chair Bob Petersen did not forward the proposal to you because he believed, and I concurred, that a Bylaws amendment to the section on Departments (and Divisions) would quickly be approved by the Faculty of Medicine, providing a more explicit assurance of the rights held by faculty in the proposed Division of Anatomy (and the Division of General Medical Sciences). That amendment is under consideration by the Faculty Senate and forwarding this proposal may illuminate some of the issues raised concerning the amendment.

After your review of the petition, I hope you will join me in recommending approval of establishment of a Division of Anatomy by the Faculty Senate and the other authorities required for final approval.

Please let me know if I can provide any additional information.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark Aulisio', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Mark Aulisio, PhD
Chair, Faculty Council

cc: Robert Petersen; Nicole Deming

Department of History
Case Western Reserve University
11201 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44106-7107
Phone 216.368.2625
Fax 216.368.4681
history.case.edu

December 16, 2016

Prof. Peter Harte
Chair
Faculty Senate
Case Western Reserve University

Recommendation from Faculty Senate Bylaws Committee

Dear Peter:

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee at its December 5, 2016, regular meeting asked the Faculty Senate Bylaws Committee to consider the question of whether the "Petition for a Division of Anatomy" from the CWRU School of Medicine is consistent with the provisions of the Faculty Handbook.

At its regular meeting on December 13, 2016, the Faculty Senate Bylaws Committee considered the question at length.

The Faculty Handbook, Article V, Section A, Paragraph 2(c)(2) provides that the Faculty Senate has the power and obligation to make recommendations to the president for consideration and transmittal to the Board of Trustees with respect to "The establishment or discontinuance of departments within constituent faculties, as provided in Article VII, Section B, the renaming of departments, the merging of departments, or the transfer of departments between constituent faculties."

Article VII, Section B of the Faculty Handbook describes the role of departments in the University Faculty and in the constituent faculties. Paragraph 1 permits constituent faculties to organize themselves into departments and specifies that "The department shall be the basic unit of those faculties so organized. Each member of the University Faculty holding a principal appointment in such a faculty shall normally have an appointment in a department." Paragraph 2 provides further, in mandatory language ("shall"): "The department shall provide a central administration and a focal point for an academic discipline or for closely related disciplines; it shall plan and provide programs of teaching and scholarly work and professional activity, assume the responsibility for implementing these programs, and determine the policies necessary



COLLEGE OF
ARTS AND SCIENCES

CASE WESTERN RESERVE
UNIVERSITY

to guide them and the practices necessary to carry them out. The department shall be responsible for the content of the undergraduate curricula and programs in its disciplinary fields. It shall maintain and staff the facilities which lie within its jurisdiction."

The Faculty Senate Bylaws Committee advises the Faculty Senate Executive Committee that, in its reading of the pertinent provisions of the Faculty Handbook, it concludes that the "Petition for a Division of Anatomy" is not in conformity with the Faculty Handbook and thus should not be considered.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Kenneth F. Ledford".

Kenneth F. Ledford
Associate Professor of History and Law
Chair, Department of History
Co-Director, Max Kade Center for German Studies
Chair, Faculty Senate Bylaws Committee

Exhibit A

PROPOSALS FROM THE FSCUE ACADEMIC STANDING SUBCOMMITTEE

Fall 2016

1. Should there be a presumption that students who do a complete term withdrawal from all of their courses late in the semester not re-enroll immediately, with exceptions granted by petition?

We allow students to do a complete withdrawal from the semester up to the last day of classes for that semester. This sometimes means that a student who is performing poorly academically avoids academic standing review, but expects to enroll for the next academic session. Recent data suggest that half of the students who do complete withdrawals late in the semester and return immediately do not perform well in the next semester, as measured by going on probation, being considered for separation, or doing another complete withdrawal. The results are roughly the same for students leaving in the fall and returning for the spring as for students leaving in the spring and returning for the fall. In many cases, there is simply not enough time to address whatever the issues were that interfered with good academic performance. At the same time, there are occasions in which a student suffers from physical or mental health issues that can be addressed in a short amount of time with proper care and that warrant the student being allowed to return to school sooner.

Proposal: Beginning Fall 2017, students who withdraw after the 11th Friday of a semester (corresponding to the deadline by which upperclass students may choose to withdraw from individual courses or choose the P/NP grading option) may not enroll for the next two academic sessions, including the summer session. Exceptions may be granted by the Academic Standing Board. [The Academic Standing Board may delegate to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies consideration of these appeals while retaining authority in these matters, as they do for other readmission decisions.]

APPROVED BY FSCUE, 12/6/2016.

2. Should there be a credit-hour limit less than 19 placed on students on academic probation and students returning for their first semester following academic separation?

Our goal for academic probation and separation is to help students return to making good academic progress toward completing degree requirements. Students sometimes feel that they need to take more credit-hours following an unsuccessful semester in order to make up for credits lost by failing grades or to raise their cumulative GPAs following D's and F's. We made some progress in this regard when we changed our academic standing rules several years ago to focus only on the just completed semester rather than two-semester runs and cumulative GPA and credit-hours earned, but continue to see students bite off more that they can chew and set themselves up for another unsuccessful semester.

While recognizing the benefits to many students from choosing a more manageable courseload following an unsuccessful semester, the FSCUE Subcommittee on Academic Standing also noted that some students are more successful with more structure rather than more unstructured time. The

Subcommittee also noted that, in many cases, the issue of returning to good standing is more a matter of the mix of courses that a student takes rather than simply the number of credit-hours. For example, a student who earned a D in a prerequisite course may not be prepared for success in the next course. A careful advising conversation may be more effective than a strict limit on credit-hours. Given the additional staff being awarded to Undergraduate Studies, the deans feel that they can manage advising conversations at the start of the semester with students going on probation. They already work closely at that time with students being considered for separation but allowed to continue on probation and with students returning from separation.

Proposal: Beginning Fall 2017, students placed or continued on probation are required to review their course schedules with their deans in the Office of Undergraduate Studies during the drop/add period in order to continue for the semester.

APPROVED BY FSCUE, 12/6/2016.

3. Should academic probation be a temporary status that does not appear on the transcript forever?

Academic probation is designed to be a warning to students that they are not performing at an acceptable level in their academic work to make appropriate progress toward earning their degrees. We limit certain activities, and deans and advisors monitor these students progress more closely while on probation than they do for other students. A second consecutive probationary record ordinarily leads to separation.

Some students make poor academic decisions during the semester in the hopes of avoiding probation and a permanent mark on their transcript. For example, a student who should reduce his courseload for medical reasons may choose to remain enrolled in too many courses to avoid having a record with too few credit-hours to remain in good standing. Having academic probation be a temporary status that does not stay on the student's official transcript may make it more palatable for the student to make academic adjustments. Those who read students' transcripts will still have the raw data that led to probation; with those data, they are free to reach their own judgments and do not need to know our automatic response.

The FSCUE Subcommittee on Academic Standing recognized that the same argument can be made for academic separation, but felt (for now) that this more serious and discretionary action should be noted on the transcript, as it reflects the Academic Standing Board's judgment and helps account for a student's time away from school.

Proposal: Beginning Fall 2017, academic probation will be a status recorded on the unofficial/advising transcript but not on the official transcript.

APPROVED BY FSCUE, 12/6/2016.



FACULTY SENATE

January 31, 2017

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION ON POLICIES FOR LATE SEMESTER COURSE WITHDRAWAL; SCHEDULE REVIEWS FOR STUDENTS ON PROBATION; AND NO LONGER RECORDING ACADEMIC PROBATION STATUS ON OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPTS

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Committee on Undergraduate Education's (FSCUE), Subcommittee on Academic Standing has made recommendations related to students who do a complete term withdrawal from courses late in the semester; schedule reviews for students who are placed or who are continuing on probation; and no longer recording academic probation on the official transcript; and

WHEREAS, on December 6, 2016, the FSCUE reviewed and approved the recommendations, attached hereto as Exhibit A (the "recommendations"); and

WHEREAS, on January 20, 2017, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee voted that the recommendations should be placed on the agenda for consideration by the Faculty Senate at its January 31, 2017 meeting;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT
FOR ALL CWRU UNDERGRADUATES:

1. Beginning fall 2017, students who withdraw after the 11th Friday of a semester may not enroll for the next two academic sessions, including the summer session. Exceptions may be granted by the Academic Standing Board.
2. Beginning fall 2017, students placed or continuing on probation are required to review their course schedules with their deans in the Office of Undergraduate Studies before the end of the drop/add period in order to continue for the semester.
3. Beginning fall 2017, academic probation will be a status recorded on the unofficial/advising transcript but not on the official transcript.



January 9, 2017



Ms. Rebecca Weiss
Secretary of the University Faculty
CWRU

Re: Recommendation from the SOM Faculty Council to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee:
identifying the Executive Committee of the School of Medicine

Dear Ms. Weiss;

The Faculty Council affirms that there is "no question" it serves as the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Medicine. At its meeting on December 19, 2016, this issue was discussed by Faculty Council In response to your letter from November 30, 2016, on whether the School of Medicine has formally identified its Executive Committee.

The Faculty Senate Bylaws state, "In the event of a question as to which body of the constituent faculty is the Executive Committee or corresponding entity for purposes of Article VI of the Faculty Constitution, the constituent faculty may make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Such a recommendation must be made by vote of the constituent faculty, and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee shall have the power to accept or reject such a recommendation."

A motion was made and seconded to agree that there is a question as to whether the Faculty Council or the Faculty Council Steering Committee is considered the executive committee of the SOM. After discussion, a vote was taken, 7 were in favor; 10 opposed. The motion did not pass.

Again, after discussion, a motion was made and seconded to send a letter to the Faculty Senate, to the attention of Rebecca Weiss, identifying the Faculty Council as the Executive Committee. A vote was taken with 20 in favor, 1 opposed, and 0 abstained. The motion passed.

In follow-up to this decision of the Faculty Council, I met on Jan 5 with Dean Davis and shared with her our recommendation.

We would appreciate the Faculty Senate's confirmation that the Faculty Council is without question the executive committee of the Faculty of Medicine.

Most sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "James W. Gentry, PhD, MAF". The signature is written in a cursive style and is placed on a light gray rectangular background.

Maureen W. McEnery, Ph.D, MAT
Chair of the Faculty Council of the School of Medicine
Chair of the Nominating Committee of the Faculty Senate
Head of the Medical School Course, "Cognition, Movement, and Sensation" (Block 6)
Department of Neurology UHCMC and the Neurological Institute
Associate Professor of Neurology
Associate Professor of Neuroscience
University Hospitals Cleveland Medical Center
Case Western Reserve University
Room WG-11
Mail box #4972
Cleveland, OH 44106
[216-368-3377](tel:216-368-3377)

mwm4@case.edu

mwmcenery@gmail.com

<http://casemed.case.edu/dept/neurology/McEnery.html>

Proposed Revision to Faculty Handbook:

CHAPTER 2, ARTICLE V. THE FACULTY SENATE

Sec. C. Membership

The voting members of the Faculty Senate shall be the president of the University, the provost or a designee of the president, the secretary of the Faculty Senate, elected voting members of the University Faculty apportioned as specified in Article V, Section F, the chair of each standing and *ad hoc* committee of the Faculty Senate, for the duration of such committee chairmanship, one undergraduate student, one student enrolled in the School of Graduate Studies, and one student enrolled in a post-baccalaureate program in any of the professional schools, the three student members to be selected by their respective constituencies. **The Chair of the Emeriti Academy Executive Committee shall be a non-voting member of the Faculty Senate and may participate in discussions.**

Current provision of the Faculty Senate By-Laws stating that only voting members of the Senate are considered when determining the quorum:

BY-LAW III. MEETINGS

Item 1. Quorum and Adoption of Motions.

At any meeting of the Faculty Senate, fifty percent of the **voting membership** shall constitute a quorum.

The quorum at regular meetings of the Faculty Senate is determined by a count of the voting members physically in the room. The quorum at Special Meetings of the Faculty Senate is determined by a count of the voting members physically present and voting members attending remotely.

The affirmative vote of the majority of the voting members in attendance shall be required for the adoption of any motion at all Faculty Senate meetings.

CWRU Action Form for Majors/Minors/Programs/Sequences/Degrees

(instructions on back)

Docket # _____

College/School: College of Arts and Sciences

Department: Psychological Sciences

PROPOSED: major
 minor
 program
 sequence
 degree

APPROVED

Endorsed: A: S CEP 4-15-16
A: S Executive Comm 5-13-16

TITLE: Communication for Health Professionals

Faculty of the College 10-28-2016

EFFECTIVE: Summer (semester) 2016 (year)

DESCRIPTION:

The objective of the development of the Communication for Health Professionals minor program is to provide an opportunity for students with primary interests in a variety of health fields a complementary focus shown to benefit the participants in careers associated with health. The minor offers introductory and advanced study in theoretical and practical applications of communication within a health context, and includes a variety of additional courses that students can choose as they apply to their more specific areas of interest. A priority in the design of the course work is to appeal to the needs of the diverse fields associated with health in the university's academic community that include majors and interests in pre-medicine, biomedical engineering, pre-law, public health, communication disorders, nursing, gerontological studies, nutrition, and social work, among others.

Is this major/minor/program/sequence/degree: new
 modification
 replacement

If modification or replacement please elaborate: Name change from Health Communication to Communication for Health Professionals

Does this change in major/minor/program/sequence/degree involve other departments? Yes No

If yes, which departments? _____

Contact person/committee: Kyra Perry Rothenberg

SIGNATURES:

DATE

Department Curriculum Chair(s)/Program Directors: N/A
Department Chair: [Signature] 4-8-16
College/School Curriculum Committee Chair: [Signature] 4-15-16
College/School Dean(s): [Signature]
UUF Curriculum Committee Chair: [Signature]

File copy sent to: Registrar Office of Undergraduate Studies/~~Graduate Studies~~

Other: PSCL
Further review/approval needed: A: S Faculty / Dean / FSCUE / B: T

Current text in Gen. Bulletin

Minor in Health Communication

The minor in health communication offers introductory and advance study in theoretical and practical application of communication within a health context. It includes a variety of additional courses that students can choose according to their specific areas of interest. The course work is designed to appeal to students in such fields as pre-med, nursing, pre-law, public policy, public health, communication disorders, gerontological studies, nutrition, health management, and social work.

The minor requires 15 credit hours of course work, of which 9 credit hours come from required courses:

<u>COSI 101</u>	Introduction to Health Communication	3
<u>COSI 109</u>	Introduction to Communication Disorders	3
<u>COSI 340</u>	Health Communication	3
Two of the following:		6
<u>COSI 200</u>	Interpersonal Communication	
<u>COSI 260</u>	Multicultural Aspects of Human Communication	
<u>COSI 280</u>	Organizational Communication	
<u>COSI 332</u>	Persuasion	
<u>COSI 345</u>	Communication and Aging	
Total Units		15

Chapter 2 of the Faculty Handbook (Art. V, Sec. C. Membership)

The voting members of the Faculty Senate shall be the president of the University, the provost or a designee of the president, the secretary of the Faculty Senate, elected voting members of the University Faculty apportioned as specified in Article V, Section F, the chair of each standing and *ad hoc* committee of the Faculty Senate, for the duration of such committee chairmanship, one undergraduate student, one student enrolled in the School of Graduate Studies, **and** one student enrolled in a post-baccalaureate program in any of the professional schools, **and one post-doctoral fellow**, the three student members and **post-doc** to be selected by their respective constituencies.

Senate By-Laws (By-Law IV, Item D. Student Membership)

- 1) Pursuant to the Constitution, Article V, Section C, student senators elected for one-year terms shall begin the day following their election. A student senator may serve on the Faculty Senate for no longer than three consecutive years.
- 2) Procedures for the election of student senators shall be as follows:
 - a. Undergraduate. The Undergraduate Student Government Vice President of Academic Affairs, who is elected each year from among members of the undergraduate student body, shall serve as the student senator. The Vice President of Student Affairs will report his/her name to the Secretary of the University Faculty no later than May 1 each year.
 - b. Graduate. Each year the Secretary shall request the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies to initiate and administer the selection by the Graduate Student Senate of a graduate student to serve as a member of the Faculty Senate for the following year, and to report to the Secretary the name of the graduate student so selected not later than May 1.
 - c. Professional School. Student representation on the Faculty Senate from the professional schools shall be by rotation among the respective schools, such rotation to be in the order of the respective dates of founding of the individual schools. Each year, the Secretary shall request the Dean or Provost of the professional school to be so represented the following year to initiate and administer an election by the student body of that school and to report to the Secretary the name of the professional school student so elected not later than May 1.
 - d. Post-doctoral. Each year the Secretary shall request the Director of the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs to initiate and administer the election by the Post-Doctoral Association of a post-doctoral fellow to serve as a member for the following year. The Director of the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs will report his/her name to the Secretary no later than May 1 each year.
 - e. In the event that a student chosen for membership in the Faculty Senate in any of the above ~~three~~ **four** categories should not return to school in the autumn semester or in any other respect be unable or unavailable to serve, the Secretary shall request the appropriate administrative officer of those named previously in this item to initiate and administer a second selection by the procedure specified.

Faculty Senate Meeting
Tuesday, January 31, 2017
3:30p.m. – 5:30p.m. – Toepfer Room, Adelbert Hall,

3:30 p.m.	Approval of Minutes from the December 20, 2016, Faculty Senate Meeting, <i>attachment</i>	Peter Harte
3:35 p.m.	President and Provost's Announcements	Barbara Snyder Bud Baeslack
3:40 p.m.	Chair's Announcements	Peter Harte
3:45 p.m.	Report from the Secretary of the Corporation	Arlishea Fulton
3:50 p.m.	Report from the Executive Committee	Juscelino Colares
3:55 p.m.	FSCUE Proposals	Robin Dubin Jeffrey Wolcowitz
4:05 p.m.	2017-2022 Academic Calendar	Amy Hammett
4:10 p.m.	Amendment to Faculty Handbook Regarding Chair of Emeriti Academy as Non-Voting Member of Senate	Ken Ledford
4:15 p.m.	PCUE Update	Kim Emmons