



## **CALL TO ORDER**

---

Senate Chair Walsh called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

## **REPORT OF THE CHAIR**

---

### Rationale for the Special Meeting

Walsh explained that most of the Senate Meeting on November 7, 2018, was spent discussing and amending the language of the resolution that was the first action item on the agenda. He stated that since the unfinished business from the last meeting included several time-sensitive items and because the upcoming December meeting will include the President's State of the Campus Address and several additional time-sensitive items, the Senate leadership agreed that it was necessary to hold another Special Meeting of the Senate. Walsh stated that it was important that the Senate completes its business and avoid any backlog or the need for an additional meeting at the end of the semester. He thanked Senators for their willingness to accommodate yet another meeting and assured them that the need for additional meetings will not be the norm.

### Protocols

Walsh reviewed regular Senate protocols to facilitate the discussion for the afternoon. He noted that speakers must be recognized by the Chair before they can speak on the Senate floor. Walsh also noted that comments, questions, or motions made from the audience would not be acknowledged and asked Senators to come to a microphone to be recognized to speak. He advised Senators to make sure they are making comments that relate to the amendment or motion under consideration and asked that Senators be respectful of other Senators and the Senate as a body.

### Procedural Motions

Walsh also reviewed procedural motions that Senators might consider making in the course of a meeting. He stated that a motion to call the question is a motion to end debate on a specific issue before the Senate and noted that the motion is unnecessary if there is no remaining discussion. Walsh clarified that if a Senator makes a motion to call the question, the Senate has to vote on whether to end debate on the amendment or motion in front of the Senate, and if that vote passes, then goes directly to a vote on the issue before the Senate. He also provided detailed information on additional potential procedural motions including a motion to postpone consideration as well as the appropriate use of a point of order or a parliamentary inquiry to ask the Parliamentarian or Chair for help.

Walsh called on Pamela Lanford, Chair-Elect, who made a motion that would facilitate completion of the action items on the agenda.

Lanford noted that there are several items on the meeting agenda that were not addressed at the last meeting. She stated that the three PCC items on the agenda would need to be reviewed by the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) if approved by the Senate and the President, and that if the Senate misses the upcoming January deadline to submit the proposals for consideration, the body would have to wait until April to submit again, which would adversely affect the University's ability to offer these new programs as soon as possible. She noted that the special order

presentation on research misconduct was a critical opportunity for the Senate to provide input to the Faculty Affairs Committee. As the committee plans to report to the Senate with recommendations early in the spring semester, and given the full agenda for the December meeting, this is the Senate's only opportunity to provide feedback that could impact the committee's work. Lanford made a motion to suspend the rules and reorder the Senate agenda to consider the three PCC items and the special order first, followed by the resolution and New Business.

Walsh asked for a second. The motion was seconded.

Walsh called for a vote on the motion. He noted that the motion is not debatable and requires a two-thirds vote to pass. The result was 80 in favor, 5 opposed. **The motion passed.**

### **PCC PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN NEUROSCIENCE (SENATE DOCUMENT #18-19-13) (ACTION)**

---

Betsy Beise, member of the Programs, Curricula, and Courses (PCC) Committee, presented the PCC Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Science in Neuroscience (Senate Document #18-19-13) and provided background information on the proposal.

Walsh thanked Beise for her presentation and opened the floor to discussion of the proposal; hearing none, he called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 82 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

### **PCC PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN HUMAN DEVELOPMENT (SENATE DOCUMENT #18-19-14) (ACTION)**

---

Betsy Beise, member of the PCC Committee, presented the PCC Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Science in Human Development (Senate Document #18-19-14) and provided background information on the proposal.

Walsh opened the floor to discussion of the proposal; hearing none, he called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 82 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

### **PCC PROPOSAL TO RENAME THE POST-BACCALAUREATE CERTIFICATE IN MSDE ADMINISTRATOR I TO SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT LEADERSHIP (SENATE DOCUMENT #18-19-15) (ACTION)**

---

Betsy Beise, member of the PCC Committee, presented the PCC Proposal to Rename the Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in MSDE Administrator I to School Improvement Leadership (Senate Document #18-19-15) and provided background information on the proposal.

Walsh opened the floor to discussion of the proposal; hearing none, he called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 78 in favor, 2 opposed, and 5 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

### **SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY**

---

**Jack Blanchard, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee**  
**John Bertot, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs**

## ***Research Misconduct at the University of Maryland***

Walsh introduced Jack Blanchard, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), and John Bertot, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.

Blanchard provided an overview of the Faculty Affairs Committee charge to consider revisions to the University's Research Misconduct Policy, which was approved by the President on an interim basis in June 2017, reviewed the Committee's work thus far, and emphasized the importance of feedback from the Senate to inform the next steps in its review.

### Process and Intent

Blanchard explained that the interim policy was created to address several issues, including aligning with federal guidance from the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Research Integrity (ORI) and the Public Health Service (PHS) on how to resolve research misconduct allegations involving federal funding. The interim policy also satisfies ORI's interest in addressing the misconduct itself and correcting the research record, while recognizing the institution's need to investigate whether University faculty, staff, or students engaged in misconduct.

Blanchard reported that the primary substantive change to the 2017 policy was to permit the University to take interim actions while the review process is ongoing. He noted that depending on the nature of an allegation, the University may need to act to protect the research environment, ensure appropriate management of research funds, or address potential safety issues. The previous policy did not allow for such actions to be taken until the research misconduct investigation was complete. Blanchard stated that the revisions also clarify provisions on committee memberships and allowed for the parties in the case to identify any conflicts of interest as the memberships of committees are being formed.

Blanchard outlined the committee's initial steps including forming a Research Misconduct Working Group to review the interim policy and make recommendations to the full committee. He noted that the Working Group reviewed peer institution policies and consulted with the Office of Faculty Affairs, Office of General Counsel, the Research Council, and the Vice President for Research. He stated that the committee is now focusing on key issues and concerns before finalizing its work.

Blanchard stated that the committee feels that the policy should be broad enough to apply to all types of scholarly misconduct, including misconduct in research as well as in creative activities. This protects ORI's interest in federally-funded research while allowing the policy to address all types of scholarship. He also stated that the committee does not believe that the policy should cover misconduct in instructional activities or professional misconduct and notes that separate University policies and procedures should be used to address activities that fall outside the scope of this policy.

### Revisions

Blanchard stated that the revisions that Working Group and committee have primarily focused on the definitions listed in the interim policy and whether they adequately reflect the types of misconduct that may occur. He stated that the current draft includes revisions to or additions of the definitions for fabrication, falsification, improprieties of authorship, and self-plagiarism. Many of these definitions vary by field, and the committee is working to ensure that the definitions are broad enough so as not to inadvertently implicate an individual of misconduct when their actions are not seen as such within their field.

Blanchard noted that the committee has also focused on preserving the due process rights of respondents. The draft revisions clarify the parties' rights to challenge committee membership, and permits the Research Integrity Officer (RIO) to remove a committee member if a conflict of interest emerges during the proceedings. He stated that the FAC is considering how to ensure that the Respondent has an opportunity to provide a written response to an allegation at the beginning of the process and that the committee is also revising the policy to allow the parties to review all evidence and supply corrections or additional supporting documentation as needed in response to the evidence submitted by others.

Blanchard reported that the FAC has also discussed the current infrastructure and role of the Research Integrity Officer (RIO). He noted that the RIO oversees the process of receiving and investigating allegations of research misconduct. At the University, the RIO is the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, though at many of its peer institutions, the RIO is a staff member or administrator within the Division of Research, or leads a Research Compliance Office that handles issues related to research misconduct as well as other compliance-related issues. Blanchard stated that the FAC has discussed the administrative burden and expertise involved in managing the research misconduct process and is considering ways to ensure flexibility for any future changes that may need to occur to appropriately support the review process.

Blanchard stated that the committee would continue its work and would report to the Senate with a finalized version of the policy at a future meeting.

Chair Walsh thanked Blanchard for his presentation and opened the floor to questions and comments on the presentation.

Senator T. Cohen, faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, asked about the definition of self-plagiarism. He commented on the fact that different fields have different norms for what constitutes plagiarism, and advised that the committee be very clear that self-plagiarism should involve an intentional attempt to deceive.

John Bertot, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, responded that there are certain thresholds for research misconduct and that intent is one of them, so honest mistakes should not rise to the level of an allegation of misconduct. He noted that there are three investigative processes that occur regarding allegations and that the initial phase would be to determine intent.

Senator Rozenblit, faculty, College of Arts & Humanities asked if the policy is intended to only cover research funded by federal grants, or if the committee intends to develop a larger policy to apply to other possible forms of research misconduct.

Blanchard responded that the intent is to develop a broad policy to apply to all possible research misconduct.

Senator Rozenblit suggested that the language of the policy be broadened to apply to fields of study that do not utilize scientific research. She cited the continual use of "data" in the policy as an example and noted that her field, history, does not typically use data despite its vast opportunities for research.

Blanchard thanked Senator Rozenblit for her observation.

Senator Zimmerman, faculty, School of Public Health commented on the multilevel nature of scholarship at the University and asked how the policy would apply to researchers, such as

graduate students, who are not faculty members and if there would be separate policies or one umbrella policy.

Blanchard responded that the Research Misconduct policy would be the umbrella policy that would apply to everyone on campus.

Bertot noted that the policy is broad so as to address every level of research, and that language has been suggested to involve working with the Office of Student Conduct when appropriate, especially in cases involving students.

Chair Walsh thanked Blanchard and Bertot.

## **RESOLUTION TO IMPROVE THE STATUS OF SHARED GOVERNANCE IN THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND (SENATE DOCUMENT #18-19-17) (ACTION)**

---

Chair Walsh provided an overview of Senate deliberations on the Resolution to Improve the Status of Shared Governance in the University System of Maryland (Senate Document #18-19-17) at the November 7, 2018 Senate Meeting and noted that the resolution was introduced at that meeting and that discussion was postponed to this meeting due to time constraints. He also noted that the Senate approved a motion to divide the resolution and that the first and third sections were amended and approved at the previous meeting. Walsh stated that the Senate would continue its consideration of the resolution by discussing the proposed amendments to the second section, and then by voting to adopt the second section. After that, the Senate would discuss any other amendments to the resolution, which may be necessary to align the preamble to the amended and approved sections. He reminded Senators that due to the motion to divide, all approved sections would be considered adopted by the Senate, and that there would be no vote on the resolution as a whole.

Walsh reported that the Senators who proposed amendments to the second section at the previous meeting had withdrawn those amendments, and that they will instead propose revised amendments to better reflect the intended principles of the resolution.

Walsh called on Senator Kenny, undergraduate student, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences to present his revised amendment to section two of the resolution.

Senator Kenny thanked the body for attending a second special Senate Meeting to continue discussion of the agenda items from the meeting on November 7<sup>th</sup>. He made a motion to amend the second section of the resolution.

**Requests that the composition of ~~seats on~~ University of Maryland, College Park presidential search committees ~~should mirror representation on be awarded in the same proportion as~~ the University Senate, with a significant majority of seats being held by ~~regards to~~ faculty, staff, and student ~~representatives~~ ~~constituencies~~ appointed by the Chancellor from a diverse pool of candidates suggested by the University Senate.**

Walsh asked for a second to the amendment. The amendment was seconded.

Walsh opened the floor to discussion of the amendment.

Senator Breslow, emeriti faculty, College of Arts & Humanities asked if the majority of the seats on the search committees would be students and faculty. He commented that he does not anticipate

that other stakeholder groups who have an interest in personnel decisions at the University would accept that.

Senator Zimmerman thanked the undergraduate student Senators for their work on the resolution and asked if the points of the resolution are binding if the resolution is approved.

Walsh responded that the resolution would be advisory and would not be binding to the Chancellor and the Board of Regents (BOR).

Senator T. Cohen expressed his support for the resolution and stated that regardless of its effectiveness, he hopes that it conveys the seriousness of the Senate body and how it views the upcoming presidential search.

Chair-Elect Lanford introduced Betsy Beise to speak. Beise asked if the intent of the resolution is to suggest that the Chancellor should look to the Senate for representatives and not to the wider campus community to select the members of the presidential search committee.

Senator Stanley, undergraduate student, College of Letters and Sciences thanked Beise for her question and stated that the driving force of the amendment was to provide constructive suggestions on potential members for the search committee as a resource to the Chancellor.

Lanford commended the Senate on crafting language that may be acceptable for the resolution. She cautioned the Senate body on the practice of opinion making. She stated that she believes that doing so is legitimate in some circumstances, but expressed concern that if the Senate were to develop a regular practice of doing so, the impact of its decisions may be lessened over time.

Senator Delaplaine, undergraduate student, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences expressed her support for the resolution and reported that the language is also supported by a wide coalition of student organizations across campus.

Senator Dorland, faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences noted that the resolution says that search committees “should” mirror the Senate constituency rather than “shall”, and expressed his support for the Senate to voice a strong opinion in the aftermath of the death of a student-athlete at the University.

Seeing no further discussion, Walsh called for a vote on the amendment. The result was 66 in favor, 14 opposed, and 5 abstentions. **The amendment passed.**

Walsh opened the floor to discussion of the second section as amended; hearing none, he called for a vote to adopt the second section as amended. The result was 67 in favor, 14 opposed, and 3 abstentions. **The vote to adopt the second section passed as amended.**

Walsh opened the floor to further discussion or amendments to the resolution, including any amendments that may be required to bring the preamble into alignment with the sections that have already been approved. Walsh introduced the preamble as it was originally presented:

WHEREAS, The USM Board of Regents, hereafter referred to as the Board of Regents, has proven itself unresponsive to the concerns of students, faculty, and other Maryland citizens in its handling of the investigation into the death of Jordan McNair.

WHEREAS, Student and faculty concerns have gone unheard in personnel and policy decisions made by the University of Maryland College Park and USM as a whole.

Be it resolved that the University Senate:

Senator Kenny made a motion to amend the preamble to align with the approved sections of the resolution:

WHEREAS, The USM Board of Regents, hereafter referred to as the Board of Regents, has proven itself unresponsive to the concerns of students, faculty, **staff**, and other Maryland citizens in its handling of the investigation into the death of Jordan McNair; **and**

WHEREAS, Student, faculty, and **staff** concerns **related to the values and the future of our institution** have gone unheard in **recent** ~~personnel and policy~~ decisions made by the ~~University of Maryland College Park and~~ USM **Board of Regents as a whole**;

**Therefore**, Be it resolved that the University Senate:

Senator Levermore, faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences made a motion to amend the amendment to strike 'USM'.

Walsh asked for a second to the motion to amend the amendment. The motion was seconded.

Walsh opened the floor for discussion of the amendment to the amendment:

WHEREAS, The USM Board of Regents, hereafter referred to as the Board of Regents, has proven itself unresponsive to the concerns of students, faculty, **staff**, and other Maryland citizens in its handling of the investigation into the death of Jordan McNair; **and**

WHEREAS, Student, faculty, and **staff** concerns **related to the values and the future of our institution** have gone unheard in **recent** ~~personnel and policy~~ decisions made by the ~~University of Maryland College Park and~~ USM **Board of Regents as a whole**;

**Therefore**, Be it resolved that the University Senate:

Hearing no discussion, Walsh called for a vote on the amendment to the amendment. The result was 71 in favor, 5 opposed, 7 abstentions. **The amendment to the amendment passed.**

Walsh opened the floor to discussion of the amendment to the preamble as amended.

Hearing no discussion, Walsh called for a vote on the amendment to the preamble as amended. The result was 72 in favor, 5 opposed, 3 abstentions. **The amendment to the preamble passed.**

Walsh called for a vote to adopt the preamble as amended. The result was 71 in favor, 6 opposed, and 3 abstentions. **The vote to adopt the preamble as amended passed.**

Walsh called for additional discussion of the preamble. Hearing none, he stated that the deliberation on the resolution had concluded and declared that the resolution had been formally approved by the Senate.

## NEW BUSINESS

---

Senator Stanley made a motion to charge the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) with compiling a diverse pool of faculty, staff, and student candidates from the campus community for consideration by the Chancellor during the development of the presidential search committee. The SEC should solicit suggestions from the University Senate as it develops the list of potential candidates for the Chancellor. The pool should include diverse representation from a variety of demographic characteristics (e.g. underrepresented minorities, gender identity, and low-income members of the campus community) and should primarily include representatives outside of governance leaders.

Walsh asked for a second to the motion to charge the SEC. The motion was seconded.

Walsh opened the floor to discussion of the motion.

Senator T. Cohen stated that he supports the ideas behind the motion but expressed concern that it gives specific examples of demographics that should be included in the search committee. He noted that there is no way for the Senate to know what an individual's gender identity or family income may be. He suggested removing the "e.g." language from the motion.

Senator Huntley, undergraduate student, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources expressed his support for including the examples of diversity in the motion and stated that the Senate already takes diversity into consideration when populating committees.

Senator Kenny stated that he also supports the inclusion of examples of diversity in the motion and suggested that without guidelines, the charge may not be as effective.

Senator Rozenblit suggested that including examples of demographics is a limited perspective of diversity, noting that differences between the positions of faculty, staff, and other stakeholders should also be considered. She expressed concern that the included list may be too prescriptive, but noted her support for the intent behind the motion.

Senator Coles, faculty, College of Arts & Humanities made a motion to amend the language of the motion.

Motion to charge the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) with compiling a diverse pool of faculty, staff, and student candidates from the campus community for consideration by the Chancellor during the development of the presidential search committee. The SEC should solicit suggestions from the University Senate as it develops the list of potential candidates for the Chancellor. The pool should include **diverse representation** from a variety of demographic **characteristics groups** (e.g. underrepresented minorities, gender identity, and low-income members of the campus community) and should primarily include representatives outside of governance leaders.

Walsh asked for a second to the amendment. The motion was seconded.

Walsh opened the floor to discussion of the amendment.

Senator Dorland stated that if the amendment fails, he would move to amend the language to strike the last sentence from the charge. He expressed his confidence that the SEC is able to review the charge without instruction regarding demographics.

Hearing no further discussion, Walsh called for a vote on the amendment. The result was 61 in favor, 12 opposed, and 7 abstentions. **The amendment passed.**

Walsh opened the floor to discussion of the motion to charge the SEC as amended.

Senator Huntley responded to Senator Rozenblit's comment about the inclusion of faculty from different academic backgrounds and inquired whether amending the charge to include a clause in the list of examples to specify including faculty of different academic disciplines would alleviate her concern.

Senator Rozenblit responded that faculty of different disciplines cannot be considered a demographic group and commented that she did not believe that the charge needed to be made more prescriptive.

Senator Levermore made a motion to amend the charge to strike the final sentence.

Motion to charge the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) with compiling a diverse pool of faculty, staff, and student candidates from the campus community for consideration by the Chancellor during the development of the presidential search committee. The SEC should solicit suggestions from the University Senate as it develops the list of potential candidates for the Chancellor. ~~The pool should include diverse representation from a variety of demographic characteristics groups (e.g. underrepresented minorities, gender identity, and low-income members of the campus community) and should primarily include representatives outside of governance leaders.~~

Walsh asked for a second to the motion. The motion was seconded.

Walsh opened the floor to discussion of the amendment.

Senator Stanley stated that he prefers the language as it was originally amended but expressed his confidence in the SEC to operate effectively if the amendment passes.

Dean Ball, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences expressed his support for the amendment.

Senator Huntley expressed his confidence in the SEC but urged the Senate to retain the final sentence in the charge. He stressed that the list of demographics was included to provide examples rather than requirements.

Senator Edwards, faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences expressed her support for the amendment.

Senator T. Cohen expressed his strong support for the amendment. He commented that he would like to further express his strong support for potential new business related to the mandatory athletic student fee at the University.

Parliamentarian Novara and Chair Walsh stated that Senator Cohen's comments were out of order.

Senator L. Brown, undergraduate student, A. James Clark School of Engineering suggested amending the charge to remove the list of examples but retain the rest of the final sentence.

Parliamentarian Novara clarified that Senator Brown could not propose such a motion while the body was still deliberating the original amendment involving that language.

Senator Kenny stated that he believes that examples of diverse demographics should be included in the charge so that the SEC could better tailor its search for candidates.

William Idsardi, Chair, Department of Linguistics noted that when the Senate charges committees, it typically does not prescribe every step that the committee will take to fulfill the charge.

Senator A. Brown, faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences expressed concern that if a list of examples is included, that those may be the only factors considered as the list for the search committee is compiled. She noted that this may be why so many Senators are in support of the amendment.

Senator Klank, faculty, College of Arts & Humanities expressed his support for including the list of examples because it captures the spirit of the issue.

Senator Huntley urged the Senate to reject the amendment so that the body may discuss the example list specifically, rather than striking the entire sentence.

Senator A. Brown stated that rejecting this amendment and further amending the charge to remove the list of examples may be a good compromise for the Senate.

Senator Rozenblit commented that she supports including the final sentence so that the Senate openly expresses its desire to include diverse groups in the search committee.

Senator Coles made a motion to call the question and end debate on the amendment.

Walsh asked for a second to the motion to call the question. The motion was seconded.

Walsh called for a vote on the motion to call the question and end debate on the amendment. The result was 69 in favor, 8 opposed. **The motion to call the question passed.**

Walsh called for a vote on the amendment to the motion to charge the SEC. The result was 50 in favor, 24 opposed, 2 abstentions. **The amendment passed.**

Walsh opened the floor to discussion of the motion to charge the SEC as amended.

Lanford urged the Senate to reject the motion to charge the SEC. She explained that the charge requires the SEC to compile a list of possible members of the presidential search committee to be delivered to the Chancellor, but that the Chancellor is not required to consider the list.

Senator Kenny noted that the Chancellor has no way of compiling a list of diverse candidates for the presidential search committee. He stated that if the Senate asks the Chancellor to include diverse populations in the search committee, the Senate should also provide a list of potential candidates for the committee.

Senator Coles stated that she agrees with the spirit of the charge, but that she also agrees that the SEC could put a tremendous amount of work into compiling a list that the Chancellor would be free

to ignore. She commented that the Senate might rather devote its energy to arguing the case that the selection committee needs to be restructured.

Senator Ferrick, exempt staff, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences introduced Robert Infantino, Associate Dean, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences. Infantino stated that the Chancellor sought guidance from the campus community for the previous three presidential searches at the University. He expressed concern that providing the Chancellor with a list of candidates from the Senate might preclude the Chancellor from seeking guidance from other members of the campus community.

Senator Stanley clarified that the Senator who planned to introduce a resolution regarding student athletic fees under New Business has decided not to do so. He then responded to Infantino's point and agreed that the Chancellor should listen to input from the campus community. He expressed his belief that it is essential that the Senate provide guidelines regarding the candidates for the presidential search committee in order to pave the way for influencing other University decisions in the future.

Senator Lau, faculty, College of Arts & Humanities stated that she agrees with the sentiment expressed by Lanford and expressed concern that the opportunity cost may be too high to require the SEC to compile a list of candidates that the Chancellor is not bound to review.

Senator Dorland stated that he would vote to support this motion as he feels that it is an appropriate action for the Senate to take under the circumstances.

Senator Huntley expressed concerns that the Chancellor is unfamiliar with the campus community at the University and that he will need guidance in order to select an appropriately diverse group of candidates for the presidential search committee. He urged the Senate to approve the motion to charge the SEC.

Chair-Elect Lanford noted that the SEC has not yet completed its review of the second Athletics report, and expressed concern that this charge would distract the SEC from the important work yet to be done on that charge.

Senator Stanley urged Senators to amend the language of the charge to better reflect their opinions rather than reject the entire charge.

Senator Winters, non-exempt staff, Department of Information Technology expressed his appreciation for statements about the influence of the President across campus. He noted that there have been changes at the University during President Loh's term that have negatively affected facilities management. He urged that the University select a new president who produces ideas that can actually be implemented.

Lanford made a motion to call the question and suspend debate on the motion to charge the SEC.

Walsh asked for a second to the motion. The motion was seconded.

Walsh called for a vote on the motion to call the question. The result was 64 in favor, 6 opposed.

**The motion to call the question passed.**

Walsh called for a vote on the motion to charge the SEC as amended. The result was 37 in favor, 30 opposed, 3 abstentions. **The motion to charge the SEC as amended passed.**

## **ADJOURNMENT**

---

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.