



---

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

May 6, 2009

**Note: The next meeting of the Academic Senate is tentatively scheduled for September 9, 2009, at 4:00 p.m. Please submit agenda items and cover sheets for the meeting to [Bob Hogue](#) by noon on September 2 at the latest. Provide both a hard copy and a disk or electronic copy of your report and cover sheet in *Word* or rich text format. A downloadable cover sheet is available at the Academic Senate web site [hit "cancel" if asked for a password]:**

<http://www.ysu.edu/acad-senate>

<a href="#">Report from President Sweet</a>	<a href="#">Senate Executive Committee</a>	<a href="#">Ohio Faculty Council</a>
<a href="#">Elections &amp; Balloting Committee</a>	<a href="#">General Education Committee</a>	<a href="#">Student Academic Grievance Committee</a>
<a href="#">Academic Events Committee</a>	<a href="#">Ad Hoc Committee on Sustainability</a>	<a href="#">Ad Hoc Committee on Admissions, Retention, and Student Success</a>

[Sign-in Sheet](#)

---

**Call to Order:** Senate Chairperson Chet Cooper called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

---

**Minutes of the Previous Meeting:**

Minutes of the April 1, 2009, meeting were approved as posted. To view the minutes, go to <<http://www.ysu.edu/acad-senate/0809/minapr09.pdf>>.

---

**Report from President Sweet:**

Thank you, Chet, for the ongoing invitation to address the Academic Senate. I wanted to mention a few highlights of this year and some information on the state budget.

First, congratulations to the search committees for the Deans of Fine and Performing Arts and Health and Human Services.

We have started construction of the new WCBA building. Applications from Western Pennsylvania are up 14%.

The state is now confronted with a shortfall of \$600 or \$900 million in this fiscal year's state budget. One proposal is to use the "rainy day" fund. The Cabinet has been working to find ways that we can meet our budget. We have about a \$2 million gap right now. All divisions will have to take part in efforts to recover that.

Friday we welcome the new class of Cochran Scholars. On May 14, there will be a news conference to announce our new Office of Veterans Affairs. We want to be known as the most friendly campus for veterans.

The AT&T tower will be painted this summer, and the letters "YSU" will be placed on all four sides.

Next time this year, Pat and I will be looking forward to retirement. But we have a lot of work to do this coming fiscal year. There will be a new funding formula used to determine state funds. It will include such things as course completion and degree completion. Assessment activities will also be important in this formula.

The Provost will be coming forward with recommendations on Centers for Excellence.

I want to thank all of you for your work this year, particularly your help in efforts to constrain our expenses and for successful enrollment efforts.

---

**Senate Executive Committee (SEC) / Report from the Chair: Chet Cooper, Chair of the Senate, reported:**

I wish to open my remarks by thanking all of you for serving the Senate this year and for supporting me in the position of Chair. It has been a pleasure and a privilege to be entrusted with this leadership position. Better still, it has been an honor to work with such wonderful people here in the Senate. I would like to thank each and every one of you by name, but I am sure that I would inadvertently miss someone. Nonetheless, I truly would be remiss if I did not thank, and of us should thank, the tireless and selfless efforts of Secretary Bob Hogue. Thank you, Bob, for all that you do, and for particularly keeping me on the straight and narrow. Not even my long-suffering wife is able to do that, no matter how often she slaps me upside the head. I am fortunate that you have yet to revert to such behavior!

Senate Secretary Bob Hogue and I are beginning the process of filling vacancies on Senate Committees based upon responses we received to the committee survey he distributed. I will be contacting prospective appointees as well as current committee members to confirm their willingness to serve. I will probably do this mainly by email, so please do watch your YSU email account for possible messages regarding this matter. Bob and I would appreciate prompt responses to that we can have all the committees filled and ready to serve by the beginning of the fall semester.

On behalf of the Senate, I would like to thank Dr. Nancy White and the entire YSU-OEA for sponsoring last month's social event. It was very well attended despite several other concurrent events on and off campus. Hence, I would also like to thank all of those who attended. The Senate hopes to continue to organize these events over the next academic year.

Congratulations, or perhaps it is our sympathies, are in order for Dr. Tammy King. At the last Ohio Faculty

Council, she was elected secretary. She will be attending the meeting this coming Friday as our sole representative. I will not be able to attend due to scheduling conflicts.

I would like to remind everyone that graduation takes place next Saturday and that, as faculty, we have an obligation to celebrate our student's successes. Therefore, I hope to see many of you at graduation.

To follow up on last month's resolution on a First Year Experience course put forth by the Student Government Association and passed by Senate, five student committee members have been selected by Student Government. I am in the process of contacting and confirming the participation of five faculty and staff representatives to serve on this committee. Since it is the end of the semester, I will report to the Senate the composition of this committee by email once all members have been selected. I will also have these names placed into the Senate record at its first meeting in the fall.

A request from Dr. Sherry Linkon, Chair of the Council on Teaching and Learning, was received asking the Senate to consider incorporating the Council into the Senate Committee structure. However, realizing that such action will take some time and further discussion, Dr. Linkon requested that an ad hoc committee on Teaching and Learning be formed for the next academic year. In general, the Senate Executive committee is receptive to the formation of an ad hoc committee, although details of the committee's composition, charge, and oversight have yet to be worked out. I will be discussing these matters with Dr. Linkon over the summer and hope to have an ad hoc committee in place by the fall. Pending further discussion by the Senate Executive committee, the possible establishment of an appointed Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning will be sent for consideration by the Charter and By Laws Committee no later than the fall semester.

I would also like to note that two special events related to the academic enterprise at YSU occurred since our last Senate meeting. The first, the Engagement Task Force held a summit of campus representatives. The summit, headed by Dean Licata, discussed not only the various ways and means by which YSU students and faculty are currently engaged in the community, but also explored how such efforts could be further incorporated into curricular activities. This event was followed this morning's Assessment Round Table sponsored by the Office of Assessment. This activity brought together various groups from across campus to discuss their activities as they relate to the broad range of assessment activities. More importantly, this meeting helped develop connections among the various campus groups so that effort and resources could be more efficiently marshaled together without duplication. I found both the engagement summit and the assessment round table to be highly successful.

With regard to the topic of assessment, this continues to be a challenge that YSU must continue to address. I know have used this bully pulpit to harangue all faculty, staff, and students of the dire need to meet this challenge. And today, I will do so again. However, I will keep my speech in this regard brief. As some wise person at this morning's session suggested, we can either be the victim of assessment, or we could be its owner. It is time for all of us to quit playing the victim. It is time to step up, take charge, and own assessment.

Likewise, I would like to close my comments today using the same phrase to address both present and future challenges the University faces in other areas. There have been a number of great things that have transpired over this past academic year. There is a very long list of them that I won't put forth here. However, the dark shadows of pettiness, greed, questionable behavior, and other unsavory acts have dulled the brightness of an otherwise outstanding year. We also move forward toward a future holding great unknowns. However, I would like to instead of thinking these as problems, why not chose to view them as opportunities? Let's no longer be a victim of a few bad actors or circumstances that we cannot control. Rather, let's forge together to own our future here at YSU – own it for ourselves – meaning that we wholeheartedly serve the best interests of our students and our community. Let us resolve to make the next academic year one in which we no longer accept mediocrity as a standard, one in which we use civility to address our differences, and one in which we put the institution before our selfishness. Together, I know we can make the 101st year of YSU's existence not only the best ever experienced by all faculty, staff, and students, but the foundation for all the successful years to follow.

**Ohio Faculty Council Report:** **Tammy King** presented the a report on the activities of the Ohio Faculty Council. The report is contained in [Attachment 1](#).

---

**Elections & Balloting Committee:** **Annette Burden** reported. The elections for Senators are complete, with only a few exceptions. The results as of now are contained in [Attachment 2](#).

---

**General Education Committee:** **Julia Gergits** reported. The committee's report is contained in [Attachment 3](#). The report contains two sections: A list of approved General Education courses, and an explanation of the denial of the appeal by the Department of Political Science.

**Keith Lepak** moved that the second part of the report be considered separately. Motion was seconded. **Paul Sracic** was recognized to address the Senate: Our concern with the second part of the report is that the Political Science proposal was rejected by the General Education Committee. Our argument is that the committee has missed the forest for the trees. One of the problems we have is with compliance with intensive courses. One solution is to roll intensives into the program. By its nature, Political Science is a writing-intensive discipline. There are not as many guidelines for writing-intensive programmatic proposals as there are for courses. We require roughly 15,000 to 17,000 words of writing in our program. Our students receive written feedback on their writing assignments. We are asking the Senate to affirm that the Political Science major is a writing-intensive major.

**Dr. Lepak** then amended his motion to include overturning the second part of the report and approving the Political Science proposal. Seconded.

**Julia Gergits:** A major part has been writing process requirements. That has always meant drafts and revisions. We reviewed two programs so far that have demonstrated drafting and revisions. There is no evidence of drafting and revision except in one course of the Political Science program. We do not dispute that the program contains plenty of writing, but the lack of specification of drafting and revision is why the committee turned the proposal down and why I hope that the Senate will not overturn our decision.

**Zack Brown:** I am a Political Science major. I feel, as Dr. Sracic has mentioned, that papers are central and essential in our major. As far as drafting and revision, I was in a course that required much drafting and revision. I think that it's clear that our major is a writing-intensive one, and approving the program will enable us to better educate our students.

**Jill Tall:** I was the author of the Biology proposals for program-based intensive approval. This included much data gathering and analysis of course activities. I have worked with Dr. Gergits on this, and I found the General Education Committee very helpful. They provided useful feedback, and they were very reasonable.

**Bege Bowers:** The thing I would like to point out is that one area the Higher Learning Commission has jumped on us for is not enforcing policies. Since we have a policy regarding writing-intensive criteria, those should be adhered to. The Political Science department needs to demonstrate that their proposal meets the criteria of a writing-intensive program.

**David Porter:** Where specifically does it say that a program-based proposal must include more than one course involving drafting?

**Dr. Bowers:** The policy that we have does require drafting and revision. I think the Political Science department needs to show that their courses meet these criteria, if they do.

**Bill Jenkins** was recognized to address the Senate: Before I left the General Education position, it was

recommended that the program-based requests be allowed. We did not intend for that to replace or modify existing policies. If the desire is to change the criteria, then asking that this decision be overturned is not the way to do that.

**Dr. Sracic:** You keep referring to these rules. If the Senate overturns this, it would be modifying the rules so that our drafting and revision would satisfy writing intensive. We are arguing that the committee did not correctly interpret the rules.

**Mark Vopat:** Outside of making every course writing intensive, how does the process work in making a program writing intensive?

**Dr. Gergits:** It depends on individual departments. Biology did something rather elegant. They have different tracks, and they showed that at different points, students get experience with drafting and revision.

**Vern Haynes:** It seems to me we are at cross purposes. We come up with a proposal where a program can satisfy writing intensive requirements. But we failed to come up with specific rules for such programs. It also does not provide an answer to the spreading of this over many classes. If we approve this, we are voting against the General Education Committee, who is using rules not exactly made for program-based rules. Where are the rules?

**Dr. Jenkins:** In response to that, from the beginning of discussing program-based proposal, it was clear that it was not intended to be less than the course-based method. The General Education Committee is specifically saying that drafting and editing equivalent to the course-based method are required. Flexibility is there to allow departments to craft a program that satisfies the revision.

**Paul Sracic:** Where does it say that in the criteria?

**Bill Jenkins** quoted from item #10 in the General Education Committee's report on this matter: "Teach students to: use writing as a means of critical inquiry within a discipline; use a writing process that includes planning, drafting, revising, and editing in response to comments from various readers; focus on a purpose for writing recognized as legitimate within a specific discipline; marshal evidence appropriate to the purpose and recognized as legitimate by the discipline; address an audience of members of the discipline according to their nature; use an appropriate tone; and obey the conventions of writing appropriate to the discipline (including organization, documentation, and mechanical correctness)."

**Dr. Sracic:** I tell students I don't want to see their first drafts. They can show them to other students for comments.

**Mehera Girardo:** For me, the question I have is this: Is there some pedagogical reason why you don't want to include the drafting and revision?

**Dr. Porter:** This argument really is about education and pedagogy. The position taken by the General Education Committee is to have the students physically hand in a draft and get it back, and that's the only way to accomplish this. I use a seminar approach. They have a week to answer questions in 10 to 15 pages. They get them back with comments. If they repeat that error on the next paper, then I write it in capitals and underline it. This method does provide feedback to students. If we rewrite this to meet the criteria, it will not improve our program. It will detract from it. Six seminars and a paper are my requirement. I can't do that under these proposed criteria. It seems to me that we are doing what we need do, whether it meets the rules stated by the General Education Committee or not.

**Thelma Silver:** I do a writing-intensive course. Our students review and edit other students' work and get graded on it.

**Dr. Lepak:** I appreciate that comment. I want to make one point about #10 as mentioned by Dr. Jenkins. The process includes "... drafting, revising, and editing in response to comments from various readers." The assumption that a cookie-cutter process isn't 100% foolproof. When we work with students, we are recognizing differences between students and their styles.

**Diane Barnes:** When History went through the process, we were concerned about much additional work, so we proposed that the writing-intensive be satisfied by different methods depending on the instructor. The General Education Committee worked with us and was very helpful on this.

**Dr. Jenkins:** A comment on the “cookie cutter” approach: The requirements came from people with background in the area of writing. We’re not expecting that every part of every course involve drafting. Throughout high school and college, I received very little feedback on my writing. I would have benefited greatly from that. If the criteria need to be changed, overturning this decision is not the way to do it.

**Dr. Lepak** moved the question.

Vote was taken. **The motion failed.**

---

**Student Academic Grievance Committee:** **Charles Singler** reported. We had three grievances last summer. Everything else that has come to my office has been resolved or dismissed.

---

**Academic Events Committee:** An informational report on committee activities is contained in [Attachment 4](#).

---

**Ad Hoc Committee on Sustainability:** The committee offered a resolution (see [Attachment 5](#)) and moved that the Academic Senate approve the resolution. Vote was taken. **Resolution was approved.**

---

**Ad Hoc Committee on Admissions, Retention, and Student Success:** **Nate Ritchey** reported.

A few months ago, this task force was formed, and we have been working hard. We looked at data on retention and found some interesting results.

Throughout our investigation, we found this: It is apparent that YSU has policies regarding retention, but some people are either unaware of them or are ignoring them. We think the policies that we have are useful and need to be enforced. Our committee will be coming forward with some recommendations in the Fall. These will include recommendations about Freshman year, second year, and actions to be taken even before a new student arrives.

My thanks to Jonelle Beatrice and the members of our committee.

---

**New Business:** None.

---

**Adjournment:** The Academic Senate adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

---

[Return to Top of Page](#)

[Return to Senate Homepage](#)

For further information, e-mail [Bob Hogue](#).

**COVER SHEET TO BE ATTACHED TO ALL REPORTS SUBMITTED TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE**

Date   **May 6, 2009**   Report Number (For Senate Use Only) \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Committee Submitting Report   **Ohio Faculty Council**  

Committee Status: (elected chartered, appointed chartered, ad hoc, etc.)  
\_\_\_\_\_

Names of Committee Members   Chester Cooper and Tammy A. King  

Pease write a brief summary of the report the Committee is submitting to the Senate:  
See Attached Report  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Do you anticipate making a formal motion relative to the report?   N/A  

If so, state the motion: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

If substantive changes in your committee recommendation are made from the floor,  
would the committee prefer that the matter be sent back to committee for further  
consideration? \_\_\_\_\_

Other relevant data: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

  Tammy A. King    
Elected Representative



**Ohio Faculty Council Report**  
**April 10, 2009**  
**Minutes**

- I. Minutes** were approved from the March 13, 2009 meeting.
- II. Open comments** were made by the Chair. The Chancellor is meeting with his lawyer to determine how the OFC can be defined as an advisory group for him.
- III. New Officers were elected** – Rudy Fenwick, UA, will service as the Chair, Keith Bernard, BGSU, will service as Vice-Chair, and Tammy A. King, YSU, will serve as Secretary.
- IV. Old Business** (None)
- V. New Business**
  - 1. Jerry Wicks from Bowling Green made a presentation regarding the use of Ohio railway system to connect all public and private colleges and universities. Dr. Wicks outlined the cost and profit of such a system. He said that every student, staff, and faculty member in Ohio’s higher education system would have to pay \$105.00 a year for the system. They would then be able to use the system year round to attend other universities/colleges or for vacation/recreational purposes. The OFC will review the proposal for endorsement at the May meeting.
  - 2. The Council reviewed the draft of the new SSI formula. The new formula is based on student outcomes versus the old formula which was based on enrollment numbers. The OFC is concerned that there would be pressure, either director or indirect, to lower standards in the classroom. Members of the OFC are working on a resolution regarding the need for faculty to maintain high standards.
- VI. Chancellor Fingerhut met with the Council**
  - 1. He is currently working with legislators in order to change how construction bids are conducted in Ohio. He wants to go with a different system which will speed up the process and allow for the completion of projects to occur quickly. Universities/Colleges are unique in the sense that they bring in private funds that are used towards construction.
    - a. The Chancellor assured the group that all rules pertaining to  
wages, minority participation, and female participation would be strictly adhered to.
    - b. The OFC made a resolution to support these efforts.  
Resolution passed.
  - 2. The Chancellor discussed State Bill 1. This Bill focuses on how monies from the Ohio College Opportunity Grant Program (OCOG) are distributed. The current formula provides students who attend “for profit” institutions 1.5 times more funding then those at public universities. It provides students at private institutions 2 times more funding. He is proposing that “for profit” and “private” institutions be removed from the program. These institutions would be given block grants to distribute to

students. It is also being proposed that the Choice Program, which provides \$500 to students attending private institutions, be eliminated. He said that students at community colleges would receive overall cuts in the sense that funding above the cost of tuition and books would be less. Students at universities would receive additional funding for tuition and books. In other words, he is trying to assure that all students who are “Pell Eligible” receive enough funding for tuition and as much as possible for books. He is not interested in funding living expenses at this time. “For Profit” institutions are fighting this change.

3. The Chancellor was briefed on concerns about the new SSI formula and the proposal concerning Ohio’s railway system.
4. The OFC, at the May meeting, will review HB 801 which deals with public research and copyright issues. Apparently research would remain in copyright rather than immediately go into the public domain. Additional information will be forthcoming.

## **VII. University Reports:**

### NEOUCOM

- 50 percent of NEOUCOM students are staying in Ohio!

### Bowling Green:

- The Hockey team survived the budget cuts.

### Youngstown:

- President Sweet announced he was stepping down in 2010.
- The Board of Trustees announced they would be taking no pay increases. Funds would be donated for student scholarships.

### Cincinnati:

- They will move to a 14 week semester.
- They are currently reorganizing their colleges.
- UC will be cutting athletic scholarships to non-revenue producing sports.

### Akron:

- President received a substantial bonus for meeting performance criteria.

### Ohio U:

- Two years ago the Administration mistakenly raised employee health care contributions. The Faculty Senate is working to assure this situation is rectified and that it does not happen again.

### Ohio State:

- The Faculty Senate approved the move to semesters. The resolution will now be reviewed by their Board of Trustees.
- Dr. Gunther, their OFC Representative, had brain surgery to remove a tumor. A get well card will be sent.

**YSU ACADEMIC SENATE MEMBERSHIP LIST, 2009-2010 (as of 2/10/09)**

<b>BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION</b>		
<b>At Large</b>	<b>Departmental (2009-2011)</b>	<b>Departmental (2008-2010)</b>
Birsen Karpak, Management	Ying Wang, Marketing	J. Rajendran Pandian, Management
Patrick Bateman, Management		Dave Law, Acctg. & Finance
Ram Kasuganti, Management		
Gang Peng, Management		
Ray Shaffer, Acctg & Finance		
Michael Villano, Accounting & Finance		
<b>EDUCATION</b>		
<b>At Large</b>	<b>At Large continued</b>	<b>Departmental (2008-2010)</b>
Regina Rees, Teacher Ed.	Jake Protivnak, Couns/Sp Ed	Victoria Kress, Couns/Sp Ed
Richard Baringer, EFRTL	Gail Saunders-Smith, Teacher Ed.	Susan DeBlois, EFRTL
Leah Gongola, Couns/Sp Ed		Lauren Cummins, Teacher Ed.
<b>FINE &amp; PERFORMING ARTS</b>		
<b>At Large</b>	<b>Departmental (2009-2011)</b>	<b>Departmental (2008-2010)</b>
Darla Funk, Music	John Murphy, Theater/Dance	Dragana Crnjak, Art
Amy Crawford, Communication		Adam Earnhardt, Communication
Francois Fowler, Music		Hae-Jong Lee, Music
Brian Kiser, Music		
Nancy Wolfgang, Theater & Dance		
Allan Mosher, Music		
<b>HEALTH &amp; HUMAN SERVICES</b>		
<b>At Large</b>	<b>Departmental (2007-2011)</b>	<b>Departmental (2008-2010)</b>
Kathylynn Feld, Health Prof	Patricia Wagner, Criminal Justice	Teresa Volsko, Health Professions
Ken Learman, Physical Therapy	vacant, Social Work	Nicole Mullins, HPES
Diane Kandray, Health Professions	Weiqing Ge, Physical Therapy	Virginia Draa, Human Ecology
Tamy King, Criminal Justice	Susan Lisko, Nursing	
Michele McCarroll, HPES		
<b>Liberal Arts &amp; Social Sciences (CLASS)</b>		
<b>At Large</b>	<b>Departmental (2009-2011)</b>	<b>Departmental (2008-2010)</b>
Denise Narcisse, Sociol & Anthro.	Julia Gergits, English	Tomi Ovaska, Economics
Cynthia Vigliotti, English	Alan Tomhave, Phil/Rel.	Ndinzi Masagara, Foreign Language
Loren Lease, Sociol & Anthro.	Keith Lepak, Political Science	LaShale Pugh, Geography
Rick Shale, English	Matt O'Mansky, Sociol & Anthr.	Galadriel Mehera Gherardo, History
Mark Vopat, Phil/Rel.		Julie Boron, Psychology
L.J. (Tess) Tessier, Phil/Rel.		
<b>Science, Technology, Engineering, &amp; Mathematics (STEM)</b>		
<b>At Large</b>	<b>Departmental (2009-2011)</b>	<b>Departmental (2008-2010)</b>
Annette M. Burden, STEM	Jamal Tartir, Math & Stats	Darrell Wallace, MECH & ISEGR
Elvin Shields, MECH & ISEGR	Jeff Dick, Geol & Env. Sci.	Patrick Durrell, Physics & Astronomy
Hazel Marie, CEEGR & CHEGR	Abdurrahman Arslanyilmaz, CSIS	Frank X. Li, ECEGR
Alina Lazar, CSIS	Chet Cooper, Biology	Kin Moy, ENTC
Daryl Mincey, Chemistry	Brian Leskiew, Chemistry	Shakir Husain, CEEGR & CHEGR
Bob Hogue, CSIS		
<b>ADMINISTRATORS (15)</b>		
<b>STUDENTS (15)</b>		

**ELECTIONS AND BALLOTING**

Annette Burden, STEM (09-11)  
Diane Burkhardt, CLASS (09-11)  
vacant, ED (07-09)  
Helen Guchong Han, WCBA (08-10)  
Kenneth Learman, HHS (08-10)  
Misook Yun, F&PA (08-10)

**SENATE EXECUTIVE**

Sunil Ahuja (Senate Chairperson on leave 2008-09)  
Chet Cooper (Senate Vice Chair)  
Bob Hogue (Senate Secretary)  
DeBorah D. Graham, Educ (08-11)  
Frank X. Li, STEM (08-11)  
Ram Kasuganti, WCBA (07-10)  
Kathlynn Feld, HHS (07-10)  
ELECTION BEING HELD NOW, CLASS (09-12)  
John Murphy, FPA (09-12)  
TBA, Administration  
TBA, Student

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

Julia Gergits, Coordinator  
vacant, CLASS (2009-2012)  
Rebecca Curnalia, F&PA (2009-2012)  
Huaiyu Chen, WCBA (2007-2010)  
Renee McManus, HHS (2007-2010)  
Sally Lewis, Educ. (2008-2011)  
Phil Munro, STEM (2008-2011)  
Michael Crist (Artistic/Literary Perspectives)  
Nicole Mullins (Personal/Social Responsibility)  
Felicia Armstrong (Natural Science)  
Roy Mimna (Math/Writing Skills)  
Yaqin Wang (Societies & Institutions)  
Mikaella Miller, Student  
TBA, Student

**1<sup>st</sup> meeting of year all for Nom for Chair: done**  
**Call for 3 nominations for Charter & Bylaws: done**

**CHARTER & BYLAWS**

Eleanor Congdon, CLASS (2008-2011)  
Keith Lepak, CLASS (2008-2011)  
Louise Pavia, HHS, (2008-2011)  
vacant, HHS (2007-2009)  
vacant, STEM (2007-2009)  
vacant, HHS (2007-2009)

**COVER SHEET TO BE ATTACHED TO ALL REPORTS SUBMITTED TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE**

Date: **April 21, 2009** \_\_\_\_\_

Report Number (For Senate Use Only) \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Committee Submitting Report: **General Education Committee**

Committee Status: (elected chartered, appointed chartered, ad hoc, etc.)  
\_\_\_\_\_

Names of Committee Members (members as of 7/10/07) **Julia Gergits, Felicia Armstrong, Huaiyu (Peter) Chen, Michael Crist, Cary Horvath, Matt O'Mansky, Renee McManus, Sue Miller, Roy Mimna, Nicole Mullins, Phil Munro, Yaqin Wang**

Please write a brief summary of the report the Committee is submitting to the Senate:

**The General Education Committee (GEC) has two reports:**

- **The first document lists courses that have been certified by the committee and circulated; no objections have been filed. Except for the first three courses whose certification awaits UCC approval, the courses are certified.**
- **The second document reports the findings of a hearing held by the GEC on the political science department's objection to the committee's decision on programmatic writing-intensive certification. The committee returned the proposal and requested revisions.**

**See attachments.**

Do you anticipate making a formal motion relative to the report?  Yes  No

If so, state the motion:

If substantive changes in your committee recommendation are made from the floor, would the committee prefer that the matter be sent back to committee for further consideration? **Yes**

Other relevant data: \_\_\_\_\_

Julia Gergits (x3419 or 2983)  
Coordinator and Chair, GenEd

# APPENDIX

## Certified General Education Courses

### Pending UCC approval:

- 990575: Public Health 1531 (Fundamentals of Public Health)—Personal and Social Responsibility (PS)
- 990574: Journalism 2604 (Journalism Ethics and Social Responsibilities)—PS
- 990581: Philosophy 2626 (Engineering Ethics)—PS

### Regular GEC Certification:

- 990578: History 1501 (American Dreams)—Societies and Institutions
- 990583: Allied Health 4820 (Directed Research)—Capstone
- 990539: Socio/Gero 3757 (Aging and Social Policy)—Oral Intensive
- 990582: Philosophy 3723 (Philosophy of Law)—Writing Intensive
- 990576: Physics 1500L (conceptual Physics Lab)—Natural Science Lab
- 990579: Geology 2605 (Historical Geology)—Critical-Thinking Intensive

General Education Committee Conclusion:  
**Hearing on Political Science Objection**

**Hearing Date:** April 3, 2009

**In Attendance:** Cary Horvath, Michael Crist, Nicole Mullins, Phil Munro, Yaqin Wang, Sue Miller, Sharon Stringer, Julia Gergits

**Absent** (but consulted via e-mail): Matt O'Mansky, Huaiyu Chen, Renee McManus, Felicia Armstrong, Roy Mimna

**Background:** Political Science proposed writing-intensive programmatic certification. Attached is the original writing-intensive proposal. After its March 19 meeting, the GEC declined certification and offered suggestions for revision; the committee sent copies of successful applications for department-wide certification as examples.

Political Science has three certified writing-intensive courses, but at least some of their majors enroll for only one, leaving the department in non-compliance with the GER. Political Science seeks programmatic writing intensive certification to fill the gap without creating or requiring more writing-intensive courses. They do not include writing-process activities in any of the other courses, nor do they plan to do so. The committee declined the proposal based on the lack of writing-process in any other location than one course.

Paul Sracic declined to revise the proposal or their program and requested that the committee rescind its decision. Dr. Sracic's and Dr. Gergits' e-mail interchange is attached. The committee initiated its hearing process to reconsider the proposal and any new evidence Dr. Sracic might choose to submit. We invited him to attend the hearing and offered two dates. He declined to attend the hearing.

He submitted a second statement (also attached), reiterating his request that the committee reverse its decision.

**Summary of Conclusions:** The GEC re-considered the proposal. The second political-science statement clarified the amount of writing required but did not indicate that the writing process is incorporated outside of the already certified writing-intensive courses. In fact, Dr. Sracic asserted that there is no need to do so: "It should be noted at the outset, however, that the 'Criteria for Writing Intensive Courses' does not actually require any such process. Even if one assumes, as the committee does, that some drafting and redrafting needs to take place, there is no requirement that it be spread across more than one class."

The GEC declines certification of the proposal and encourages Political Science to revise its proposal. The committee observed a lack of enough clear detail concerning how the program would meet drafting and revision requirements. This may require some course revision to include drafting and revision. No single class need bear the brunt of this revision process. That was the original intent of the programmatic option: to allow drafting and writing to be distributed through a program rather than focused in two courses. There was never any intent to dispense with a core part of the original writing and writing process requirements, as review of committee minutes from that time period and presentations to senate will indicate.

Dr. Sracic asked that the committee outline which of the ten criteria for a writing-intensive course are not met in Political Science's proposal. The committee determined that the proposal fails to meet criteria 7, 8, 9, and 10:

7. Prepare students to write for specific purposes and audiences.
8. Employ a "learning to write" approach (aimed at teaching students to write as members of a professional discourse community) in addition to a "writing to learn" approach (aimed at using writing as a tool of inquiry and discovery of disciplinary information).
9. Include instruction on the writing process – the interconnected activities of planning, drafting, revising and editing writing.
10. Teach students to: use writing as a means of critical inquiry within a discipline; use a writing process that includes planning, drafting, revising, and editing in response to comments from various readers; focus on a purpose for writing recognized as legitimate within a specific discipline; marshal evidence appropriate to the purpose and recognized as legitimate by the discipline; address an audience of members of the discipline according to their nature; use an appropriate tone; and obey the conventions of writing appropriate to the discipline (including organization, documentation, and mechanical correctness).

The GEC has the authority and experience to review proposals. It has reviewed and approved writing-intensive proposals since 2000; it has approved the first programmatic writing-intensives this year. The policy regarding the new format was created by the GEC; all aspects of its guidelines and implementation were created by the GEC.



## E-mail Archive: Paul Sracic, Political Science chair, and Julia Gergits, GEC chair

*From Gergits, dated 3/26/09*

Paul,

I'm sorry that this took so long to get back to you—I waited so that the missing GEC members could vote and add comments if they choose to. The consensus is pretty much what you already heard. One of the missing members wrote, "In reviewing the portal docs, it appears that the political science proposal is the only one still in discussion. I don't think the proposal meets the criteria, as it requires drafting and re-drafting in only the one course." She also asked whether this would also apply to the minor, which I assume that it doesn't (we've received proposals for minors as intensive, which is an interesting alternative).

I'm attaching a zipped folder with two examples (biology and history) that did an excellent job with the WI programmatic proposal. As you'll see, drafting appears in various places. In history, it's in all of their upper-division courses, which is far more than we expected anyone. In biology, it's in selected courses, but it's impossible in any of their various degree programs to miss sufficient drafting and writing. In Political Science's case, it's clear that plenty of writing is required; the missing piece is the process. In the programmatic proposals, we look that at least as much drafting as now is required, but it can be on far shorter documents and spread out differently than anticipated in the original format. The committee agreed that, in creating the programmatic option, they had not abandoned the writing-process requirements and that one course is insufficient to fulfill that requirement.

I'd be happy to talk to you further about this, of course.

Julia

Julia M. Gergits  
Professor, Department of English  
Coordinator, General Education Program  
Youngstown State University  
Youngstown, Ohio 44555

*From Sracic, 3/26/09*

To: The General Education Committee

From: Paul Sracic  
Chair, Dept. of Political Science

RE: Political Science Programmatic Writing Intensive Proposal

The criteria for evaluating WI intensive courses are listed in the appendix to proposal form. Please indicate the specific criterion or criteria that are not fulfilled by our program. Criterion 9 states that courses must "include instruction on the writing process – the interconnected activities of planning, drafting, revising and editing writing." It does not say anywhere in this criterion or in the other criteria that the drafting and redrafting of each individual assignment must take place.

If the GEC is not able to explain how the Political Science proposal fails to satisfy the specific criteria stated in appendix, then the committee is not authorized to reject the proposal. The GEC is an implementing, not a rule-making committee. The academic standards for YSU are set by the aptly named Academic Standards Committee and are approved by the Senate.

If the GEC has in the past applied different standards when reviewing WI courses (or any other Gen Ed course), then the GEC is in error. The GEC has no power to revise the general education standards based on its own understandings of what the general education program should mandate.

We will not revise our proposal. Your decision will be appealed to the Academic Senate.

*From Gergits, 3/26/09*

The process, as you no doubt know, is to appeal to the committee, as you are now doing. The committee has copies of all e-mails relating to this issue. We'll discuss the appeal at our next meeting, which is next Friday (April 3). We will report to you the results of that review. You may, if you wish, attend that meeting, too, since it's your appeal.

There are some factual errors in your assertions below, the most important of which is the assertion that we insisted that all assignments must be drafted and revised. That is not the case, nor was it the case in the examples that we sent you. As noted both in that meeting and in my original e-mail, the committee has looked for the same approximate amount of drafting that exists in the two-course option, but arranged differently and appropriately for a discipline.

I'll double-check with Chet Cooper to determine our committee's obligation after its consideration. As you also know very well, we don't usually present to Senate proposals that are denied to the Senate, and I'm not sure of the process for bypassing the committee's decisions.

Of course, new business can always be brought to the Senate floor.

Julia

Julia M. Gergits  
Professor, Department of English  
Coordinator, General Education Program  
Youngstown State University  
Youngstown, Ohio 44555

*From Gergits 3/30/09*

As I noted in the previous e-mail, we will follow the process for a hearing outlined in the general-education documents regarding your objection e-mailed to the committee. Our next meeting is this Friday (4/3) at 9:00 in the provost's conference. You have the right to appear and speak at this meeting or to send a representative, but you are not required to attend.

As a courtesy to you, if you cannot make this meeting but would like to speak to the committee again, we could schedule you at the April 16 meeting instead. It will be at 9:00 again; this time in Kilcawley 2068.

The process outlined in the GEC document offers departments the chance to present reasons for changing a decision. After that meeting, the GEC will report its decision within five days. Then GEC will include that decision in the senate report.

Please let me know whether you wish to appear and which day you prefer.

Julia

*From Sracic, 4/2/09*

As I have already informed you, I will not be attending the meeting on Friday. What follows is the response of the Political Science Department to the decision of GER Committee.

Paul

Political Science Response.

As we understand the committee's decision, the Political Science proposal was rejected because we are requiring a drafting and redrafting assignment in only one course.

It should be noted at the outset, however, that the "Criteria for Writing Intensive Courses" does not actually require any such process.

Even if one assumes, as the committee does, that some drafting and redrafting needs to take place, there is no requirement that it be spread across more than one class. Would the committee approval a proposal for a writing intensive class where 2500 words were written, while only 1250 words were subject to drafting and redrafting? If a student took two of these courses, would he or she have completed their writing intensive requirement? Students in Political Science are required to take 11 classes in their major. We offer only 4 lower division classes. This means that each of our students takes at least 7 upper division classes. They will therefore be required to write at least 17,500 words. Of these 17,500, 2500 words are subject to the drafting and redrafting requirements. Drafting and redrafting of the same paper, however, is only one way of offering instruction in the writing process. In each upper division class, students have papers returned to them filled with comments relating to grammar and style. Presumably, a student who receives a low grade for a poorly written essay in one class, will use those comments as a guide to how to improve their writing in future classes. And this process goes on as they move from class to class.

Indeed, I would argue that having students use the comments made on a single paper to improve their overall writing performance is precisely what we are aiming for in mandating a writing intensive curriculum. The proposal for Political Science ought to be approved without revision. If the proposal is not approved on appeal, we ask that the committee provide an explanation which specifically references which of the 10 rules listed under "Criteria for Writing Intensive Courses" we have violated.

Thank you for taking the time to consider this appeal.

COVER SHEET TO BE ATTACHED TO ALL REPORTS SUBMITTED TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Date **April 16, 2009** \_\_\_ Report Number (For Senate Use Only) \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Committee Submitting Report **Academic Events Committee** \_\_\_\_\_

Committee Status: (elected chartered, appointed chartered, ad hoc, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

---

Names of Committee Members **Jill Tall Gifford (Chair), Rich Baringer, Jeff Tyus, Jennie Wood, Alyssa Lenhoff, Eleanor Congdon, John Sarkissian, Bill Vendemia, Jan Elias, Charles Singler, Mike McGiffin, Jeremy Adkins-Hill**

Please write a brief summary of the report the Committee is submitting to the Senate:  
**Our committee has made its selection for the mace bearers for the 2009-2010 commencement ceremonies. This information has been provided to the Chair of Academic Senate and the Office of the Provost.**

---

Do you anticipate making a formal motion relative to the report? \_\_\_\_\_ **NO** \_\_\_\_\_

If so, state the motion: \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

---

If substantive changes in your committee recommendation are made from the floor, would the committee prefer that the matter be sent back to committee for further consideration? **YES** \_\_\_\_\_

Other relevant data: \_\_\_\_\_

---

Jill (Tall) Gifford

---

Chair

*“Reversing global warming is the defining challenge of the 21st century. We face a crisis that threatens society's very viability. Eliminating this threat successfully will mean transforming our economy, our institutions, our daily lives within a generation, a challenge of massive proportion. Higher Education has a unique role in America. It has been granted tax-free status, the ability to receive public and private funds, and academic freedom, in exchange for educating students and producing the knowledge that will result in a thriving civil society. For these reasons, higher education has a moral and social responsibility to rise to this challenge.”*

—From the website of the American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment ([www.presidentsclimatecommitment.org](http://www.presidentsclimatecommitment.org))

## **A Resolution**

Whereas, Youngstown State University is an institution of higher learning and a major economic force in the region; and

Whereas, the University is an opinion leader in the local community; and

Whereas, the University takes seriously its mission to “lead in the discovery, dissemination, and application of knowledge; advance civic, scientific, and technological development; and foster collaboration to enrich the region and the world;” and

Whereas, the global climate crisis humanity faces is also a local crisis with local consequences; and

Whereas, the University may be able to realize significant efficiencies by reducing its use of natural resources,

We, members of the Academic Senate of Youngstown State University, resolve that Youngstown State University initiate a comprehensive plan to work toward climate neutrality by acting immediately on the following fronts:

## **One**

Bring the study of climate change and issues of sustainability into the forefront of its academic and research pursuits by

- Addressing course content in any relevant course as it relates to sustainability;
- Encouraging research that promotes sustainability;
- Evaluating the potential to incorporate sustainability into the general education requirements, while recognizing the desire to not increase the burden of the general education curriculum.

## **Two**

Establish a permanent committee, consisting of faculty, staff, administration, and students, and appointed by the Faculty Senate, the YSU Student Government Association, and the University administration to study the University's environmental impact and make recommendations across the institution that will reduce our environmental footprint and move YSU closer to climate neutrality and sustainability. Specific recommended actions include:

- Conducting a campus-wide awareness campaign about how individual choices and actions affect our individual and collective impact on the environment and, at the same time, provide an economic benefit to the institution.
- Identifying at the office/department level a sustainability advocate who will educate other employees about good sustainability practices and be a point person for news and information about the greening of YSU.
- Exploring opportunities for policy change that will reduce environmental impact and may result in increased efficiency and reduced costs.
- Proposing widespread policy change and resource allocation that will allow YSU to be a community and regional leader in environmental awareness and scientific research.
- Exploring the feasibility of the University's signing on to the American College and University President's Climate Commitment.

**YSU ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE ROSTER – May 6, 2009**

**At Large**

*[Signature]* Birsen Karpak, Management  
 Jane Reid, Marketing  
 Ram Kasuganti, Management  
 Gang Peng, Management  
 Ray Shaffer, Acctg & Finance

**At Large**

Regina Rees, Teacher Ed.  
*[Signature]* Richard Baringer, EFRTL  
*[Signature]* Benjamin McGee, Couns/Sp Ed

**At Large**

Darla Funk, Music  
*[Signature]* John Murphy, Theater & Dance  
*[Signature]* Francois Fowler, Music  
 Brian Kiser, Music  
 Jane Shanabarger, Theater & Dance  
*[Signature]* Allan Mosher, Music

**At Large**

*[Signature]* Kathlynn Feld, Health Prof  
*[Signature]* Sue Leson, Human Ecology  
 Patty Hoyson, Nursing  
 Tammy King, Criminal Justice  
*[Signature]* Nancy Wagner, Nursing  
*[Signature]* Diane Kandray, Health Prof

**At Large**

Diane Barnes, History  
 Eleanor Congdon, History  
*[Signature]* Vern Haynes, Psychology  
*[Signature]* Rick Shale, English  
 Nancy White, Psychology  
 L.T. (Tess) Tessier, Phil/Rel.

**At Large**

*[Signature]* Chet Cooper, Biology  
 Phil Munro, ECEN  
 Hazel Marie, CHEN  
*[Signature]* Alina Lazar, CSIS  
*[Signature]* Daryl Mincey, Chemistry  
*[Signature]* Bob Hogue, CSIS

Martin Abraham  
*[Signature]* Cynthia Anderson  
*[Signature]* Jonelle Beatrice  
*[Signature]* Bege Bowers  
*[Signature]* Jef Davis

**At Large (5)**

Jason Heyman  
 L. Mikaella Miller  
*[Signature]* Ray Michaels  
*[Signature]* Zach Brown  
 Ben Kalaman

**BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION**

**Departmental (2007-2009)**  
*[Signature]* Peter Reday, Marketing

**Departmental (2008-2010)**

*[Signature]* J Rajendran Pandian, Management  
 Dave Law, Acctg. & Finance

**EDUCATION**

**At Large continued**

*[Signature]* Jake Protivnak, Couns/Sp Ed  
 Gail Saunders-Smith, Teacher Ed.

**Departmental (2008-2010)**

Victoria Kress, Couns/Sp Ed  
 Susan DeBlois, EFRTL  
*[Signature]* Lauren Cummins, Teacher Ed.

**FINE & PERFORMING ARTS**

**Departmental (2007-2009)**

*[Signature]* Dennis Henneman, Thtr/Dance

**Departmental (2008-2010)**

Dragana Crnjak, Art  
*[Signature]* Adam Earnhardt, Communication  
 Hae-Jong Lee, Music

**HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES**

**Departmental (2007-2009)**

Gordon Frissora, Criminal Justice  
*[Signature]* Thelma Silver, Social Work  
*[Signature]* Ken Learman, Physical Therapy  
*[Signature]* Renee McManus, Nursing

**Departmental (2008-2010)**

Teresa Volsko, Health Professions  
*[Signature]* Nicole Mullins, HPES  
 Virginia Draa, Human Ecology

**Liberal Arts & Social Sciences (CLASS)**

**Departmental (2007-2009)**

Tim Francisco, English  
*[Signature]* Mark Vopat, Phil/Rel.  
 Sunil Ahuja, Political Science  
*[Signature]* Loren Lease, Sociol & Anthr,

**Departmental (2008-2010)**

Tomi Ovaska, Economics  
 Ndinzi Masagara, For. Language  
*[Signature]* Lashale Pugh, Geography  
*[Signature]* Galadriel Mehera Gerardo, History  
 Julie Boron, Psychology

**Science, Technology, Engineering, & Mathematics (STEM)**

**Departmental (2007-2009)**

*[Signature]* Annette Burden, Math & Stats  
 Jeff Dick, Geol & Env. Sci.  
 Kriss Schueller, CSIS  
*[Signature]* Jill Tall, Biology  
*[Signature]* Brian Leskiw, Chemistry

**Departmental (2008-2010)**

*[Signature]* Darrell Wallace, ISEN  
 Patrick Durrell, Physics & Astron.  
 Frank X. Li, ECEN  
*[Signature]* Kin Moy, Eng. Technology  
 Shakir Husain, CHEN

**ADMINISTRATORS (15)**

*[Signature]* Michael Crist  
*[Signature]* Joseph Edwards  
*[Signature]* Janice Elias  
*[Signature]* Shearle Furnish  
*[Signature]* Philip Ginnetti

*[Signature]* Ikram Khawaja  
*[Signature]* Peter Kasvinsky  
*[Signature]* Paul Kobulnicky  
 Betty Jo Licata  
 Thomas Maraffa

**STUDENTS**

**School/College**

*[Signature]* Gary Davenport, CLASS  
*[Signature]* Ian Peshel, STEM  
*[Signature]* Nicole Peterson, FPA  
 Erica Cross, Business  
 Marie Mars, Graduate  
 Juliana Merhaut, HHS  
 Justin Jones, Educ.

**Student Government**

Mike McGiffin – President  
 ✓ ~~Shanna Kelly - Executive V.P.~~  
 Maddie D'Orio, Chair of Acad. Aff.

→ Abbie Turford, Exec VP

*[Signature]*